CRITICAL NEW LITERACIES

Foreign Language Education in Japan

Exploring Qualitative Approaches

Sachiko Horiguchi, Yuki Imoto and Gregory S. Poole (Eds.)

Foreword by Ryuko Kubota

SensePublishers

Foreign Language Education in Japan

CRITICAL NEW LITERACIES: THE PRAXIS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING (PELT)

Volume 3

Series Editors:

Marcelle Cacciattolo, *Victoria University, Australia*
Tarquam McKenna, *Victoria University, Australia*
Shirley Steinberg, *University of Calgary; Director of Institute of Youth and Community Studies, University of the West of Scotland*
Mark Vicars, *Victoria University, Australia*

As a praxis-based sequence these texts are specifically designed by the team of international scholars to engage in local in-country language pedagogy research. This exciting and innovative series will bring a dynamic contribution to the development of critical new literacies. With a focus on literacy teaching, research methods and critical pedagogy, the founding principle of the series is to investigate the practice of new literacies in English language learning and teaching, as negotiated with relevance to the localized educational context. It is being and working alongside people in the world that is at the core of the PELT viewpoint. The Praxis of English Language Teaching and Learning series will focus on inter-culturality and interdisciplinary qualitative inquiry and the dissemination of “non-colonised” research.

Foreign Language Education in Japan

Exploring Qualitative Approaches

Foreword by Ryuko Kubota

Edited by

Sachiko Horiguchi
Temple University Japan Campus, Tokyo, Japan

Yuki Imoto
Keio University, Tokyo, Japan

and

Gregory S. Poole
Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan

SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6300-323-0 (paperback)
ISBN: 978-94-6300-324-7 (hardback)
ISBN: 978-94-6300-325-4 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
https://www.sensepublishers.com/

All chapters in this book have undergone peer review.

Cover photo: courtesy of Jin Sakai

Printed on acid-free paper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RYUKO KUBOTA

FOREWORD

"Globalization" has become a catchword to describe and transform various facets of our contemporary society. The word conjures up a borderless society in which diverse people, commodities, and information traverse freely, creating numerous opportunities for exchanging and sharing perspectives, customs, and values. Of the many real and virtual global spaces created in business, media, entertainment, and education, one concrete example of a global space is the international sport event. In preparation for the Tokyo Summer Olympics of 2020, the then newly elected Governor of Tokyo, Yoichi Masuzoe, visited the Sochi Winter Games of 2014. During the press conference upon his return, he made the following comments about Sochi:[1]

> … One problem was that they only spoke Russian. Usually when we go abroad and shop, people there can at least say, "*One, two, three*" (in English) … No language other than Russian was spoken. The same can be said about Japan. It'd be no good if only Japanese could be used. As I said before, I think it's good to have volunteer interpreters, to have English conversation lessons. … Actually the first official language of the Olympics is French and the second is English. … So I think it'll be good if some people serve as volunteers in French. … (original in Japanese)

Some readers may be puzzled by the logic of this comment. Clearly, if Russian people are unlikely to speak English, then the host of the Tokyo Olympics should provide interpretation service in Russian. However, the oddity of the comment is perhaps unquestioned by most people in Japan due to a prevailing discourse that equates "global" (or anything "foreign") with "English" (and "French" in this particular case), while entirely disregarding actual linguistic practices and demands.

As the above comment suggests, issues of teaching additional languages are fraught with paradoxes. These paradoxes are intertwined with politics and ideologies at the state, institutional, and individual levels, as focused in this book. For another example of paradox, we can take a look at Canada, where I currently live. Compared to the anti-bilingual education policies and sentiments in the United States, Canadian language education policy appears to be progressive, as represented by its successful French immersion programs (i.e., bilingual education in French and English for English-speaking students). However, a closer look at the situation reveals that the Canadian support for bilingual education applies only to the two official languages—English and French, or "white settlers' languages." The fact that there are very few bilingual or immersion programs in languages other than the official languages implies the political marginalization of indigenous peoples and settlers of color (Haque, 2012; Haque & Patrick, 2015). The irony is that the lack of an official language in the United States, which leads to fewer legal or financial constraints in education, perhaps has enabled local school administrators, teachers, and parents to support far more varieties of programs, including immersion, two-way immersion, and bilingual programs, in various languages.

As in the United States, no official language is specified in Japan. However, in actuality, Japanese is assigned the status of an official language. Another dominant language in Japan with a symbolic (but not necessarily pragmatic) status is English, as we have discussed in the Tokyo governor's comment above, and as was epitomized in the public discussion and debates surrounding a proposal made in 2000 about making English an official language (see Butler & Iino, 2005; Kubota, 2002). Although the 2000 proposal was never adopted, education policy and practice implemented since then have reflected a further prioritization of English language teaching and learning. A paradox here is that the emphasis on English does not necessarily correspond to actual linguistic demands in domestic or international workplaces; multilingualism and locally situated linguistic practice, rather than a universal use of English, is the norm (see Murata in this volume; Kubota & McKay, 2009; Kubota, 2013; see also increased international scholarly attention to multilingualism and plurilingualism—e.g., Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Martin-Jones, Blackledge, & Creese, 2012). Nevertheless, the discourse of English as a universally useful lingua franca shapes policies and practices in various institutions in Japan, while marginalizing the teaching of foreign languages other than English,

It is important to note that the emphasis on English language learning, which signifies an outward orientation and the neoliberal ideology of human capital development (Kubota, 2011; Park & Lo, 2012), paradoxically coexists with an inward thrust toward nationalism in Japan. Enhancing global capitalism dominated by multinational corporations, neoliberalism has transformed a welfare state into a corporate-style society of competitiveness supported by a flexible and unstable employment system. Developing communication skills especially in English is deemed part of the essential competence to survive in this unstable and yet globalized workforce. Conversely, this emphasis on the outward vision of internationalization (*kokusaika*) and globalization (*gurōbaruka*) has also promoted patriotic values in social and educational contexts. The nationalistic trend is being strengthened under the Abe conservative government's uncompromising stance toward conflicts with neighboring countries. Such a trend is further fueled by xenophobia overtly expressed by some citizens who experience social and economical marginalization, which is not unrelated to the economic disparity created by neoliberalism and the nation's economic stagnation (Yasuda, 2012).

The above discussion raises a host of questions especially with regard to English language education: What is the ultimate goal of learning English? Is it to increase individual economic mobility, to enhance economic competitiveness of the nation, to express and disseminate the nationalistic interest, or rather to promote border-crossing communicative competence with critical understanding of culture, history, and ideology (Kubota, 2012)? Does teaching English foster "global human resources"—a recent buzzword in Japan—or "'docile' bodies" (Foucault, 1995, 138)—neoliberal subjects with linguistic skills and subjugated dispositions?

The outward-inward tension creates contradictions in not only teaching English as a foreign language but in other aspects of language education. For instance, teaching a heritage language in a globalized society naturally necessitates negotiation with linguistic practice that reflects hybridity and diaspora, given the fact that language is increasingly used across linguistic, cultural, and ethnic borders. The neoliberal notions of human capital and "global human resources" imply the need to foster plurilingual individuals and build a multilingual society. Such outward trends run into conflict with an inward convergent worldview that attempts to determine what type of heritage language should be taught in what way and what kind of national identity should be fostered (see Blackledge & Creese, 2010 for the U.K. context).

This indicates that language education is shaped by a complex interplay between policy and practice, which hides or reveals coherent or paradoxical discourses. This also indicates that the ways in which power is exercised in language education symbolizes governmentality. Drawing on the notion of governmentality discussed by Foucault, Pennycook (2002) argues that language education policy and practice should be understood as a multiplicity of means and techniques to exercise power, through which policies and governances are enacted as local practices, rather than as an imposition of rules and laws by means of authoritative power only. This perspective encourages us to analyze how not only macro-level discourse, but also diverse micro-level discourses and social practices (e.g., social, cultural, political, economic, scholarly, and educational activities) function to enact governmental power. Thus, exploring how language education policies and practices are carried out at both macro and micro levels—e.g., state, institutional, classroom, and individual dimensions—will enable us to understand how practices, no matter how seemingly incoherent or paradoxical, are organized through discourses that circulate power and to explore where resistance might exist. In this sense, this book offers valuable knowledge and perspectives on language education as the embodiment of politics and practices in diverse locations in Japan and beyond.

NOTE

1 http://www.metro.tokyo.jp/GOVERNOR/KAIKEN/TEXT/2014/140227.htm

REFERENCES

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism.* London, England & New York, NY: Continuum.
Butler, Y. G., & Iino, M. (2005). Current Japanese reforms in English language education: The 2003 "Action Plan." *Language Policy, 4*, 25–45.
Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.
Haque, E. (2012). *Multilingualism within a bilingual framework.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
Haque, E., & Patrick, D. (2015). Indigenous languages and the racial hierarchisation of language policy in Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 36,* 27–41.
Kubota, R. (2002). Impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 13–28). London, England: Routledge.
Kubota, R. (2011). Questioning linguistic instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education, 22,* 248–260.
Kubota, R. (2012). The politics of EIL: Toward border-crossing communication in and beyond English. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 55–69). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
Kubota, R. (2013). Language is only a tool: Japanese expatriates working in China and implications for language teaching. *Multilingual Education, 3*(4). Available from http://www.multilingual-education.com/content/3/1/4
Kubota, R., & McKay, S. (2009). Globalization and language learning in rural Japan: The role of English in the local linguistic ecology. *TESOL Quarterly, 43,* 593–619.
Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (Eds.). (2012). *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism.* New York, NY: Routledge.
Park, J. S.-Y., & Lo, A. (2012). Transnational South Korea as a site for a sociolinguistics of globalization: Markets, timescales, neoliberalism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 16,* 147-164.
Pennycook, A. (2002). Language policies and docile bodies: Hong Kong and governmentality. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 92–110). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Yasuda, K. (2012). *Netto to aikoku: Zaitoku kai no "yami" o oikakete* [The internet and patriotism: Chasing the "darkness" of Zaitokukai (Citizens' League to Deny Foreigners Special Rights)]. Tokyo, Japan: Kodansha.

Ryuko Kubota
University of British Columbia

PREFACE

This project originated from a panel session titled "Changes and Continuities in Japanese Educational Institutions: Foreign Language Education and the Discourses of Multi-Culturalism" that was organized by Imoto and Horiguchi for the Annual Meeting of the Anthropology of Japan in Japan, held at Temple University Japan in 2009.

The issues raised in the panel resonated with many of the conference participants, who had experience teaching English or were involved in international education in Japan and who saw the necessity of addressing language education policy from the ground level using qualitative approaches. We are grateful for the constructive comments we received from the panel audience, and particularly to Jerry Eades who encouraged us to bring the papers to publication.

It is hard to believe that the project has since then extended into a six-year conversation, orchestrated by Greg Poole. We thank Thomas Hardy for providing us the comfortable space of his home for the numerous lively authors' meetings over meals and drinks. And we thank all contributors for their good humor and patience in this long process and for their continuing friendship and intellectual support. The real fruits of the project have undoubtedly been in the hours of discussion and thinking that took place among applied linguists and anthropologists as well as between the editors. We hope that the manuscript is not only a reflection of this process but a springboard toward further dialogue.

Since the initial inception of this project, much has moved on in the field of Japanese education, not to mention the deep impact of the triple disasters of March 2011 on Japanese society. We believe that the fundamental issues that this volume raises such as power, local contexts, and the need for dialogues, are still, if not more, relevant today.

Finally, we extend our sincere gratitude to the series editors, Marcelle Cacciattolo, Tarquam McKenna, Mark Vicars, Shirley Steinberg, publisher Peter de Liefde, Kim Schuefftan, Yuka Mizuno, Akiko Katayama, and Kumiko Sawaguchi.

Japanese names within each chapter are written as in the vernacular, surname first followed by given name. 100 JPY (¥100) is equivalent to approximately 0.80 USD ($0.80).

Sachiko Horiguchi
Yuki Imoto
Gregory S. Poole

SACHIKO HORIGUCHI, YUKI IMOTO
AND GREGORY S. POOLE

1. INTRODUCTION

VOICES FROM THE FIELD

Language education is a perennially contested arena within a nation and one that arouses an array of sentiments and identity conflicts. What languages, or what varieties of a language, are to be taught and learned, and how? By whom, for whom, for what purposes and in what contexts? Such questions concern not only policy makers but also teachers, parents, students, as well as businesspeople, politicians, and other social actors. With the gradual dismantling of "modern" ideologies that had bound one language to one nation-state, such contests are now being uncovered, revealing fluid, pluralistic notions and practices of language by individuals at the local level. The heightened discourse of "globalization" and the dominance of English as the "global" language means that, for many countries, concerns are increasingly directed towards English language education.

This volume seeks to present the cacophony of voices in the field of language education for the case of Japan, with a focus on English language education, which has been a dominating concern throughout the postwar period. We explore the complex and intricate relationship between the "local" and the "global" (see also Poole, 2008), and more specifically the links between the levels of policy, educational institutions, classrooms, and the individual. Broadly put, such an exploration that takes a *qualitative* approach to the study of language education is pressing, within a climate that favors standardization towards global norms and emphasizes quantified evidence based on statistical data to reinforce those norms. In this introductory chapter, we set out the social and historical context of education, and particularly of foreign-language education, to show how the Japanese case speaks to larger global trends. We wish to thus provide a thematic and theoretical basis for bringing together researchers in applied linguistics, sociology, anthropology, as well as concerned educators and English speakers in Japan, into the discussion that follows in this volume.

THE JAPANESE CASE: INTER/NATIONALISM, "GLOBAL STANDARDS" IN EDUCATION, AND THE SYMBOLIC NATURE OF ENGLISH-LANGUAGE EDUCATION

From a historical and socio-political perspective, Japan poses an interesting and illuminating case for studying the processes of language education and policy. Despite

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 1–18.

the emergent discourses of multiculturalism, as a society it is mostly perceived and portrayed through the media, education, and other public arenas, as "monolingual." On the other hand, Japan is often described as a keen and creative "borrower" of foreign systems, including its language, which combines Chinese-originated and Western-originated loan words distinguished in its three-part orthography. The creative and "permeable" nature of the Japanese language, however, when placed against English and set in the international context, becomes an impenetrable, primordial, and mystified culture. A very brief portrayal of how the concepts of "language," "Japanese," and "English" have developed in relation to the changing education system—intricately tied to social, political, and economic changes—will help us to explain how these are in turn linked to the notion of "culture," which we wish to problematize in this chapter.

The formation of a standardized national language, *kokugo* (Yeonsuk, 1996; Carroll, 1997; Mashiko, 2010), can be largely attributed to the establishment of the modern education system that began as part of the Meiji government's enterprise of Westernization. As scholars have pointed out, however, it was only after World War II that the ideology of a homogeneous, mass middle-class society came to be operationalized, and this has been upheld by a highly standardized educational system structured by rigorous entrance examinations—the belief that homogeneity and education has enabled Japan to attain a highly literate and efficient workforce, the engine that drives the nation's economic power (see Oguma, 2004; Marshall, 1994). As Japan joined the ranks of the economic superpowers and gained confidence on the international stage in the 1980s, discourses of "internationalization" were paralleled with expressions of Japanese identity. *Nihonjinron* (theories on the Japanese) literature proliferated during this period of internationalization, which often made reference to the "uniqueness" of Japanese culture and its inseparability from the Japanese language, both only truly understandable by those of "Japanese blood" (Miller, 1982). The use of "internationalism" to express Japanese national identity was particularly prevalent in the 1980s, when conservative Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro propounded a series of educational reforms to drive Japan's internationalization. Although the extent of the outcome of reforms are contested, his legacies can be identified in the contemporary context (Hood, 2001), with Liddicoat (2007, 42) stating that "Japanese policy in relation to the teaching and learning of English in Japan and of Japanese abroad appears concerned with increasing the symbolic power of Japanese in a global linguistic marketplace."

Since the 1990s with the burst of the economic bubble, the myth of a homogeneous, middle-class Japan has been dismantled, to be replaced by discourses of a stratified society. There has been an increased visibility of poverty, and a problematization of the apathy of younger generations in a social system faced with serious financial and demographic issues in accommodating a super-ageing, declining population (see Allison, 2013; Kingston, 2012; Goodman et al., 2011; Oguma, 2012). Serious fiscal problems led to the dramatic implementation of neoliberal ideologies, which had begun to be formulated during the Nakasone era but had previously been held back by ministry-dominant politics (Schoppa, 1993; Hood, 2003). With increasing dominance of neoliberalism in economic, social, and education reforms in postindustrial nations from the 1970s (Takayama, 2008; Kubota, 2011b), efficiency, decentralization, and flexibilization became key words that found their way to Japan particularly during Prime Minister Koizumi's reform years from 2004, with much that had previously been controlled by the state being off-loaded to the market.

Under a neoliberal regime, education becomes redefined as a market-driven private commodity. In terms of Japanese education, neoliberal restructuring was steadily taking place as in other postindustrial states, despite being disarticulated and masked under discourses that focused on the buzz word of *kosei* (individuality) since the 1980s and, more radically, of *yutori* ("relaxed" education) reforms since the 1990s (Takayama, 2009). The increasingly visible shift of power from state bureaucracy to the business sector also meant a move away from postwar egalitarianism to a multitrack system that would better serve the changing economic structures; six-year integrated "elite" secondary schools were introduced, breaking down the postwar 6-3-3 single-track system, and school choice and ability grouping were also introduced.

At the levels of compulsory education, a sense of "crisis" concerning failing academic standards ensued after the *yutori* reforms were implemented in 2002 (Tsuneyoshi, 2004). The relaxed curriculum saw a 30% reduction of curricular content but soon after it was introduced into public schools, it incited criticism from various groups, including the neoconservatives, who called for a return to "basics" and to more "traditional," rigorous styles of education, as well as those on the left (e.g., Kariya, 2012; Fujita, 2010), who saw the reforms as leading to social disparity and a widening academic gap (Goodman, 2003). These critiques coincided with "the PISA shock" in 2003, when Japan's academic performance in the world rankings saw "a significant drop" (see Takayama, 2008). The "problem of declining academics standards" was heavily reported in the media, and the 2008 revisions with increased academic content in the Curriculum Guidelines put a quick end to the 2002 reforms.

The levels of access to English-language education is also increasingly being perceived as stratified, with English-language skills being one symbolic "global capital" in the context of a more flexible, school-to-work transition where students can no longer depend on the "protection" of a company offering lifetime employment or the "name" of a top university on a resume (Brinton, 2011). Neoliberal discourses emphasize that it is the responsibility of the individual to acquire the information and skills, including communication or language ability, that are considered important for the new knowledge economy—self-development of the "human capital" needed to survive in a competitive labor market (Keeley, 2007). English attainment is thus increasingly stratified, not only generationally but also in terms of class and gender through the commodified English education market—private language conversation and cram schools with an "international" orientation serving those with the economic means, especially women with ambitions for upward mobility through the cultural capital of English skills (Kitamura, 2011). As Kubota (2011b) finds, together with this neoliberal promise of English giving individuals a competitive edge and the accountability framework that measures this skill, language teaching has increasingly focused on the superficial aspects of language competence that can be "objectively" quantified and tested by language exams, while overlooking the many personal, cultural, and historical dimensions of the subjective experience of language learning and language use, or "translanguaging" (Garcia & Wei, 2014).

While the distribution of discourses of "internationalization" and English education has thus become diverse and stratified, the public discourse has shifted to the current overarching buzzword of "globalization," which is more about aligning with the "global standard" for survival of individuals in the market than of asserting national identity. However, the power balance between the two is a volatile and ambivalent one (Seargeant, 2011) and, as Kubota (2013) also notes, the sociopolitical climate of Japan during this period of "globalization" has been characterized by growing nationalism.[1]

The following more recent policies concerned with cultivating "global leaders" illustrate the extent of the impact of globalization discourse in the education and employment market. The five-year Global 30 Project (Burgess et al., 2010) was launched in 2010 by MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology), whereby 13 prestigious universities were selected to promote English medium instruction (EMI) to raise the number of international students from roughly 20,000 to 200,000 (Phan, 2013). This was followed by a five-year Super Global High School scheme for 56 selected high schools across Japan in 2013 (Clavel, 2014), and the ten-year Top Global University Project launched in 2014 for 37 leading public and private universities to boost their global ranking (Maruko, 2014). Such funding schemes for the cultivation of global *jinzai* (global human capital) in higher education and other policies that propose to accommodate foreign students have been implemented alongside, and have been driven by, business sectors calling for radical change, such as the electronic commerce/internet company Rakuten, which raised media attention in proposing to conduct all business in English from 2010. On the surface, these policies seem to demonstrate an expansion of state and business investment in globalizing Japanese citizens; but "globalization" reform in higher education has generally been invested in a small and competitively selected top tier of society, which, ironically, tends to involve the core established institutions most resistant to grassroots change (Imoto, 2013). Moreover, as Kamikubo (2013) points out, the quintessentially neoliberal language of global *jinzai* pronounced in business as well as educational sectors in Japan, places the responsibility of attaining global human capital on the individual workers and students, which may potentially allow these sectors to escape from institutional commitments towards cultivating global human resources.

In all these policies, globalization is conflated with Englishization (Phan, 2013, see also Murata's chapter). Returning to the larger picture, we are reminded of the extent to which the English language is a salient symbol in Japanese society (Seargeant, 2011), not only as the tool and fuel for responding to global pressures, but also in the larger historical story of its modernization ever since the arrival of Commodore Perry's Black Ships in 1853, and more pertinently after the arrival of the GHQ in 1948 and the subsequent influence of American culture (see Seargeant, 2009; Terasawa, 2014, for an extended discussion). The English language represents the historical ambivalence of Japan towards the cultural Other; English is both desirable and threatening—or, as Aspinall (2003, 2013) implies, desirable if acquired in a controlled manner so that "Japaneseness" is not obscured (see also Seargeant, 2011).

In spite of, or perhaps because of this ambivalence, there seems to be an ingrained consensus in both the native and scholarly discourse, that postwar English-language education in Japan has been a "failure" (Aspinall, 2006; Poole, 2005), which at the policy level is linked to the absence of a coherent language policy (Yamada, 2003), but more generally tends to be explained in terms of Japanese cultural characteristics. This perception of "failure" has driven discussions of foreign-language education reform at the national policy level for the past fifty years, creating a vast industry of foreign-language teaching and a population of dedicated English-language learners.[2] Rather than taking for granted that foreign-language education has "failed" and to suggest solutions, however, we suggest the need to unpack how this "failure" is constructed and consumed by interested actors. We are interested in how this perception is explained and legitimized through complex discourses of "culture" and how it interplays with issues of power and economics and identity. We outline the conversations among applied linguists and anthropologists on this issue to provide further context, specifically for the case of foreign-language education in Japan.[3]

THE CULTURAL DEBATES SURROUNDING FOREIGN-LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN JAPAN

At the center of cultural debates surrounding foreign-language education in Japan are numerous theories proposed as to why the Japanese have great difficulty in acquiring proficiency in English as a second language. The blame usually falls on either the students/citizens themselves or their learning/educational/social environment. Seargeant, in his detailed account of the various meanings and functions of English in Japan, notes Haye's (1979) stereotyped characterization (cited in Seargeant, 2009, 53) of how "the inward nature of the Japanese, the periods of ethnocentricity, ultranationalism and xenophobia all augur against the teaching of English." A more recent citation that Seargeant gives are the remarks made in 2006 by Ibuki Bunmei, the neonationalist Minister of Education at the time, which argued against the need to teach English at the elementary level[4] because it would diminish the Japanese sense of values (2009, 15).

On the surface, the perceived lack of success with English-language teaching (ELT) in Japan appears discordant with the fact that Japanese education shows relatively good results in other areas (in spite of internal academic crises). Japan is famous for "borrowing" and "copying" technology, and anthropologists have noted that such "copying" is an important theme in Japanese education—"'imitation is the highest form of praise' in the Japanese cultural logic" (Rohlen & LeTendre, 1996, 371). In fact, the Japanese language itself consists of fully 13% loanwords, mostly from English (Honna, 1995, 45). Why then, experts ask, has there been such a widespread failure in, effectively, learning to "imitate" or acquire the English language?

The discourse surrounding "foreign-language education failure" is perhaps most completely summarized by the sociolinguist Loveday (1996, 95–99), who describes ELT in the context of language contact in Japan. He explains how Japan is a case of a "non-bilingual distant contact-setting" because of deficiencies that are related to 1) the system of education, 2) the teachers, 3) the institutions and 4) the socio-linguistic environment. Loveday argues that the education system has failed because of the emphasis on grammar and translation teaching methodology (GT, or *yakudoku* in Japanese, see below), the "wash-back" of entrance exams, and a history of reductionist concentration on receptive skills for decoding foreign texts. Teachers are at fault, he continues, because of their often limited proficiency in English, lack of overseas experience, and opportunities for practical training (professional development [*PD*] or faculty development [*FD*], as it is often glossed at universities), and for perpetuating large, mixed-ability classes with a strict syllabus and time limits using standardized texts prescribed by MEXT. He argues that there is an institutional conservatism that inhibits effective English-language learning—the local classroom norm of teacher-centered lecturing, collective conformity, emphasis on rote-learning methods, and absolute correctness, and students motivated only by the extrinsic demands of university entrance exams. Finally, Loveday points out that socio-linguistic attitudes hamper proper second-language learning due to 1) the linguistic distance between Japanese and English, 2) culturally specific styles of expression and interaction with an emphasis in Japan on self-control, modesty, reassurance, and perfectionism (factors, which, when combined, prioritize the written text over verbal communication and make for taciturn students in the language classroom), 3) a nonintegrative attitude of ethnocentrism among Japanese speakers, 4) a lack of both perceived and actual need for foreign languages, and finally, 5) little support for maintenance of language skills after schooling, leading to wide-scale attrition. Loveday (see also Aspinall, 2003, 2006) thus summarizes nicely the arguments underpinning the widespread cultural belief in Japan, held by the person on the street and the education expert alike, that ELT has failed.

This belief is strengthened by the prevalence of ELT in postwar Japan. Like many industrialized nations, Japan has a high rate of postsecondary school attendance, with 2.5 million undergraduates enrolled at over 600 national, public and private four-year universities (Hirowatari, 2000). The majority of all Japanese teenagers, then, apply to take a college entrance exam for admission into a tertiary institution. Most such admissions exams include a compulsory English proficiency subtest, even though English as a foreign language (EFL) is not a state-required subject at primary, secondary, and tertiary schools in Japan (Poole, 2003). Partly because of this, university entrance exams focus on English. Over ten million twelve to eighteen year-olds, and another million or so university students, have no choice but to study English. As Terasawa (2014) shows, based on his meticulous historical analysis, despite the fact that English officially became a compulsory subject in 2002, it has de facto been a compulsory subject in Japanese secondary schools throughout the postwar period, with a dramatic increase in the enrollment rate of students attending English-language classes in secondary schools in the 1960s. Not only is English a requirement to enter college, but most students also study the subject at some point during their four years of attendance. Nearly all tertiary institutions offer foreign-language courses, and EFL is by far the most studied subject of these. In fact, although students sometimes have a choice of different English classes from which to choose, EFL in some form is a required subject at nearly every secondary and postsecondary institution in Japan.

Notwithstanding this "failure" in Japan, very similar hurdles hamper foreign or second-language learning in other predominately monolingual societies such as Britain or the U.S. (see Holliday, 1994; Thornbury, 1998). Though it has been argued there is a "larger culture of Japanese peculiarities" (McVeigh, 2002, 157–158), we feel it is important to also consider the comparative socio-cultural realities of foreign-language education worldwide—a "smaller culture of the ELT classroom" (Holliday, 1999). Many generalizations that describe the Japanese context of language teaching and learning are in fact attributes of a wider phenomenon of tertiary English programs worldwide, which Holliday (1994) describes as "Tertiary English and Secondary English Programs" (TESEP).[5] In fact, Kubota (1999) has argued, correctly in our opinion, that observers need to take more care in their evaluations of the Japanese context and that there exists an overemphasis of essentialized features of Japanese students in the research literature on ELT. Holliday (1994, 14) points out a similar danger of assuming too much when he argues that "'learner' carries the implication that the only purpose for being in the classroom is to learn...[while] 'student,' on the other hand, implies roles and identities outside the classroom." Likewise, anthropologists have also noted that, for many students in Japan, classroom learning is in fact not always the main priority and warn that the Western view of learner may not fit with the Japanese model (McVeigh, 1997; Poole, 2010).

One example of the overgeneralizations that are rather common in the ELT literature is the description of Asian students generally as "often quiet, shy and reticent in ELT classrooms, indicating a reserve that is the hallmark of introverts... These ethnic groups have a traditional cultural focus on group membership, solidarity and face-saving, and they de-emphasize individualism" (Oxford et al., 1992, 445). While any EFL teacher who has spent time in a Japanese language classroom would probably agree that many of their students are quiet, an instructor in a North American college might just as easily label a class of eighteen-year-olds as "reticent" or "face-saving" (e.g., Nathan, 2005; Moffat, 1989).

Though similar to other contexts, the "failure" of ELT at Japanese secondary and postsecondary levels is a cultural perception, an image, and an ideology that has challenged both educators and MEXT officials for much of the past century.

Responses to this challenge have varied, and for the most part real change has been superseded by mere rhetoric for reasons that Holliday's TESEP phenomenon underscores. What might be important to point out in the context of this volume and the chapters that follow, however, is the existence of a discourse around two traditions of ELT in Japan. Japanese ELT experts, themselves, have formed two factions, one supporting the *yakudoku* or GT method and one in favor of the "communicative approach"—"one saying that cultural enrichment through reading is important in the traditional manner, the other saying that English is needed for international communication" (Wada & McCarty, 1984, 28).

The grammar translation method developed as a standard learning style for mastering classical Greek and Latin in medieval Europe, persisting into the modern classrooms of grammar schools in the West as a ubiquitous form of modern foreign-language teaching (see Prator & Celce-Murcia, 1979). Likewise, the GT method has a long tradition in Asia, with some tracing the origin of this language learning methodology in Japan to the Nara and Heian periods (710–1185), when Japanese Buddhist scholars were greatly influenced by the Chinese written language without regard for oral proficiency (Henrichsen, 1989, 104–107). Later in the Edo period (1603–1868), *rangaku* (the study of Western sciences through Dutch) began to complement this interest in Chinese and also necessitated the *yakudoku* approach to language and learning (Wada & McCarty, 1984, 28). In prewar Japan, English taught through *yakudoku* was part of the liberal arts approach at high schools and preparatory schools in preparation for specialized training at universities. This long GT tradition continues today alongside the more recent communicative approach to ELT.

This latter methodology, employing theories from abroad, provided the impetus for a wave of ELT reform in Japan in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. During this period, language teaching worldwide underwent a change in perspective that has been called the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) revolution. A disenchantment with grammar-translation and a search for a more effective oral approach to language learning was one impetus to the development of a communicative teaching theory and methodology. Shifts in theory of language were also instrumental in the CLT paradigm shift (Higgs, 1985). In Japan, secondary and postsecondary level language teachers who saw CLT as the next step in English teaching methodology published a collection of reports on communicative methodology in the 1987 volume *Gengo shūtoku to eigo kyōiku* (Language Acquisition and English Education) (Tanaka et al., 1987).

There exist, then, ongoing debates between proponents of a nativist *yakudoku* camp, with some claiming a hegemony of English linguistic imperialism (Tsuda, 1990; Suzuki, 1999), and other ELT scholars encouraging a communicative approach based largely on Western applied linguistic theory.[6] Against this backdrop of foreign-language education in Japan, and ELT specifically, we explore the question of *how* this can be observed and researched as a socio-cultural phenomenon and introduce the methodological approaches we have taken in this volume.

CALLS FOR A QUALITATIVE, COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF FOREIGN-LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND FOREIGN-LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY

When defining our approaches in this volume, we are faced with a diverse range of perspectives and assumptions regarding the meaning of research, the meaning of data, and the meanings of culture. In order to create a platform for dialogue and reflection, our intention is to accommodate for these diverse assumptions while loosely connecting them under the banner of a qualitative approach.

A qualitative approach, in general, aims at providing a descriptive, micro-level analysis of ideas and practices in specific local contexts and cases, as opposed to macro-level analyses often based on statistical large-scale surveys modeled around a natural science approach. Qualitative researchers study phenomena in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or to interpret them in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, 4–5). Such research may involve a mixture of methods, structured or unstructured interviews, open-ended questionnaires, and ethnographic fieldwork. Qualitative research is often criticized by those relying on a quantitative approach as lacking in objectivity or generalizability and scientific rigor; qualitative researchers often identify themselves as bringing to light more sensitized, plural, alternative, and thus holistic understandings. Ultimately, it can be said that all research methods, whether quantitative or qualitative, and all paradigms that frame and guide them, are human constructions that reflect partial realities. Furthermore we should be aware that qualitative approaches encompass a number of competing paradigms (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). For the purposes of this chapter, we categorize them broadly into two: positivistic and processual. The positivistic approach assumes an existing, identifiable reality—or problems—and research would entail revealing those realities through the verification of hypotheses and seeking solutions objectively. The processual approach assumes realities as socially and historically constructed, and as being constantly (re)created through the interaction of human actors. Such research generally aims at deconstructing assumptions behind practices and relies more on an emic, insiders' perspective while engaging dialogically with etic perspectives.

All the authors in this volume take a qualitative approach, but while some of the authors rely on the positivistic approach, others take the processual approach, using primarily ethnographic methods. Thus, whilst some authors in this volume employ "culture" as an objective, identifiable reality and an explanatory tool for understanding practices and barriers of language education, others have more fluid, constructivist notions of culture, pointing to ways in which cultures are constructed and negotiated in educational practices, with the researcher being situated within that very process.[7]

Although the methods employed and the assumed paradigms differ among the contributors, we have aimed to sensitize all chapters to issues of power, taking a critical stance in analyzing everyday practices and ideologies. As exemplified in works of critical applied linguists such as Pennycook (1998) and Kubota (2003), "power" is a concept that cannot be ignored when dealing with language education and policy. Not only do respective chapters in this volume place the role of actors engaged in this identity formation as central, but we also explore a variety of dimensions of power dynamics: the impact of socio-economic power to national language policy (Lee & Doerr), the influence of discursive power or peer pressure in the classroom (Katayama), institutional politics between the "core" and "periphery" (Imoto & Horiguchi), negotiations of power in materials development (Hardy), power of "universal" knowledge (ELT expertise) (Rosenkjar), and the gatekeeper's power (Murata). The authors in this volume see power as negotiated, often causing conflict between agency and structure. This approach foregrounds individual actors, seeing them as interested agents involved in the negotiation of political processes at various institutional levels, situated in structures of power.

One of the key features of this volume is our aim for a dialogue between the fields of applied linguistics and social or educational anthropology, as well as a dialogue between practitioners and observers. It is therefore not viable to regard applied linguistics as positivistic or "scientific" and anthropology as processual or "practice-oriented," in terms of ontological paradigms. The fields of applied linguistics and anthropology are increasingly overlapping, with the emergent trends in using qualitative methods in the former (Atkinson, 1999). For anthropologists, the emerging discipline of applied linguistics and the professionalization of foreign-language education to which the discipline is closely connected cannot be dismissed. This is because anthropology is situated within interdisciplinary area studies, and language has always been a key element of anthropological training and education. Anglophone anthropologists of Japan, moreover, often first experience life in Japan as English-language teachers, and some of them continue to retain dual identities as language teachers and anthropologists in Japan. The backgrounds of the authors of this volume, which often cross between the fields of anthropology and applied linguistics, suggest the interrelatedness of these disciplines. Some of the authors have backgrounds in applied linguistics with expertise in ethnographic research, some have backgrounds in anthropology but have been engaged in the practices of foreign-language education, while others have backgrounds in all of them: anthropology, linguistics, and education. Although each chapter takes a distinctive approach and style of research within the parameters broadly defined above, by presenting them in one volume, we begin to better understand and become more aware of the varied assumptions and methodological traditions that each researcher carries. We therefore juxtapose chapters that are more concerned with macro-level policy analysis against those that seek to contribute to classroom-level pedagogical practice; and we juxtapose chapters that place importance on the observer's subjective role against chapters that present data in the form of positivist social science.

In addition to disciplinary collaboration, another dialogue we attempt to create in this volume is that between "Japanese" and "non-Japanese" researchers on foreign-language education. Language teachers in Japan tend to be grouped into two camps; "native" speakers of English and those comprised of mainly Japanese speakers of English. The two groups hold separate academic conferences (the Japan Association of Language Teaching, JALT, for "native" speakers, and the Japan Association of College English Teachers, JACET, for Japanese teachers), and in recruitment practices, the categorization of *native* or *non-native* speakers is a culturally engrained phenomenon. What we attempt in this book is to overcome this symbolic disjuncture between Japanese and non-Japanese teachers/researchers in the research field. It is worth noting that the Japanese authors in this volume have received their postgraduate training and/or developed their careers in non-Japanese institutions either abroad or in Japan (including Temple University Japan Campus), while the non-Japanese authors have extensive experience in Japanese academic contexts, leading to the questioning and dissolution of the very boundaries of what counts as "Japanese" or "non-Japanese/foreign."

Although we cannot claim to have sufficiently achieved such dialogues in this volume, we see our endeavor as a starting point of a spiral process of generating discussion and reflection. We see our attempt for collaboration as a significant meeting of actors in the field of language education—seeking alternative, more sensitized discourses and practices. One characteristic shared by all authors is that we place ourselves, whether intentionally, or through serendipitous circumstances, as marginals in our disciplines, institutions, and national or cultural affiliations, crossing and blurring the boundaries of disciplines or Japanese-ness/foreign-ness. This sense of marginal identity comes partly from the status of qualitative researchers within the field of applied linguistics or linguistic/educational anthropologists within the larger anthropological community. But marginal identity for anthropologists and ethnographic researchers is a useful "tool" in gaining critical perspectives on taken-for-granted assumptions and everyday realities at the ground level. A marginal identity also results in heightened awareness of one's own positionality, which was shared in frequent conversations among the editors and authors—although the degree to which the "reflexive self" is revealed in the text differs according to the inclinations of each author within the broad spectrum of qualitative approaches.

Finally, as we proceed to present a brief summary and guideline of the chapters of this volume, we provide some background on where each author is situated and how she/he identifies her or himself in the vast discourse and industry of language education in Japan.

The authors of Chapters 2 and 3 address the issue of implementation of national policies drawing on long-term ethnographic research. The focus of Chapter 2 by Lee and Doerr is on policies regarding the Japanese language and the practice of Japanese language schools outside Japan. Hardy (Chapter 3) is concerned with English-language education policies and the process of construction of an English-language textbook.

Chapter 2 examines the widening gap between government policies regarding the education of Japanese children overseas and the students' needs at a community-based Japanese weekend school overseas. Linguist Lee and anthropologist Doerr point to the focus of MEXT policies on Japanese children with Japanese citizenship (Japanese nationals) who plan to come back to Japan and the lack of attention given towards the children whose experiences were more rooted in the local culture. This has created gaps between these policies and the shifting realities of children who attend the community-based Japanese weekend schools with the rising number of children who were born and raised outside Japan and have little Japanese-language background. Through an ethnographic case study of a historical development of a Japanese weekend school in the United States, the authors illustrate the difficulties and conflicts faced by local administrators as well as MEXT-sent principals in its endeavor to meet the requirements of a MEXT-approved school while catering to the realistic needs of the local students.

In Chapter 3, Hardy, an anthropologist with over 20 years of experience teaching English in Japanese private universities, discusses the roles the politics of identities play in the construction of an English-language textbook series for Japanese middle school students based on participant observation of meetings among the textbook writers. He examines in particular the writers' identities represented and negotiated in the process of deciding on place, character, sex, language, culture, and nation. Hardy points to the lack of the writers' reflection about setting the geographical location to Japan, yet endorsing a view of cosmopolitan Japan by including the English-speaking Other as characters living in Japan.

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 on the other hand, are studies based on participant observation and ethnographic interviews that examine how national and transnational policies are implemented within institutions that do not come under direct control of the nation state. In Chapter 4, Murata, an anthropologist trained in the U.S. and the U.K., examines the Japanese government's policy initiative to facilitate the use of English language in higher education and in workplaces through two ethnographic case studies. Her first case study analyzes engineering students and their language contexts in graduate seminars at a Japanese college. Murata finds that while Japanese is not required for entry into the graduate program, Japanese language is the norm in the graduate seminars, which create problems for the international students. The second study explores the importance of Japanese-language ability for Indian software engineers to enhance their position in the Japanese labor market. Both cases reveal how the power of the Japanese gatekeepers at school and workplace as well as Japanese-language ability limit the accessibility of non-Japanese students and workers even in sites where the use of English is supposedly facilitated at the policy level.

Chapter 5 by Imoto and Horiguchi, U.K.-trained anthropologists, examine the processes and identity politics behind the rhetorics of language education reform through an ethnographic case study of a Japanese educational institution attempting to adopt a European model of language education policy. The authors discuss how the "CEFR" (Common European Framework of Reference) and its key concepts such as "plurilingualism," "autonomy," and "communicative learning" seemed attractive at the level of ideology, yet when implemented in practice, conflicts and resistance emerged due to the multiple interpretations. This chapter also points to how the organizational structure of power and the personal and institutional interests and identities set within the university work both as incentive and obstacle for the implementation of the reform.

Chapter 6, by Poole, an anthropologist, and Takahashi, an applied linguist and bilingual education specialist, examines foreign-language immersion education in private schools in Japan that reflect global ideologies and lie at the borderlands of both national and local policies. Their chapter is based on ethnographic research at two private primary schools in Japan and explores the contradictions of the ideology espoused at these institutions, one that although purports to be "international" is actually closely tied to statist schooling objectives. Poole and Takahashi's study questions whether elite international schools in Japan are not merely further entrenching values that emphasize national boundaries, even while appearing to embrace as a mission the ideals of a "global society."

In the subsequent chapters in this volume, applied linguists take qualitative approaches to make sense of learning that takes place in the area of English-language education. Chapters 7 and 8 by Matikainen and Katayama focus in particular on practices and expectations in Japanese university classrooms.

Matikainen, an applied linguist trained in the U.S., explores in Chapter 7 various views of successful language learners and teachers among Japanese students and non-Japanese teachers of English at a university in Tokyo. She finds that while both students and teachers agreed that motivation and autonomy are important factors in learning, there are differences in their perceptions of what makes a good language teacher. She points to the importance of raising awareness of differences in individual cultures of learning to bridge the gap between teachers' and students' expectations.

Katayama, an applied linguist trained in the U.S. and Japan, in Chapter 8 draws on ethnographic research done with junior college English major students, who demonstrate two different manners of pronunciation in two types of English courses in one semester, and examines these differences using Foucault's concepts of power and discourse. She attempts to solve the puzzle of students who passionately imitate an American accent in one pronunciation class while speaking with a heavy Japanese accent in a different discussion class, through pointing to the temporary and localized nature of students' subjugation to power.

Chapters 9 and 10 examine the individual-level learning that takes place outside the classroom. Chapter 9 by Matsuoka, an applied linguist trained in the U.S., focuses on the learners of English and illuminates the ways in which the experience of volunteering as interns at an international conference was successful in reducing the levels of communication apprehension and increasing the willingness to communicate among serious learners of English. Utilizing a content analysis approach, Matsuoka captures the five concepts of competitiveness, perfectionism, other-directedness, self-efficacy, and strategy evident in the narratives of nine students and demonstrates how students succeeded in gaining strategies to overcome communication apprehension through an enhanced self-efficacy.

On the other hand, the focus of Chapter 10 by Rosenkjar, an applied linguist, is the "development" of a high school English teacher's ability. Rosenkjar's study draws on data from dialogues between the teacher intern and the author, produced in weekly journals reflecting on a year-long internship program at an American university in Japan, and provides thick description of the process of identity formation as a teacher of learning "new" pedagogical methods and as a user of English. It also highlights the changes in pedagogy the teacher initiated as a result of the internship experience.

The afterword by Doerr provides a commentary on each of the chapters. The critical commentary enables a more engaged, dynamic dialogue between readers and authors as well as between the chapters. We therefore suggest that this book be read back and forth, rather than linearly, using Doerr's incisive critique as one guide and our general outline of the volume's approach as another. We invite the reader to find connections and contradictions among the chapters, to gain a sense of the contested, dynamically changing, and multilayered nature of foreign-language education in Japan. To help to further facilitate such a reading of this volume, Katayama has also provided us with an appendix of discussion questions. We welcome you to join the process of reflecting upon our practices, contexts, and conclusions.

NOTES

[1] Moreover, at the level of Japanese education policy, as described by Roesgaard (2011), the alignment with global norms through the introduction of *yutori* education was paralleled with the reintroduction of traditionalist moral education with the revised Fundamental Law of Education (2006) encouraging strong notions of patriotism and familialism. Roesgaard suggests that this strengthening of moral education can be seen as a "gate-keeping" response to the perceived risks of an increasingly individualized and fragmented society—"an attempt to retain Japanese national identity and values while also integrating with the world" (2011, 104).

[2] As Kubota (2011a) notes, it is significant that most discussions of foreign-language education in Japan focus on the teaching and learning of English, despite the fact that the vast majority of foreigners in Japan are non-native speakers of English. Of the two million immigrants in Japan, less than 5 percent are from Anglophone countries. Most have emigrated from China, Korea, Brazil, and the Philippines (Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Internal Affairs & Communication, 2014). This makes Japan an important case study of the use of English as a lingua franca/international language and situating it under the paradigm of "World Englishes" (Kachru, 1992; Seargeant, 2011) that can potentially problematize the "native-speaker ideal" in English-language education. And yet it is also important to note that this ideal is persistent in both public and private modes of English-language education in Japan (Breckenridge & Erling, 2011).

[3] We focus here mostly on English-language scholarship. Japanese-language scholarship is reviewed in great detail by Terasawa (2014, 2015).

[4] English was introduced in elementary school in 2011, after 40 years of emotional debate between the proponents (which include the Keidanren and bilingualism specialists) and opponents (which include conservative intellectuals and traditional scholars of English literature).

[5] Holliday's (1994) description of this worldwide phenomenon, Tertiary English and Secondary English Programs or TESEP (Holliday, 1994) includes the following attributes:

- EFL as a part of a wider curriculum and influenced by institutional imperatives.
- ELT has a role alongside other subjects in socializing students as members of the work community.
- EFL is but one of many subjects taught and must work within the parameters and resources that are delimiting factors for all courses.

- ELT methodology choice is limited by institutional-wide approaches adopted across different subjects, as well as the expectations of the actors themselves (students, language teachers, teachers of other subjects, administrators, and MEXT).

This seems to us to describe very closely the Japanese context.

6 Mizuno (2008) shows that recommendations made by Keidanren (Japan Federation of Economic Organizations) provided a basis for MEXT's "Action plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English abilities'" (2003) that supports CLT and emphasizes practical competence in English.

7 The authors of this volume have been in dialogue, but we have not always bridged the gap between our different disciplinary assumptions. For example, we were caught in a dilemma trying to reach a shared understanding of the concept of "culture." In the end, we decided not to privilege one assumption over another but to present a variety of interpretations of this contested concept.

REFERENCES

Allison, A. (2013). *Precarious Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Aspinall, R. W. (2003). Nationalism and the reform of English language teaching. In R. Goodman & D. Philips (Eds.), *Can the Japanese change their education system?* Oxford, England & Wallingford, CT: Symposium Books.

Aspinall, R. W. (2006). Using the paradigm of small cultures to explain policy failure in the case of foreign language education in Japan. *Japan Forum*, *18*(2), 255–274.

Aspinall, R. W. (2013). *International education policy in Japan in an age of globalisation and risk*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Atkinson, D. (1999). TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(4), 625–654.

Breckenridge, Y., & Erling, E. J. (2011). The native speaker English teacher and the politics of globalization in Japan. In P. Seargeant (Ed.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brinton, M. (2011). *Lost in transition: Youth, work, and instability in postindustrial Japan.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, C., Gibson, I., Klaphake, J., & Selzer, M. (2010). The "Global 30" project and Japanese higher education reform: An example of a "closing in" or an "opening up"? *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *8*(4), 461–475.

Carroll, T. (1997). From script to speech: Language policy in Japan in the 1980s and 1990s. *Nissan Occasional Paper Series,* 27. Retrieved from www.nissan.ox.ac.uk/sites/sias/files/documents/NOPS27_0.pdf

Clavel, T. (2014). 56 schools across Japan aim to nurture 'super global' leaders. *The Japan Times,* June 1, 2014. Retrieved from www.japantimes.co.jp/community/2014/06/01/issues/56-schools-across-japan-aim-to-nurture-super-global-leaders/#.VHQiL6M_g3o

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fujita, H. (2010). Whither Japanese schooling? Educational reforms and their impact on ability formation and educational opportunity. In J. Gordon, H. Fujita, T. Kariya, & G. LeTendre (Eds.), *Challenges to Japanese education: Economics, reform and human rights.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Goodman, R. (2003). The why, what and how of educational reform in Japan. In R. Goodman & D. Philips (Eds.), *Can the Japanese change their education system?*. Oxford, England: Symposium Books.

Goodman, R., Imoto, Y., & Toivonen, T. (2011). *A sociology of Japanese youth: From returnees to NEETs.* London, England: Routledge.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Henrichsen, L. E. (1989). *Diffusion of innovations in English language teaching: The ELEC effort in Japan.* New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

Higgs, T. (1985). The input hypothesis: An inside look. *Foreign Language Annals*, *18*, 197–203.
Hirowatari, S. (2000). Japan's national universities and *dokuritsu gyōsei hōjin-ka. Social Sciences Japan*, *19*, 3–7.
Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
Holliday, A. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, *20*, 237–264.
Honna, N. (1995). English in Japanese society: Language within language. In J. Maher & K. Yashiro (Eds.), *Multilingual Japan*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
Hood, C. (2001). *Japanese education reform: Nakasone's legacy*. London, England: Routledge.
Hood, C. (2003). The third great reform: 1980s onwards. In R. Goodman & D. Philips (Eds.), *Can the Japanese change their education system?* Oxford, England: Symposium Books.
Imoto, Y. (2013). Japan: Internationalisation in education and the problem of introspective youth. In P. J. Hsieh (Ed.), *Education in East Asia*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). Urbana, IL and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Kamikubo, M. (2013). Nihon de mattaku ikusei dekiteinai "shin no global jinzai" to wa. [The "true global human resource" that Japan has completely failed to train]. *Diamond Online*. Retrieved on October 23, 2013, from http://diamond.jp/articles/-/43698
Kariya, T. (2012). *Education reform and social class in Japan: The emerging incentive divide*. London, England & Tokyo, Japan: Routledge/University of Tokyo Series.
Keeley, B. (2007). *Human capital: How what you know shapes your life.* Paris, France: OECD.
Kingston, J. (2012). *Contemporary Japan: History, politics and social change since the 1980s* (2nd ed.). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.
Kitamura, A. (2011). *Eigo wa josei wo sukuuno ka [Will English save Japanese women?]*. Tokyo, Japan: Chikuma Shobo.
Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(1), 9–35.
Kubota, R. (2003). Critical approaches to culture and pedagogy in foreign language contexts. In J. Sharkey & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The TESOL quarterly dialogues: Rethinking issues of language, culture and power*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Kubota, R. (2011a). Immigration, diversity, and language education in Japan: Toward a global approach to teaching English. In P. Seargeant (Ed.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
Kubota, R. (2011b). Questioning linguistic instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education*, *22*, 248–260.
Kubota, R. (2013). *Neoliberal paradoxes of language learning: Xenophobia and international communication*. Paper presented at the American association for applied linguistics 2013 conference.
Liddicoat, A. (2007). Internationalising Japan: Nihonjinron and the intercultural in Japanese language-in-education policy. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *2*(1), 32–46.
Loveday, L. (1996). *Language contact in Japan: A socio-linguistic history.* Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
Marshall, B. K. (1994). *Learning to be modern: Japanese political discourse on education*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
Maruko, M. (2014). Universities aim to boost their global ranking. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved on October 22, 2014, from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2014/10/22/national/universities-aim-to-boost-their-global-ranking/#.VHQrmaM_g3o
Mashiko, H. (2010). Gendai nihon no gengo-seisaku wo kangaeru ni atatte [In considering language policies in contemporary Japan]. In E. Tajiri & Y. Otsu (Eds.), *Gengo-seisaku wo tou! [Questioning language policy!]*. Tokyo, Japan: Hitsuji Shobo.
McVeigh, B. J. (1997). *Life in a Japanese women's college: Learning to be ladylike.* London, England: Routledge.
McVeigh, B. J. (2002). *Japanese higher education as myth*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
Miller, R. A. (1982). *Japan's modern myth: The language and beyond.* Tokyo, Japan: John Weatherhill.

MEXT (Ministry of education, culture, sports, science and technology). (2003). "*Action plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English abilities*'". Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/015/siryo/04042301/011.htm

Mizuno, Y. (2008). Keidanren to "eigo ga tsukaeru nihonjin" [Keidanren and the Japanese who can use English]. *Eigo Kyōiku* [*The English Teachers' Magazine*] *57*, 65–67.

Moffat, M. (1989). *Coming of age in New Jersey: College and American culture.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Nathan, R. (2005). *My freshman year: What a professor learned by becoming a student.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Oguma, E. (2004). *A genealogy of "Japanese" self-images*. Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.

Oguma, E. (2012). *Heiseishi (Heisei history).* Tokyo, Japan: Kawade Shobo.

Oxford, R., Holloway M. E., & Horton-Murillo, D. (1992). Language learning styles: Research and practical considerations for teaching in the multi-cultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. *System, 20*, 339–546.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism.* London, England: Routledge.

Phan, L. H. (2013). Issues surrounding English, the internationalization of higher education and national identity in Asia: A focus on Japan. *Critical Studies in Education*, *54*, 160–175.

Poole, G. S. (2003). Assessing Japan's institutional entrance requirements. *Asian EFL Journal, 5*(1).

Poole, G. S. (2005). Reform of the university English language teaching curriculum in Japan: A case study. In J. Eades, R. Goodman, & Y. Hada (Eds.), *2004 and the 'big bang' in Japanese higher education*. Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.

Poole, G. S. (2008). Localized constructions of knowledge: Understandings of *rō-karu na chi* within the anthropology of education. In A. Shinbo (Ed.), *Local knowledge: An alternative theory of lifelong learning, Vol. 52: Community education in Japan (Nihon no shakai kyōiku)*. Tokyo, Japan: JSSACE.

Poole, G. S. (2010). *The Japanese professor: An ethnography of a university faculty.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Prator, C. H., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). An outline of language teaching approaches. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. New York, NY: Newbury House.

Roesgaard, M. H. (2011). "The ideal citizen", globalization, and the Japanese response: Risk, gate-keeping and moral education in Japan. In D. B. Willis & J. Rappleye (Eds.), *Reimagining Japanese education: Borders, transfers, circulations and the comparative.* Oxford, England: Symposium Books.

Rohlen, T. P., & LeTendre, G. K. (1996). Themes in the Japanese culture of learning. In T. P. Rohlen & G. K. LeTendre (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in Japan.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schoppa, L. (1993). *Education reform in Japan: A case of immobilist politics.* London, England: Routledge.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language.* Bristol, CT: Multilingual Matters.

Seargeant, P. (Ed.). (2011). *English in Japan in the era of globalization.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. (2014). Retrieved from www.stat.go.jp

Suzuki, T. (1999). *Nihonjin wa naze eigo ga dekinai ka [Reasons why Japanese are poor at English]*. Tokyo, Japan: Iwanami Shoten.

Tanaka, H., et al. (Eds.). (1987). *Gengo shūtoku to eigo kyōiku [Language acquisition and English language education]*. Tokyo, Japan: English language education council.

Takayama, K. (2008). The politics of international league tables: PISA in Japan's achievement crisis debates. *Comparative Education*, *44*, 387–407.

Takayama, K. (2009). Is Japanese education the "exception"? Examining the situated articulation of neo-liberalism through the analysis of policy keywords. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *9*, 125–142.

Terasawa, T. (2014). "*Nande eigo yaruno?" no sengoshi: "Kokumin kyoiku" to shite no eigo, sono dento no seiritsu katei [Postwar history of "why we do English": The process of building up the tradition of "English as national education"]*. Tokyo, Japan: Kenkyusha.

Terasawa, T. (2015). "*Nihonjin to eigo" no shakaigaku: Naze eigokyouiku-ron wa gokai darake nanoka [A sociology of "Japanese people and English": Why discourses on English language education in Japan are full of misunderstandings]*. Tokyo, Japan: Kenkyusha.
Thornbury, S. (1998). Comments on Marianne Celce-Murcia, Zoltan Dornyei, and Sarah Thurrell's "Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching?" A reader reacts. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*, 109–119.
Tsuda, Y. (1990). *Eigo shihai no kōzō [Structure of English domination]*. Tokyo, Japan: Daisan Shokan.
Tsuneyoshi, R. (2004). The new Japanese educational reforms and the achievement "crisis" debate. *Educational Policy, 18*, 364–394.
Yamada, Y. (2003). *Gengo seisaku toshiteno Nihon no eigokyōiku [Japan's English language education as language policy]*. Hiroshima, Japan: Keisuisha.
Yeonsuk, I. (1996). *Kokugo toiu shisō: Kindai nihon no gengo ishiki [The ideology of national language: Language consciousness in modern Japan]*. Tokyo, Japan: Iwanami Shoten.
Wada, A., & McCarty, S. (1984). The history of foreign language education in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, *8*, 28–29.

Sachiko Horiguchi
Temple University Japan Campus

Yuki Imoto
Keio University

Gregory S. Poole
Doshisha University

KIRI LEE AND NERIKO MUSHA DOERR

2. HOMELAND EDUCATION IN A NEW HOME

Japanese Government Policy and Its Local Implementation in a Weekend Japanese Language School in the United States

INTRODUCTION

As of July 2014, there were eighty weekend Japanese language schools in the United States. They are called supplementary instruction schools (*hoshū jugyō kō)*, and their main purpose is to serve Japanese children overseas by providing them with instruction in the Japanese language arts. All of the schools of this type are community based, but their supporting organizations vary greatly. Schools located in a region where many Japanese businesses exist are sometimes supported by a local branch of the Japanese Chamber of Commerce; others are run by Japanese or Japanese-American Associations (*nihonjin-kai* or *nikkeijin-kai*), and even by small groups of Japanese families. Once these schools get approved by the Japanese government and are officially recognized as *hoshū jugyō kō,* they can receive grants and subsidies from the Japanese government. When a school has 100 students or more, it can request the Japanese government to deploy teachers and a principal from Japan. However, there are inherent conflicts in running a *hoshū jugyō kō* with teachers and a principal from Japan, as the following two points are in contradiction with each other: 1) *hoshū jugyō kō* are run by local people in the United States with the aim of serving local students' needs; and 2) Japanese government policy toward Japanese children overseas is basically to provide instruction in the same curriculum designed for schools in Japan, based on its Course of Study developed by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, and Technology (MEXT). As a result, *hoshū jugyō kō* have an inherent tension between the local administration of the school and the teachers and principal deployed by the Japanese government, who may not be fully knowledgeable to deal with situations particular to a local community where the school is located. In the 2000s, as the student bodies of *hoshū jugyō kō* diversified to include those with fewer ties to Japan, this tension became more apparent.

In studies of heritage language education, however, the issues arising from the gap between the policy of the Japanese government and its local implementation has rarely been discussed. In this chapter, we examine how the tension common to all *hoshū jugyō kō* played out in one weekend Japanese language school in the northeastern United States. We trace the struggles of administrators sent by the Japanese government and locally appointed counterparts to cope with a changing

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 19–34.

student body, which reflected Japan's changing position in the world and shifts in migration patterns. The chapter is part of a wider, four-year-long ethnographic study on the effects of institutional settings and heritage language education on students' subjectivities (see Doerr & Lee, 2009, 2010, 2013).

We first situate our chapter in the existing research on heritage language education, outline the changes in Japanese government policies towards the education of Japanese citizens' children overseas since the 1960s, and introduce a weekend Japanese language school founded in 1980, located in the northeastern United States, which we call Jackson Japanese Language School (JJLS; all names are aliases). Then we present struggles experienced by local school founders/administrators, and the principals deployed by the Japanese government, as the school sought to respond to the changing student body while maintaining the status *hoshū jugyō kō* with a principal deployed by the Japanese government.

RESEARCH ON HERITAGE LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Since the 1990s, scholars have used the term "heritage language" in the context of research on education in the United States. It is an emerging field (Brinton et al., 2008), and perhaps as a result a consensus has not yet emerged as to what exactly "heritage language" is, or who "heritage learners" are (Carreira, 2004; Hornberger & Wang, 2008, among others). In terms of studies in the Japanese heritage language (JHL henceforth) in the United States, the focus has generally been on children who are bilingual in English and Japanese (Kanno, 2003; Sato & Kataoka, 2008). Such studies often discuss children's language proficiencies (Chinen & Tucker, 2005; Kataoka et al., 2008), their identity construction (Chinen & Tucker, 2005; Kanno, 2000, 2003), and heritage language curriculum development and pedagogy (Douglas, 2005; Kondo, 2003). These studies do not refer to the operation of *hoshū jugyō kō* from the points of view of local or MEXT-sent administrators. One of the exceptions is Shibata's study (2000), which describes the process of opening a Japanese Saturday School and briefly mentions that the school became approved by the Japanese government and was thus eligible to receive financial support. However, the school discussed did not receive MEXT-sent teachers or a principal, and there was no discussion on the relationship between MEXT-sent and local teachers and administrators. Another exception is the study by Doerr and Lee (2009, 2013), which refers to administrators' efforts in building a JHL program within a *hoshū jugyō kō*. It is safe to conclude that there are not many studies done on how the Japanese government policies are interpreted and implemented by local administrators in such community-based Japanese weekend schools, especially when they involve a teacher who was sent by the government to oversee language instruction based on MEXT guidelines. What makes the matter comparatively more complex in Japan's case is that the Japanese government policies must be implemented beyond the Japanese boundary as a nation. However, because not many governments intervene with the education of its citizens and their children abroad, there is not much discussion about policies such as the Japanese government's. Thus, discussions of policies usually focus exclusively on the host country's government policies on minority language maintenance within that country (Hubner & Davis, 1999; Pavlenko, 2002). This chapter, then, attempts to capture the increasingly widening gap between the government policies towards the education for Japanese citizens' children overseas and students' needs at community-based Japanese weekend schools. We then examine struggles experienced by administrators—MEXT-sent and appointed locally—in dealing with this gap.

HOSHŪ JUGYŌ KŌ AND JAPANESE GOVERNMENT POLICIES SINCE THE 1960s

Hoshū jugyō kō are weekend Japanese schools that give instruction in subjects such as language arts, mathematics, and social studies to "Japanese" children who are in the 1st to 9th grades, which corresponds to compulsory education in Japan. They are found mainly in the developed countries in Europe and North America (Sato, 1997).[1] As mentioned, they are community-based schools, but the purpose is to educate Japanese citizens' children using the curriculum based on the Course of Study designed by MEXT so that these children would have a smooth transition to Japanese education once they return to Japan. These children go to either an international school or a local school during the week and go to a *hoshū jugyō kō* on either Saturday or Sunday. The length of school hours vary among *hoshū jugyō kō,* from 3 hours to 6 hours per week (Japan Overseas Education Services, 2010).

Weekend Japanese schools have existed in Hawaii and California since Japanese immigration started in the early 1900s, but our focus in this article is *hoshū jugyō kō* since the early 1960s. There were no government policies on full-time Japanese schools or weekend Japanese language schools abroad prior to this time. In 1962, the Japanese government started deploying certified-administrators (principals/vice principals) to *nihonjin-gakkō* (full-time schools for Japanese people) abroad, and through these administrators, the education in Japanese schools abroad began to follow the Japanese government's Course of Study designed for schools in Japan (Sato, 1997).

According to Sato (1997), once the Japanese government began to be involved in education of Japanese citizens' children overseas early in the 1960s, the Japanese government's policy toward them has been consistent; that is, to give the children the same education they would have gotten in Japan as much as possible. The Japanese government provides the education for Japanese citizens' children due to Article 26 of the Japanese Constitution, which guarantees free compulsory education for Japanese children between the ages of six and fifteen. Therefore, their policies are always based on building "a good Japanese national," and, as a result, they export the same language arts curriculum they use for school children in Japan to these schools abroad and send teachers who are trained to teach in public elementary and middle schools in Japan.

In the beginning of the 1970s, because of Japan's growing economy, more and more companies began to send their employees abroad with their families. Based on the data from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2010), in 1971, there were 8,662 Japanese children abroad, which increased to over 30,000 a decade later in 1981. As the number of Japanese children increased, the number of full-time and weekend Japanese schools increased very rapidly. The first certified teacher was deployed to New York *Hoshū Jugyō Kō* in 1974. At the same time in 1974, the Central Education Committee (*Chūō Kyōiku Shingikai*), one of the official committees of MEXT, proposed governmental support for *hoshū jugyō kō* as follows (the Central Education Committee, 1992, 297–298; English translation by Lee):

> Support for *Hoshū jugyō kō*: (1) *Hoshū jugyō kō* is a part-time educational institution which offers Japanese children overseas education such as that of Japanese language arts while they attend local schools. Their operation is not always easy; therefore the support toward these institutions should be drastically increased by subsidizing items such as teachers' salary, rental fees, educational materials, etc. (2) More certified-teachers should be deployed similar to full-time Japanese schools and the training of local teachers should be encouraged.

In the 1980s, the number of *hoshū jugyō kō* increased rapidly—approximately ten new schools per year—reflecting the increased number of Japanese employees being sent abroad due to Japan's increasingly strong economy and strong currency (yen). Following this trend, in 1987, MEXT formed the Ad Hoc Education Committee (*Rinji Kyōiku Shingigai*) and came up with a statement entitled "The Reforms in Response to Internationalization" (*Kokusaika e no taiō no tame no kaikaku*). One of the points of the reform relevant to the education of Japanese children overseas is as follows (the Ad Hoc Education Committee, 1987, English translation by Lee):

> Regarding education of Japanese children overseas, while placing importance on building their foundation as Japanese citizens, the effort should be made for them to gain experiences from the local setting. Also, appropriate educational institutions should be accommodated for the increasing number of high-school age children.

However, no concrete measure was taken to implement this so that Japanese children overseas "gain experience from the local setting." The MEXT curriculum designed for schools in Japan continued to be implemented, and there was no special consideration for students whose experience was rooted more in local culture than Japanese culture, such as those who were born and/or raised in the area.

As the number of children who were enrolled in *hoshū jugyō kō* increased, the Research Study Group on Education of the Japanese Children Overseas (*Kaigai Shijo Kyōiku ni Kansuru Chōsa Kenkyukai*), another committee of MEXT, made the following proposal entitled “The Condition of Supplementary Schools” *(Hoshū jugyō kō no arikata)* in 1992:

> *Hoshū jugyō kō* are facing a big turning point: while they are expected to expand their roles according to changes of the era and requests of parents, they should reexamine their goals and existence in relation to other educational institutions and the local community and explore their future roles and existence.
>
> Proposal: 1. Clarify the purpose and goals of education. 2. Improve the curriculum and pedagogy. 3. Strengthen guidance for students. 4. Strengthen teachers’ organization. 5. Increase outreach for local communities.

The above proposals show that the Japanese government’s policies toward the children overseas started to change in order to adjust to the globalizing world in the early 1990s. However, their basic stance that this education was for Japanese citizens has never changed.

Around this time, diversity of the student body began to grow for two reasons. First, because of the adverse economic situation due to the bursting of the “bubble economy” in Japan, many Japanese companies started to deploy their employees for a longer term, which would help reduce the cost of relocating families abroad. Rather than calling them back within 3–4 years, they began keeping them abroad for more than 5 years, and sometimes for 10 years (Kataoka, 2008). Second, the number of children of “interracial” and “intercultural” couples increased. According to the statistics from 2005 (the Ministry of Health, Labour, & Welfare, 2006), “international marriage” (*kokusai kekkon),* meaning marriage between a Japanese citizen and a non-Japanese citizen, increased from less than 10,000 couples in 1980 to more than 40,000 in 2005. In the late 1990s, the term “international children,” (*kokusai-ji*) meaning children of Japanese and non-Japanese parents, started appearing in the government reports and scholarly literature frequently. This trend was reflected in the number of such children residing in the United States.

Are these “international children” included in the target of the *hoshū jugyō kō?* One way to tell this is to look at how MEXT decides who “Japanese” students are when they decide whether to deploy teachers and/or principals to the school. As mentioned, as part of support for *hoshū jugyō kō,* MEXT sends teachers/principals from Japan to schools with more than 100 “Japanese” students. How to count enrolment of “Japanese” children to qualify for this deployment is very arbitrary. MEXT defines “Japanese” children as Japanese citizens who do not hold permanent residency in the United States and who plan to return to Japan.

However, such a criterion does not capture the shifting reality of Japanese families in the United States. For example, some families who stay in the United States longer than they expected end up attaining permanent residency in the United States when their children become high school students and start considering going to college in the United States. Other families whose plan was to stay in the United States permanently end up returning to Japan for personal reasons. As a result, it is completely up to a MEXT-sent principal's discretion as to how to count the number of qualified "Japanese" students. It is very crucial for *hoshū jugyō kō* to receive principals and teachers because they bring in the most recent knowledge and information about education in Japan. Also, local administrators feel that these MEXT-sent teachers and principals enhance direct ties to Japan and Japanese education as well as serve as a stamp of approval from the Japanese government.

The *hoshū jugyō kō* education was established on the assumption that students' first language is Japanese and that they return to Japan in several years. However, by the 1990s the language background of the student body was diverse and very different from the expectation when *hoshū jugyō kō* were originally established. When most of the students who went to these schools conformed to the original purpose of *hoshū jugyō kō,* the MEXT-based curriculum worked. But it did not work as well when the students' language background became more diverse. In order to resolve this gap, *hoshū jugyō kō* responded differently. Some made a hard decision to cater only to children who are in the United States for a short period of time. This means ignoring the needs of students who are born and raised in the United States with little Japanese language background.[2] Some provided supplemental instruction within the MEXT-based curriculum. Other *hoshū jugyō kō* decided to create their own curriculum, independent of the MEXT-based curriculum. Such programs are called *keishō go* (heritage language) programs and were developed in some United States cities (Chinen, 2004).[3] However, unless they live in metropolitan areas, the children who need any kind of Japanese language instruction often turn to a *hoshū jugyō kō*, whether it specifically addresses their needs or not.

Which approach a school chooses depends on three issues. The first issue is size. If the school is small, it makes no financial sense to even make supplemental classes in addition to the usual classes in *hoshū jugyō kō,* let alone an independent heritage language program for students who do not plan to return to Japan. The second issue is the characteristics of the operating body. *Hoshū jugyō kō* in New York and Chicago are overseen by Japanese Chambers of Commerce, whose main interest is the wellbeing of their member companies' employees who are based in those cities but are planning to return home eventually. Therefore, they support the MEXT-prescribed curriculum. The third issue is the school's relationship to MEXT-sent principals. Whether MEXT-sent principals are adamant about strictly following the MEXT-based curriculum or willing to compromise to include non-MEXT-based curriculum makes a big difference.

In sum: from the 1960s to present, both domestic and international contexts surrounding *hoshū jugyō kō* have changed drastically. The Japanese government policies towards the education of children of Japanese citizens abroad have shifted to reflect those changes: from merely transporting the Japanese curriculum based on the MEXT Course of Study to the United States, to enriching their Japanese education by taking advantage of regional culture. However, there was no practical measure taken to incorporate such regional culture and no attempt by the government to cater to students whose lives center around the local culture, as it was left up to the schools themselves. That is, despite changes in its policies, the Japanese government's approach to *hoshū jugyō kō* has not changed; it is "education of its own nationals."

In the following sections, we will introduce and discuss the case of Jackson Japanese Language School (JJSL).

INTRODUCING JJLS

JJLS is located in a suburb of a major metropolitan area in the northeastern United States. It caters to students who wish to learn Japanese, from preschoolers (three-year-olds) to adults. JJLS is a private nonprofit organization and is overseen by a board of trustees, who are chosen by existing board members. JJLS is funded by a combination of tuition fees, MEXT funds[4] (50% of the rent and roughly 50% of *hoshū kō-bu* [supplementary school section][5] teachers' salary), and donations from local businesses. JJLS received its first principal sent by MEXT in 1989. JJLS's school year starts in April following the Japanese academic calendar. The school meets 42 Sundays per year from 1:00 p.m. to 4:20 p.m. The school day is divided into four periods with recesses in between. JJLS also offers optional mathematics classes between 11:50 a.m. and 12:35 p.m. every Sunday and an optional current affairs class for middle school students between 4:30 p.m. and 5:15 p.m. every other Sunday.

JJLS's school-age student body can be roughly categorized into three groups[6] according to the length of their intended stay in the United States: (1) The *chūzai* ("short-term residence") group: students who live in the United States for three to five years due to a parent's intracompany transfer. Japanese tends to be the "first language" of students in this group. (2) The *chōki-taizai* ("long-term residence") group: students who plan to stay in the United States for more than five years. Their return to Japan depends on a parent transfer within the company. English is usually the common means of communication for *chōki-taizai* students; they use Japanese only in limited situations, such as at home to their parents or at JJLS. (3) The *eijū* ("permanent residence") group: students who have no plans to live in Japan. Often, Japanese is not the "first language" of one or both of the student's parents. For *eijū* students, who are usually born and raised in the United States, English tends to be their first language.

Since its inception in 1980, JJLS has opened its door to children with diverse backgrounds. Its Japanese-as-a-foreign-language (JFL) program was there from the beginning along with the *hoshū jugyō kō.* However, the existence of two programs was not enough to cater to the diverse needs of students of JJLS, especially that of *eijū* students, as their number increased in the 2000s. As of April 2010, the students who have only one Japanese-speaking parent constituted about 60% of the student body (135 out of 226, excluding families in the JFL program). Despite this diversity in students' background and experiences with Japanese, all of them used to attend *hoshū jugyō kō* until 2004. Consequently, for some students, it became difficult to meet its expectations. In order to accommodate such students, JJLS has offered several optional language classes supplemental to the MEXT-based curriculum since 2002 within the umbrella of *hoshū jugyō kō.* This arrangement was very well received by the *eijū* families, but the then MEXT-sent principal insisted that it did not suit the goal and purpose of *hoshū jugyō kō.*

After much contemplation, in 2004, the school reorganized its structure, creating another education unit, which houses programs that are based on curriculums other than MEXT's Course of Study-based curriculum. The section, which houses *hoshū jugyō kō* was named *hoshū kō-bu,* and a MEXT-sent principal became the head of that program. A position to head the new section was created, which was filled by Lee.

JJLS also started offering a JHL curriculum in the new education unit for mostly *eijū* students, whose purposes for studying Japanese language did not fit the MEXT-based curriculum and expectation in the *hoshū kō-bu.*

The following is a brief summary of JJSL's history regarding the status of their *hoshū jugyō kō* and changes in curricula:

- 1980. JJSL opened with 47 students. Among them, 8 students enrolled in the JFL program. It became a state-approved nonprofit educational organization and was also approved as a *hoshū jugyō kō* by the Japanese government.
- 1987. JJSL requested a teacher be deployed by MEXT.
- 1989. JJSL received the 1st principal deployed by MEXT.
- 1992. JJSL received the 2nd principal deployed by MEXT.
- 1995. JJSL received the 3rd principal deployed by MEXT. It started offering a separate curriculum for US-college-bound high school students.
- 1998. JJSL received the 4th principal deployed by MEXT.
- 2000. JJSL received the 5th principal deployed by MEXT.
- 2002. JJSL opened optional language classes for lower grade *eijū* students.
- 2003. JJSL opened optional classes for middle school *eijū* students.
- 2004. JJSL received the 6th principal deployed by MEXT curriculum. It created a new education unit for the programs with non-MEXT base headed by a local administrator, and started offering an independent JHL class to *eijū* students.
- 2006. JJSL received the 7th principal deployed by MEXT.
- 2009. JJSL received the 8th principal deployed by MEXT.
- 2012. JJSL received the 9th principal deployed by MEXT.

THE ROAD THEY TOOK: THE STORY OF JJLS

In this section, we describe struggles of local administrators and MEXT-sent principals regarding balancing MEXT's requirements and local needs. It is based on interviews with former school administrators and one of the MEXT-sent principals as well as the recollections of Lee, a local administrator between 2004 and 2012. All interviews introduced below were done by Lee in Japanese and translated into English here by Lee.

Mr. and Mrs. Ikeda: Founding Members and Local Administrators

Lee interviewed the former administrators, Mr. and Mrs. Ikeda, who were also one of the founding families of JJLS, on January 12, 2011 at their home. Mr. Ikeda came to California with his family when he was in eighth grade. He went to college and graduate school in the United States and is now a researcher at a local research institute. He was the president of JJLS between 1980 and 2004. Mrs. Ikeda came to the United States to marry Mr. Ikeda in 1975. They were classmates in Japan. She was a secretary of JJLS between 1982 and 2004.

During the preparation period in 1979, the founding members came up with three goals: first, the school should become a state certified non-profit organization in the United States; second, it should become a MEXT-approved *hoshū jugyō kō;* and third, it should have a realistic view of meeting students' needs. Mr. Ikeda recalled, "One of the founding members strongly felt that JJLS should become a MEXT-approved *hoshū jugyō kō,* while another one wanted to build a school for the local community. That was the reason why we have had a JFL program from the beginning."

The first two goals were attained soon. The school attained a nonprofit organization status in June 1980 and then started to receive grant money towards teachers' salaries from the Japanese government in 1981 after becoming a MEXT- approved *hoshū jugyō kō.* In 1989, the first MEXT-sent teacher was deployed to JJLS. However, the third goal was not attained until the mid 2000s, since the second and third goals implied incompatible aspirations, which were magnified as the student body diversified.

The second goal was achieved as the demography changed and more *chūzai* families arrived. "In the early 1980s, we did not have many Japanese families who were sent by [Japanese] companies in the area. Japanese families here were mostly visiting researchers at local universities, and they returned to Japan in two to three years." Mrs. Ikeda continued, "During the 1980s, the number of families sent by Japanese companies increased, and we received the first principal from Japan in 1989."

There were benefits of being approved by MEXT. In answering Lee's question about the benefit of becoming a MEXT-approved *hoshū jugyō kō,* Mrs. Ikeda said, "Before we became an approved school, we had to go and get textbooks somewhere else, but once approved, textbooks are given free of charge and sent to our school [by MEXT]. Also it would give peace of mind for parents if the school is MEXT-approved." She added that it is not possible to receive the governmental grant towards rent of the school building if it is not MEXT approved. When Lee asked if they were thinking of receiving a MEXT-sent teacher from the beginning, Mr. Ikeda said that "It was not a goal, but if they have a program based on the MEXT-based curriculum, we should follow the MEXT policies as much as possible, just like in Japan." Mrs. Ikeda added to her husband's answer by saying, "It is very difficult to build a curriculum from scratch. If there is already a curriculum with textbooks, why not use it."

However, there were difficulties in implementing what MEXT expected in its approved schools. When asked when they felt that the MEXT-based curriculum was not appropriate for all the students at JJLS, Mrs. Ikeda replied, "By the late 1980s, we already noticed that, especially in the high school program, there were students whose Japanese abilities were not adequate to study with the MEXT certified textbooks."

Responding to this situation, local administrators sought to solve these problems derived from the gap between MEXT's requirements and the local situation by offering classes at the high school level specifically designed to cater to local students, as described earlier. However, not all welcomed such efforts. Mrs. Ikeda recalled: "Before we started a high school program for U.S. college-bound students in 1995, we made efforts to accommodate high school students who could not follow the MEXT curriculum. When we ran a special composition class for *eijū* students, there was a lot of opposition from their parents. They felt their children had been put in a special-needs class." However, Mrs. Ikeda recalls that the students were very happy. She also said that a new principal who was sent by MEXT to JJLS had a hard time explaining the high school program for the U.S. college-bound students in the information session because this new program did not follow the MEXT curriculum.

Nonetheless, it was easier to create a program for *eijū* and *chōki-taizai* high school students than for younger students, because high school is not a part of compulsory education in Japan and thus it is out of the scope of *hoshū jugyō kō* education. As mentioned earlier, in the late 1990s, the number of "interracial" and "intercultural" marriages increased. This corresponded to the time when JJLS also started facing the need to accommodate *eijū* and *chōki-taizai* in the lower grades.

When the school formed a committee to explore the possibility of building a program for *eijū* and *chōki-taizai* children in the lower grades in 2001, Mr. and Mrs. Ikeda recalled that the MEXT-sent principal then could not comprehend the idea of JHL education. It was very difficult for the school to work with him. He made complaints to MEXT, and the school was ordered not to involve the MEXT-sent principal in any other part of school operation except the compulsory education part. This shows MEXT's firm position that MEXT-sent teachers are only responsible for the education in elementary and middle schools within the MEXT-prescribed curriculum.

This struggle of balancing MEXT's position and local needs reflects the fact that, while MEXT came to show its willingness to adjust to local needs in its policy statements, its policy was not actually aimed to be put in practice. For example, even though the Research Study Group on Education of the Japanese Children Overseas in 1992 recommended that *hoshū jugyō kō* should accommodate parents' wishes in a changing world and contribute to local communities, the basic education policies towards Japanese children overseas do not go beyond the MEXT-prescribed education for Japanese nationals.

There were other issues that made balancing being a MEXT-approved school with MEXT-sent principals and catering to needs of local students difficult, according to

Mr. and Mrs. Ikeda. First, there was the issue of the system in which the MEXT-sent principals stayed only for a short period of time, and, thus, such principals were not expected to meet the local needs. In answering Lee's question if they felt these MEXT-sent principals received enough orientation before they left, Mr. Ikeda said, "I feel that often these teachers come to *hoshū jugyō kō* to use it as a stepping stone in their career after they go back to Japan. Therefore, often there is no continuity from one principal to the next."

Second, there was an issue of the division of labor. Mrs. Ikeda added, "The school is told by MEXT that it cannot involve a MEXT-sent teacher in business operations of the school. He should only be involved in educational matters in 1st through 9th grades. However, if we treat him following MEXT's order and do not consult him with school business matters, we end up insulting him." This issue became solved once the school was divided into two sections. However, the transition was not easy, as Lee recalls next.

Lee: The Principal of the Second Educational Unit

JJLS ended up offering independent JHL classes as a result of negotiating the three issues mentioned earlier. For financial reasons, in the first year, the school offered only one pilot multi-aged class for students who do not plan to return to Japan; this pilot class was all that was within their budget at the time. As more students started enrolling in this course, it became financially viable to develop a full-fledged JHL curriculum. The philosophy of the JJLS also influenced the new program: JJLS's roots as a community-based school founded by local parents, not by a local Japanese Chamber of Commerce, was conducive to the establishment of the JHL program.

The school's relationship to the MEXT-sent administrators was rocky initially. In 2002 and 2003, the difficulties in balancing the MEXT-sent principal's role and catering to *eijū* students' needs reached its peak. There was significant tension between the MEXT-sent principal and the local administrators. The friction derived from disagreement as to whether or not the MEXT-approved *hoshū jugyō kō* was responsible for education that did not use MEXT-based curriculum and for students who were not planning to return to Japan to live.

Then, as described earlier, local administrators decided to reorganize the programs in response to MEXT's request that a MEXT-sent principal must concentrate on educational matters only in the *hoshū jugyō kō* part. The JJLS was divided into two educational units: one for the program with the MEXT-based curriculum, and the other for an independent curriculum. This arrangement enabled a MEXT-sent principal to only be concerned with the *hoshū jugyō kō* part of the school. In April 2004, the *hoshū jugyō kō* part of the school was renamed as *hoshū kō-bu* or the first educational unit (*daiichi-bu*) and headed by a MEXT-sent principal, and the rest of the programs in the school were named the second educational unit (*daini-bu*) and headed by a local administrator, Lee. Lee feels that the JJLS response to MEXT's request and the efforts of a new team of administrators have been taking effect, and the school has been more or less functioning as one community.

MEXT-Sent Principals

MEXT-sent principals are the representatives of MEXT who ensure that a *hoshū jugyō kō* runs according to the purposes and goals described by MEXT. They are only responsible for the education of 1st through 9th grades following the MEXT-based curriculum.[7] They are public school teachers who apply to positions in schools overseas and are selected by an individual local school board in Japan. They act as a liaison to a Japanese consulate in the region, oversee how the curriculum is carried out, train locally hired teachers, and give advice to *chūzai* families about their children's educational concerns.

As the representatives of MEXT, working with local administrators who have a different agenda sometimes makes it difficult for the MEXT-sent principals to implement MEXT's agenda, especially when the division of labor is not clear. That was the case for the 5th MEXT-sent principal, who served JJLS from April 2000 to March 2004. As mentioned by Mr. and Mrs. Ikeda and Lee, pre-2004 JJLS developed programs to institutionally cater to *eijū* students outside the MEXT-based curriculum, which created ambiguity in what the MEXT-sent principal should do, leading to a tense atmosphere between the MEXT-sent principal and local administrators. As his expressed duty was to take care of *chūzai* and *chōki-taizai* students whom he understood as the responsibility of MEXT, Lee recalls, the principal did not welcome the fact that his position as the principal of the entire JJLS included programs that do not follow the MEXT-based curriculum: he insisted that it did not suit the goal and purpose of *hoshū jugyō kō.* It is worth noting here, however, that many MEXT-sent principals in especially small schools have been engaged in matters beyond their job description. However, as long as their complaints are not reported to MEXT officials, it does not seem to become a big issue. That is, it is up to the MEXT-sent principals to a certain degree whether to make an issue of non-MEXT based programs in their schools.

The 6th MEXT-sent principal who served the JJLS from April 2004 to March 2006 worked in the new structure of JJLS in which his duty was limited to *hoshū kō-bu,* while Lee oversaw the second educational unit of JJLS. Prior to his arrival, he held a position of principal in an elementary school in the western part of Japan, and coming to JJLS was the first time he left Japan. There was no open tension or struggle during his term. However, Lee heard later indirectly that he felt that the school's administrative support was not adequate enough and filed a complaint to MEXT. This shows that there are pressures and difficulties that the MEXT-sent principal feels despite the overt smoothness of operation at school.

The 7th MEXT-sent principal who served from April 2006 to March 2009 had never held a position of either principal or assistant principal in a school in Japan, unlike the other MEXT-sent teachers to JJSL. In his interview with Lee in December

30, 2008 in the school business office, he told her that he originally applied for a position of regular teacher in a *hoshū jugyō kō,* but was assigned as a principal at JJLS. He was supportive of JJLS's aspiration to cater to diverse students and was involved in all aspects of school operation. However, he told Lee that he was told by MEXT in official meetings and conferences not to pay too much attention to the matters beyond *hoshū kō-bu.*

The 8th MEXT-sent principal, who served from April 2009 to 2012, was a retired principal. MEXT started sending retired teachers to *hoshū jugyō kō* in 2008 as a cost-saving measure. He held positions of principal in middle schools in Japan, and also was a principal of a full-time Japanese school in the United States in the early 2000s. Therefore, he was well-informed and knowledgeable about the situations in both full-time and weekend Japanese language schools in the United States. In one of the meetings for the regional *hoshū jugyō kō* held in summer of 2010, at which Lee was present, he stated that JJLS is a future model of *hoshū jugyō kō* in offering programs based on three different curricula: MEXT-based curriculum, JHL curriculum, and JFL curriculum.

DISCUSSION

As described above, the Japanese government did not have a clear policy toward full-time and weekend Japanese schools abroad prior to the 1960s. Through establishing the system of sending teachers to those schools, the government was able to regulate curriculum to follow the MEXT-based one and organize their support to these schools.

For JJLS, being a MEXT-approved school yet rooted in the local community, its desire to offer realistic education to all students was not always easy. The school was founded in 1980, six years after the first teacher was deployed by the Japanese government to *hoshū jugyō kō* in the midst of the rush of building such schools. Therefore, it was easy to turn to MEXT for curriculum, textbooks, and accreditation from the beginning. It differed from other *hoshū jugyō kō* in that it offered the JFL program from the start to the local children and Japanese children from *eijū* families based on their founding philosophy that the school should be open to the needs of the local community. This philosophy played a pivotal role later. As the Japanese economy became strong, more and more Japanese companies sent their employees with their families, hence JJLS's *chūzai* population increased, too. However, as Mr. Ikeda's statement shows, the school was well aware of the limitations of using the MEXT-base curriculum for *eijū* students already in late 1980s.

As mentioned above, in 1987, the Ad Hoc Education Committee delivered a statement on the importance of internationalization in education, and this implies that the Japanese government was aware of the difficulty of enforcing the MEXT-prescribed curriculum in *hoshū jugyō kō.* However, the data we introduced show that the government's policy was always based on "building good Japanese nationals" and there was no concrete attempt to solve such a discrepancy. Faced with the immediate need to cater to all students with reasonable goals, the third goal for JJLS, JJLS created JHL courses with independent curricula. This created a tension between the MEXT-sent principal and local administrators, as described by local administrators (Mr. and Mrs. Ikeda and Lee). The tension was ameliorated gradually after creating the second education section for non-MEXT-base curricula.

The experience of the MEXT-sent principals show the effects of institutional arrangement—whether or not there is a separate program with non-MEXT-based curricula and whether or not the MEXT-sent principal is officially in charge of such programs—as well as personal difference of the principals in terms of their philosophy of what *hoshū jugyō kō* should look like, how to deal with the diverse student body, as well as the philosophy of the school as a whole. The 5th MEXT-sent principal's case shows the most difficult scenario. The 6th MEXT-sent principal needed more administrative support in the time of institutional transition. The case of 7th MEXT-sent principal shows a successful case of the appropriate institutional structure and the principal's philosophy matching that of JJLS. His experience also shows that, despite MEXT's new policy to acknowledge student experience from local settings, MEXT does not encourage putting that in practice. That puts the MEXT-sent principals in a difficult position, especially if they wish to work with local administrators and be involved in the activities of the entire JJLS. The case of the 8th MEXT-sent principal shows a good match between the institutional maturity and his own experience and vision.

CONCLUSION

As shown in this chapter, there has been a gap between the Japanese government policies toward the education of Japanese citizen's children overseas and locally-based, community Japanese language schools. In facing the changing demography of the Japanese children overseas, the way each individual school makes adjustment to accommodate the local needs are intertwined with many factors.

The policies of the government changed to emphasize a need to adjust to local situations, but there were no concrete measures to implement the changes nor to provide support to locally initiated changes. This led to struggles by and between the MEXT-sent principals and local administrators. The MEXT-sent principals thus struggle to mend the gap. Also, the local administrators, who remain there while MEXT-sent principals come and go, need to be innovative in coordinating different needs of MEXT and the local student body and creating an institutionally viable structure.

Research on heritage language education in Japanese has not been focusing on this issue of interface between the government in the "homeland" and the local implementation and struggles of those involved. This chapter attempted to trace changing struggles and solutions that JJLS administrators developed.

NOTES

[1] When a Japanese family is sent abroad, if they want to keep their children in the Japanese education in one way or the other, they have two choices: to send them to a full-time Japanese school called *nihonjin gakkō* (full-time school for Japanese people) or to send them to a weekend Japanese school called *hoshū jugyō kō* while they attend an international school or a local school. In developing countries, especially in Asia, Japanese families tend to choose the first option (Sato, 1997).

[2] For example, Washington *hoshū jugyō kō* followed this pattern.

[3] For example, the establishment of the Washington Japanese Heritage Center in 2004, separate from Washington *hoshū jugyō kō*. See www.keisho.org (Accessed November 15, 2014).

[4] Because of the declining economic condition, the governmental supports have been decreasing recently.

[5] In order to differentiate JJLS's set up from other *hoshū jugyō kō*, we use the term "*hoshū kō-bu*" which houses the program equivalent to Japan's compulsory education.

[6] These are conventional categories used at *hoshū jugyō kō* in general in the United States (see Sato & Kataoka, 2008). Although there is another group who study JFL at JJLS, they are out of scope of our research.

[7] Job descriptions of teachers deployed to schools outside of Japan 3-(1), Department of International Education, MEXT (*zaigai kyōikushisetsu haken-kyōin-no shokumu 3-(1) Kokusai kyōiku-ka*).

REFERENCES

Brinton, D. M., Kagan, O., & Bauckus, S. (2008). *Heritage language education: A new field emerging*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term "heritage language learner." *Heritage Language Journal, 2*, 1–25. Retrieved from http://www.international.ucla.edu/media/files/carreira.pdf

Chinen, K. (2004). *Heritage language development: Understanding the roles of ethnic identity, attitudes, motivation, schooling, family support and community factors* (PhD dissertation). Carnegie Mellon University.

Chinen, K., & Tucker, R. (2005). Heritage language development: Understanding the roles of ethnic identity and saturday school participation. *Heritage Language Journal, 3*, 27–59.

Doerr, N. M., & Lee, K. (2009). Contesting heritage: Language, legitimacy, and schooling at a weekend Japanese language school in the United States. *Language and Education, 23*, 425–41.

Doerr, N. M., & Lee, K. (2010). Inheriting "Japanese-ness" diversely: Heritage practice at a weekend Japanese language school in the United States. *Critical Asian Studies, 42*, 191–216.

Doerr, N. M., & Lee, K. (2013). *Constructing the heritage language learner: Knowledge, power, and new subjectivities.* Boston, MA /Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

Douglas, M. (2005). Pedagogical theories and approaches to teach young learners of Japanese as a heritage language. *Heritage Language Journal, 3*(1).

Hornberger, N. H., & Wang, S. C. (2008). Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 3–35). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hubner, T. (1999). Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy, politics, and praxis. In T. Hubner & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (pp. 1–16). Amsterdam, The Netherlands / Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Japan Overseas Education Services. (2010). *Nihonjin gakkō, hosyū-jyugyōkō gakuhi-tō ichiran [List of nihonjin gakkō, hosyū-jyugyōko and their tuition]*.

Kanno, Y. (2000). Bilingualism and identity: The stories of Japanese returnees. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*, 1–18.

Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kataoka, H. (2008). *Amerika-ni iru nihon-no kodomotachi [Japanese children in the United States]*. In G. Sato & H. Kataoka (Eds.), *Amerika de Sodatsu Nihon no Kodomotachi [Japanese Children growing up in America]*. Tokyo, Japan: Akashi Shoten.

Kataoka, H., Koshiyama, Y., & Shibata, S. (2008). Amerika-no hoshū-jugyōkō-de manabu kodomotachi-no eigo to nihongo no chikara [Proficiency in English and Japanese of children who study at hoshū-jugyōkō in the United States]. In G. Sato & H. Kataoka (Eds.), *Amerika de Sodatsu Nihon no Kodomotachi [Japanese Children growing up in America]*. Tokyo, Japan: Akashi Shoten.

Kondo-Brown, K. (2003). *Heritage language instruction for post-secondary students from immigrant backgrounds.* Retrieved from UCLA Center for World Languages, The Regents of the University of California. website: www.international.ucla.edu/languages (Accessed July 30, 2007).

MEXT. (1987). *Kyōiku Kaikaku-ni Kansuru Dai Yo-ji Tōshin [The Forth Response on the Education Reform]*.

MEXT. (1992a). *Chūō Kyōiku Shingikai Tōshin Sōran [The comprehensive report of the central education committee]*. (Retrieved from mext.go.jp.)

MEXT. (1992b). *Hoshū jugyō kō ni Okeru Kyōiku no Jūjitsu Hōsaku ni tsuite [On the strategies for strengthening the education in Hoshū-Jugyōko]*.

MEXT. (2008). *Kaigai-de manabu nihon-no kodomotachi: Wagakuni-no genjō [Japanese children overseas: Present situation in our country]*. Tokyo, Japan: MEXT.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs. *Kaigai Zairyū Hōjin-sū Chōsa Tōkei [Annual report of statistics on Japanese nationals overseas]*. Retreived from mofa.go.jp

Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare. (2006). *Jinkō dōtai chōsa [Report on population changes]*. Retreived from mhlw.go.jp/toukei/itiran/

Pavlenko, A. (2002). 'We have room for but one language here': Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20th century. *Multilingual, 21*, 163–196.

Sato, G. (1997). *Kaigai kikokushijo no kyōiku no saikōchiku [Reconstruction of education of oversea/ returnee children: From the perspective of cross-cultural education]*. Tokyo, Japan: Tamagawa University Press.

Sato, G., & Kataoka, H. (2008). *Amerika de Sodatsu Nihon no Kodomotachi [Japanese children growing up in America]*. Tokyo, Japan: Akashi Shoten.

Shibata, S. (2000). Opening a Japanese saturday school in a small town in the United States: Community collaboration to teach Japanese as a heritage language. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24*, 465–474.

Kiri Lee
Lehigh University

Neriko Musha Doerr
Ramapo College

THOMAS HARDY

3. IDENTITY, PLACE, AND LANGUAGE

Conflict and Negotiation in the Writing of an English Textbook for Japanese Secondary School Students

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I discuss the roles that the politics of identities play in the construction of a second language textbook for Japanese junior high school students. The chapter begins with a précis of some of the contexts of the matter, including the textbook itself, institutional issues, and methodological matters.

The ways that one group of writers navigates among these matters while they create the identities of characters in English textbooks for Japanese junior high school students are recounted in brief. In particular, in my role as a language educator with a background in anthropology, I report on discussions dealing among my informants about various Others and the languages they speak. This brings to the fore tensions inherent between the use of English as a global language, English used for cultural expression in Japan, the demands of markets, and powerful state institutions.

I conclude with reflections on some of the implications of these matters for education, the state, and identities.

ISSUES AND CONTEXTS

To fruitfully observe the politics of identities in the construction of a second language textbook for Japanese junior high school students, it is useful to address the following issues and contexts: what identity is; the field on which it is being played out and enacted; when and how the fieldwork takes place; and who the stakeholders in the processes are.

Identity

For the purposes of this chapter, and drawing on the work of writers as varied as Martin and Nakayama (2000) to classic reflections by Erickson (1968), I define identity as stories claimed by the individual and conferred by the group answering the questions “Who am I?” and “What makes me, me?” Some of the classical answers in identity studies to the first question, “Who am I?” include responses based on four basic sociological clusters: age; sex, gender, and sexuality; social class, variously

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 35–49.

defined; and the constellation of race, ethnicity, and nationality. Common answers to the second question, "What makes me, me?" typically include four basic social institutions: family; schools; peer groups and friends; and religion.

Identity is a fraught concept. The attraction and perils of identity and the pitfalls of these questions and the standard answers—conceptually, politically, and in practice—are well known (Nussbaum, 2006; Sen, 2006). In particular, identity and its relationships to language, nation, culture, and education are complex with no complete or satisfying single response (Joseph, 2004; Lin, 2007; Schmid, 2001). Nevertheless, it remains a powerful concept that needs to be considered. However, for the purposes of this chapter, I accept these problematic responses because they take us directly to issues of personal identities, in particular to those issues concerning the constellations of sex and gender, and race, ethnicity, and nationality. One standard answer leads directly in the role of school, a powerful state institution guiding the construction of identity. And, these answers lead, by only slightly more circumspect paths, to language and the place of foreign-language education in identity.

In short, the textbooks and their construction processes lend themselves to investigations of the linkages between language and personal identities; the linkages between language and national identities; the linkages between national languages and foreign languages; and the role of the state in these matters.

The material that follows could go in many directions other than the ways writers construct identities for characters in the textbook. It lends itself to an analysis of the politics of textbook publishing as suggested in the classic work by Apple (1988). A close reading of the images and texts would also repay the effort. And the textbooks and responses to them by teachers and students could eventually lead to an analysis of textbooks' roles in the broader Japanese educational system. Though these are beyond the scope of this chapter, these and related issues will be addressed in the fuller ethnography of the textbook that is, hopefully, to follow.

Fieldwork and Methodology

Ethnography, of education or more generally, is a form of research focusing on the sociology of meaning through close field observation of socio-cultural phenomena. It is not far removed from the sort of approach that we all use in everyday life to make sense of our surroundings; it takes research activities from the lab to the homes, streets, and classrooms where people are. It relies heavily on close observations and personal experience. Clifford and Marcus (1986) famously observe that ethnography literally means a "portrait of a people" and is a written description of a particular culture based on information gathered through fieldwork.

Contemporary ethnographies since the work of Clifford and Marcus (1986) tend to have a voice that is more personal and more accurately reflects the indeterminate and uncertain nature of fieldwork (Hendry, 1999). "The writer" in ethnography is now, as often as not, an "I." Informants are given greater voice and allowed to speak for themselves as much as possible in a postcolonial world. This can be done by letting them write their own ethnographies or by providing space in the ethnography that allows their voices to be heard, as seen in Taussig (1991) and Feldman (2007). Both these developments emphasize the transformative experience fieldwork can have on the subjects and the writers (Lewin & Leap, 1996).

These changes have not been universal in ethnography nor have they been without critics. But the current and developing ethnographic style, with its unconventional and narrative structure, is in fact motivated by the same high academic motives as the earlier rhetorical patterns: the reflection and analysis of reality that is as complete and accurate as possible. The ethnographic descriptions that follow reflect these changes in ethnographic discourse. There is an explicit "I" in the discourse, that of the ethnographer, the primary writer of this chapter. Informants are given extended space to express themselves, sometimes at odds with the ethnographer. The shifting relationship between ethnographer and informant is explicitly acknowledged and presented. And the ways that the fieldwork experience transforms both informants and ethnographer are alluded to.

In this account I do not avail myself of all these possibilities, but recognize their presence and their utility in exploring aspects of an ethnography of a textbook.

The Field

The issues of identities being considered here are primarily being played out and enacted in an English as a foreign language textbook series (Takahashi et al., 2005). The series covers the three years of junior high school in Japan: grades 7, 8, and 9. Each of the three textbooks contains about 120 pages, including inside front and back covers, introduction, and appendices; 82 to 96 pages of actual text and exercises; 8 or 9 two-to-three-page lessons; and 2 two-to-four-page readings. The rest is composed of exercises and appendices. For simplicity, I refer to all three as "the textbook."

The fieldwork experience: Participants. There are four major categories of participants in the textbook writing process: a small group of four at the emeritus level who provide general guidance and comments; the *honbu-in,* a core group of five writers who set the parameters and topics of the book, make the final decisions and do most of the close final writing; a broad group of about twenty-four writers who submit materials for consideration by the core group and create first drafts; and editors assigned by the publishing company to the project. The writers are based all over Japan, making electronic communications the primary media of sharing materials, though two or three times in the publishing cycle there may be a general meeting of all participants.

I participate in general meetings, all core-group meetings, and am on call for specific issues raised by subgroups. In addition, I frequently meet with the editorial staff and create materials for future discussion at core group meetings. The experiences of working with the core group and editorial staff are the primary sources of information for this chapter, supplemented where appropriate with communications from members of the emeritus and general writing groups.

In the following paragraphs, I briefly describe the background and professional activities of the core group members. I refrain from identifying specific members and specific activities in the interests of their privacy and of preserving ongoing professional relationships with them.

Most core group writers have long and deep connections with the profession of language teaching in Japan. Most are active members of JACET (Japan Association of College English Teachers), the major Japanese language association of such professionals in Japan. JACET holds frequent conferences and publishes a journal and newsletters, keeping its members current with developments and trends in language education around the world. They are able to refer knowledgably to current work in all four fields of language teaching, major areas of language such as pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar, classroom issues such as computers in language classrooms and learning styles, as well as cultural and postcolonial critiques of the larger project by writers such as Pennycook (1998) and Fairclough (2001).

All core group members are male and all, aside from me, are Japanese. The youngest is in his late forties; the oldest is approaching retirement age. All have advanced degrees, most with experience in graduate programs outside Japan. All teach at Japanese universities, a practical if not a formal requirement, given that the commitment of time and energy involved in being a member of the core group more or less precludes the inclusion of secondary school teachers.

Among the members, there are varying areas of specialization—both professional and in terms of his role in the core group. For example, one has close ties with MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology) and other governmental and semigovernmental entities and is usually able to interpret their more opaque guidelines in a way that can be used by writers and avoid later complications in the authorization process. Another has an interest and experience in the EU language policies and the various educational strategies being taken to achieve and measure them, including a special focus on situation-based communicative strategies. Yet another has had recent experience in teaching in secondary schools and brings a special knowledge of actual classroom practices and needs to the discussions.

In short, the members of the core group are knowledgeable about issues of language education, identity, language, and culture. They are also aware of and responsive to the realities of Japanese textbook writing and publishing and the nature of Japanese junior high schools (LeTendre, 2000). These realities, as will be seen, set limits on what can and cannot be conceived and constructed.

In the interests of full disclosure, I receive royalties from the publisher as a member of the core group writing team and so have an economic interest in the matter. This level of involvement does not unduly shape the questions I ask and the answers I come up with, at least no more than those of any funded ethnographer who mines and produces materials for popular and academic cultures (Fish, 2007).

From the very beginning, the writers and staff have known that I have training in anthropology and that I am using my work with them as a field of study; they have raised no objections to it, though they occasionally find my observations and analytic asides mildly amusing.

The fieldwork experience: Calendar and activities. Writing a MEXT-approved textbook is usually a four-year process. I have been closely involved as a participant and observer in more than two cycles. The information presented here focuses on the 2001–2005 cycle, ending when the textbook was published.

Meetings of the core group take place at least one a month during years 1 and 2 when discussions focus on general matters of curriculum, syllabus, topics, and exercises. The writers review the results of teacher surveys and focus groups' responses to the existing textbook in addressing the matters above. They also consult the shifting and gnomic requirements of MEXT. They suggest, consider, reject, and reconsider a wide range of materials. Items are accepted, placed in their context, reconsidered, and recast or rejected. The core group writers create templates for lessons and activities. There is a constant juggling of priorities and concerns, including those dealing with identity. More than thirty all-day meetings are held to deal with these matters.

During year three, with conceptual issues addressed, the actual writing takes place. The thirty-three writers noted on the credits page are divided into small groups, which create materials based on the needs noted and templates created earlier. These drafts then go to the five-person core group for redrafting and revision. This process can occur several times and, as noted by Langham (2007) for high school textbooks, are exhaustive as well as exhausting and frustrating. Late in year three, page proofs are created, circulated, and revised. Also, crucially, a "white book" of the completed text is printed and submitted to MEXT for approval. This process is described in slightly more detail below.

During year four the focus shifts to the production process. Work begins on a wide range of ancillary materials, including teachers' manuals, teaching guides, workbooks, texts, listening materials, a video, and a teaching guide for non-Japanese teachers. At the end of the publishing year, the completed textbook series and all supplementary materials are in students' and teachers hands on April 1.

Stakeholders

Two of the major groups of stakeholders involved in the textbook writing process and the creation of textbook identities are MEXT and teachers.

MEXT

Japan has a powerful centralized education ministry. MEXT sets the course of study for all required subjects, including junior high school English (MEXT, 2003a). All junior high school students are required to use MEXT approved textbooks. These textbooks are written and edited by private publishers.

The publisher submits the completed textbooks to MEXT, which vets them based on the principles and guidelines laid out in the course of study (MEXT, 2003a). It also checks to be sure that the textbooks are "both objective and impartial, and free from errors, and that proper educational considerations are paid (MEXT, 2003b: II English 3 (2))." The final MEXT review contains comments and suggestions at a range of levels, including typographical, visual, pedagogical, and content. The publisher can follow the suggestions, make counter suggestions to finesse them, or choose to fight them.

Teachers

Japanese junior high school teachers who use this textbook series have needs and interests, which must shape the issues and identities presented in the textbook. The writers and editorial staff are very aware of this and take pains to get the teachers' ideas and response to current and proposed materials. To this end the editorial staff actively solicits ideas and suggestions from teachers and reports about teachers' experiences with the use of materials in classrooms. The editorial staff looks for this information in focus groups, through questionnaires, and through informal off-the-record discussions and get-togethers. The editorial staff then reports their findings to the core group at meetings. Every response is noted, discussed, and, wherever possible, met. The writers and editors noted the following major points to be incorporated into the edition as far as possible:

1. Ease of learning: Names of characters and vocabulary items should be easy to pronounce; content should have some relationship with the lives and experiences of students.
2. Ease of teaching: Materials should be usable with very little preparation time, given the competing demands from other participants in the educational process (such as principals, boards of education, and parents).
3. Communicative language lessons: Lessons should be communicative in nature, but with specific and limited outcomes; too wide a range of appropriate responses leads to confusion and wasted time.
4. Interest in gender and social equality: Topics should be innately gender free, without bias toward any social or cultural group, and should stress the importance of equality of all groups.
5. Interest in social issues: Content should display an interest in matters of concern to future citizens and participants in Japanese society.
6. Concern with global issues: Issues should not be limited to Japan but should display a range of interests related to major global matters, including the environment, peace, and transcultural issues.

Issues of definition, the formal and physical requirements of the publisher, a lengthy and involved writing processes, and stakeholders with competing needs:

these are some of the matters facing writers of an English as a foreign language textbook for the Japanese market.

IDENTITIES (RE)PRESENTED

Given the conflicting contexts and needs noted above, how do writers (re)present identities? What stories are given to the individual characters and assigned by the groups in the textbook? How are characters expected to answer the questions "Who am I?" and "What makes me, me?"

Six central answers to these questions can be found in the processes surrounding the writers' representations of place, character, sex, language, culture, and nation. The writing and decision-making processes were recursive, the same topics and themes came up again and again in meetings. At each visitation of a topic, writers brought slightly different insights and suggestions to the fore. The recurrence of topics below reproduces, in part, this writing and decision-making processes.

Identities of Place

An early question the writers faced was to identify the geographic setting of the textbook. Some argued to set the textbook in an English-speaking country. These writers noted that, if the textbook was set in an English-speaking country, students could learn about another culture and the language naturally. They pointed out that the successful EU language program sets French language texts in France, Greek language texts in Greece, and so on. However this seemingly straightforward issue soon became complicated. In the case of English there was an embarrassment of riches, which lead to the matter of deciding which English-speaking country to choose.

Other writers opposed the plan of setting the book in an English-speaking country. They raised arguments with observations similar to those of Fairclough (2001) and noted that the choice of a foreign country implies an endorsement, at some level, of that country's life, culture, and politics. In addition, the MEXT (2003a) course of study strongly urges textbooks to include sections giving emphasis to "actual use situations" and "be useful in deepening the understanding of the ways of life and cultures of foreign countries and Japan."

Given these considerations, the writing team therefore decided to set the textbooks in Japan, since this was the most familiar location and where students are most likely to use English and to offer chances to deepen understanding. The eventual decision was to set the textbook at a Japanese junior high school in the suburb of an unnamed major city.

Characters

The writing team also discussed who should appear in the textbook. One writer suggested self-enclosed lessons with each lesson determining who and what would be discussed. Doing this would give maximum flexibility in terms of writing. It would keep each lesson self-enclosed, making it easier for teachers to move around in the textbook and make allowance for students who might miss a class.

Other writers wanted a tightly knit cast of clearly delineated characters. These writers argued that this would best reproduce the experience of life at Japanese schools. In addition, such a novelistic approach could give a shape to the textbook series and provide a narrative arc to the story that would draw students into the unfolding drama as they followed the characters through years one, two, and three of junior high school. Further, students could learn how these characters meet and overcome obstacles similar to those the students might face in their own lives.

Though both the self-contained lessons and the narrative approach were appealing, the final decision was to have the textbook series focus on a small set of recurring characters all attending the same junior high school. The intent was to encourage Japanese students to identify with and learn from these characters. At the same time, secondary characters (such as a foreign teacher) and those with one-time appearances (such as a friend from a main character's home country) could occur as needed and appropriate.

English

With English now being a global language (Crystal, 2003), the question arose as to which English to teach. One writer supported British received English and pronunciation as a counterweight to American English. Some writers noted the importance of including emerging Englishes, such as those spoken in Hong Kong, India, or Singapore (Jenkins, 2003). Another core-group writer noted the possibility of some sort of abbreviated English as espoused by certain Asian language leaders.

The final decision was to go with the standard of Japanese schools: a relatively uninflected American English. Among the deciding factors were: the global reach of American popular culture in providing out-of-textbook models of pronunciation and vocabulary choice; the history of the United States and Japan (the Occupation, corporate ties, and such); the generally simplified spellings common in American English; and the general wider availability of U.S.-oriented supplementary materials.

Characters and English

The writers clearly felt it untenable for all the characters to be native speakers of English and to all come from the United States. In tandem with the foregoing discussions of the ranges of English, the writers decided to use a three-part division of English into circles of usage: inner circle, outer circle, and expanding circle (Kachu, 1989; Yamanaka, 2006). The first, inner circle, contains countries in which English is a native language. Some obvious examples are Great Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The second, outer circle, includes countries in which English is a second (or third) language. This would include countries and sites such as India, Kenya, and Hong Kong. The third, the expanding circle, consists of countries in which English is a foreign language and covers everywhere not included in the inner and outer circles, with most of Europe, Japan, and China being examples.

Characters were to come, more or less equally, from all three circles of language usage: English as a native language, English as a second language, and English as a foreign language. Doing this, the writers felt, offered a number of advantages. It could introduce students to the range of Englishes around the world. It could let students see English as a medium of communication outside of the inner-circle countries. And, importantly for the students' language-learning experience, the characters from outer-circle and expanding-circle countries could provide role models for the Japanese students and encourage them to learn English.

Characters and Place

Having determined the linguistic range of the English presented, the writing team tackled which countries to include: the national identities of the characters. Discussions were long, inconclusive, and occasionally heated. Some writers wanted a near global cast of characters with all continents and all major regions represented. Others suggested focusing on countries that shared a level of development with Japan, as they would be most culturally similar to the students and hence easier to teach.

The writing team finally reached a compromise of sorts: to focus, as far as possible, on characters from Asian-Pacific countries: the United States, Australia, India, and China. Countries from other regions (notably Africa and Europe) could be brought in as the occasion permitted.

The United States was selected over Great Britain only after extensive discussion. Those writers supporting a character from Great Britain made mostly historical arguments: Great Britain is where English was born. To not have a character from it was somehow unthinkable. Writers supporting a character from the United States countered with a range of reasons. Culturally, they pointed out the dominance of American popular culture, a culture that students would be familiar with, like it or not. Economically, they pointed out the importance of the United States to Japan and the role this might play in the later lives of students. Linguistically, they pointed back to the decision to use an uninflected American pronunciation as the standard, and how odd it would be to have no speaker of that in the textbook series. And finally, they noted that the United States shares an ocean with Japan and thus fits into the larger Asian-Pacific scheme.

The decision to include a character from Australia had four major rationales. First, it offered a chance to expose students to a second native speaker. Second, it offered a chance to contrast the two native speakers, such as differences in dialect, vocabulary, and vernacular phrases ("G'day, mate"), and thus help students learn that there is no single right English, though in the final version most recognizably Australian vocabulary items were cut. Third, recognizing the realities of school life in Japan, an Australian character fit into one common pattern for home-stay experiences and school-sponsored trips for Japanese high school students: spending time in Australia. Such a character could provide students with a general sense of familiarity with a possible future experience. And fourth, Australia fit neatly into the Asian-Pacific plan.

Prolonged discussions preceded the decision to include a character from India. This partly involved internal political matters and the personal commitment of a writer to a pre-existing character from Kenya; ruffled feathers had to be smoothed. Eventually the decision to include a core character from India focused on three major reasons. First, India is the largest country in which English is spoken as a second language and as such deserves a place. Second, given the place of India in the literary imagination and the performance of broadly Indian writers in major literary competitions, India is hard to ignore. Third, India occupies an increasingly important place in economic relations with Japan, and students might benefit in the future from an early introduction to at least some aspects of Indian life. Fourth, India clearly meets the Asian-Pacific requirement.

The decision to include a character from China as the representative of an expanding-circle country was also contentious. Questions were raised by various writers about the troubled historical relations between Japan and China, about the fraught current relationship between the two countries, and, about the response of teachers and MEXT to such a problematic central character, and, less abstractly, about the possibility of provoking a response from rightist circles and the attendant harassments.

In the end, a character from China was chosen over the alternatives (Indonesia, Russia, and Korea figured prominently). Several reasons emerged in discussions. First, fraught though relationships with China might be, it was considered the lesser of the evils at hand as Indonesia, for example, would inevitably include references to Islam, an even more sensitive matter. Similar doubts figured in discussions of other nations. Second, despite the difficult recent historical relations, China is the source for much of Japanese culture, including the written language, and language is the topic of the textbook series. Third, China is emerging as the dominant Asian nation and is a major trading partner with Japan. It thus deserves representation and the character, if crafted carefully, can serve to introduce students to a major element in the future of Japan. Finally, it was felt difficult to have a focus on the Asian-Pacific region and leave out one of the major players.

Local Identities and Places

In addition to these recurring characters from outside Japan, there are two major examples of "otherness" in Japan.

One lesson reports on a visit to Okinawa and some of the activities specific to the Ryukyuan culture. Items mentioned and shown include the *eisa* dance, a *bon* dance performed by practiced, perambulating "troupes" of performers, and the *sanshin,* a three-stringed musical instrument with a snakeskin-covered body, related to the better-known Japanese *shamisen*.

Another lesson reports on a local Ainu festival being held near the character's junior high school. In it, students are introduced to the *mukkuri,* a musical instrument made of bamboo and string and played in a way similar to the jaw harp. Students also learn about the Ainu language, its appearance in Japanese in certain place names, its near disappearance, and its ongoing revival.

Bringing the Identities Together

Following these deliberations, the following identities for characters were finally chosen. All the characters live in Japan and attend the same public junior high school.

There are two Japanese characters, Ken, male, and Kumi, female. They represent the Japanese boys and girls using the textbook and the peculiar difficulties they experience while learning English in a country in which it is a foreign language with few immediate day-to-day uses.

Two characters come from English inner-circle countries. Paul comes from the United States and Emma from Australia, the dominant English inner-circle Asian-Pacific country. Ratna is from India, an Asian English outer-circle country, and speaks English as a second (well, actually a third) language. Ming is from China, an Asian English expanding-circle country, and speaks English as a foreign language.

All speak a relatively uninflected variety of American English. Most markers for gender, status when talking to peers (when talking to authority figures such as teachers and parents, slightly more polite or formal forms are used), age, and country of origin are removed.

DISCUSSION

A close look at the processes informing the choices writers made surrounding identities of characters for the textbook can bring some major issues into focus and help us approach the ways the characters would answer the question "Who am I?". These, in turn, can lead to preliminary reflections on the ways issues of identity connect with broader social and national issues. I focus on matters of geographic and national identities, though similar arguments could be made concerning identities based on sex and language.

When considering the geographic location of the textbook, writers, as noted, showed an awareness of the political and linguistic issues involved in placing it in the United States or some other country. However, there was essentially no discussion of the corollary issue: the implications of placing it in Japan. Was this an implicit endorsement of the policies of the Japanese government? Though keenly attuned to the roles of power and neocolonial politics in setting the text outside Japan, there was little reflection on the political implications of setting it in Japan.

Similar issues emerge when considering the national identities of the foreign characters. Though core writers felt a need to focus on characters from Asia, there was little discussion of the fraught historical relationships between Japan and the characters home countries of India, China, Australia, and the U.S. Nor was there any but oblique discussion of current issues regarding ongoing historical and contemporary disputes between these countries (for example, visits by Japanese politicians to Yasukuni Shrine and the ongoing efforts of Chinese to get compensation for wartime wrongs). Neither did the Japanese writers even raise issues of national identity and related identity issues, for example gender (the missing girls of India and China) and social class (or caste in the case of India).

There was some discussion among the Japanese writers regarding the content for the lessons on Okinawa and the Ainu, but little reflection on the Japanese domestic colonial takeover of the Ryukyuan kingdom and Ainu culture, and little sympathy for the matters when fleetingly raised. The sense seemed to be that these were historical matters with little current relevance and the residual traits presented less a matter for cultural otherness than regional distinction.

Such sensitive topics may themselves be inappropriate for inclusion in a junior high English textbook, as well as standing little chance of getting through the MEXT vetting process. Nevertheless, a greater awareness of the complexity and relevance of the issues (not just “sensitivity”) would add depth and range to even the simplest passage and the ways the characters would respond to the questions, “Who am I?” and “What does it mean to be me in the here and now of Japan?”

INTERPRETATION

A dialectical interpretation of the processes of creating identities for characters in a junior high school English textbook can suggest much. It starts from the ways language textbooks contest commonly held notions of identity and community. From here the analysis considers the resistances thus evoked, first concerning the place of the Other in Japan and second in the foreign language these Others would have Japanese learn. I close with hopes for ways of overcoming these resistances.

The Japanese Community and the Other

The dialectic starts with the ways this textbook series, or, perhaps any language textbook, contests commonly held notions of the indigenous organic Japanese community. The notion of a national identity is contested by the very presence of the Other characters in Japan: the American and Australian and Indian and Chinese characters. And, of course, by the presence of the Other, such as in the case of Okinawa and the Ainu, already ostensibly integrated into the Japanese body politic and culture.

The indigenous organic Japanese community is, by definition exclusive. This textbook and the characters it features contest that evocation by making Japan a cosmopolitan site (Appiah, 2006). By doing this, the writers create a place, a frame of mind, a language, and, literally and figuratively, a text that calls into question the students' membership in that organic Japanese community (Buruma & Margalit, 2004, 34). In short, a foreign-language text, almost by definition, brings into question the purity of faith and race.

Resisting the EFL Textbook's Others

The questions raised by the presence of the Other do not go unnoticed. Local school boards can act as gatekeepers for textbooks. During talks among the core group, teachers—through focus groups, questionnaires and surveys, and direct meetings with the core group—raise a wide range of reasons for gatekeepers not selecting this textbook: the relatively high level of language and the relatively difficult topics. As talk continues, other issues emerge. In some parts of Japan, these gatekeepers seem to sense a cosmopolitan threat of the Other characters in the textbook, similar to the threats 19th and 20th century Russian intellectuals felt from the West (Berlin, 1997, 246). According to informants, some school board members object to the many foreign characters living and studying in Japan. They feel it is more "natural" to have Japanese characters in Japan and foreign characters overseas.

These gatekeepers seem to subscribe to the view that there is a simple dichotomy that is co-equivalent with national boundaries (Buruma & Margalit, 2004), that there is the culture of Japan and the culture of the Other. When a textbook highlights characters that are Others living and learning in Japan or, by merely including them, endorses their Otherness, as in the case of the lessons on Okinawa and the Ainu, that textbook, at some level, is suspect. The hard-fought boundaries are threatened.

Resisting the EFL Textbook's Language

The gatekeepers' resistance is of a piece with a larger resistance to English in Japanese schools. Resistance to English education, explicit or not, can be seen in the inability of the Japanese educational system, despite a tremendous expenditure of time, energy, and money, to create a widespread class of people able to use English. McVeigh (2002) suggests that English is conflated with its cosmopolitan status in such a way that language itself becomes the Other. He notes some of the ways this is counterproductive for language learning and for cultural exchange. By extension, this reluctance to learn could include cultures approached through English, including, in the case of this textbook, Chinese and Indian cultures.

As McVeigh (2002, 154–155) notes, "English performs the role of the linguistic Other, mirroring and thereby defining Japanese identity… Some students who have acquired English are called *gaijin* (foreigner) in a derogatory manner…" This reflects a general tendency to essentialize culture and other cultures in ways that turns cultural studies into barriers rather than bridges between cultures.

Overcoming Resistances

English textbooks in Japan operate in a liminal area that, within the broad course of study allows for relative flexibility. This leaves writers relatively free of the constraints of MEXT's notions of fairness and balance (at least as practiced in MEXT reviews of and strictures on social studies and history textbooks). Writers can create characters that provide a sense of the diversity of experience and life in Japan. Their productions may be resisted. But these English textbooks can, to a degree, fly under the radar and, in that way, provide a real sense of cosmopolitan diversity in contrast to popular revanchist organic identities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A preliminary version of this chapter was presented at the American Anthropological Association meeting, 2007, Washington, D.C., which was refined and presented at the Anthropology of Japan in Japan 2009 meeting; I thank participants for their comments and suggestions. The chance to write the article and complete this portion of the research was made possible through the generosity of Keio University, which provided me with a sabbatical and partial funding and the generous support of Ken Schaefer at Temple University. In particular, I thank the members of the New Crown writing and editorial teams for their time, patience, and forbearance.

REFERENCES

Appiah, K. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: Norton.

Apple, M. W. (1988). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Berlin, I. (1997). *The crooked timber of humanity: Chapters in the history of ideas*. In H. Hardy (Ed.), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Buruma, I., & Margalit A. (2004). *Occidentialism: The west in the eyes of its enemies*. New York, NY: Penguin

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Erickson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York, NY: Norton.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

Feldman, J. (2007). Constructing a shared bible land: Jewish Israeli guiding performances for protestant pilgrims. *American Ethnologist, 34*, 351–374.

Fish, A. (2007). Mining difference for the culture industry. *Anthropology News, 48*, 6–7.

Hendry, J. (1999). *An anthropologist in Japan: Glimpses of life in the field*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students.* London, England: Routledge.

Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillian.

Kachru, B. (1989). Teaching world Englishes. *Cross Currents, 16*, 15–21.

Langham, C. (2007). MEXT-authorized English textbooks: The writing and screening of a Japanese high school text series. *Second language acquisition – Theory and pedagogy: Proceedings of the 6th annual JALT Pan-SIG conference* (pp. 7–11), Sendai, Japan.

LeTendre, G. K. (2000). *Learning to be adolescent: Growing up in US and Japanese middle schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lewin, E., & Leap, W. (Eds.). (1996). *Out in the field: Reflections of lesbian and gay anthropologists*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2007). *Problematizing identity: Everyday struggles in language, culture, and education*. Philadelphia, PA: Lawrence Erlbaum

Martin, J. N., & Nakayamam, T. K. (2000). *Intercultural communication in contexts* (2nd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

McVeigh, B. (2002). *Japanese higher education as myth*. New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology). (2003a, March). *The course of study for foreign languages*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/shotou/030301.htm

MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology). (2003b, May). *Kyokasho seido no gaiyou [The outline of textbook policy]*. Retrieved from http://mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/kyoukasho/gaiyou/04060901/0001.htm

Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership*. Cambridge, England: Belknap Press/ Harvard University Press.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism.* London, England: Routledge.

Schmid, C. L. (2001). *The politics of language: Conflict, identity, and cultural pluralism in comparative perspective*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. New York, NY: Norton.

Takahashi, S., et al. (2005). *New crown English series* (new ed., Vols. 1, 2, 3). Tokyo, Japan: Sanseido.

Taussig, M. (1991). *Shamanism, colonialism, and the wild man: A study in terror and healing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Yamanaka, N. (2006). An evaluation of English textbooks in Japan from the viewpoint of nations in the inner, outer, and expanding circles. *JALT Journal, 28*, 57–76.

Thomas Hardy
Keio University

AKIKO MURATA

4. STUCK IN BETWEEN

English Language Environment for International Students and Skilled Foreign Workers in Japan

INTRODUCTION

Language policies are closely related to corporate and national agendas for many countries in the face of increasingly fierce global competition. Language education and the medium of instruction need to be understood as being shaped through this sociopolitical context (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). As Tollefson and Tsui argue, policies regarding the medium of instruction and the promotion of a particular language often occupy a central role in impacting students' school performance as well as their social participation and access to resources.

In the case of Japan, the strong connection between the major Japanese industry body, *Keidanren*, and the English language policy enacted by the Japanese government since the 1980s indicates the economic motivations for pushing forward the "communicative approach" in English language teaching as well as the complex issues of retaining national identity (Aspinall, 2011). This amalgam of corporate and national interests operates as the driving force in shaping a language policy that – at least at the surface level – promotes oral English proficiency. This chapter highlights the complexities behind the promotion of the use of the English language from the viewpoint of international students and engineers studying and working in Japan.

This chapter first analyzes the policy initiative to promote the use of English connected with the larger social goal of recruiting skilled foreign workers. English language education tends to be understood as "globalizing" the Japanese; however, the study reveals that the promotion of English language education is not simply a means for training and sending more Japanese students or workers abroad, but also a means of attracting and "acquiring" foreign students and workers in Japan for national development and economic expansion and to display to the world that Japan offers borderless work and study environments. This chapter then examines how such a language policy initiative is enacted and contested within the practice of the classroom and workplace.

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 51–64.

PROMOTION OF ENGLISH FOR THE ACQUISITION OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Japan, the third largest economy in the world, has been debating how to expand its economy in the age of a shrinking domestic market, the population decrease, and the rapidly aging society. The rise of the Japanese currency, the yen, increased the acquisition of overseas business operations and the need for direct communication in overseas assignments as well as in virtual meetings. The linguistic interface is considered essential to enable Japan's global expansion and to stimulate a sluggish domestic economy that has been suffering from a low growth rate. The use of English has been strongly promoted by some well-known Japanese CEOs. Media coverage have captured the images of CEOs such as the president of Rakuten, the biggest internet shopping mall in Japan and among the world's largest by sales, as well as Fast Retailing Co., Asia's biggest clothing chain. The reportings symbolize the strong interest and concern of business leaders in large Japanese corporations that are seeking bilingual resources with English for their global expansion plans (e.g., Nikkei BP Net, 2010). Such corporate interests are not necessarily confined to Japanese bilingual "resources," but extend to international workers as well, and they are closely tied to the corporate needs of the acquisition of highly skilled foreign workers that are in high demand in other OECD nations.

Japan has been opening its doors to highly skilled foreign workers by easing visa processes for professionals (Ministry of Justice, 2000; Ministry of Labour, 1999), because skilled foreign workers are considered as economic assets and "resources" to the nation in creating innovation and enhancing global competitiveness. However, despite an open immigration policy for highly skilled workers, Japan has largely failed to facilitate the acquisition of skilled foreign workers; there is also a growing concern regarding how to increase the number of skilled foreign workers for the growth of the nation.

It is in this context that international students come into the picture. In recent government discussions and policy reports, international students are indicated as the major supply resource for these workers; thus, facilitation of their recruitment as well as supporting their campus life is necessary for the "settlement" of skilled workers in Japan (*Kodo jinzai ukeire suishin kaigi,* 2009). Viewing international students as promising labor resources is not new. According to a report by UNESCO (2009), more than 2.5 million students worldwide were studying outside their home countries. These international students are not only regarded as contributing to the host countries' education industry, but are also deemed important future labor resources and a valuable human capital for those countries. Therefore, OECD nations have been competing to recruit the best and brightest students across transnational boundaries. Japan, however, lags behind in this global competition, and it is struggling to compete with other OECD nations such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and other major European nations.

One of the identified causes of this failure is the language barrier. As a means of improving the situation, facilitation of bilingual language education (two-way language support involving teaching English to the Japanese and teaching Japanese to international students and workers) is proposed in various reports produced by the government and business leaders. The government's report on facilitating the acquisition of foreign skilled workers in May 2009 (*Kodo jinzai ukeire suishin kaigi,* 2009) emphasizes the importance of two-way language support: on one hand by enhancing the English language proficiency of Japanese workers "*in order to effectively utilize the foreign skilled workers."* (*Kodo jinzai ukeire suishin kaigi,* 3). It emphasizes that the Japanese and foreign workers should collaborate, complement, and compete with each other for the development of the national economy (*Kodo jinzai ukeire suishin kaigi,* 4).

In order to catch up with other nations, Japan announced a new policy initiative entitled "A Plan for 300,000 International Students" (2008) to facilitate the recruitment of international students, with the aim of increasing the number of international students in Japanese colleges to 300,000. The core project of this initiative started in 2009 to provide a large sum of funding to the 13 selected elite universities to establish bilingual campus environments. Measures included increasing the number of English-language courses, increasing the number of foreign scholars, and providing more support for Japanese language education with a greater emphasis on English language education.

It is in this context that the promotion of English as a medium of education is facilitated. This chapter analyzes the promotion of English in colleges and workplaces, and reveals both constraints and possibilities generated by this policy initiative. The chapter examines two case studies: the first study analyzes engineering students and their language contexts in graduate seminars, and the other study explores linguistic boundaries beyond classrooms in software workplaces. By combining both analyses, the study aims to examine how the government initiative intersects with the discourse of classroom and workplace and how possibilities and constraints are constructed and deconstructed therein.

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

The argument of this study in part resonates with the concept of "liminality" (Turner, 1969). Turner illuminated that participants in a liminal space (individuals placed in a transitional space, somewhere betwixt and between) have a possibility of gaining temporary freedom, as institutional boundaries, status differences, and hierarchies are temporarily halted or loosened for some limited period. In some respects, international students can be seen as being placed in such liminal space, where they are often regarded as a group that will return to their home countries eventually. Indeed, the data in this chapter partly uncover some level of freedom that international students are granted in bilingual situations in English-Japanese language mixing. I also interpreted this language mixing as an act of "bricolage," drawn from Lévi-Strauss's well-known metaphor (Lévi-Strauss, 1966), that is, an act of creating something with the materials at hand. I used this metaphor in order to highlight the potentiality of mixing Japanese and English in international students' participation in their graduate career. Both concepts, liminality and bricolage, are used in this chapter to reveal the enabling factors of the promotion of English in the college environment.

However, the examination of liminality (both in time and space) also directs our attention to the "temporariness" and boundaries surrounding it, thereby also highlighting the disabling mechanisms and constraints. An analysis of the data reveals the difficulties that international students face when they wish to gain a greater and deeper participation in the Japanese labor market. As Lave and Wenger's practice theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991) reveals, individual participations in various social fields can deepen from periphery to core, and changing participatory relations can generate learning; however, their theory also reveals that learning and participation can be hindered in asymmetrical social relations. By analyzing the two case studies, this study reveals how the government initiative intersects with the discourse of classroom and workplace, and how possibilities and constraints are constructed and deconstructed therein.

METHODS

The data for the two case studies were collected as follows. The first case study draws upon research data of a large engineering school in the Tokyo metropolitan area (Murata, 2009). The data were collected through interviews of international students, observations of classroom activities, informal chats, and interviews with instructors as well as from questionnaires administered to international students regarding their language use in the study. The second case study is based upon research data collected as part of the author's dissertation research from 2008 to 2010, which examines Indian software engineers' labor in Japanese firms (Murata, 2010; Murata, 2011).

CASE STUDY 1: FROM A GRADUATE SEMINAR

English as an Enabling Factor

As discussed earlier, the G30 initiative states that it offers a two-way support for the provision of both English and Japanese language education. However, top Japanese engineering colleges, such as the one examined here, already have a large number of international students who are selected on the basis of English proficiency and not on proficiency of the Japanese language. The emphasis is primarily placed on the promotion of the English language for Japanese students, rather than providing Japanese language education for international students, although Japanese language programs have expanded for international students.

In the Graduate School of Engineering, particularly in the programs with a large number of international students, English is a common means of communication among Japanese and international students, although the degree of English used varies among labs. Some international students claim that they hardly need any Japanese in Japan except for shopping and going out. Although many international students recognize the need to learn Japanese in order to mix with Japanese students who are shy and reluctant to speak English, learning Japanese is in many programs not a must but an option that one can pursue depending on one's own interest and needs. This was confirmed by a survey conducted by the Japanese language program. Survey responses were collected from the faculty members of graduate programs and showed that the emphasis on the use of English in the labs and in thesis work supports the efforts of international students who do not have the time or resources to learn Japanese.

International students with a government scholarship are usually placed on an intensive language course for several months before they start their study in Japanese colleges. They are expected to learn Japanese first in order to adjust to college life and the academic environment. However, initiatives to increase the number of English medium courses are considered to lower the entry boundary for international students. Therefore, students who enter Japanese colleges for the English medium programs can at least choose whether, and to what extent, they will learn Japanese. They may be considered as being placed in the "liminal" space where they are not alienated on the basis of language, at least at the college. Some students argue that they are learning Japanese for day-to-day communication, but they will continue to use English for academic discussions because it gives them more freedom to express themselves.

Boundaries

However, many international students also state they have difficulty participating in graduate seminars, where many Japanese students tend not to use English in their presentations. A high level of English proficiency is required in the seminars, and results in heavy preparation for many Japanese students. For many, presenting in English is neither practical nor feasible, although many would feel English learning is a must for engineering graduate students who wish to have academic- or research-related careers, and knowing English is desirable for the sake of those who do not understand the Japanese language.

For international students, Japanese-language seminar discussions create a problem. In seminars where Japanese is the medium of communication, not knowing the Japanese language limits students' access to various resources. When access to resources is blocked, learners become alienated from the community in which they are situated (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and the Japanese language can alleviate this alienation.

Although some Japanese students use slides written in English, their explanations are basically conducted in Japanese, and it is difficult for international students to extract the necessary information just by looking at the slides. Some presenters use PowerPoint slides written in Chinese characters (*kanji*), and this also ends up excluding international students who lack *kanji* knowledge from the rest of the class and demarcates a clear linguistic boundary.

One student mentioned that it is an agonizing experience to sit in a seminar for hours, not understanding what is being discussed. Some labs start regular seminar sessions in the evenings, where international students, who have little or no understanding of the language used, are also expected to attend. One student, for instance, did not have *kanji* knowledge when he first arrived in Japan and therefore could not read slides written in *kanji* characters or figure out what the diagrams or graphs meant. This student struggled hard for more than a year, taking Japanese language courses and trying to learn *kanji* during the seminars, and it took him a considerable amount of time to gain a sufficient level of Japanese proficiency. Many international students often point out that they are anxious to know more about the discussions that seem to be relevant to their research.

Bricolage

However it must also be pointed out that international students can use English in seminars when they are presenting, and many international students do so—some with a mixture of a little Japanese inserted into their English presentations. For instance, in the example below, Anurak, a student from Thailand, is presenting his research in English, and the professor is responding and making comments in Japanese.

However, Anurak also uses Japanese in Q & A sessions because Q & A sessions require less detailed explanations.

Professor : *Ja S-kun* ("OK, Mr. S.")
Anurak : (Starts presenting in English)
Professor : *Un* ("Yeah.")
Anurak : (Presentation in English)
Professor : *Un*
Anurak : (Presentation in English)
Professor : *Un*
Anurak : (Presentation in English)
Professor : *Un*
Anurak : (Presentation in English)
Professor : *Un*
Anurak : (Presentation in English)
Professor : *Un*
Anurak : (Presentation in English)

Professor : *Fufu* (“I see.”) *Un*
Anurak : *Ee*, *sumimasen, kaite mo ii desu ka?*
(“Excuse me, but may I write it?”)
Professor : *Ii yo* (“OK”)
Anurak : *Hai* (“Yes.”)
Professor : *Kono* “*X”tte*? (“What is this X?”)

Q & A Session after the Presentation

Professor : *Tsukau mokuteki wa nani* (“What is it used for?”)
Anurak : *Mokuteki wa…eto*…solution *no kairyo* (“It is for the improvement of the solution.”)
Professor : *Un*, solution *no*? *Kairyo* (“Improvement of solution?”)
Anurak : *Kairyo o shite… eto* (“I will improve and…”)
Professor comments in Japanese
Anurak : *Hai, sō desu ne, hai* (“Yes, that’s right.”)
Professor : *To iu koto to* (“and…”)
Anurak : *Mō hitotsu wa…eto…tokei jikan ga…eto* (“Another thing is time.”)
Professor : *Hayaku naru kara* (“It will become faster.”)
Anurak : *Hai* (“Yes.”)
Professor : *N…*
Anurak : *O kangaete imasu* (“I think so.”)
Professor : *N…, sō da yone* (“That’s right.”)
(From here, Anurak switches to English to provide detailed explanation.)

In this segment, Anurak switches from English to Japanese and then reverts back to English when a detailed explanation or comments are required. Anurak states that he usually explains things in English and that professors and other students respond and ask questions in Japanese. Although Anurak can manage to present his research in Japanese, and he actually did several times, it was too time consuming and unfeasible. Anurak also uses visual aids when explaining in English and uses a whiteboard to supplement the explanation with a diagram.

Anurak’s language mixing can be analyzed as an attempt to accommodate the needs of both international students and Japanese students, and this mixing is an act of *bricolage,* making use of the materials at hand to create something of their own (Lévi-Strauss, 1966). It may be an everyday tactic of ordinary people, an act of trying to create space of themselves in the space that is imposed upon them, in someone else’s territory, as De Certeau (1984) mentions.

GATE KEEPERS

The previous section illuminated how the language to be used in the classroom is determined by practicality and feasibility, and priority. When members are not proficient in two languages, the question is who should be the priority and who will be the gate keeper—the person who takes part in prioritizing the use of one language over the other. If we look closely at the discussion between Anurak and the professor, while Anurak uses a mixture of English and Japanese, the professor's feedback and comments are all in Japanese throughout the seminar; the professor never shifts to English. In this situation, English is acceptable for international students, but it is never the norm in the seminar. Although Anurak says he has never been pressured to use Japanese in his seminars, he also says that the professor tests new international students by asking questions in Japanese and checking how much progress the student has made with the Japanese language. Everyday language use in the labs and seminars is not necessarily static, and all participants make everyday choices of language use, but it is also true that the gate keeper's actions affect the ways in which certain expectations are set.

Many students choose to present their work in English; even those who can do so in Japanese. Part of the reason for not using Japanese is that these students are afraid to receive harsh comments or criticism from their colleagues or supervisors. Using English functions as a wall of protection for international students because many Japanese students hesitate to ask in English and have difficulty in understanding and expressing their opinions in English. The situation, however, works negatively because these students are losing opportunities to learn from other students' feedback.

It is true to say that English language courses and an English language environment at Japanese colleges will be useful for many international students, especially those who have English language knowledge and who wish to study in Japanese colleges using English. English-language courses will facilitate conditions in which such students can focus on their chosen field from Day 1 of their college life; these students can pick up the Japanese language in the course of their participation in the graduate community and determine to what extent they will take up the Japanese language according to their needs and goals of their stay in Japan. Anurak's case shows an example of a student finding a way to carve out a space of his own by mixing English and Japanese and adjusting to his own needs and that of the circumstances. Further facilitation of bilingual campus environments, if proceeded as planned, may erase tensions and contradictions within the campus environment by offering more flexibility in linguistic choices of both Japanese and international students.

Yet, when looking at the composition of international students, there is a larger boundary making in progress. G30 supports two languages, English and Japanese, but the majority of students are from East Asian countries. Although many students are familiar with the English language, it is not necessarily the most comfortable language for both Japanese and international students to use. Projects such as G30 provide funding for English language support for Japanese students, but they do not have room for languages other than English and Japanese to be taught and thus do not truly make a "multilingual" campus space. These projects open up opportunities to those who are proficient in English, but they close the door and exclude others who do not know English.

Moreover, the more freedom international students gain in an increasingly bilingual campus, the thicker the boundary they may have to face when they try to find jobs in Japanese firms. Although the government and business leaders are trying to promote the English language in Japanese workplaces, the percentage of foreign workers employed by Japanese companies remains very low, and Japanese companies show reluctance in hiring foreign workers who have limited Japanese proficiency. One research study indicates that highly skilled workers employed by large Japanese corporations constitute only one out of a thousand employees in Japan. Many Japanese firms state that they do not have special selection criteria regarding hiring international students (that is, companies claim that they do not differentiate Japanese from foreigners) but they do want someone who has native-level Japanese proficiency.

During graduate life, many international students feel no need to learn *keigo*, the honorific Japanese language. However, they also know that once they decide to find a job, *keigo*'s importance looms large. A course that teaches *keigo* in the college where I conducted my investigation is very popular among international students, particularly those who intend to find jobs in Japan. *Keigo* and *kanji* have to be mastered in order to obtain jobs in Japan, and the potential benefits that bilingual campus environments provide to international students will remain limited as long as external thick boundaries continue to exist between the colleges and labor market in Japan.

CASE STUDY 2: FURTHER BOUNDARIES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE WORKPLACE

The difficulty of finding a job without Japanese language proficiency can be seen in labor market situations. The table below illustrates an example of the language requirements specified in a job advertisement for software engineers.

Table 1. Japanese language requirements in job ads for IT programmers (Daijob.com ,2009, 9.25)

Required level of Japanese language	*Numbers of ads*	*%*
Native	55	48.6%
Fluent	31	27.4%
Business	18	15.9%
Conversational	1	0.8%
Basic	1	0.8%
None	7	6.1%

As shown in the table, those who do not have linguistic capital have limited mobility in the Japanese software labor market.

The author conducted an analysis of Indian software engineers' labor situation at Japanese firms, and the results revealed various linguistic boundaries limiting their work (Murata, 2009; Murata, 2010; Murata, 2011). Indian software engineers are known for their technical proficiency and for their proficiency in English. English is one of the factors that enable engineers' jobs across transnational boundaries. Lacking English language skills becomes a boundary against entering the software industry, and those who are not familiar with English-speaking environments have a disadvantage according to the interviews conducted with the HR managers and engineers. One of the HR managers, Sanjay, stated that software companies are "service providers" who need to communicate with clients overseas, the majority of whom are English-speaking clients, and therefore, engineers need both soft and hard skills. Sanjay and other HR managers state that they check not only English fluency, but also look for candidates with clear English accents, for smooth communication with clients. Many of the engineers in this research went to English-medium schools, and engineers' fluency in English tends to be affected by the class-based divide between an English-medium education and vernacular-medium education at school (Faust & Nagar, 2001).

In English-speaking countries such as Australia, Indian IT engineers can exercise considerable power as newly emerging Asian "power immigrants" who can compete in the local labor market at a level playing field (Ishii et al., 2009); such an advantage tends to diminish in the Japanese labor market, where the linguistic barrier remains strong. Acquiring business-level oral proficiency in the Japanese language is possible from a few years of work experience in Japan. Yet, writing and reading the Japanese language is time-consuming, and only a small portion of foreign engineers reach an advanced level of Japanese language mastery.

Linguistic capital, however, can play an interesting (from a corporate perspective, an ironic) role in finding employment, as engineers with little experience but with bilingual skills sometimes have better job opportunities and career prospects in Japan than engineers who are technologically proficient. Because bilingual engineers are in high demand, certain engineers are hired not based on technical skill sets but based on their linguistic skills. A sales manager of a medium-sized Indian firm stated that they make an investment in training engineers with language education, but those engineers leave the firm in one or two years time and move to larger Indian firms in Japan. Many of these engineers are not technically proficient and have little experience, but they utilize their linguistic capital to their advantage and gain mobility in the Japanese labor market as on-site engineers who can coordinate work with Japanese clients. He mourns that these bilingual engineers become, "commodities that have wings."

The following is a case study of Uday, an Indian software engineer in his early thirties, who changed companies five times in Japan using his technical, as well as linguistic, capital. This case study reveals an instance of foreign software engineers' career aspirations and struggles to acquire linguistic capital. The term "career" here does not simply refer to workers' choice of work, detached from social constraints, but rather, refers to the dialectics of workers' aspirations and social constraints.

The researcher regularly met with and talked to Uday about his work and career plan regularly for more than a year and heard about his work experiences and career plans. Uday studied software engineering in college, joined an IT company in India, and came over to Japan eight years before the interviews on a project basis. He gradually learned Japanese, and moved up by changing companies—both Japanese and Indian firms. He has a good command of Japanese and is now employed as a direct regular employee of a Japan office of an Indian based software service company, and his income is close to USD125,000.

Uday states that he managed to move up to his current position by changing companies using his technical capabilities, management skills, and social skills, including Japanese language proficiency, to market himself. He works hard to obtain various qualifications and technical certification. For instance, Uday studied hard to pass the highest level of JLPT (Japanese Language Proficiency Test) to prove his proficiency in the Japanese language. He believes that this certificate will enhance his career opportunities and bring higher income. The JLPT exam is considered to be an important economic capital for many engineers interviewed.

For Uday and many other engineers interviewed, constantly upgrading technical and language skills is extremely important, because this will enhance their market value and create more stability in their employment condition. After passing an important exam, Uday stated, "It is a relief. If some problem arises, I can always move. I'm confident with that. Layoffs are everywhere." There is a reason that Uday works hard to earn as many qualifications as possible: his company works under a prime contracting firms that requests engineers who have certain qualifications. Uday's constant efforts to upgrade his skills by taking qualification exams reflects not just his aspirations to become a better engineer or to learn new technology, but is also influenced by corporate pressure and unstable employment conditions. He invests money and time and sacrifices his personal life with his family to prepare for qualification exams and spends considerable spare time learning new skills.

Language skills are also considered important from corporate perspectives, because engineers without language skills are more costly (due to arranging for a translator). Lacking language skills creates extra costs, and not being able to interact directly with clients tends to generate communication difficulties, and clients' extra efforts and frustrations in facing and defeating these communication barriers. The CEO of the firm Uday works for told him that he cannot become a project manager because he cannot write documents in Japanese, which is essential to manage projects. Therefore Uday explains that he feels a glass ceiling exists because of the language issue.

Uday finds the relationship with his supervisor at the second Japanese company most useful, and thinks this is the turning point of his career in Japan. Uday was still struggling to learn basic Japanese at the time, and his supervisor, Tanaka, constantly put pressure on him to learn Japanese. For instance, Uday used English in emails, but after a while, Tanaka wrote emails entirely in Japanese and expected Uday to reply in Japanese. Uday spent hours writing emails in Japanese, but Tanaka would return them with the comment "rewrite." Email correspondence with Tanaka took up most of Uday's time in the office, from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. It was necessary for Uday's firm to train a bilingual engineer, and Tanaka functioned as both a gatekeeper and language trainer for Uday. Tanaka told Uday, "I can't sell you if you don't know Japanese." After one year, Uday was offered only a small pay rise, since he could not talk to clients in Japanese. Uday tried to negotiate, and he was told, as a trial run, to take charge of one project and communicate with the Japanese clients on his own. Uday tried, but he failed miserably. Uday recalls Tanaka's comment: "I knew you couldn't. That's why your pay rise is ¥10,000." Uday then recognized that learning the language would be an essential tool for his career mobility, and he has since striven to learn Japanese.

For Uday, changing companies enhances risk yet also poses a positive challenge for him. Uday feels that changing jobs and increasing income is a natural cycle, like that experienced by many other Indian engineers. He has been working for his current company for three years, and his Indian friends often ask him why he does not change companies. Uday states that Indian engineers feel anxious when they are not learning a new technology, and that they are constantly worried about their skills becoming obsolete. Uday regularly meets with headhunters to check his market value. For him, language qualification is his passport to becoming a project manager for a Japanese client.

Uday's case may be considered an example of an engineer's successful career development in Japan, but his efforts are also closely connected to the issues of unstable employment conditions and fears of being unmarketable. Language skills add to one's employment value, because engineers without Japanese language skills are more expensive due to unforeseen communication costs. On the other hand, Tanaka's language training for Uday was subverted by Uday changing companies, and Tanaka's efforts to educate Uday were thus wasted from Tanaka's company's point of view. Uday's career is generated as an amalgam of his own choices and aspirations as well as corporate pressures and vulnerable employment conditions.

CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the government's policy initiative to facilitate the use of English in colleges and in workplaces through two case studies, and examined how the promotion of English affected and was subverted by students and workers. The analysis illustrates the potential of this initiative in the sense that it opens up opportunities for international students and workers who have limited knowledge of the Japanese language to come to Japan to study and work. However, it also illustrated an instance of boundary making by gatekeepers, which limits access to resources for students and workers and limits their opportunities to pursue a "career" in Japan. Both cases reveal that the dual language use of Japanese and English generates an amalgam of constraints and opportunities, and boundaries are enacted and deconstructed in everyday practices. The first case revealed that the international students were given the freedom to choose the language they feel more comfortable with, within the "liminal" time and space of their graduate school, yet the demarcation emerges clearly when they seek to cross boundaries to become core participants in the Japanese labor market. The analysis of the software engineers further revealed opportunities and boundaries generated by the use of English and Japanese.

In both case studies, on-site voices and practices reveal that the promotion of English is neither an all-purpose cure nor a total poison, but it is something that needs to be enacted and realized through the daily struggles of participants who are caught in, but are constructing, the social world in which they are embedded.

The author argues that language practitioners as well as anthropologists should continue to closely examine such constructions and deconstructions of boundary makings in various levels of time and space in everyday language classrooms and workplaces. Moreover, it is important to critically highlight what is at stake in such practices. This shows how language policy and practice as well as the voices of those directly affected, intersect and construct each other.

REFERENCES

Aspinall, R. (2011). Globalisation and English language education policy in Japan: External risk and internal inertia. In D. Willis & J. Rappleye (Eds.), *Reimagining Japanese education: Borders, transfers, circulations and the comparative.* Oxford, England: Symposium Books.

De Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Faust, D., & Nagar, R. (2001). Politics of development in postcolonial India: English-medium education and social fracturing. *Economic and Political Weekly, 36*, 2878–2883.

Ishii, Y., Sekine, M., & Shiobara, Y. (2009). *Asiakei senmonshoku imin no genzai. [The contemporary situation of skilled Asian migrants]*. Tokyo, Japan: Keio Daigaku Shuppankai.

Kodo Jinzai Ukeire Suishin Kaigi. (2009). *Gaikoku Kodo Jinzai Ukeire Seisaku no Honkakuteki Tenkai o [Toward a New Policy for Receiving Highly Skilled Professionals from Abroad]*.

Lave, J., & Wenger., E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2008). *Ryugakusei sanjumannin keikaku kosshi [The "300000 Foreign Students Plan" Campaign]*.

Ministry of Justice. (2000). *Dainiji Shutsunyukoku Kanri Kihon Keikaku [The Second Basic Immigration Control Plan]*.

Ministry of Labour. (1999). *Daikuji Koyo Taisaku Kihon Keikaku [The Ninth Basic Employment Measures Plan]*.

Murata, A. (2009). The meaning of bricolage in pluri-lingual situations: The analysis of two engineering communities. *Literacies*, *6*, 1–8.

Murata, A. (2010). International migration of highly skilled workers: Analysis of the temporary migration of Indian IT engineers and contract labor in Japan. *Migration Policy Review*, *2*, 6–22.

Murata, A. (2011). An analysis of the career development of highly skilled foreign workers. *Intercultural Education*, *33*.

Nikkei BP Net. (2010). *Yunikuro, Rakuten Dakejanai Eigo Koyogoka e mukau Genjitsu [Not just Uniqlo and Rakuten: The reality of moves towards officialising English]*. Retrieved from http://www.nikkeibp.co.jp/article/news/20100824/242724/

Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
Turner, V. W. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Pub. Co.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2009). *World conference on higher education report.*

Akiko Murata
Hosei University

YUKI IMOTO AND SACHIKO HORIGUCHI

5. BRINGING A EUROPEAN LANGUAGE POLICY INTO A JAPANESE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

The Contested Field of Institutional Foreign-Language Education Reform

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the identity politics involved in the process of implementing institutional language education reform through an ethnographic case study of one Japanese educational institution, which we shall call Aoba.[1] Like many leading educational institutions, Aoba is seeking ways to "globalize" through curricular and pedagogical reforms. But why did one marginal research center within the large Aoba system attempt institutional language education reform? Through a detailed case study, we suggest an approach for understanding how globalization is interpreted and received or rejected at the local level of individuals and institutions. Specifically, we investigate why and how individuals within Aoba's Research Center for Foreign Language Education (hereafter the Research Center) attempted institutional reform through adopting a "European" model of language education policy—the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (hereafter, the CEFR).[2]

After a brief review of the methodology, we will begin by introducing the CEFR as the key symbolic text of our ethnographic story, examining the background to why and for whom it was seen as an "attractive" policy package for implementing foreign-language education reforms in Japanese educational institutions, and at Aoba in particular. We will then provide an account of the CEFR Project—a large-scale government-funded project that was carried out at the Research Center from 2006 to 2011—to discuss how the key concepts of the CEFR were interpreted and played out by individuals at the Research Center. Finally, we examine the organizational structures of power and the competing identities within those structures, which we regard to be an essential part of the ethnographic analyses of educational reform practice.

METHODOLOGY

Our method can be described as a "team ethnography" (Horiguchi & Imoto, 2015), and we conducted collaborative fieldwork from April 2009 to March 2010. Data was primarily derived from participant observation and supplemented by 22 unstructured

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 65–83.

interviews with teachers and staff members involved in the project. We conducted most interviews together and shared each other's field notes throughout the research, which led to a heightened awareness of the subjective and situated nature of what we perceive in the field and which enriched our discussions and understandings on the multiple "realities" within the project. In addition to this ethnographic data, we collected and reviewed documents and publications from the Research Center as well as literature on foreign-language teaching relevant to the context of this particular project.

The nature of team ethnography means that our account is a synthesis of perspectives derived from our respective positionings in the field. Imoto joined Aoba's CEFR Project as a postdoctoral fellow of the Research Center for Foreign Language Education in April 2009. Her main role was to engage in administrative duties as part of the project's central Coordination Group to ensure the smooth running of the project. Her secondary role was to "produce research"—particularly through providing assistance to Unit 2 (see below). Horiguchi joined the CEFR project as an adjunct researcher of the Center for Research on Foreign Language Education in June 2009 to assist in research within Unit 2. Thus, Imoto acted as one of the core members of the project during the fieldwork period assuming a stronger participant role and hence an *emic*, insider perspective. On the other hand, Horiguchi's main work throughout the period was as an English instructor at another university. Her role, therefore, has primarily rested as an observer, and hence she holds a relatively *etic*, outsider perspective.

A challenge of organizational ethnography, as noted in Alderson (2009), is the issue of defining what counts as viable data, as opposed to mere gossip or even scandalous disclosure; not to mention the sensitivities involved in publishing and the limits of anonymity when a description of context becomes central to the ethnographic account. We made it clear to our informants throughout our fieldwork that we were conducting ethnographic research about their/our research project and that we were interested in the identities and perspectives of the individuals involved. However, gaining the informants' understanding of our objectives was difficult because of the different assumptions regarding research and the different levels of epistemology within which we situated ourselves. Our hope, however, is that our research will ultimately give back to the field and its participants (including ourselves), a more reflexive understanding of the processes of project management and language education reform at the institutional level.

THE CEFR

As Gellner (2001) points out, there are certain key concepts that one finds in an organization that seem to "hold things together" and define the field that is being contested. In the case of this research, we initially identified the key symbolic concept that defined the project organization as the "CEFR" and sought to unpack its multiple layers of interpretations and the interests or motivations behind them. It is necessary, then, to begin with a description of the background and nature of the policy framework known as the CEFR, and its main components.

The idea of a CEFR was launched in 1991 during a Council of Europe symposium titled Transparency and Coherence in Language in Europe organized in Ruschikon, Switzerland. It culminated from a need to provide a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabi, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc., across Europe, which would facilitate educational and occupational mobility across European countries (Council of Europe, 2001, 1). The official version of the CEFR was published in 2001 from Cambridge University Press in English and from Didier in French. The text proposed to provide a *comprehensive, coherent, and transparent* framework for language learning and teaching, and hence a practical tool for setting clear standards to be attained at successive stages of language learning and for evaluating outcomes in an internationally comparable manner (Council of Europe, 2001, 7). It is important to note, however, that the CEFR's framework does not imply the imposition of one single uniform system. Rather it is intended to be open and flexible so that it can be applied with necessary adaptations to suit particular situations.

A culmination of research and discussion on language teaching since the 1970s, the CEFR advocates communicative competency, within the trend of emphasis towards function over form and structure in language (see Rosenkjar, this volume). Foreign-language learning in this paradigm is no longer an intellectual and analytical pursuit for the privileged elite, but a necessary survival skill—communication—for migrant workers and students increasingly crossing national borders within Europe. Based on a communicative approach to language learning, the CEFR describes the competences necessary for communication, the related knowledge and skills, and the situations and domains of communication. The CEFR defines levels of attainment in different aspects of its descriptive scheme with illustrative descriptors. These level descriptors are often called "*can-do* lists," since they describe the tasks that the learner can do at each level, in any language, across different educational contexts. Accompanying the CEFR is the European Language Portfolio, which is a booklet or portfolio for learners' self-assessment and for keeping a record of their language learning as they move through different educational and occupational contexts.

With its basis in communicative competence, three important ideas that underlie or relate to the CEFR may be identified as plurilingualism, communicative language, and autonomy. Plurilingualism (translated as *fukugengo-shugi* in Japanese), which refers to an individual's competency in multiple languages to deal with diverse social contexts, is posited as differing from the idea of multilingualism (*tagengo-shugi*), which refers to the coexistence of different languages in one given society (Council of Europe, 2001, 4) and is more strongly associated with the U.S..

The ideas of communicative language and autonomy are strongly linked in the context of the CEFR through the idea of action or agency. The approach adopted in the CEFR is an action-oriented one that views the users and learners of a language primarily as autonomous social agents. From such a perspective, the Council of Europe outlines language use as follows:

> Language use, embracing language learning, comprises the actions performed by persons who as individuals and as social agents develop a range of *competences,* both *general* and in particular *communicative language competences.* They draw on the competences at their disposal in various contexts under various *conditions* and under various *constraints* to engage in *language activities* involving *language processes* to produce and/or receive *texts* in relation to *themes* in specific *domains,* activating those *strategies* which seem most appropriate for carrying out the *tasks* to be accomplished. The monitoring of these actions by the participants leads to the reinforcement or modification of their competences. (Council of Europe, 2001, 9)

It is not difficult to imagine from the discussions in this volume thus far that the conception of "language" and the assumptions of what it means to acquire a language as described in the CEFR is perceived to be different from the conception of language and language learning assumed in Japanese formal education traditionally. Foreign-language education at university level primarily meant deciphering and translating a foreign text, which was regarded as an intellectual endeavor of consuming higher cultural knowledge, decontextualized from everyday practical use. Why, then, would a language policy text that seems so far removed from the indigenous Japanese local context become attractive for higher education institutions in Japan? In the following sections, we will consider why the CEFR and its underlying ideas outlined above were seen as an attractive tool in the process of implementing foreign-language education reforms.

HOW THE CEFR CAME TO JAPAN

One could claim that the CEFR's attraction for language educators in Japan lies in its "foreignness" and global value. As Goodman and Phillips (2003), Marshall (1990) and others point out, Japan's modern educational history has been based on the borrowing of foreign models. Moreover, in the fields of applied linguistics and language teaching, the U.S. and Europe have been viewed as the center of academic research. In fact, in the related field of language policy and planning, Japanese academics go as far as to claim that there is no language policy in Japan, hence the need to learn from research-based policy such as the CEFR. A closer examination of how the CEFR was incorporated into Japan, however, helps us to go beyond the usual explanation of Japan's attraction to foreign models of education or its tendency to borrow from the experiences and knowledge of the West.

The interest in the CEFR in Japan began from the early days of its European inception in 2001, led by institutions of higher education—both public and private—initially as part of European Studies research, later attracting the interest of language education researchers and teachers. One small but significant CEFR study group that met regularly at the Goethe Institut in Tokyo from 2001 constituted a marginal but enthusiastic group of literary and linguistic scholars of German who were interested in improved practice of German language teaching in Japan. The Aoba professor later to become a key actor in the decision of the AFG project was one of its members. In 2004, the leader of this study group and his students at the University of Tokyo translated and published the official Japanese translation of the CEFR with sponsorship from the Goethe Institut.

Since then, a variety of research on the CEFR and its application in Japanese foreign-language education has been conducted. In the area of English-language education, MEXT has been funding projects on improving English communicative competence in response to demands from the business world, and the CEFR has caught the attention of some researchers and educators as an innovative source for funded research. One significant example is the "*Koike project*", a four-year government-funded COE research project led by an applied linguist and vocal figure on MEXT committees, Koike Ikuo, launched in 2004. The aim of the project was to find coherence and smoother links in English education between the levels of schooling from elementary school up to university and to thus develop a "CEFR Japan." Within the English-language testing industry, attempts have been made to relate the CEFR descriptor levels to language qualifications widely recognized within Japan, such as Eiken and TOEIC. This follows the trends in Europe, led by textbook publishers and testing bodies such as the Cambridge University Press. Most of the research and application of the CEFR, however, has been conducted as part of foreign-language education reforms at higher education institutions rather than at the national level. A closer examination of the political dynamics of foreign-language teaching at Japanese universities helps us to understand why this may be so.

Pressures in Japanese Higher Education

The increasing wave of "globalization" and English dominance, coupled with Japan's economic stagnation, demographic decline, and marketization of the university from the late 1990s to the 2000s has severely impacted the demand of non-English languages within higher education, particularly of German and French. It is significant to note in this context that the initial key advocates of the CEFR in Japan were professors of German and those involved in German language teaching.

From the late 2000s, the popularity of languages spoken in neighboring countries, particularly Chinese, rose as university courses to be taken as a second foreign language after English.[3] As explained by several liberal arts professors we talked to, students nowadays are keen on meeting the socio-economic demands for communicative competency in foreign languages and being able to "speak" the language rather than studying languages to be "cultured." This is considered problematic from the viewpoint of many domestically bred European language professors who tend to come from literary or philosophical academic backgrounds. Underlying such trends is the gradual devaluation of the liberal arts and humanities in favor of applied or vocational training in higher education, preparing students with qualifications that may potentially give them an advantage in the competitive job market.

With the growth of interest in enhancing communicative skills in languages of the emerging Asian economic market, and a resulting decline of interest in European languages, the professors of French and German languages have come to be placed in a struggle for survival in the academic market. In such a challenging era for survival, one could argue that the CEFR—rooted in the European plurilingual ideal—provided a *raison-d'etre* for non-English European languages in higher education. The CEFR was appropriated as a new area of expertise for German and French professors; this can be seen as a strategy for survival in an increasingly competitive academic market with pressure to produce research and to gain funding, and it can also be seen as resistance to increased dominance of the languages of global power.

A key turning point in determining this competitive academic climate was the semiprivatization of national universities into corporate bodies in 2004 (*hōjinka*), which aimed to promote institutional autonomy and entrepreneurism and thus raise the overall level and efficiency of Japanese universities through market forces (Eades et al., 2005; Kitagawa & Oba, 2009; Poole & Chen, 2009; Poole, 2010). This led to a quest for innovation and efforts in branding, both for national and private universities, within the context of demographic decline (Poole, 2009). The government's policy emphasis has been on invigorating research among the top elite universities through the introduction of competitive systems for gaining research funding, the strengthening of graduate schools (*daigakuin jūtenka*), and the introduction of professional graduate school programs in 2003, to respond to changing skill needs in the so-called knowledge-based society (Kitagawa & Oba, 2009).

From such changes in the climate of higher education, we begin to understand how and why the CEFR was introduced into the Japanese context; the answer is a combination of foreign attraction, legitimization for attracting research funds, strategy for academic survival, and economic interests of textbook and testing companies. In particular, we suggest that the incentives of individuals who are situated in institutions and departments struggling to survive in the global and competitive academic market is one reason why the CEFR—a policy created for a context far removed from Japanese schools and universities—was taken up as a research agenda. To turn to our specific case study, liberal arts professors who teach French and German may have advocated the implementation of the CEFR, not only because of their ideals, but also because they saw it as an attractive "research topic" to obtain funding and to reinvigorate teaching and research at Aoba—the institution where our ethnography is set.

HOW THE CEFR CAME TO AOBA

The Institutional Context: Aoba and Incentives within Aoba for Borrowing the CEFR

The Aoba institution is a conglomerate of one elementary school, three junior high schools, five high schools and ten university faculties; this conglomerate style is a particular feature of many Japanese private educational bodies (*gakko hōjin*), which offer continued education (*ikkan kyōiku)* from elementary school up to university. Each of these schools and faculties are autonomously governed and compete with one another both for budgets and for political influence and status while also being held together by an Aoba identity. The boundaries between the Aoba schools are firmly kept intact by their different approaches to education, with little communication between the teachers of the respective schools. The boundaries of the university faculties are also kept intact by their respective systems of recruitment, curriculum design, and management, ingrained through the social exchange and political networking of administrative work, which for most professors takes place and remains within the faculty level. Although there is interaction between faculties and campuses, the first and foremost institutional identity of most Aoba professors is thus with the faculty.

In addition to the boundaries between schools and between faculties, one needs to note the boundary of the *campuses,* which, again, are separately governed and which compete for budgets and political power. Aoba has five main campuses; three of which cater for arts and social science faculties. The central and oldest campus—Azuma campus, located in central Tokyo, houses the graduate schools and caters for the more specialized education of the arts and social science faculties in their 3rd and 4th years of the undergraduate, offering a seminar- (*zemi*) centered education—the quintessential Japanese university-style education (see Funabiki, 2005). Okano campus is the larger campus set in the suburbs, about one hour by train from Azuma campus, which is recognized as a liberal arts campus where each faculty offers general education for the first two years of the students' undergraduate course.

Liberal arts, or culture, and the study of foreign-language texts have strong connections in Japanese modern intellectualism. Thus the majority of the professors (around 180 out of 230) of the Okano campus are teachers of foreign languages, though virtually none of the professors (we have identified two) are claimed specialists in foreign-language education research itself. The strong liberal arts (as opposed to vocational or professional) orientation of the Okano campus means there is low credibility given to foreign-language education as a legitimate academic discipline. Traditionally, most of the foreign-language professors were recruited from the graduate school of letters at Aoba's Azuma campus, reproducing a hierarchical and patriarchal system of academic clans with professors in the Azuma campus having higher status and power over professors in the more peripheral Okano campus. Since the late nineties, a change in hiring traditions to openly recruit outsiders—typically academics with Ph.D.s from foreign universities—to reduce academic inbreeding has gradually occurred, leading to some diversification of approaches to education and research among the younger generations. Such "outsider" professors generally agree, however, that the power rests on the purebred professors who have progressed through the Aoba educational system.

The specialists of foreign-language education are instead stationed at the Mirai campus, located in the rural outskirts of Tokyo. This is the newest and most peripheral campus within the Aoba geographical and political map, established in 1990 by a group of dissatisfied "revolutionary" Okano professors, specifically to counter—and with hopes to eventually replace—the traditional Japanese campus model.

THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESEARCH CENTER

With the recommendations from the president of Aoba for more innovation on the Okano campus, particularly as part of the university's 150th anniversary reforms to create a "Grand Design for Aoba in the 21st Century," the Audiolingual Center created in the 1970s based on the now outdated "audiolingual method," was revamped to become the Research Center for Foreign Language Education in 2003. All existing contract teachers of the Audiolingual Center, who were mostly foreign "native" language teachers, were dismissed. The oral language courses that the Audiolingual Center teaching staff had offered were to be taught mainly by the tenured professors from various faculties within the Okano campus, as well as some newly hired part-time lecturers.

The new mission of the Center was to be based around the three pillars of research, education, and support in the learning and teaching of foreign languages. It was decided that in order to establish its new roles and identity, the Center, for the first time in history, would hire an associate professor who would be based full-time at the Center on a five-year contract. The arrival of a full-time research associate who would be resident in the Center was met with some apprehension and resistance among the administrative staff; a point to which we shall later return.

The symbolic status of the Center has, however, remained marginal even after its reform. The liminality of the institution, which crosses the boundaries of faculties and schools and identifies itself with the discipline of "foreign-language education research," also means that it is a space for new encounters, possible change, and innovation. The "appropriation" of the CEFR by certain key members of the Center in this context of pressing needs for research and innovation came from their large ambitions and hopes for change—of raising the status of the Center and its staff, the status of Okano campus, the status of foreign-language teaching within the university, and of leading the university in its competition for more innovation in research and teaching. While these large but officially hidden ambitions were often discussed over long meals and drinks as well as in interviews with core members of the project, the surface goals that were discussed and published as "research agendas" were to do with the smoother linkage of Aoba schools, faculties, and campuses and the improvement of language teaching in general.

The Decision to Import the CEFR and the Birth of the AFG Project

The new associate professor who arrived at the Center in 2004 was a teacher of French. He was a graduate of the faculty of letters in the Azuma campus, where he obtained a master's in French literature, after which he had taught and helped develop teaching materials as a part-time lecturer at the Mirai campus. Now at Okano, his assigned role was to revitalize research and to establish a better, well-equipped environment for foreign-language learning at the Center. There was little money available for research, however, and so he proposed to the Center's director to apply for a MEXT-funded, large-scale research project.

The other significant actor we introduce here is a professor of German who was an associate director at the time the project was launched and who later became the director of the Center. He originally specialized in German Romanticism and aesthetics and gained his master's degree at the University of Tokyo. By the time he came to teach at Aoba in 1997, his research interest had shifted to foreign-language education and European language policy. By 2004 he had become particularly interested in the CEFR, having been involved in the CEFR study group at the Goethe Institut. It was through the daily heated and lively discussions over lunch between these two professors around 2004 that sparked the ideas to utilize the CEFR to implement policies of foreign-language education reform at Aoba.

The two key actors were not necessarily politically influential figures in the institutions—rather, they were marginally positioned. However, with the support of the Center's director, who was closely connected to the Aoba president, and who was respected by many professors and teachers across the Aoba schools/departments as well as the administration, the project was initially able to engage researchers from a variety of schools and departments. To "engage" in this context means agreeing to "lend their name" as research members on the official MEXT document. The AFG project proposal text was completed and successfully accepted as a large-scale, five-year MEXT funded project with a total budget of about ¥200 million to be managed and implemented at the Center.

THE AFG PLAN

It was proposed that the research project place its aims on promoting an action-oriented, autonomous learning environment of multiple foreign languages, drawing on the CEFR. It also aimed to promote the continuity and transparency of foreign-language education at all levels of the Aoba educational institution and to achieve collaboration among its language teachers. In order to achieve these goals, the AFG project proposed to develop a learning and assessment framework based on the CEFR and to adapt it for the Aoba context.

In the project proposal submitted to MEXT, it was stipulated that the project would operate in three units, each unit based on certain conceptual themes taken from the CEFR:

- Unit 1: The Language Education Policy Proposal Unit
  As the core unit of the project, the goal is to establish a *Common Japanese Framework of Reference for Languages*, based on the original European framework. This devised framework is intended to enable a coherent foreign-language education program at Aoba that will function as a model case for Japanese education more broadly. Surveys and research will be conducted on the state of foreign-language education in Japan and abroad, to design an effective model of language education to meet the needs of the 21st century information-based, plurilingual and plurilicultural society. The unit will conduct basic research for ultimately designing a graduate school for foreign-language teacher training at the Aoba Okano campus.
- Unit 2: The Action-oriented Plurilingual Competence Development Unit
  The function of this unit is to research and develop teaching methods and tools for communicative, task-based learning. The practical concerns are in enabling a coherent English-language education system, encouraging plurilingual/pluricultural competence development and intercultural training.
- Unit 3: The Autonomous Learning Environment Improvement Unit
  The function of this unit is to research and provide an effective system for the enabling of autonomous learning and teaching. Its other function is to improve the IT infrastructure so that it is particularly compatible for multilingual contexts, modeled on the initiatives of the Mirai campus.

Through the operation of the three units and drawing on the attractive CEFR, the project as a whole envisioned an initiative led by the Research Center to implement language education reform cutting across the boundaries within Aoba and to revitalize research in foreign-language education.

THE MULTIPLE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CEFR AND ITS CONCEPTS

Despite the excitement and hope for change that the launch of the CEFR Project and its ambitious plans for reform that it had initially aroused, by the time Imoto and Horiguchi joined the project in 2009, there seemed to be a consensus among its members that the project was not progressing as expected, in large part due to the indifference or resistance that was met as advocates of reform reached out to the larger Aoba community. The CEFR's key ideas outlined above: plurilingualism, autonomy, and communicative learning seemed attractive at the level of ideas, but when implemented as actual practice—i.e., as a proposal of how Aoba should organize and conduct its foreign-language education—conflicts and resistance emerged due to the multiple ways in which such ambiguous words are understood by individuals with different identities and interests.

Plurilingualism

One key ideal within the AFG project drawn from the CEFR was plurilingualism, advocated by many of the non-English teaching staff. Two key initiatives were launched through which the CEFR Project sought to realize the pluriligual ideal. One was the publication of a student booklet and teacher's manual that promoted plurilingualism (*Fukugengo no susume*) and the learning of multiple languages at high school and university. The other was the establishment and running of the "plurilingual lounge," which provides a space for students to stop by and engage in interactions with exchange students and foreign language teaching staff speaking a variety of languages.

Both of these initiatives were primarily led by non-English teachers (i.e., French and German teachers); from the perspective of English teachers, however, the concept of plurilingualism was often received with apprehension. The word strongly raised images of Europe, and one American-educated professor of intercultural communication admitted that it seemed *yōroppa kabure* (pretentious Europeanism). This professor, while being involved as a research member of AFG, continued to refuse to use the terms "plurilingual" and "pluricultural" and preferred terms such as "multilingual/multicultural" education or "intercultural/cross-cultural" training based in the North American tradition. This apprehension from certain English teachers symbolizes the overall indifference among English teachers to the AFG project from Aoba. We often heard from project members that throughout the five years in which the project progressed, there was minimal commitment from professors specializing in English-language education, which led to difficulties in keeping the integrity of the project. While the non-English-language teachers, faced with the declining popularity of their specialist languages, were interested in the promotion of the "plurilingual" ideal and the AFG project that endorses it, the English teachers, with an ever-increasing importance placed on the English language, were either uninterested, or found the project a threat to their autonomy in deciding how to teach, or as a burden to their already full teaching load. Ironically, despite the ideals and interests behind the plurilingual lounge, one of our interviewees remarked that the plurilingual lounge in practice had become "an English-speaking lounge." Although participants were speakers of various languages, the commonly used language in their social interactions tended to be English.

Even among the non-English professors, there seems to have been a lack of consensus regarding the extent to which they agreed to the plurilingual ideal. One non-English professor mentioned, "Even among non-English professors, not everyone agrees with the idea of plurilingualism. They may be concerned about the survival of their own language in the foreign-language curriculum, but not necessarily advocate its coexistence with other languages."

Autonomy = Use of ICT?

As we can see from the way Unit 3 was organized, the concept of autonomy—which the Council of Europe defined as the capability of acting on one's own initiative—was seen as something that could be cultivated through use of ICT (Information and Communication Technology), including self-learning computer facilities. It was conceived that these ICT facilities allowed learners to engage in learning on their own initiatives. Within Unit 3, projects involving setting up and utilizing televised meeting systems, experimental classes using podcasting, establishing interactive voice communities (IVC) in a senior high school, setting up a self-access language learning center in a junior high school, workshops of teachers on using e-learning systems, among others, were conducted. These projects, which involved the use of costly resources and infrastructure, seemed to be understood as one of the practical ways of using the large sum of money that had been obtained through the AFG project. The French language professor leading the overall AFG project played a key role in these ICT-related schemes and invited his former colleagues at the Mirai campus and other non-English professors familiar with the use of ICT in language education to this these projects.

To a certain extent, these initiatives were welcomed by the teachers of Aoba; participants of ICT workshops on e-learning systems included teachers from different schools/faculties/languages, functioning as a rare opportunity for interaction and communication among them. Nevertheless, on the whole, such initiatives were met with either indifference or resistance from members in the AFG project as well as larger Aoba institution. Not many of the teachers based in faculties or schools other than the Mirai campus were familiar with computer-assisted teaching. Such indifference also seems to result from the contested meanings given to what constitutes "research." For those teachers familiar with ICT technology, the ICT-type of research conducted in collaborative groups of teachers and their research outcomes outlining the usage of ICT technologies and their perceived benefits, particularly in enhancing student motivation, were the type of research that they conceived as contributing to the improvement of foreign-language education. But for a number of professors engaging in foreign-language education based in the humanities or social sciences, including literature, philosophy, and linguistics, research is understood as something conducted on one's own, separate from their educational routines. As discussed above, the majority of foreign language teachers at Aoba have not had postgraduate training in the area of foreign-language education and, thus, such ICT-oriented "research" was very different from what "research" meant to them.

Autonomy = Self-Assessment?

Another central initiative in the AFG project related to the development of the "autonomous learner" was the Language Portfolio project within Unit 2. Drawing on the European Language Portfolio, which involves self-assessment based on grids in CEFR descriptors, it was intended that Aoba develop its own version of the Portfolio for use in all Aoba schools and faculties to develop autonomous learners as well as to enhance transparency and coherence of foreign-language curriculum.

In our surveys and interviews, teachers as well as students often pointed to the foreignness and hence inapplicability of self-assessment based on *can-do* lists in the foreign-language classrooms in Japan. Teachers noted that "Japanese people like tests—like Eiken and TOEIC—rather than *can-do*s." This implies that in the local classroom context it has been understood that Japanese students are not accustomed to a student-centered autonomous learning model. Partly due to such negative responses to the Language Portfolio, a key member in the Portfolio project decided to embark on a speaking test development project in collaboration with an external educational research institute. This shift from a self-assessment scheme to a testing scheme symbolically shows the preference given to external modes of assessment.

Communicative Language

Paralleling the ambivalence seen in the views towards communicative language teaching in the history of foreign-language education, we find resistance and ambivalence towards CLT (communicative language teaching) among teachers at Aoba. The resistance found in the implementation of the Language Portfolio mentioned above can partly be explained by the perceived nonrelevance of CEFR-based language descriptors (see Appendix) to Japanese learners. While the CEFR descriptors are about being able to use a foreign language as citizens in a plurilingual society, many teachers pointed out that their Japanese students hardly ever use the foreign language they are learning outside the language classroom.

Many of the Japanese teachers of English at secondary schools whom we interviewed had received teacher training in CLT, or were aware of the importance of communicative competency in foreign languages from personal experiences of living abroad. However, even such teachers did not disregard the grammar-translation method, though neither did they strongly advocate practicing CLT in their own classroom; they suggested that the latter method may not necessarily match the classroom culture given the EFL (English as a foreign language) context of Japan. Japanese teachers of foreign languages also often commented that indifference—or an "inferiority complex" regarding CLT seems to exist, particularly among teachers and professors trained in the traditional grammar-translation approach as part of their literary or philosophical academic education.

Various interpretations of CLT were thus found. On the one hand, there were teachers who commented that CLT is not necessarily incompatible with grammar-translation methods, suggesting that grammatical knowledge provides an important basis for effective communication. On the other hand, there were Japanese teachers who would associate CLT with "what native-speaking English teachers do"—and thus something "foreign" to them. With such a variety of views on the communicative language learning model, it proved difficult to implement a standardized language learning framework modeled on this approach.

In brief, the various interpretations of the key ideologies—plurilingualism, autonomy, and communicative language—show that while such terms seemed attractive at the level of policy text, when put into practice, their multiple interpretations by various actors led to a divergent and contested ground.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES OF POWER AND STRUCTURED IDENTITIES

The tensions and contradictions we have identified with regard to the ideologies, interpretations, and practices of the CEFR thus far still do not sufficiently explain the struggles that drivers of the AFG project faced. Why was the project unable to attract the interest and gain the consensus of the larger Aoba community to implement reform based on the CEFR? A closer examination of the organizational structures of power within Aoba, and the personal and institutional interests and identities set within them, reveal the reasons why real change seemingly was not realized.

The Peripheral Status of the Center and Tensions among Its Actors

Earlier in this chapter, we noted the marginal status of the Research Center for Foreign Language Education and its members in the overall Aoba institution, and how the initiators of the AFG project wished that its implementation would raise the visibility and the status of the Center. The Research Center was launched as an attempt to reinvigorate research in foreign-language education, but the relatively low status given to foreign-language education as an academic discipline, and the low priority given to research activities (as opposed to administrative and educational duties) within the Okano Campus in general, meant that persuading the professors of the Okano Campus—whose primary obligations are to the *faculty* and *department* to which they belong rather than to any research center—to join the project turned out to be difficult.

One former administrative staff member in the project commented that the professors at Okano campus do not have interest in such large-scale research funds, since they do not engage in collaborative research, and in terms of work within the university, they are primarily concerned with their *uchimuki* (internal) roles and status (see Poole, 2010) of the faculty or school they are affiliated to. Due to the foreignness of the ideas of the AFG project to those engaging in foreign-language education and/or research at Aoba and the complexities in the process of its implementation, the Research Center failed to rise beyond its peripheral status. Rather, it seemed to marginalize itself further through "foreign" methods and standards, implemented in ways that deviated from conventional ideas of research and education at the Okano campus.

It was not only the academic staff of the Center that were seen as marginal; this marginality also applied to its administrative staff. The administrative staff members play a key role in the smooth running of any research project, and their commitment and support were essential. However, members within the AFG project often commented on tensions that exist between some of its research members and the administrative staff. Some research members complained of the reluctance of the administrative staff in supporting the project's events, and others of the low capabilities of the staff at the Center in general. Some members of the project complained that the project's ultimate failure came from the incapability of the administrative staff—the two core members who had been working at the Center for over fifteen years—who were unable to, or unwilling to, adapt to the sudden changes in their work that they were asked to accommodate, such as the management of large-scale research funds and interactions with outsiders such as part-time researchers and newly hired nontenured staff. The reformist professors explained that administrators and older academics who hold on to traditional practices continue to resist new initiatives, through the commonly used reasoning that "there is no precedence" (and hence by common law the new ideas cannot be accepted).

Another organizational tension to consider is the conflict between the core full-time and peripheral part-time teachers at Aoba. Only full-timers were to be included in the official documents as members of the AFG project, and while part-time teachers and researchers were invited to conduct research, mostly through personal connections, their research outputs would not be given as much recognition as their full-time counterparts on the official documents to be submitted to MEXT. The tenured full-timers, with other resources for research funds, would have little incentive for securing funding for their own research from the AFG project. On the other hand, the nontenured and/or part-time staff, would be enthusiastic to make full use of this opportunity to gain research funding, with hopes of gaining full-time status by being part of this large-scale project. All official research projects had to be represented and led by full-time staff, however, which led to contradictions of interest and access to resources.

It has become clear from the examination of the Aoba institution that organizational tensions, or the "walls" which largely define the institution and the identities of those situated within, were both the incentive and obstacle for the conceptions and realization of the CEFR Project. It is worth noting that these organizational tensions may most likely be present at other educational institutions in Japan and abroad, creating similar struggles with which "foreign" and innovative projects progress. The peripheral status of the initiators and drivers of the CEFR project meant that despite the large sum of money that it was able to bring in from the outside, as well as the significant attention the project received from outside the institutional boundary, at the end of the five-year project, the project itself had little impact on Aoba's foreign-language education reform in practice.

CONCLUSION

Through the ethnographic case study of Aoba, this chapter has considered the intricate and complex human identity politics behind state-funded, project-based research that aims for foreign-language education reform. We have examined how the CEFR was seen as an attractive policy package for Japanese educational institutions, and Aoba in particular, due to its "foreignness." At a more actor-centred level, we discussed how the CEFR was a way for Aoba professors in the reformist camp to secure research funds and to claim legitimacy of their academic/professional fields in the global competition. Furthermore, our ethnographic account of the implementation of the AFG project has demonstrated a symbolic interactionist approach, by showing how the symbolic concepts of the CEFR, namely "plurilingualism," "autonomy," and "communicative language" were interpreted, and how those interpretations were contested.

From the perspective of anthropology of policy, our study points to the importance of examining both "ideology and practice" (see Goodman, 1992) in conducting a study of institutional policy reforms. We have shown that while reform policies at the level of *text* look attractive, when played out in *practice*, divergent meanings and conflicting interests are uncovered. One of the tasks of anthropologists in policy research is to critically examine the extent to which the reform has *actually* brought about change at the ground level, and the *process* of change and resistance. This study has shown how the power structure inherent in the institution in which the reform is implemented—which places some individuals at the core and others in the periphery, and some with dominant voices and visibility, and others whose voices are ignored or whose presence is resisted—creates the realities of reform at the ground level, and our fieldwork experience has revealed the multiple ways in which this reality is experienced and recounted. From the perspective of foreign-language education, we have identified how language educators appropriate "new" methods, pedagogies, and policies to legitimize their position in an increasingly competitive and globalizing (English-dominant) higher education context. At the same time, those who are situated at the core of the institution tend to be reluctant to promote changes and prefer to hold onto the methods they have been accustomed to. While the perspective from which we write comes more from the institutional "periphery" rather than the "core," our respective positionings and relationship with the field, and hence the "realities" that we attempt to portray, have shifted over the course of time—an issue that we leave to discuss further in another chapter.

The discourse of foreign-language education in Japan has been characterized by dichotomized tensions: the debates between the traditional grammar-translation methods and communicative language teaching; tensions between teachers of English and teachers of other languages and the underlying assumption of hegemony of English in an increasingly globalizing world (see Aspinall, 2013). As our case study demonstrates, these dichotomies can be constructed and reinforced for certain interests, in order to claim certain identities and resist others. They are also mechanisms for gaining academic legitimacy and research funds in a climate where "educational research" and the closely connected "reform proposals" are increasingly a production process implicated in the competition for MEXT research funds and the pressures for globalization. When examined ethnographically, the story of the AFG project is not about success or failure, nor about change versus non-change, but about the *multiple interpretations* of the rhetoric that is appropriated for reform. We have thus tried to consider how and why certain ideas become attractive to certain actors of reform, and how certain ideas gain more legitimacy over others due to the more dominant positions of certain individuals and sub-institutions over others.

What is important, then, and what our approach can contribute towards, is a search for processes of reform in pedagogy and curricula that pay more attention to and thus present the first step to overcome these unequal distributions of power that tend to mute certain voices and resist certain—usually unprecedented and "foreign"—ideas over others, both at the national and the institutional levels. Our own marginal and sometimes vulnerable positions leave the question of to what extent this contribution can be achieved—and this vulnerability and ambiguity of the insider ethnographer is what we wish the reader to also imagine when (re)reading through the surface of our own constructed and contested ethnographic text.

NOTES

1 Pseudonyms are used for the name of the institution and its campuses.

2 See Rappleye et al. 2011 for a more actor-centered analysis of the implementation of the CEFR at Aoba utilizing a four-stage model of "educational borrowing."

3 It should be noted, however, that there has been a drop in the number of students choosing to study Chinese since around 2011 due to political tensions with China.

REFERENCES

Alderson, J. C. (2009). Setting the scene. In J. C. Alderson (Ed.), *The politics of language education: Individuals and institutions*. Bristol, CT: Multilingual Matters.

Aspinall, R. W. (2013). *International education policy in Japan in an age of globalisation and risk.* Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching and assessment*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Retrived from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf (Accessed January 13, 2015)

Eades, J. S., Goodman, R., & Hada, Y. (Eds.). (2005). *The 'big bang' in Japanese higher education: The 2004 reforms and the dynamics of change.* Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.

Funabiki, T. (2005). *Daigaku no Esunogurafiti* [Ethnografiti of the university]. Tokyo, Japan: Yuhikaku.

Gellner, N. D., & Hirsch, E. (Eds.). (2001). *Inside organizations: Anthropologists at work.* Oxford, England & New York, NY: Berg.

Goodman, R. (1992). Ideology and practice in Japan: Towards a theoretical approach. In R. Goodman & K. Refsing (Eds.), *Ideology and practice in modern Japan*. London, England: Routledge.

Goodman, R., & Phillips, D. (Eds) (2003). *Can the Japanese reform their education system?* Oxford, England: Symposium Books.

Horiguchi, S., & Imoto, Y. (2015). Fostering learning through unlearning institutional boundaries: A team ethnography of a liminal intercultural space at a Japanese university. *Ethnography and Education, 10*, 92–106.

Kitagawa, F., & Oba, J. (2009). Managing differentiation of higher education in Japan: connecting excellence and diversity. *Higher Education*, *59*, 507–524.

Marshall, B. K. (1994). *Learning to be modern: Japanese political discourse on education.* Boulder, CO: Westview.
Poole, G. S. (2010). *The Japanese professor*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
Poole, G. S., & Chen, Y.-C. (Eds.). (2009). *Higher education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the professoriate*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
Rappleye, J., Imoto, Y., & Horiguchi, S. (2011). Towards "thick description" of educational transfer: Understanding a Japanese institution's "import" of European language policy. *Comparative Education*, *47*, 411–432.

Yuki Imoto
Keio University

Sachiko Horiguchi
Temple University Japan Campus

APPENDIX

CEFR *can-do* descriptors (Reproduced from Council of Europe, 2001)

Level	*Description*
A1	Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.
A2	Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g., very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
B1	Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes & ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.
B2	Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.

(Continued)

Level	*Description*
C1	Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.
C2	Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in the most complex situations.

GREGORY S. POOLE AND HINAKO TAKAHASHI

6. EFFECTING THE "LOCAL" BY INVOKING THE "GLOBAL"

State Educational Policy and English Language Immersion Education in Japan

INTRODUCTION

An educational or schooling system can be considered a mirror of society. Certainly many observers would agree that the challenges presently facing the Japanese education system are issues that reflect broader cultural debates within society. The issues that surround such heated educational topics as creativity, critical thinking, the curriculum, literacy, and immigrant students correspond fairly directly with recent societal debates regarding diversity, identity, national pride, and the economy (Willis, 2006). The introduction to this volume discusses in detail how language education reflects these debates.

This chapter is an account of foreign language immersion education based on qualitative research at two private primary schools: Jōshū International School (JIS) and Nantō International School (NIS).[1] Both institutions are examples of alternative learning communities that have been conceived at least in part as a response to the realities and rhetoric of "globalization" on the one hand, and a critique of educational policies on the other. In both examples, the educational corporation creating these language immersion schools has espoused a similar ideology—an education that purports to reach beyond the boundary of the nation-state yet at the same time firmly rooted in the cultural knowledge of an "imagined community" (Anderson, 1983), tied very closely to statist schooling objectives (Marshall, 1994). Although this ideology is on the surface contradictory, we will discuss how this educational approach is related to recent discourses on Japanese identity (Hashimoto, 2000; Burgess, 2004)—strategies to both build the "local" while embracing, or appearing to embrace, the "global."

The choice of the field sites for this study arose out of the personal interests of the authors as members of the communities where the schools are located—a city in southern Gunma prefecture, 80 kilometers north of Tokyo, and a city in the middle of the main island of Okinawa. Both authors conducted small-scale fieldwork projects consisting of semi-structured and informal interviews with board members, principals, teachers, and parents, as well as firsthand observations, including an extended ten-month period of participant observation in the case of NIS. In this

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 85–102.

chapter we will first briefly summarize the qualitative and textual data we collected and then present an analysis of this data in an attempt to situate the schools within more general societal debates on language, education, and identity.

JIS

School History and Mission

JIS is the brainchild of the mayor of the city, who is the chairman of the parent organization, Jōshū International Academy.[2] The mayor had the vision for and then put into action plans to create one of the first schools in Japan to take advantage of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology's (MEXT) designated "Special Zone" school of English education. Unlike other "international schools" or "schools for foreigners" (i.e., ethnic minority schools, see Tsuneyoshi et al., 2010), JIS is fully approved under the Japanese School Education Law as an *ichijōgakkō* or *ichijōkō*, Article One school, giving it legal and accreditation status equivalent to all other private and public schools in Japan.

Although JIS is a private school originally set up with support by a management team from a private educational publishing company and with half of the students commuting from outside the municipality, the land and much of the financing for the school was supported by public municipal funds. The administrative office is partly staffed with city government employees. This practical (and political) decision by the mayor to mix private and public sectors has been a continuous point of protest by citizen groups.[3] Many feel that public funds should not be used for the personal gain of a few families perceived as "elite," especially when they are not even city residents.[4]

In April 2005, the school opened its doors to its first students. There were initially two intakes of students at both the first and fourth grade levels of primary school. In 2006–7, there were 100 first and second graders and 120 fourth and fifth graders. In 2008 classes opened in all the primary school years, first through sixth, along with preparations to open a junior high school (JHS). The initial goal for JIS to educate at all grade levels of primary and secondary school, K-12, was realized with the opening of a high school in April 2011 at the site of a former local junior college located in the city. As a local resident, Poole had the opportunity to visit the school in early 2007 and also meet the chairman, the mayor of the city, on a number of occasions. Of course this personal interest as a member of the local community certainly influenced his perspective on JIS, fluctuating between frames of subjectivity as friend, partner of a local resident, and researcher.

Educational Philosophy and Methodology

The former primary school principal, Dr. Good,[5] an American Ph.D., in an interview explained that he saw JIS as "a test-bed for educational innovation in Japan." By this, he meant that the ongoing curriculum evaluation of the three educational pillars of JIS—English immersion, open classrooms, and team-teaching in pairs of Japanese and non-Japanese teachers—be disseminated to the public through cooperative research. Part of this approach is both collaborative curriculum development and action research.

The cooperative effort between teachers, staff, and parents at JIS began with the preparation committee before the school opened. One result was the collective mission statement that emphasizes the need for instilling in students an awareness of and an appreciation for “Japanese culture,” a major difference with international schools and other immersion programs in North America, for example (Hamers & Blanc, 2000, 333–340). Japanese members of the preparation committee all included in their individual vision statements a need for “the maintenance of Japanese customs” (see also Downes, 2001).[6]

As a tool to begin to reflect on exactly “what Japanese culture is,” the principal and his staff implemented a North American program called The Virtues Project. Using this teaching resource they hoped to identify which items on the menu of “universal virtues” are most strongly held by the majority of individuals in Japan. According to JIS, The Virtues Project is a “morals education with the goal of intellectual understanding of the meaning of these virtues.” The principal believed that recognition of virtues most often exhibited in Japan, or those least often seen, helps students to understand themselves and others, both intellectually and emotionally

As with the first educational experiment of its kind, the St. Lambert project in Quebec, the foreign-language immersion aspect of JIS gets most of the publicity (Grosjean, 1982, 217–220).[7] Dr. Good felt, however, that the open classroom techniques actually have the most potential for immediate applicability across different schools and contexts in Japan. Immersion methods are much more of a long-term project in terms of widespread application in Japan, not least because they need the support of extensive teacher-training programs at universities.[8] On the other hand, the former principal believed that open classrooms—a methodology that he said “promotes critical thinking skills through both individual and group work, project-based learning, and less direct instruction”—could be more easily and readily adopted in primary and secondary schooling settings in Japan. This vision was not necessarily held as essential by the JIS board of directors and families[9] who all seem to hold dear the immersion, or at least the “international English,” aspect of the school.

Teacher, Student, and Family Experience

The JIS leadership expressed that the most difficult challenges facing the school are managing both the recruitment of teachers—Japanese teachers, but especially non-Japanese—and conversations with parents. It is not easy to attract qualified, non-Japanese content subject teachers to JIS (not least because of the location being quite a distance from the Tokyo metropolis). Also, while parent involvement is encouraged, some parents are "over-involved" (as one administrator put it). Correspondence between teachers and parents about individual students is considerable, and much of this burden is placed on the Japanese teacher in the team-teaching pairs, since interestingly very few of the parents speak English. The dynamics of open classroom management and discipline techniques is also a cause for difficulty—teachers come from a variety of different countries, and the diversity in beliefs about education and the Article One schooling regulations often become points of contention. Although some teaching teams work cooperatively and find healthy consensus through compromise, in some teams the Japanese teacher basically follows the lead of the headstrong non-Japanese and complains that they are often "busy *tidying up* after them." Most teachers had little or no experience with open classrooms and immersion education, but they did seem to become invested in the approach after a time. A few view their role less idealistically than others, but generally speaking there is great dedication from the teachers.

Even though JIS is in a regional city, four prime ministers hail from the prefecture and, unlike Tokyo, there are few choices for private alternatives to public schools considering the strong local interest in education. The basic attraction to the school for parents then is a disappointment in the local public schools combined with the rather fashionable allure of "native" English speaking teachers (see the Introduction to this volume). The teaching philosophy of open classrooms and the methodology of learning through a second language are less important to the parents than the practical view of English as a tool for opportunity. This opportunity is one many of the parents themselves did not have as probably less than twenty percent of the parents have conversational English ability, and of these, only a very few have the confidence to speak directly with the principal or teachers in public. One teacher mentioned that in the first two years of the school, during in-school meetings they recall, only two parents asking questions directly to the principal in English. Of course the limited English ability of the parents affects the amount of educational support at home that they can provide for their children.

According to the principal and teachers, the children at JIS are very accepting of differences and are flexible in their thinking—there is almost no bullying and very little thought of their own identity, per se. Adults (especially leaders even more than parents), however, are quick to try to squeeze and pigeonhole the alternative approach of JIS into a "Japanese standard" to fit the Article One regulations—many worry about *hensachi* (standardized exam scores), teaching more classes in Japanese, and children losing their Japanese language skills (and hence their "Japaneseness," see Befu, 2001; Downes, 2001). These concerns developed into a conflict over the JHS curriculum between the principal and the board members—Dr. Good was intent on offering social studies subjects in English "to ensure students gain skills in critical thinking." However the Japanese board members were concerned that at the JHS level the students and parents should be concerned with getting into elite high schools and universities, which would of course also serve to further the reputation of JIS in the wider community. Because of this concern, many argued that social studies classes should be taught in Japanese, defusing the principal's argument by asking,"Why can't critical thinking skills be taught in Japanese?" This disagreement precipitated Dr. Good's resignation.

Reflecting this debate, in an open forum on immersion education held for the JIS community, one parent questioned a graduate of the first primary school immersion program in Japan, Katoh Gakuen (Downes, 2001)—"When you made the decision with your parents to attend an immersion school, were you not concerned about your future in society, issues such as gaining entrance into a prestigious university and finding employment?" The Katoh Gakuen graduate, by then a university student, explained very patiently to the parent that they "were totally missing the point of immersion education. If you are worried about social status then why not have your child attend any number of high schools in Japan that will provide rigorous preparation for entering a 'good' university?"

Location and Role within the Community

Although within the community there is political opposition to JIS as a drain on public money, there seems to be support for the educational experiment in and of itself. Rather than questioning the alternative educational philosophy per se, the problem among citizens seems to be with a perception of "privilege."[6] Japanese society is becoming more and more stratified (e.g., Kariya, 2001), and OECD statistics (2009) have recently shown how Japan is positioned among the worst five in terms of discrepancy of annual income families in advanced countries, along with Turkey, the U.S., the U.K., and Portugal (also see Mock, 2009). The principal estimated that of the families with children enrolled in the preschool and kindergarten programs at JIS, 5–7% of these parents are unable to send their children to the primary school because they cannot afford the tuition. Indeed, this socio-economic stratification is evidenced among the families with children enrolled at JIS. Staff members note, for example, that some parents are able to afford the time for intensive help with homework each evening. Nearly 100% attendance by mothers (and fathers to a lesser extent) on parent participation days also suggests that these are single-income families, although the trend in Japan is for more and more mothers to work in order to supplement their husband's incomes. There may be a certain truth to the perception of privilege.[10]

Interestingly, no public school teachers in the city send their children to JIS. When asked why, a JIS administrator thought that one reason she had heard voiced was that public school teachers have a pride that prevents them from admitting that there may be a more desirable alternative to a public school education. "What is wrong with the job we are doing?" Of course this is an interesting comment in light of the tolerant attitude most public schools and MEXT have toward the cram school industry in Japan (Roesgaard, 2006), which in a way contradicts the more general worldview that places high import on meritocratic and egalitarian educational ideals, no matter the stratified reality (e.g., Rohlen, 1983). The other reason is, of course, the tuition fees—upwards of US $10,000 per year per child—as compared to state-subsidized, free compulsory education. Residents echo the sentiment of public school teachers with some pointing out that the school is not meeting the needs of the community. Since this area of Gunma has the highest concentration of Brazilians in Japan (Tsuda, 2003), some have pointed out the linguistic demands of the citizens is not being met by offering an immersion program exclusively in English and not Portuguese (which echoes the points about multilingualism that Kubota makes in the Foreword).

NIS

School History and Mission

The idea of creating an international school for children of international background in Okinawa originated with the foundation of Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology (OIST), a nationally funded international graduate school and research institution in central Okinawa. In order to attract qualified international researchers and professionals, it was thought necessary for Okinawa to establish an international school where these international researchers and professionals could send their children for an education in English. Three entities were responsible for the building of the school—Okinawa Prefecture, a central Okinawan city, and a private educational publishing company (the same institution that managed JIS). Okinawa Prefecture funded the building of this international school with the conviction that the success of OIST depended on the existence of a quality international school for the children of the international OIST community. The Okinawan city provided the land for the school building site, formerly a natural recreation park. The publishing company was responsible for the school administration. The primary and convincing reason that this Tokyo-based publishing company—and not a local Okinawan management team—was selected and given total control over the institutional management, school philosophy/mission, and day-to-day operation down to and including the level of the classroom, was because of the prior experience that this publishing company had with running the English immersion program at JIS.

The school states as an important element for founding the school the need for an English immersion school in the community of Okinawa:

> …a large percentage of local people expressed the necessity to have an English immersion school that develops young people who can cope with the rapidly-globalizing society in Okinawa Prefecture. The survey data gathered from the parents whose children are attending public schools, and OIST staff members showed that 60% of the parents of public school students and 80% of OIST staff feel the need to have a school which offers classes in English. (NIS, 2015)

Although the consensus of designating a Tokyo-based company to administer this new, important school for the future of Okinawa due to their prior experience with similar international school was viable, one can only suspect the resentment of local community leaders towards having Tokyo outsiders taking charge of the school, especially given Okinawan autonomy and its complex historical relationship with Japan (Pearson, 2001).

The school literature further explains the complexity of establishing an English immersion school while being authorized in the Japanese education system:

> Though several international educational institutions are located in Okinawa, including some alternative schools, the majority of these are unauthorized, except for a few “miscellaneous schools.” There is no international educational institution in Okinawa that is authorized under the First Article (Article One) of the Japanese School Education Law. In light of the above, the foundation of an international educational institution is in demand [sic]. Such an institution will be able to offer an option to the [sic] people who are interested in English or international education, such as the children of OIST staff, employees of the institutions involved in the Asian Gateway Initiative, US military forces, and citizens of Okinawa.

NIS opened in April, 2011 in Okinawa as a private international school that provided two strands: an “international strand” and an “English immersion strand.” The school was designated by MEXT as an Article One school, adhering to government rules and regulations as an officially sanctioned Japanese school. As mentioned in the section above, whether public or private, Article One schools receive funding from the Japanese government unlike non-Article One international or ethnic schools in Japan. Students who graduate from primary and secondary schools not accredited as an Article One school, outside the officially sanctioned schooling system, often have difficulty entering Japanese high schools and universities. The alternative entrance pathways that exist in the admission process at most universities designed to accommodate Japanese returnee students (*kikokushijo*) or foreign students (*ryūgakusei*) do not apply to Japanese students educated in international schools in Japan. NIS’ status as an Article One school following the MEXT rules and regulations was appealing to parents of Japanese nationals since once their children graduate from this school, they would receive the same certificate and qualifications as the counterpart local public schools or private Japanese schools. When these students graduate from NIS Junior High School, they would have the qualifications to apply for entry to any Japanese high school.

Educational Philosophy and Methodology

The school mission was to be a “unique school” providing a “unique experience for children like no other school in the country.” The core of the school’s educational philosophy is to provide education to children so that they can become independent in their learning, thinking, and behavior. The mission further states that for children to develop their own worldview they need to develop knowledge and understanding of global society. The school puts emphasis on the learning of English as a means to communicate effectively with "the world's people [sic]": "Cultivating such a person requires the ability to communicate effectively with others… Focus on educating children in English is rooted in the reality that English is a valuable tool for communicating with the world's people… children will reap the benefits of expanding their communication through English and Japanese, through a greater sense of partnership with people, and with more appreciation and deeper respect for the world's people [sic]." The school philosophy goes even further to say that "children will gain more understanding of themselves and their country… Children of diverse background [sic] and nationalities who come together to learn at [NIS] in the same space embody the essence of globalized education."

In addition to English education, the school provides other features not found in conventional Japanese elementary schools, such as open-classroom style buildings where students can work freely interacting and communicating with others. The school is also situated in a location with many trees and hills where students can be immersed in a natural environment. The school's educational philosophy states that "lively, flexible communication will help to develop a unique, creative persona." NIS also provides a unique opportunity for children to interact with horses. They established a horse facility within the school grounds with as many as ten horses, stables, a horse arena, and personnel for taking care of the horses. Activity clubs at the end of school day included a variety of activities to foster children's varied interests. These clubs range from ones not common at many other primary schools such as *uma-bu* (horse club), karate, cycling, pottery, and traditional Okinawan crafts, to more conventional activities like soccer, art, and music.

The school offers two educational programs in which students can choose to enroll: an "Immersion Course" for Japanese students, and an "International Course" for international students. However, since both courses are accredited under the MEXT Article One, the curricula and instructional contents offered are rather similar. Students enrolled in both programs have a homeroom team of one Japanese bilingual teacher and one international English-speaking teacher assigned to each class. In all classes in both programs the content is offered in English as the medium of instruction (EMI), except for Japanese language arts (*kokugo*) class. The only other exception is a social studies class (*shakai*) in Japanese offered for immersion course students.

Teacher, Student, and Family Experience

NIS is in its fourth year of operation since the opening in April 2011. Student enrollment has been increasing every year. The first year began with kindergarten, first, second, and fourth grades in the primary school. Each grade had two classes, one "international" class and one "immersion" class. The second year, the enrollment nearly doubled with the addition of one class each in the first and second grades along with new kindergarten students. In the third year, the primary school was completed with a total enrolment of over 400 students in all grade levels, kindergarten through sixth. In the fourth year the junior high school opened with a group of students who had graduated from the primary school. NIS, with the label of "private international school with accreditation from the Japanese Ministry of Education," achieved a rapid growth in enrollment, attracting many students not only locally but also from cities outside of Okinawa.

More than 90% of the student body turned out to be Japanese nationals with varied abilities of English language. One crucial reason for not attracting many international students is that student recruitment is conducted according to the Japanese school calendar. The school year starts in April and ends in March. NIS has entrance exams in October for the following April like all the other private, MEXT-accredited schools in Japan. Many foreign students or returnees coming to Okinawa from a system not on the Japanese calendar look for schools during the summer months in order to begin the school year in the fall. NIS is often not flexible about accommodating students coming from outside the Japanese system by allowing them to enroll midyear or during the summer. Accordingly, it was inevitable that the school ended up enrolling mostly Japanese students already on the Japanese school calendar. Another reason for low enrollment of non-Japanese is that the tuition is high even when compared to other private schools and international schools in Okinawa making it difficult economically for young scientists from OIST, many who are postdoc fellows and entry-level researchers, to consider NIS for their children.

Since there are few students with L1 English skills, there is in effect nearly no distinction between the International Course and Immersion Course. Although students for the most part communicate with their teachers in English during the instructional times of the day, in settings among themselves they naturally gravitate towards using Japanese almost exclusively for both social interaction and even during peer-to-peer academic work. The dominance of Japanese language is such that even students who have strong English skills choose to use Japanese instead whenever possible.

In a kindergarten class that Takahashi was teaching, an American child had some Japanese as an L2. Interestingly, he preferred to speak Japanese as much as possible during the day and only would revert to his L1, English, when it was encouraged or enforced during certain times during the lessons. This boy had quickly recognized that Japanese is by far the dominant language of interaction amongst NIS students and therefore was required if he was to participate fully in social settings at school. Another student, a Korean boy who enrolled in the school mid-year, had come from another kindergarten where he was forbidden to speak Japanese. After a week of only speaking English in class, he realized that Japanese was the dominant language at NIS, and indeed, he could not make any friends if he did not speak Japanese. He stopped speaking English to his classmates in social settings, and appeared to be much happier in school.

For teaching and learning, English is the target language at NIS, and is a measure of success at various levels for the individual student, teacher, class, grade, and school.

However, Japanese is definitely the language of power; it is the dominant language in the school. There was no Japanese as a Second Language (JSL) program or any class designated for non-Japanese speaking students at the time. If a student cannot speak, read or write Japanese, he or she is outside of the norm, and is assigned to Japanese tutors for Japanese language instruction, which was not originally planned for and so takes place outside the regular curriculum in open spaces on campus such as the library, reinforcing further these JSL students' outsider status.

In this "international school," the Japanese nationals who are fluent in Japanese might potentially benefit from an additive bilingualism of English. However, since the school is resistant to any kind of international accreditation and only needs to adhere to the standard Japanese curriculum to meet MEXT Article One requirements, and since the social world of the children does not require any other language besides Japanese, there is no immediate incentive for students to gain English language proficiency other than perhaps maintaining a good grade in English language arts class.

Since NIS is an elementary school with kindergarten, parents are the major decision-makers when enrolling their children. There are numerous psychological, social, and emotional factors that influence the parent's decision to send their children to an international/immersion school rather than a local Okinawan public school. English education at an early age is the overriding reason for why the school attracts so many children. In the case of kindergarten students, many of them already had been to an English-speaking preschool before starting kindergarten at NIS.

One factor that affects the parent's decision to send their children to NIS is, the parent's own experience of learning, or attempting to learn, English. One parent shared her own experience of having a short stay in the U.S. in high school, but not being able to communicate with her host family because she did not speak much English. She then took many years as an adult to learn to speak English including another extended experience of living and studying in the U.S. in order to gain English language proficiently. She believes that if her son is exposed to English at an early age, he will not have the difficulties she had, especially in pronunciation. Another parent also mentioned her own experience of living in the U.S. and wanting her child to be exposed to the world at an early age. She says English language learning is not the objective for sending her child to an international school. Rather, she sees English as a way for her child to see the "bigger world." Another reason a parent stated was that she did not want her children to go through the regimented Japanese school system she had to experience.

Another factor of this kind of decision-making is the student's family background. For example, a bicultural family with a Japanese mother and American father shared a sense of family crisis when their children reached school age and started to spend their days at school speaking Japanese to their teachers and friends. They started to have difficulty communicating with their English-speaking father. The parents felt that in order to facilitate effective family communication, they needed to do something about their children's English development and hence the decision to send them to NIS. In these cases the father had a limited involvement in the children's education when they were attending the Japanese school, since he could not communicate with the teachers directly or participate fully in school functions. One such father asserted,"As an international family, we really wanted our children to understand the world, understand the two cultures, and how their roots are in two languages, Japanese and English, and to be well prepared to make contributions to the world whatever they decide to do." They were particularly pleased with the school providing bilingual support, not just English, but also Japanese. The father explains, "Each of our children has two main teachers, one Japanese and one an international English speaker. Both teachers are highly experienced. For me it is important, because I can talk to them. I don't speak Japanese. I speak several other languages, but not Japanese. But I can speak to the staff and teachers. I can be involved in my children's education."

Location and Role within the Community

The news of an international school that would provide an alternative education excited the interest of many local Okinawan people. Since NIS opened, every year there has been more applicants than places, exceeding the school's capacity. Some children applied again the year after they had not been accepted. Many resident families from outside of Okinawa welcomed NIS, since their children sometimes did not get along with Okinawan children.

The unique location of Okinawa, with so many American military bases housing tens of thousands of American families on the island, creates another layer of complexity in terms of building an international school. In spite of a large number of native English speaking families and children living on the island, these families have very little contact with local Okinawan residents. The bases are restricted to American military-related personnel. The bases are equipped with all the social facilities, including several large elementary schools, therefore families living inside the base precincts and base system have no reason to go outside the bases. The few American children from base related American families were enrolled in NIS for the primary reason of getting Japanese experience while living in Okinawa. They were not looking for an international education in English, but rather, it was convenient to have English-speaking teachers and children when learning Japanese language and culture.

The contradictions in people's perceptions of the school and their expectations for the school are revealing. Some parents and teachers perceive and expect the school to be a true international school that provides an international curriculum in English with some Japanese support. This perception is challenged by the conspicuous fact that the management and administration of the school is entirely run by staff hired by a Japanese corporation, a Tokyo-based firm that according to many informants elicits little or no input from the teachers with extensive international experience. Other parents and teachers perceive and expect the school to be a Japanese school with a Japanese curriculum and an English-language education, a view that is again challenged by the questionable educational credentials of the corporation's administrative staff and management, a point that some parents and teachers argue would not be the case at a typical MEXT-accredited school funded by Japanese taxpayers. Indeed, NIS is a new category of school that does not fit any established mold and is still in the process of shaping its educational model.

The timing of the establishment of the school also affected the student population. Just before NIS opened in April, 2011, the catastrophic earthquake and tsunami hit the Tohoku area of mainland Japan. Families from the Tokyo area moved to Okinawa because they felt that it was not safe for their children to live in Tokyo after the Great East Japan Earthquake and resulting Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Plant meltdown in 2011. Because there are very few private schools in Okinawa, especially at the primary level, families who could afford to send their children to a private school rather than a local public school simply preferred to do so. NIS seemed like a good option for these relatively wealthy families seeking refuge in Okinawa. Many of these families did not speak English well enough to send their children to an all-English international school.

With high tuition fees and additional fees for entrance and teaching materials, NIS students are invariably from wealthy families. Most of the parents are professionals—medical doctors, lawyers, professors, business owners, and celebrities. A high percentage of Japanese students are from mainland Japan (for example, one-third of Takahashi's NIS class was from outside of Okinawa). Surprisingly, some families are split, with fathers staying and working in their home cities of Tokyo, Osaka, or Fukuoka, while the mothers and children relocate to Okinawa for the purpose of sending their children to NIS.

CONCLUSION

The pursuit of "global education" in Japan is faced with complexities such as how educational approaches and initiatives outside the norm can be incorporated into the state schooling system. Local (read Japanese) MEXT Article One accreditation regulations effectively create insurmountable barriers to educators pursuing the global (read "international") approaches—the oxymoron of an "international Japanese school." Alternative education is marginalized. The complexity of being both an international school and a MEXT Article One school seems to create barriers for the pursuit of global education. The school is required to follow the MEXT rules and curriculum, which are aligned with Japanese educational philosophy and traditions. This rule limits any initiatives to be innovative for providing international and global pedagogy. If they break away from the MEXT, they can no longer receive any funding from the government or obtain the accreditation for the students to be able to go on to Japanese high schools or universities.

The local politicians and community leaders in Gunma and Okinawa who advocated to fund the establishment of these international schools had high hopes for JIS and NIS to be able to prepare local children to be competitive in the world as well as providing international educational venues for international children from regional international communities, such as OIST. The educational philosophy and the goals the schools aimed for were to provide a global education and create independent thinkers, with English language being the major medium of instruction. However, once the schools started, the various operational constraints of the rules and regulations of Article One created forces that ultimately reconstructed the schools into institutions indistinguishable from a “regular” Japanese school. The instructional content through all the grades had to follow the MEXT curriculum. The entrance exams and the school schedule of starting in April and ending in March made it difficult for international students coming from non-Japanese schools to be enrolled, and there was much confusion among staff members and parents as to whether the school should be a MEXT Japanese school or a new type of international school. For example, local Japanese bilingual teachers sometimes treated international teachers as outsiders coming to teach at a Japanese school in Japan, rather than including them as part of the same “international” school. Instead of trying to understand each other, and analyzing the real source of disagreement—the MEXT regulations—Takahashi overheard Japanese teachers commenting, “Foreign teachers are lazy. They just complain about work hours and not having enough vacation days.”

The schools provide opportunities for English language education and exposure to international views through international teachers, however, they have not gone any further to provide an education that might nurture students with global skills and thinking to be competitive in a global environment. This was felt by many of the students and parents of mostly international students with good English skills who did not fit the majority group profile of Japanese students learning English which resulted in NIS losing fifty or so students in the first three years. Some of the international students moved away from Okinawa due to their parent’s job situations, but many of them moved to different international or American schools.

In the end, one wonders if these schools, knowingly or inadvertently, simply perpetuate the societal status quo—children from wealthy and educated families gaining resources to compete and maintain the social advantage of links with “the international.” The result is that the popularity of “international” as a fad and buzzword drives the conversation among the elite and privileged. The schools fail to be an agent of change for Japanese youth and society since any links they can provide to global awareness are only offered to advantaged, elite children given the prohibitive tuition fees.

This phenomenon parallels that of the *yutori kyōiku*[11] (“relaxed education”) initiatives as having been cause for the creation of a wider gap between the privileged wealthy groups able to afford to compete in a competitive *juken* system of entrance exams. Those who can afford studying opportunities such as *juku* (after school cram schools) gain a huge advantage over children whose families come from lower economic groups and therefore not able to compete with this “relaxed” education policy of *yutori kyōiku* (Kariya, 2002). According to Kariya and Rappleye’s study on the effect of globalization on Japanese education (Kariya & Rappleye, 2010), "relaxed education" increased the number of students who did not study and that the students from disadvantaged families stopped studying outside of school at a higher rate than those from advantaged families, therefore contributing to widening of inequalities in education. "As a result, for the disadvantaged students, not only were there fewer outlets and clear pathways for low-skilled manufacturing jobs in local areas, they became even more heavily disadvantaged because they lacked a strong set of basic skills in traditional core subjects (math, science, reading)" (Kariya & Rappleye, 2010, 51).

The educational initiative such as these English language immersion schools for Japanese elementary school age children could have great potential for creating *global jinzai*, "global human resources," talented young people who could work and compete in the global market. However these schools cater to parents and teachers who are only familiar with and most comfortable in Japanese systems that are in alignment with the educational priorities of the state—a Japanese curriculum for language arts, social studies, and English as a foreign language, rather than alternative curricula based on critical thinking and collaboration (such as the International Baccalaureate). Therefore this seemingly innovative educational setting of Japanese elementary schools with both an international and English immersion strand for economically advantaged Japanese families does not lead to cultivating globally minded individuals, but rather individuals comfortable only in a prescribed Japanese cultural and societal norm. This is not accidental, because fear of losing "Japaneseness" perhaps starts from state assumptions of cultural identity maintenance. As Befu argues, "Japan needs to develop an environment that can foster…multiculturalism…, abandoning its zero-sum game model of acculturation and embrace a positive-sum model" (Befu, 2009).

The stated goals of the immersion education at JIS and NIS is to address traditional arguments surrounding the failure of ELT in Japan (see Introduction), arguments that tend to focus on deficiencies related to the educational system, the teachers, the institutions, and the sociolinguistic environment. The problematic of globalization (or internationalization, as indicated in the name of the schools themselves) is also by implication an important focus of the schools. These arguments are similar to the ones that Imoto (2011) found at international preschools—English is the overt reason given, a powerful symbol of the programs. But there is a tension of purpose and orientation, since both schools state their goal is not as "mere language schools" but as national Article One accredited institutions whose mission is school education with EMI (if not the lingua franca amongst pupils and teachers). Identical to the situation that Imoto (2011) describes at early childhood institutions, English is a "multivocal symbol," at once a commodified product and an unmarked language for communication depending on the meaning given it by each individual actor, whether teacher, parent, or pupil.

Ideally one might expect that language immersion at JIS and NIS would be less about (re)defining cultural boundaries ("cultural literacy")[12] and more about developing a “critical literacy” (Freire & Macedo, 1987), creating opportunities for students to construct knowledge and identities that are not inherently linked to a national cultural identity. Indeed, such language immersion might foster thinking beyond the dichotomy of *us and them* (the “transcultural,” “creole,” or “hybrid” e.g., Willis, 2006, Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu, 2008), with more diverse understanding of “Ourselves” and “Others.” Unfortunately, analysis of our data shows this is clearly not the case.

A similar tension of “authenticity” appears to underlie the decision-makers themselves as well as the participants in these schools. On the one hand, there is a fear of becoming “too international,” since to do so would render the schools “inauthentic” in terms of the Japanese educational system. On the other hand, the “international” label hints at an “authenticity” that links English to cultural prestige or even elitism. In essence, one might argue that these examples—English language, the symbol of “international”—are invoked as boundary markers. Though the institutional names of JIS and NIS give the impression to the local communities, prospective student families, and job applicants that these are “international schools,” once in the school, students and teachers are constantly reminded that “this is a Japanese school in Japan.” Typical Japanese school activities and cultural practices from the *nyūgakushiki* (entrance ceremony), *sotsugyōshiki* (graduation ceremony), *undōkai* (sports day), *gakugeikai* (performance day) to wearing *uwabaki* (indoor shoes) inside the school buildings all reinforce the “Japaneseness” of the schools. At NIS, when staff or parents made suggestions for changing these traditional customs and practices, they are simply told by the administration, “This is a Japanese school in Japan.” At JIS a debate between the American principal and school board members over whether critical thinking skills can be taught in Japanese is another example of how such cultural boundaries are being reinforced. Because these “inverse bilingual programs” we are discussing are by definition *elite*, at least at JIS and NIS, the educational process itself and the cultural knowledge that is being transmitted tends to reinforce traditional stereotypes and norms. The nontraditional model of immersion education is unconsciously reformulated, pigeonholed by parents, board members, and teachers into familiar categories where borders between Japan and the “Other” can be constructed for security. This in the name of “globalization.”

Children themselves seem to have an inherent flexibility in the creation of transcultural identities (Downes, 2001). Ethnographic work shows that students are not particularly concerned with their own national identity. It is the adults (parents, school leaders, and, most importantly, the State) that are concerned with pigeonholing the learning of an identity, the transmission of culture through schooling, into the standardized testing and national curriculum benchmarks for fear that otherwise children will lose their Japanese language ability and national identity (a powerful tension, especially given the location of NIS in Okinawa, a region historically located alternately in and out of Japan and thus engaging with a long-standing identity debate over “Japaneseness”; see Allen, 2002). Where is the place/space for these "global children" to flourish at the primary, secondary, and postsecondary levels of education within the present schooling structure?

As mentioned above, one question that scholars of Japanese education have asked is how initiatives such as *yutori kyōiku* actually exacerbate social inequalities if the underlying examination and entrance system is not adjusted. Is this a pattern? The related question we are tempted to ask is whether these Article One schools in Japan (or similar schools in other countries) that embrace as missions the ideals of a "global society" simply further entrench values that emphasize national boundaries? This question, in turn, touches on other questions of Japan as an emerging creolized, immigrant society—which it arguably must become if we consider the aging Japanese population and the declining birth rate as serious phenomena. Can alternative schools succeed in creating educational models that can help effect change towards such an *imin shakai* (immigrant society) in contrast to the present neoliberal model that supports nationalistic discourse on a "beautiful nation" (*utsukushii kuni*)[13] assumption?

NOTES

[1] Pseudonyms.

[2] Pseudonym.

[3] Interestingly, the opponent whom the incumbent mayor defeated in the last election ran on an anti-JIS platform. Because of the large subsidies it receives from the city, the school has been in this way used as a political tool of sorts.

[4] This perhaps reflects a deep-seated belief that in Japan education is egalitarian as well as "meritocratic," a stereotyping that has been questioned (e.g., Takayama, 2008).

[5] Pseudonym.

[6] This perhaps reflects the belief expressed by some in Japan of a cultural "zero sum"—gaining "foreignness" (e.g., proficiency in a foreign language) means a loss of "Japaneseness" (cf. Goodman 1990).

[7] Since bilingual immersion programs have most often been implemented to help minority populations to more effectively learn the dominant language of a community, this school could be considered an "inverse bilingual program" since the purpose is to educate a majority population in a minority language.

[8] For example, more than 4,500 bilingual teachers would be needed to implement immersion programs in merely 1% of compulsory schooling grades in Japan.

[9] No public school teachers send their children to JIS—one administrator whose husband is a public school teacher indicated that this was because of "pride" and perception of elitism. Interesting to contrast this with the very accepting view of *juku* cram schools by public school teachers—even though both JIS and*juku* indirectly question the effectiveness of the local public schools, the category of school is different.

[10] A recent report by the Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare claims that in 2005 the income disparity in Japan was 7% greater than in the U.S., up nearly 40% over figures for 2000. This is quite significant, even though the MHLW does note that the figure is probably skewed because pensioners, of which there is a growing number in Japan, are recorded as having zero income (nikkei.co.jp, August 25, 2007).

[12] *Yūtori kyōiku* ("relaxed education" or "room to grow"), an education reform in Japan introduced in 2002, was an initiative for students to develop new types of academic abilities, including student initiative, independence, critical thinking, creativity, and the ability to investigate topics of interest

to students, all of which are considered essential qualifications for 21st-century global economic competitiveness (see Kariya & Rappleye, 2010).

[12] Edward Hirsch models of cultural literacy that speak of knowledge deficit—"What every American child needs to know"—are also quite common in Japan and often referred to as "theories of Japaneseness" (*Nihonjinron*).

[13] Prime Minister Shinzō Abe's "Toward a Beautiful Nation!" (*Utsukushī kuni e*, 2006) became a best seller in Japan. In this book, he claims that Class A war criminals (those charged with crimes against humanity) were not war criminals in the eye of domestic law. The Korean and Chinese governments, as well as noted academics and commentators, have voiced concern about Abe's historical views and his ties to the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform (*Atarashīrekishikyōkasho o tsukuru kai*) and the new history textbook, which among other claims denies the abduction of "comfort women" for sex slavery by Japanese troops.

REFERENCES

Allen, M. (2002). *Identity and resistance in Okinawa.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, England: Verso.

Befu, H. (2001). *Hegemony of homogeneity*. Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.

Befu, H. (2009). Societal and cultural context of educational issues. In J. Gordon, H. Fujita, T. Kariya, & G. LeTendre (Eds.), *Challenges to Japanese education: Economics, reform, and human rights*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bjork, C. (2011). Imagining Japan's "relaxed education' curriculum": Continuity or change? In D. B. Willis & J. Rappleye (Eds.), *Reimagining Japanese education: Borders, transfers, circulations, and the comparative.* Oxford, England: Symposium Books.

Burgess, C. (2004). Maintaining identities: Discourses of homogeneity in a rapidly globalizing Japan. *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies*. Retreived from www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles/Burgess.html

Downes, S. (2001). Sense of Japanese cultural identity within an English partial immersion programme: Should parents worry? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *4*(3), 165–180.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world.* South Hudley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Goodman, R. (1990). *Japan's "International youth": The emergence of a new class of school children*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages.* Cambridge, England: Harvard University Press.

Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hashimoto, K. (2000). "Internationalisation" is "Japanisation": Japan's foreign language education and national identity. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *21*(1), 39–51.

Imoto, Y. (2011). Producing the "international" child: Negotiations of language in an international preschool in Japan. *Ethnography and Education*, *6*(3), 281–292.

Kariya, T. (2001). *Kaisōka Nihon to kyōikukiki [Education crisis in stratified Japan]*. Tokyo, Japan: Yushindo.

Kariya, T., & Rappleye, J. (2010). The twisted, unintended impact of globalization on Japanese education. In E. Hannum, H. Park, & Y. Goto Butler (Eds.), *Globalization, changing demographics, and educational challenges in East Asia*. New York, NY: Emerald.

Marshall, B. K. (1994). *Learning to be modern: Japanese political discourse on education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Mock, J. (2009). *Exacerbating educational inequality: Impact of rural/urban split on rural Japan*. Presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

OECD. (2009). Retrieved from http://stats.oecd.org

Pearson, R. (2001). The place of Okinawa in Japanese historical identity. In D. Denoon, M. Hudson, G. McCormack, & T. Morris-Suzuki (Eds.), *Multicultural Japan: Paleolithic to postmodern.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Roesgaard, M. H. (2006). *Japanese education and the cram school business: Functions, challenges and perspectives of the juku.* Copenhagen, Denmark: NIAS Press.

Rohlen, T. P. (1983). *Japan's high schools*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Takayama, K. (2008). Beyond orientalism in comparative education: Challenging the binary opposition between Japanese and American education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *28*(1), 19–34.

Tsuda, T. (2003). *Strangers in the ethnic homeland: Japanese Brazilian return migration in transnational perspective.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Tsuneyoshi, R., Okano, K. & Boocock, S. S. (Eds.). (2010). *Minorities and education in multicultural Japan*. London, England: Routledge.

Willis, D. B. (2006). Learning culture, learning citizenship: Japanese education and the challenge of multiculturalism. In S. Lee, S. Murphy-Shigematsu, & H. Befu (Eds), *Japan's diversity dilemmas*. New York, NY: iUniverse.

Willis, D. B., & Murphy-Shigematsu, S. (2008). *Transcultural Japan: At the borderlands of race, gender, and nation.* London, England: Routledge.

Gregory S. Poole
Doshisha University

Hinako Takahashi
University of Maryland University College

TIINA MATIKAINEN

7. CULTURES OF LEARNING IN JAPANESE EFL CLASSROOMS

Student and Teacher Expectations

INTRODUCTION

This chapter attempts to understand English language classrooms in a Japanese university through participants' own understanding and expectations of what constitutes a good language learner and a good language teacher. The participants' views are important in learning what teachers and learners expect of each other. This, in turn, is an important part of the *culture of learning* that can determine what takes place in a language classroom and what is viewed as successful language learning and teaching in Japan. Holliday (1994) talks about how classroom events incorporate many *lessons;* one that the teacher plans for execution in class and one for each student taking part in the lesson. These different lessons are marked by different expectations, abilities, and preferences. In addition, these factors are rooted in the larger "deep action phenomena," including psycho-cultural, informal, and micro-political factors, which are not necessarily visible to the outside. Inevitably, the teachers' and students' lessons and expectations differ somewhat and are in conflict with each other.

To try to better understand the lessons that Japanese students and EFL teachers bring into the classroom at one Japanese university, through written responses and interviews the participants in this study were asked about their expectations of a good language student and a good language teacher. The data gathered revealed differing views of successful language learners and teachers by the participants, which will be discussed in this chapter. As a conclusion, the *cultural synergy* of different cultures of learning, as discussed by Jin (1992) and Jin and Cortazzi (1995) in a Chinese context, will be explored and applied to the current Japanese context. Suggestions on how to achieve cultural synergy in a Japanese context will be discussed to conclude the chapter.

WHAT IS CULTURE?

When discussing a language learning context where people from different nationalities interact, it is important to address the concept of culture as a starting point. Most researchers today agree that any definition of culture is a simplification

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 103–117.

of this complex and multidimensional phenomenon. Eriksen (2004) provides four points regarding use of the word "culture." First, he finds the plural form, "cultures," problematic, since he feels this implies that culture is something that divides humanity, whereas the singular form "culture" has a unifying implication. Second, a definition of culture ignores the variations among individuals belonging to any group, which often can be greater than variations between groups. Third, he objects to the political use of "culture," which often results in conflicts and discrimination. Finally, he criticizes trying to reduce such a wide, vague, and messy concept as culture into a simple term to cover the scope of its meanings. Such observations have been echoed by many other researchers.

Holliday (1999) has developed an alternative to the "large culture" approach in which he proposes the useful concept of "*small culture*" as a tool for explaining social group formation. Holliday's main objection to the large culture concept is that it carries preconceived notions and stereotypes about what a person is or how a person is expected to behave. He suggests that the concept of small culture—small groups, such as family, classroom, and workplace—is more accurate. He characterizes small cultures as being dynamic groups that continue making and remaking themselves. This definition focuses on the activities taking place within the group, not the group itself.

Holliday offers four steps for the genesis of small cultures. First, a need for group cohesion arises, which starts the process of culture creation. Second, people in that group contribute aspects of all the other small cultures they belong to, and, thus, interaction between all these cultural residues takes place and result in social continuity. Third, this new small culture produces something; for example, conventions on how to behave within the group. The fourth step is when these conventions within a group come to be taken for granted by all group members. The small culture is thus formed, but will continue to remake itself and develop because it is active and dynamic by nature. Holliday encourages the researcher to use this concept of small cultures when trying to understand the behavior of social groups.

In this chapter Holliday's definition of small cultures is adopted. Culture is seen as an active, dynamic system that changes and evolves as members interact and reconstruct the rules, conventions, and activities of their group.

Cultures of Learning

Holliday (1994) also argues that in any classroom many lessons take place simultaneously, which affects the building of a small culture in each classroom. Mainly, he is talking about the lessons that the teacher has planned and is implementing in the classroom, vis-à-vis what the students experience. These can vary greatly. A teacher's lesson involves an agenda as expressed in the lesson plan designed for a specific class or course. This is influenced by many factors: teaching methodology, teaching materials, teacher and school expectations of student and teacher roles, conventions of the academic subject, as well as a teacher's personal needs, beliefs, abilities and motivation. In addition, some deeper forces are in play, such as wider educational conventions of teacher and student behavior and the political climate of the institution.

A student's lesson experience, on the other hand, involves what each student or the students as a group want to get out of the lesson. This is influenced by several factors: student expectations of teacher and student roles and lessons, conventions for how to respond to classroom events, and student motivation, needs, abilities, and beliefs. Some deeper forces include wider societal and educational rules for student and teacher behavior as well as the political climate of student groups. It is clear that teacher and student "lessons" are different, and, therefore, are likely in conflict at times.

In Japan, such "conflicts" bring to mind foreign teachers teaching Japanese students. However, this conflict extends beyond national cultures. Teachers inevitably belong to different small cultures from their students and thus, together, both need to develop a new small culture for their shared learning situation. This is important to allow both students and teacher to succeed. More specifically, in language classrooms, cultures of learning are an important factor.

Cortazzi and Jin (1996) introduce the idea of a "culture of learning" by discussing language teachers' and students' understanding of what it means to be a good teacher or a good student. The goal of their original study was to incorporate these views into the ideological teaching model of what language teachers and learners expect from each other. They argue that a culture of learning is an important factor in what is happening in language classrooms, and therefore, worth investigating by language education researchers. According to Cortazzi and Jin (1996), we all have our own cultures of learning made up of our own

> taken-for-granted frameworks of expectations, attitudes, values and beliefs about what constitutes good learning, about how to teach or learn, whether and how to ask questions, what textbooks are for, and how language teaching relates to broader issues of the nature and purpose of education. (169)

However, as the authors point out, learners and teachers are often unaware of their own complex framework, and gaps in frameworks between teachers and students or between different groups of students often go unnoticed. In order to get a glimpse into these cultures of learning, it is important that researchers examine statements from the students and teachers who are participating members in a classroom. In this chapter, culture of learning refers to the beliefs and values that students and teachers hold about education and more specifically, about the perceived roles of teachers and learners that they bring into the classroom with them.

The key question underlying a culture of learning has to do with students' expectations of good teachers and good students as well as teachers' expectations of good learners and good teachers. In their study, Cortazzi and Jin (1996) investigated this by asking 135 Chinese students to answer an open-ended question about the qualities of a good language teacher. The participants overwhelmingly indicated that having deep knowledge is the most important characteristic. Other characteristics valued in a good teacher included being patient, humorous, a good moral example, friendly, and teaching students about life as well as arousing students' interest. The researchers also asked the students about what constitutes a good student. The most common characteristic mentioned by the participants was being hard working. Other characteristics included being sociable, learning with others, paying attention to the teacher, respecting and obeying the teacher, being active in class, cooperating with the teacher, and studying independently.

Just as Cortazzi and Jin (1996) have indicated, a very important aspect of cultures of learning deals with teacher and student beliefs. In order to understand what is happening in classrooms, it is important to investigate what the participants themselves think about their roles. Therefore, for language education research, investigating teacher beliefs about what constitutes a good language teacher as well as a good language student and investigating student beliefs about the same issues provides useful information on the cultures of learning in language classrooms.

TEACHER AND STUDENT BELIEFS IN JAPAN

Several studies have investigated the characteristics of foreign language teachers (Bell, 2005; Borg, 2006; Brosh, 1996; Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006). There is also much research available on what educators and administrators think good teachers do and should do in the classrooms (McEwan, 2002; Stephenson, 2001; Young & Shaw, 1999); however, less has been written and researched about what students think good teachers do and are like. Therefore, many researchers (Horwitz, 1988; Matsuura, Chiba & Hilderbrandt, 2001) have called for more research on student and teacher beliefs about expectations for successful language classes, while much of this research has concentrated on learning strategies and beliefs about teaching practices and methods. Very little research has actually examined students' and teachers' beliefs about what good teachers and good language learners do in the classroom, based on their own experiences. In addition, much of the previous research has used questionnaires for data collection; however, this restricts the participants' responses. Therefore, many researchers have called for open-ended questionnaires, for instance, to be used to elicit opinions because they provide more authentic and detailed responses.

Borg (2006) points out that it is important to understand and to investigate what it means to be a language teacher in particular teaching and learning contexts. He also emphasizes that it is important to investigate particular institutional and sociocultural language learning contexts to better understand how language learners in these cultures characterize their language teachers as well as themselves as language learners. Several studies in a Japanese context have tried to do this.

Hadley (1996) examined Japanese students' views on what characteristics they think good teachers possess. In his study, the participants—165 Japanese university students—were asked to answer an open-ended research question: "What is a good teacher?" The data were analyzed according to text frequency and descriptive statistics. The ten most common characteristics mentioned by the participants were kind, friendly, impartial, understandable, cheerful, punctual, fun, enthusiastic, humorous, and nonviolent.

Evans (2004) examined 48 Japanese first-year university students' views on their learning by asking them several open-ended questions about their favorite subject and its teacher, their best subject and its teacher, and about the overall characteristics of good teachers and bad teachers they had in the past. The data were then categorized into four areas: personality of good teachers, personality of bad teachers, teaching behaviors of good teachers, and teaching behaviors of bad teachers. Evans found that the participants viewed good teachers as kind, caring, humorous, experts in their field, and clever. As for the classroom behavior of good teachers, the participants mentioned the following as being important: making the class interesting, making the class easy to understand, clarity of explanation, and rephrasing. Regarding bad teachers, the participants viewed bad teachers as having the following qualities: being angry most of the time, being too strict, favoritism, lack of fairness, and looking down on students. As for classroom behavior of bad teachers, the participants mentioned the following as being prevalent: boring presentation, classes being too difficult, and not being able to understand the teacher.

Lee (2010) investigated a group of Japanese university students' perceptions on what characteristics make EFL teachers distinguishable from other teachers of other subjects through a questionnaire. The participants most strongly agreed with the following characteristics as making EFL teachers unique: they have a more difficult job because they have to explain things to learners in English, they have more positive attitudes, they show more enthusiasm, they encourage more student involvement, and they encourage more speaking in class. In addition, Lee (2010) asked the participants to rate the distinctive features of English language teaching in comparison to other subject areas. He found that the participants most strongly agreed on the following features: teaching the cultures of English-speaking countries and developing learners' communication skills, difficult because teacher and learners work in a non-native language, and involving more than teaching the skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

In many of these studies, character issues seem to outweigh the skills or abilities the ideal teacher might have. Previous research has found that Japanese students' view of good teachers resembles the Japanese *sempai* approach to leadership. The relationship between *sempai,* the "companion ahead," and *kohai,* the "companion behind," is an important one in Japan. This up-down model for relationships is important for cooperation in Japan, both in the work place as well as educational institutions. Rohlen (1974) describes this relationship in the following way:

> Ideally, the *sempai* will represent, advise, console, teach and discipline their *kohai*. *Kohai*, in return, will confide in, listen to, depend upon, follow, and

> respect their *sempai*… there is an implication that leadership should be as sympathetic, protective and unselfish as good *sempai*. (23)

Poole (2010) discussed the factors and actions that go into becoming a "good university professor" at one higher education institution in Japan. He pointed out that one of the characteristics of a good professor is being kind and gentle with the students. This kindness, according to him, is manifested in many ways, some of them being lenient with grading students and providing guidance to students by acting as a mentor to them. Strictness is also built into this kindness, mainly by ensuring that a professor is in control of his/her students and can manage a class in an efficient and controlled manner. Being kind and gentle while maintaining a certain level of strictness is considered a sign of a "good professor," Poole (2010) explains.

THE STUDY

As discussed above, investigating teacher and student beliefs can provide useful information about what is happening in the language classroom. To examine these beliefs, empirical research is necessary. This chapter attempts to do that in a similar way to Cortazzi and Jin (1996). However, their study only used a questionnaire, while this study aims to delve more deeply by using open-ended questions as well as interviews. The following section introduces the methodology used to conduct this study.

Participants

Thirty Japanese female university students participated in this study, juniors and seniors at a private Japanese women's university majoring in British and American Literature, Communication Studies, and Language Sciences. Five non-Japanese English teachers teaching at the same university also participated in the study—two Americans, one Canadian, and two British. All of the students have at some point during their university studies been taught by one of the participating teachers.

Method

A questionnaire was not used in this study for several reasons. First, with a questionnaire, responses are limited to what the researcher asks. Second, the researcher's cultural background may affect the questions included in the questionnaire and therefore may be culturally inappropriate and bias the participants. In addition, even if open-ended questions are included at the end of questionnaires, these are often left blank. Therefore, in this study, open-ended questions were used to elicit responses from the participants. Both the student and the teacher participants were asked to answer the following two questions: 1) In your opinion, what makes a good language learner?, and 2) In your opinion, what makes a good language teacher? The participants were given as much time as they needed to write their answers in essay format, and it took the participants between 20–45 minutes to complete the task. After this, follow-up interviews were held to explore the written answers in more depth. Directed interviews were held with 20 of the student participants and all of the five teacher participants. These were all recorded and transcribed.

Analysis

An interpretive approach was used to analyze the data. Because the responses were open-ended and qualitative, the statements produced by the participants were synthesized in a way to produce possible patterns. Keywords found were analyzed to identify and categorize emerging themes used by the participants to describe the characteristics of good language teachers and learners. For each research question for the students, the ten most frequent characteristics mentioned were included in the results. For the teachers, due to the small number of participants, the five most frequent characteristics mentioned were included in the results.

Results

In this section, first, the results from the student participants will be presented, followed by the results from the teacher participants.

Student expectations of good language teachers. The frequency of student participants' comments on what makes a good language teacher is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Most frequently mentioned characteristics for good language teachers

Characteristic	*Number of respondents (%)*
1. Can motivate students	25 (83%)
2. Communicative classroom	23 (77%)
3. Kind and patient	19 (63%)
4. Uses variety of materials	15 (50%)
5. Passionate	13 (43%)
6. Teaches practical English	12 (40%)
7. Sense of humor	10 (33%)
8. Good pronunciation	10 (33%)
9. Highly educated	8 (27%)
10. Explains learning goals	7 (23%)

The most frequently occurring characteristic mentioned by the participants was being able to motivate students to learn, mentioned by 83% of the participants. Some of the ways this should be done by the teacher are choosing interesting and appropriate topics for lessons, making activities interesting for students, and finding ways to make students enjoy language learning, according to the participants.

One student said,

> A good teacher makes a boring and difficult topic attractive to students. For example, such as politics and economics.

The second most frequent characteristic was for the teacher to ensure that students get many chances to speak in the classroom. 77% of the participants mentioned that it is important for the teacher to give students many chances to practice and be active in the classroom.

One student explained:

> I like a teacher who gives us many opportunities to talk in English and to discuss different topics. Giving opportunities to students is a really good way to be a good student, too.

Another student wrote:

> A good teacher makes students speak a lot. If a teacher speaks English for a long time, maybe students become bored, I think.

Next, 63% of the participants felt that language teachers should be kind and patient. Many of them mentioned that this means that the teacher guides the students to find the right answers and does not get angry if a student supplies a wrong answer but rather, encourages the students even if they are wrong. Many students expressed the importance of having a teacher who can make students relax. A few participants mentioned that they expect a different degree of strictness from a foreign language teacher than they do from a Japanese language teacher.

One participant said:

> A good teacher makes students relax. A foreign teacher should not be too strict. If the teacher is too strict, students are afraid of making mistakes and afraid of trying and expressing themselves. A Japanese English teacher should be strict because English is hard and students must study hard.

Another student added,

> A kind teacher who is smiling makes us relax. This is important for studying.

Half (50%) of the participants mentioned that a language teacher should use various materials when teaching, including authentic audio and video materials.

The other characteristics mentioned by the participants were being passionate, teaching practical English that is connected to daily life, having a good sense of humor, having good pronunciation, being highly educated with extensive knowledge, and making the goals and purposes of learning and activities clear to the students. In the follow-up interviews, many students elaborated especially on two of these points:

having good pronunciation and being highly educated with extensive knowledge and experiences.

One student said about pronunciation:

> I like a teacher whose pronunciation is clear and good. It's very important, I think. Teacher who can pronounce well and speak well motivates us and makes me make an effort. They are a role model, and I want to become like that.

Another student stressed the importance of a teacher's experiences:

> I like a teacher who has experienced many things, such as study, living abroad, work in another country, and has a lot of knowledge.

Student expectations of good language learners. The frequency of student participants' comments on what makes a good language teacher is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Most frequently mentioned characteristics for good language learners

Characteristic	*Number of respondents (%)*
1. Active	23 (77%)
2. Risk-taker	21 (70%)
3. Everyday learning	18 (60%)
4. Goal-oriented	13 (43%)
5. Uses multiple learning resources	12 (40%)
6. Enjoys English	11 (37%)
7. Independent thinker	9 (30%)
8. Listens carefully	9 (30%)
9. Asks questions	7 (23%)
10. Hard-working	5 (17%)

The most frequently occurring characteristic mentioned by the participants was being active, mentioned by 77% of the participants. Most of them explained this means speaking up and using any opportunity to participate. The second most frequent characteristic, mentioned by 70% of the participants, was being a risk-taker, which means not being afraid of making mistakes, according to the participants.

One student said,

> Japanese students are afraid of making mistakes and don't talk much. It's important for students to speak up and make conversation. Students should be more active and use all opportunities for talking.

Next, 60% of the participants said that learning outside of the classroom is important. They stressed the fact that students should be exposed to English every day.

One student observed:

> I decided to speak English every day. This is very important, I think. Having a habit of using English every day can motivate you. For example, it's a good idea to listen to foreign countries' music or study English every day or watch foreign movies.

Another student said:

> A good student loves something that is related to English. For example, Hollywood stars or foreign music. To enjoy something is a good way to be a good student and study English.

Having goals, such as reaching a certain standardized test score, finding a foreign boyfriend, or studying abroad, were mentioned as being important by 43% of the participants. Using multiple resources available for learning English was also mentioned as an important factor in being a good language learner, mentioned by 40% of the students. The quotes above from the student participants show examples of this as well.

Other characteristics of good learners that were mentioned were enjoying English, being an independent thinker, listening to the teacher carefully, asking questions, and being a hard worker.

Teacher expectations of good language teachers. The frequency of teacher participants' comments on what makes a good language teacher is presented in Table 3. There was not as much variety in the teachers' answers as there was in the students', so only five of the most frequently mentioned characteristics are listed here.

Table 3. Most frequently mentioned characteristics for good language teachers

Characteristic	*Number of respondents (%)*
1. Knowledge of language teaching	5 (100%)
2. Able to motivate students	5 (100%)
3. Able to develop student autonomy and learning strategies	3 (60%)
4. Knowledge of students' culture	3 (60%)
5. Some knowledge of students' L1	3 (60%)

All the language teachers that participated in this study felt that the two most important characteristics of good language teachers are knowledge of language teaching and being able to motivate students. The teachers expressed the need to understand how key language skills should be presented in lessons and how equal learning opportunities for all language skills should be present. In addition, the teachers stressed the importance of not only knowing the language but also being able to break down the language into easily understandable and teachable units. Professional training in these areas is necessary to become a good language teacher, the participants felt, and therefore, education in teaching foreign languages was considered important by these participants.

Being able to motivate students and to provide motivating activities and lessons for students was considered equally important. The teachers mentioned that this is important because research shows that motivated students are more effective language learners.

One teacher participant explained:

> I believe it's important to motivate students so that they can enjoy learning English and they can become better communicators. For example, in my class, to motivate students, I try to find out what they are interested in and then try to combine these interests into my lessons.

Being able to foster autonomy in students, becoming independent learners and thinkers, and being able to help develop students' learning strategy were mentioned as important factors as well. The participants explained that these are especially important in EFL contexts, where students have fewer opportunities to use English outside of the classroom.

One teacher wrote:

> My ultimate goal in teaching my students is to produce independent critical thinkers who are autonomous learners. I try to explain to them that they will not always have a teacher with them, so learning good thinking and learning to learn by themselves is an important factor for life-long learning.

Three out of five participants also mentioned the knowledge of the students' culture and L1 as being important factors for good language teachers.

Teacher expectations of good language learners. The frequency of teacher participants' comments on what makes a good language learner is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Most frequently mentioned characteristics for good language learners

Characteristic	*Number of respondents (%)*
1. Motivated	5 (100%)
2. Active	4 (80%)
3. Respect for teacher	3 (60%)
4. Study on their own outside of class	3 (60%)
5. Autonomous	2 (40%)

All the participants felt that the most important characteristic of a good language learner is being motivated. The teachers mentioned that the best language learners respect the culture and people of the language they are learning, and only being extrinsically motivated, aiming for a specific goal such as a standardized test score or a promotion, is not as helpful for language learners.

One teacher participant wrote:

> There is a saying in English, "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink." The same is true for language learners. Unfortunately, students who are forced to study a language they don't like or feel they will have no use for in their lives usually refuse "to drink," no matter how charismatic or entertaining the teacher is.

The second factor mentioned by the teachers was being active. Many of the teacher participants also mentioned that being motivated and being active actually often go together.

One teacher said:

> I believe being active is important, especially since to me being active includes being motivated and autonomous. If students are actively participating in the class, then to me that means that they're working with each other and that they're curious to learn more. This to me shows that they are motivated.

The other important factors mentioned by the teachers were respect for the teacher, studying outside of the classroom independently, and being an autonomous learner. The teachers mentioned that good students do not forget that the main purpose of a language teacher is to teach language and the culture that it is connected with, not to be a friend, to always entertain them, or to have fun in class.

One participant wrote:

> Many people believe that if language teachers have charisma or are good entertainers, they will automatically be good teachers and vice versa. This is simply not true, because I've had teachers with the personality of a brick who I considered to be some of my best teachers...I respected them as teachers and wanted to learn the information they had to offer. I was not in class to be entertained.

Teachers also mentioned the need for students to seek out language learning opportunities outside of the classroom, especially in EFL contexts and when a language course does not provide enough key learning opportunities. Possessing autonomy and being aware of different learning strategies to help one's language learning was also mentioned as an important characteristic for a good language learner to have.

DISCUSSION

Expectations of good language teachers. Based on the results of this study, both student and teacher participants felt that motivation is one of the important factors that makes language learning successful. Being able to motivate students was listed as one of the most important characteristics of a good language teacher. Therefore, this implies that both teachers and learners view motivation and being motivated to learn a language as a necessary and very important part of language teaching.

The participants, however, did not seem to agree on the other most important characteristics they felt make up a good language learner or a good language teacher. Whereas the teachers thought knowledge of the English language teaching field is the most important characteristic for good language teachers, only 27% of the student participants mentioned their desire to have a teacher who has been highly educated in the field of language teaching. Another aspect that teachers felt important is for language teachers to help learners become autonomous, independent learners who can use learning strategies to help their learning. Students did not mention these characteristics at all, which suggests that the students may feel that the teacher's job stops in the classroom and only involves teaching the lessons they have planned for each class. Teachers also felt that language teachers should have some knowledge of the learners' culture and native language, which the students did not seem to consider important, since it was not mentioned by any of the participants.

For the students, a teacher's personality seemed to play a big role, as suggested by their responses. Many of the top ten characteristics mentioned by the learners involved a teacher's personality. These were: being kind, patient, and passionate as well as having a good sense of humor. None of the teacher participants mentioned these, which suggests that they do not think a teacher's personality is an important factor in good teaching.

Expectations of good language learners. With the expectations for good language learners, the participants were in more agreement. One of the most important qualities for a good language learner is motivation, which was also the most important factor for good language teachers, according to the participants. Teachers felt that motivated and active students make the best learners, while active students who enjoy English and therefore are motivated to learn it make the best language learners according to the student participants of this study. Teachers also felt that studying outside of the classroom is very important for successful language learning, and the students seemed to agree, because they indicated that good language learners should use English every day by enjoying multiple sources for language learning. They felt it is important for students to find something they enjoy doing in English and then use that as a language learning resource and tool. Teachers also felt that being an autonomous language learner is an important factor in success, and the students had a similar view by indicating that successful language learners are independent thinkers.

Teachers also mentioned that respect for a teacher is an important characteristic of a good learner, a factor that was missing from the student responses.

CONCLUSION

It is important to investigate teacher and student beliefs in every classroom. To this end it would be useful to ensure that teachers are capable of conducting ethnographies in their own language classrooms. In fact, it could be argued that this is an essential activity for every teacher. Cultural synergy, as coined by Jin (1992) and Jin and Cortazzi (1995, 1996), is an idea that different cultures of learning can be combined. Cultural synergy is when teachers or students from different cultures of learning "interact systematically, cooperating for the common purpose of students' language development with an attitude of being willing to learn, understand, and appreciate the other's culture without loss of their own cultural status, role, and identity" (Jin & Cortezzi, 1996, 201). This involves raising conscious awareness of differences in individual cultures of learning, of which an important part is for teachers and students to express verbally their expectations for each other at the outset, from the first class meeting. It is not enough for teachers to teach about their cultures or their teaching beliefs, but it is also important that they listen to students and then reflect on both sides to see where these cultures differ and what can be done to bridge the gap between teacher's and students' expectations. Both sides need to have an explicit understanding of each other's cultures of learning and in this way maximize the positive aspects of the classroom environment by addressing any gaps that may negatively affect learning.

REFERENCES

Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: Results of a questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals*, *38*, 259–270.

Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*, 3–31.

Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29*, 125–138.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Eriksen, T. H. (2004). *What is anthropology?* London, England: Pluto Press.

Evans, D. R. (2004). Student evaluation of teachers. *National College of Nursing Journal*, *3*(1), 91–99.

Hadley, G., & Hadley, Y. (1996). The culture of learning and the good teacher in Japan: An analysis of student views. *The Language Teacher*, *20*(9), 53–55.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Holliday, A. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, *20*(2), 237–264.

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*, 182–193.

Jin, L. (1992). *Academic cultural expectations and second language use: Chinese postgraduate students in the U.K. – A cultural synergy model. (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis). Leicester, England: University of Leicester.*

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (1995). A cultural synergy model for academic language use. In P. Bruthiaux, T. Boswood, & B. Du-Babcock (Eds.), *Explorations in English for professional communication.* Hong Kong, China: City University of Hong Kong.

Lee, J. J. (2010). The uniqueness of EFL teachers: Perceptions of Japanese learners. *TESOL Journal*, *1*(1), 23–48.

Matsuura, H., Chiba, R., & Hilderbrandt, P. (2001). Beliefs about learning and teaching communicative English in Japan. *The JALT Journal*, *23*, 69–89.

McEwan, E. (2004). *10 Traits of highly effective teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Mullock, B. (2003). What makes a good teacher? The perception of postgraduate TESOL students. *Prospect*, *18*(3), 3–24.

Park, G.-P., & Lee, H.-W. (2006). *Characteristics of effective English teachers perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea*. Paper presented at the 19th English Australia Education Conference, Perth, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.englishaustralia.com.au/ea_conference2006/proceedings/pdf/Lee.pdf

Poole, G. S. (2010). *The Japanese professor: An ethnography of a university faculty.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Rohlen, T. (1974). Up and down. In B. Finkenstein, A. E. Inamura, & J. Tobin (Eds.), *Transcending stereotypes: Discovering Japanese culture and education.* Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.

Stephenson, F. (2001). *Extraordinary teachers: The essence of excellent teaching.* Kansas City, MO: Andrews McMeel Publishing.

Young, S., & Shaw, D. G. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(6), 670–686.

Tiina Matikainen
International Christian University

AKIKO KATAYAMA

8. TWO CLASSES, TWO PRONUNCIATIONS

A Postmodern Understanding of Power in EFL Students' Classroom Performance

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses a case of junior college English majors in Japan who demonstrated two very different manners of pronunciation in two types of English courses in one semester. The case introduced here derived from a larger ethnographic study, which included about four years of data collection. The first-year junior college English majors in the study yearned for native-like English pronunciation but did not utter English the way they desired when they actually spoke the language. The students tried hard to imitate idealized Midwestern American speech and made significant progress toward this goal during one academic year in their first-year pronunciation course; in contrast, the same group of students constantly and consistently spoke with heavy Japanese accents in the concurrent theme-based English discussion class.

Pronunciation, which is a recognized identity marker (Canagarajah, 1993), is indeed an example of social constraint. If one pronounces words differently from other members in a social group, it will be noticed, marked, and may result in loss of group membership. To understand the features of the constraints manifested in those junior college students' inconsistent English pronunciation, I am guided by Michel Foucault's notion of power and its internalization.

English learning in post-war Japan, including the situation of the present study, fits neither the modernist assumption of linear and continual growth caused by investment nor the Marxist assumption of unequal distribution based on socioeconomic class. If English was a form of capital for the Japanese people, as it seems to be in other non-English speaking communities, the Japanese would have gained English language proficiency just as people in post-war Japan achieved quite remarkably in science and technology. If English was capital distributed on a class basis, Japanese professionals, including politicians, academics, and corporate leaders would all be proficient in English. Despite the fact that substantial material and human investment has been made in English education in and out of the nation's school system, a great majority of Japanese, regardless of socioeconomic class, have remained functionally monolingual.

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 119–132.

Alarmed by the global shift from a manufacturing to an information-based economy, many in industry and mainstream media have publicly problematized the static functional-monolingualism of the nation, pressuring the government to intervene in school English, particularly with regard to the absence of communicative training. Since 1987, nearly all middle schools in Japan have had periodic visitations by native speaker English teachers, AETs (Assistant English Teachers) or ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers). Furthermore, the Course of Study (the guidelines for the contents of public education issued by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan) revised in 1989 included oral communication as a compulsory component of the senior high school English program. The oft-criticized entrance examinations have been changing gradually. For example, listening comprehension has been increasingly common in high school and college or university entrance exams in recent years. However, the central practice of school English has reportedly remained grammar-translation taught in the students' first language (L1), and there is as of yet no appreciable sign that interventions have altered the monolingual state of the nation.

It must be noted that L1-medium grammar-translation is not the only method experienced by Japanese learners of English. In fact, many Japanese have sought opportunities to practice English for communication outside the school system and have spent serious money on private English education. The so-called English conversation market, including English conversation school chains and commercial learning materials in 2002 recorded the revenue of $6.7 billion USD (Yano Research Institute, 2003). Also, the number of people who study abroad for the purpose of English learning is not small. But again, there is no clear evidence that monetary investment in learning English outside the school system has produced much gain in the English proficiency of the Japanese. Such is the society in which the students who spoke English with two inconsistent pronunciations are situated.

MICHEL FOUCAULT'S CONCEPT OF POWER AND DISCOURSE

In this section, Michel Foucault's concept of power and discourse will be introduced only to the limit of its relevance to the present chapter. Foucault's conceptualization of discourse and power in its entirety, as recognized in understanding the contemporary human condition (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982; Imamura & Kurihara, 1999), is far beyond the scope of this chapter.

Foucault challenged the traditional idea of power, particularly that of Marxism, as a static possession of a person or party (Foucault, 1982; Gordon, 1980). Modernist problematization of power, typically represented by Marxism, had, and possibly still has, a role in solving dire problems requiring immediate solution. However, social science in recent years has become increasingly aware that deeper, situational understanding of complexity in power relations is necessary not only to enable change but to ensure lasting change, and to make change meaningful to those for whom the change is meant to serve.

Influenced greatly by Heidegger, Foucault attempted an anti-humanist approach to conceptualizing power (Sakurai, 2001). To put it simply, Foucault removed humans from the center of the concept of power as active and conscious possessors of power. Instead, Foucault considered a person, regardless of class, status, or wealth, as a *docile body* (Dreyfus, 2004) that becomes the subject of power. In this view, a modernist and fixed snapshot of the powerful exploiting the powerless is rejected. Foucault famously adopted the “archaeological” approach, which was, in his own words, interested in the “how of power” (Gordon, 1980, p. 92) instead of the who or why.

One of Foucault’s attempts to illustrate the “how of power” is his famous analogy of Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982; Foucault, 1980; Sakurai, 2001). The Panopticon was an innovative design of a prison in which one small tower had a view of individual prison cells surrounding the tower in a circle, but inmates were not able to see the guard in the tower. In fact, the inmates could not tell whether the guard was in or out of the tower. The design of the apparatus highlights the internalization of power within the prisoners. Even when the source of control, the prison guard, is absent from the tower, power manifests because the prisoners, who internalized their role in relation to the tower, are already and always subjects of power nonetheless. This constraint, according to Foucault, is an important characteristic of power relations, particularly in institutions (Foucault, 1980). The physical existence of a power source becomes irrelevant to people’s behavior; in other words, people act, talk, and be as expected as far as they are incorporated into the design.

It is important to note that while Foucault did discuss apparently force-based institutions such as prisons and mental institutions to illustrate his view of power, his goal of understanding the “how of power” was not restricted to power manifestation as seen in particular types of institutions. Foucault attempted to generally explicate how power was internalized by individuals—individuals of all ranks, in any sort of social group. In other words, individuals participate in the formation of power moment by moment by accepting and conforming to the binding norms of the group (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008).

Foucault referred to these binding norms as *discourse* (Foucault, 1969/1972), which is another important notion in Foucault’s anti-humanist concept of power. Discourse is perhaps one of the most contested terms (see Pennycook, 1994 about the dispute in applied linguistics), in fact, the term is differentially defined in social science at large by contemporary thinkers (Macdonnell, 1986). Foucault viewed discourse as a set of rules formed by people in any possible social group and binding people as parts of a system, including the system of language. Foucault claimed that these rules would authorize certain people to speak, certain things to be spoken about, and determine the manner in which things are spoken about. The other side of the coin is that discourses also act to exclude people and things. Furthermore, a person in any society is bound by many, and sometimes conflicting, discourses. In his 1976 lecture, Foucault described the tight-knit relation between power and discourse:

> What I mean is this: in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated, nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse. (Foucault, 1976/1980, 93)

Foucault's concept of power has been criticized as unproductive relativism, which does not provide solutions to social problems (Macdonnell, 1986; Rorty, 1998). On the other hand, an increasing number of studies of education are interested in the concept because the field is seeking change that is less top-down and enforced and more sustainable and student-centered (Tanaka, 2009; Taylor & Robinson, 2009). In a time when the complexities of social practices and fluctuations in social progress receive much attention in social science, including applied linguistics (Canagarajah, 2006), Foucault's perspective about power should serve as, in his own words, "a thinking tool" for educators—from local practitioners to national policy makers—who are troubled by unexpected outcomes of interventions.

As this volume amply shows, complexity in social practices is of particular interest to studies of EFL situations, which are so diverse that the single EFL acronym hardly captures the realities. In past decades, under the "grand narrative" (Lyotard, 1984) of "master English since it is a beneficial skill in an era of globalization," mainstream TESOL methods, typically communicative language teaching (CLT) have been widely introduced in EFL teaching contexts. However, instead of the expected linear progress in learners' communicative competence, several recent studies report on highly complex local reactions, which cannot be isolated from their political, and historical conditions (Atkinson, 2003; Canagarajah, 1993; Duff, 1995). While Foucault's notion of power seems ambiguous and rather hard to apply in empirical studies to demonstrate tangible traces, spoken language allows us to witness immediate manifestations of the power phenomena in local human relations.

The present study attempts to look at the recorded spoken English of young female beginner EFL students who appeared to have a love-hate relationship with English pronunciation.

STUDY

This section revisits one of the findings, the distinctive difference in the same students' pronunciation in a theme-based English discussion class and skill-based English pronunciation class, from an ethnographic study I did for my dissertation (Katayama, 2008). I will later discuss the data guided by the above-mentioned Foucault's perspective of power and discourse. The data I discuss in this chapter were selected from a large set of ethnographic data, including the video tapes and field notes from the entire academic year of an English discussion course, field notes from two class sessions of the same group's phonetics course, and the students' phonetics course practice tapes.

SITE

The site of the study was a Christian junior college in a city in western Japan called, in pseudonym, Nishinihon Junior College, or "Nishi" for short. Nishi had a good reputation in the local community for its unique English education. However, just like most other junior colleges in Japan, Nishi was under pressure in the early 2000s when the data were collected. One of the most serious problems was the enrollment decline. While the nation's birthrates were lowering rapidly, the number of colleges and universities continued to increase even after the burst of the so-called "bubble economy" in the early 1990s. In addition, the prolonged recession in the early 2000s resulted in a record low of job placements for junior college graduates (Ministry of Health, Labour, & Welfare, 2006). Furthermore, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of Japan started a new policy to evaluate tertiary institutions and redistribute funds based on merit and declared that it would stop subsidizing schools that fell short on enrollment (*Teiin ware shidai,* 2003). To resist the multiple pressures, Nishi invested in revising its curriculum, incorporating modern TESOL practices including theme-based courses taught in English with communicative language teaching. The change resulted in the English program becoming a site of struggle between old and new ideological practices. To apply Foucault's notion of discourses being rules to form practices, Nishi's English program for first-year students contained conflicting discourses. Specifically, the former included phonetics, grammar, and reading courses, by policy, taught by Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) and the latter, discussion and writing by native-speaker teachers of English (NSTEs).

At the time of the research I was a special contract teacher at Nishi who had been teaching there regularly for several years but was not involved in the teaching of the courses or students discussed in this chapter. The position allowed me to have much access to people and events at school on a daily basis, and also allowed me to have the necessary distance from the participants for the purpose of the research.

PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR ONE-YEAR TRAJECTORY

The central participants of the ethnographic study were 27 first-year female students, whom I call 4Bers. They were placed in one of the basic level first-year classes called 4B (not the actual name of the class), the fourth of five proficiency levels at Nishi. Almost all of them grew up in middle-class families in western Japan, and were fresh out of average-level Japanese high schools, where, in most cases, English was taught in the grammar-translation method focusing on the college and university entrance examinations. The participants' TOIEC (Test of English for International Communication) scores at the time of entrance were typically in the low 400s, indicating a "basic user" level of competence when considering the CEFR (Common European Frame of Reference) standard for languages. The early interviews revealed that 4Bers chose Nishi because of its demanding English program. Most participants expressed the strong wish to be a fluent “native-like” speaker of English, and many said they wanted to get a job that required English. About half of the participants specifically wanted a job at an airlines company or airport.

In the first year, the student participants had a rapid change in behavior and beliefs. To put it simply, 4Bers’ focus shifted from the pursuit of a career dream to academic survival. Although the students were generally diligent, the workload at the junior college, mainly to study *about* English in Japanese particularly in grammar or reading, soon started to overwhelm them. The initial expectations of linear progress and success—in other words, speaking like a native speaker—which should have happened as a result of hard work, disappeared quickly according to the students’ interview responses. This state of loss of dream was further confirmed by the societal realities about the economy and job prospects seeping into their lives as the year progressed. The student participants witnessed the struggle of second-year students’ job-hunting, which forced the participants to realize that corporate Japan did not count a junior college English major as an English-speaking workforce, and even non-English speaking entry-level jobs could be too competitive for them in the time of economic depression. Meanwhile, the students were also reminded that graduation was not automatic in the school’s demanding program. The students feared to become part of the 25 percent of the second-year students who failed to graduate in two years.

The 4B class of 27 students took most of their weekly lessons together and soon became a remarkably tight community; the members helped each other both practically and emotionally with various difficulties they faced in and out of school. Both 4Bers and their teachers repeatedly mentioned the close friendship of the class members. Throughout the year I observed the formation of a number of group practices that marked the membership of 4B, including the choice of clothing and lipstick colors, the sharing of sweets and homework, and, of course, the use of language. It can be said that the students formed discourses of their own in the turmoil of socialization into the multiple, conflicting institutional discourses and discourses of the future job market. In the following section, I will attempt to demonstrate a symbolic manifestation of Foucauldian discourse and power in the starkly different pronunciation performances by the 4B students in two concurrent English courses.

It must be noted that in the original ethnographic study, the data from the “Discussion” classes were significantly larger than that of the “Phonetics” classes because the original study initially focused on the Discussion class taught by a native-speaker teacher. I weekly observed and video-taped the Discussion class, conducted taped formal interviews with each of the 4Bers and their native-speaker Discussion teacher, Donald (pseudonym). The observation of the Phonetics class was first planned as a contexual data collection, however, over the course of the interviews with the students, the issues surrounding pronunciation and the Phonetics course became salient, and further investigation became necessary. For that reason, I took detailed observation notes in the two Phonetics classes for which I received permission to observe. Furthermore, I had informal but repeated long interviews with the Phonetics chief instructor as well as the Phonetics classroom teacher who taught the 4Bers.

TWO COURSES, TWO DISCOURSES, TWO PRONUNCIATIONS

Phonetics. In the constantly revised English program at Nishi where old and new, local and imported practices clashed, all the first-year students were required to take Phonetics and Discussion simultaneously throughout the first year along with other required English courses: Reading, Writing, and Grammar. Each course had twice-a-week 70-minute sessions for three semesters—altogether 25 weeks. In the following paragraphs, I will contrast the students' oral production in Phonetics and Discussion.

The Phonetics course involved traditional local practices. The course design was based on the belief that native-like pronunciation was essential to become a proficient speaker of English, but the instructors teaching the course were exclusively Japanese female non-native speakers despite the fact that many English native speakers were teaching at Nishi. Moreover, the course explicitly preached that the sound of foreign language was best learned first with the eyes by learning the International Phonetic Alphabet. The detailed meta-knowledge of American sound system was followed by a rigorous, speech therapy-like training using a sophisticated Language Lab. Classes were conducted almost totally in Japanese except for the JTE's demonstration of English sounds.

As mentioned, 4Bers spoke about pronunciation and the Phonetics course frequently in the interviews. Few 4Bers said that they wanted to increase their vocabulary or knowledge of English grammar, but many passionately expressed the wish to achieve beautiful pronunciation (*kirei na hatsuon),* as opposed to bad pronunciation *(warui hatsuon)*. Several 4Bers criticized their high school English teachers' accent as bad pronunciation. The students appeared to be instantly attracted to the distinctively American pronunciation of their Phonetics teacher, Katsura-sensei (pseudonym). Phonetics quickly became most 4Bers' favorite class. Historically, Phonetics was one of the most popular courses at Nishi. The course was well designed to motivate students to work hard on rote training, for example, incorporating movie dubbing activities or an interclass English chorus contest as part of the course work. As an annual tradition, all Phonetics students compared their recordings of the same skit, which they made in the beginning and the end of the course. Many 4Bers told me with excitement how enormously their pronunciation had improved. All the interview excerpts were originally in Japanese, and all the names in the transcripts hereafter are pseudonyms.

Satomi: But I thought Phonetics was pretty good.

Natsumi: Yes (Strongly agrees).

Satomi: I guess Phonetics was the most helpful one.

I: I hear many students say Phonetics helped them most, or they liked Phonetics best. Why is that?

Natsumi: Why is that? Like, we had a class in which we got to hear our tapes, like the first one, and the last and then, we all listen to them and, I go like, Ain't I cool, or what? ((Everyone laughs)) It's like, (in an excited voice) Is it me or who? Right, I was so happy. (Group Interview on February 14, 2002)

My class observations, the viewing of the students' video performances of memorized speeches and dialogues impressed me with the remarkably Americanized pronunciation, which I had never heard in my regular class observation in Discussion. I asked Donald, the Discussion class instructor, to view the video with me, and he agreed with my assessment.

DISCUSSION COURSE

In stark contrast to their efforts in Phonetics, 4Bers in Discussion spoke English differently. Discussion was a theme-based course topically coordinated with Reading and Writing. The course reflected a new and imported discourse in the Nishi English program. All the Discussion teachers were NSTEs usually with some TESOL or related backgrounds. The course was L2 (English)-medium, and the method was generally communicative adopting many group activities. Students were required to discuss issues including human rights and environment, which they had studied in the Reading course. Most 4Bers were interested in the topics, but their spoken English was not sufficient to express their opinions freely. Soon, group discussions became predominantly in Japanese. However, 4Bers did speak English when communicating with Donald individually, when speaking up in whole class activities, and in the unit-end projects, which included simple skits written by the students themselves and semi-prepared panel discussion. In those limited occasions when 4Bers spoke English, their pronunciation was almost consistently and unanimously Japanized with almost no detectable effect of the Phonetics course they were taking simultaneously. The accent was almost the same across the Discussion activities, regardless of whether the students spoke to their peers or to their native-speaker teacher Donald.

The following is an example of some of the 4Bers doing meaning negotiation without changing their accent from a class in July. By July the students had numerous drills on how to pronounce a simple word such as "fast," the problem source of the negotiation below.

Maki: (Looking at her electronic dictionary) *hua:suto* (fast) *hua:suto* ? + *E?* (What?)

Donald: fur?

Maki: hua:suto, hua:suto? ((laugh)) *nassingu* (Nothing)

Donald: nothing? fast?

Maki: hua:suto

*Donald:*I don't understand+ can you explain +more? talk?

Natsumi: (Looking at Maki.s e-dictionary) *donto habu,[i:to,* (don't have eat)

Donald: [Fast?

Natsumi: donto habu hoodo, donto habu [i:to hoodo (Don.t have food, don.t have eat food)

Hikki: [*USSEYA:.* [you've got to be kidding]

Donald: wh, I can't hear you once more?

Natsumi: donto habu [*e*?

Donald: [don't have food ok +FA:sting you're right fast fast

(Discussion class, July 9, 2002)

Cognitive explanations for the heavy accent in the discussion class are possible. For example, however rigorous the training was in the pronunciation class, 4Bers did not acquire the sounds to the level to be able to reproduce them in the discussion class where their cognitive space was occupied by content tasks. However, limited sound acquisition of each student does not sufficiently explain the fact that almost all the student participants had an unchanged accent throughout the year, while other aspects of the students' L2 production, for example vocabulary and complexity of sentence structures, improved.

To support the point above, one 4B student recounted her pronunciation adjustment. Masayo was an outlier in 4B. Her English teachers felt she was misplaced because her overall proficiency was higher than other 4Bers. The recorded data indicated Masayo, too, was speaking just like other 4Bers, but occasionally mixed native-like pronunciation. One year later, I pointed that out in an informal interview with Masayo. She told me that in retrospect, she was probably Japanizing her pronunciation in the Discussion class. It is fair to say that there was group maintenance of the heavy accent in the 4B discussion class throughout the academic year. In the next section, I will explore why the students who admired native-like pronunciation, who happily did rather mundane pronunciation drills throughout the year, and who did learn to produce distinctively Americanized sounds, did NOT demonstrate them when real speaking was required in the presence of a native speaker.

DISCUSSION

I argue that Foucault's notion of power illuminates the seemingly contradicting practices demonstrated by the students. In the two classes, power was not stably possessed by any controlling or authoritative figures but was formed only when students became the subject of the power. Moreover, what became power would change moment by moment and location by location. In the pronunciation class, 4B students' willing, even passionate imitation of American pronunciation caused "nativeness" to be power for the moment in the classroom despite the fact that in class there was no native speaker, and English was not used for communication. The students' admiration of the Americanized pronunciation models demonstrated by the JTE was evident. One of the 4Bers told me with excitement:

> *Sayaka:* The pronunciation class, urm, Katsura-sensei has really beautiful pronunciation, so I feel like I want to work hard and, it's like, can I be like that? (Interview on December 2, 2002)

In contrast, 4Bers' consistently and unanimously heavy Japanese accent in the discussion class—even when they communicated with the native-speaker teacher—indicated that "nativeness" was not much of a controlling influence in this classroom. Rather, 4Bers in the discussion class became the subject of non-nativeness or Japanese-ness by speaking Japanese most of the time and eliminating nativeness from their spoken English. The following interview response indicates the formation of 4Bers' discourse of Japanese-ness in the discussion class. Ayumi was one of the active students who was eager to speak English in the beginning and continued to speak up in English with a heavy accent in teacher-front, whole class discussions, but even Ayumi stopped speaking in English in group discussions. She tried to offer the reason:

> *Ayumi:* If you tried to speak something now, you probably couldn't, because of *fun-iki* (literal translation, "atmosphere")
>
> *I:* You mean speaking English?
>
> *Ayumi:* Yeah.
>
> *I:* Ah, why is that?
>
> *Ayumi:* Because the *fun-iki* of the class is already *fun-iki* of not speaking English. I think it is absolutely impossible to be the only person to speak English. (Interview on October 11, 2002)

The ambiguous term, *fun-iki,* "atmosphere," well reflects the Foucauldian notion of discourses. That *fun-iki* bound Ayumi and other 4Bers to maintain certain language practices; to put it plainly, speak like a 4Ber, act like a 4Ber, then, you are seen as a proper 4Ber, or as Gee (1996, 129) argues, you are "doing being-or-becoming-a-real" 4Ber.

To illustrate the nature of this binding, it is crucial to note that the students seemed to be unaware of the different pronunciation practices. This is indicative that 4Bers became docile bodies (see the section on Michel Foucault's concept of power and discourse), subjugating themselves to power they formed, namely "an ideal native speaker" in the pronunciation class and "an ordinary member of 4B" in the discussion class. In the follow-up interviews after the courses were over, I attempted to have some students explain the reason for the different pronunciation performances in the pronunciation and discussion classes, but the most common answer was "I don't know." In fact, nearly all the respondents did not seem to realize the difference in their accent until I mentioned it.

The following was perhaps the only explanation I could elicit from a 4Ber. In the following response, Ami seems to be talking about the internalized *gaze* from her past that prohibits "good" pronunciation.

> *I:* So, why are they all (4Bers) pronouncing (English) like that (in a Japanized way)?
>
> *Ami:* (High school) teachers spoke like that (with accent) all the way from the beginning
>
> *I:* I see.
>
> *Ami:* We came to take it for granted, so if some kids tried to make their pronunciation better in high school, if there were some kids whose pronunciation was kind of good, others go like *Ohhhh* (unkind sound of surprise), and the kids would be kinda embarrassed. (Interview on February 24, 2003)

To sum, the differences in the "how of power" between the pronunciation class and the discussion class is manifested in the different bindings on the students' manner of English pronunciation. In Phonetics, the students smoothly subjugated themselves to empower ideal nativeness. The students also became the subjects of the discourses of traditional classrooms in Japan—namely, Japanese-medium, teacher-centered, drill-based classes in which perseverance and repetition are required. In contrast, in Discussion, the students did not automatically become the subject of nativeness despite the fact that the students had wanted to be "like a native." Instead the students became the subjects of temporary, peer-based discourses in which they talked actively about issues but mostly in Japanese, and when speaking English, everybody spoke with a distinctive Japanese accent until the end of the course. Indeed, the students' subjugation is better understood by examining discourses of the two courses instead of trying to locate the owners of power—in other words, who or what enforces practices.

CONCLUSION

Guided by Michel Foucault's concept of power, this chapter has discussed a highly local and complex formation of power in two concurrent English courses in one EFL program being developed in a junior college in Japan. The contrast between the students' passionate imitation of American sounds in the pronunciation class and the same students' persistently heavy Japanese accent in the discussion class suggest the complexity of the students' temporary and local self-subjugation to power. The student participants demonstrated the internalization of the power of "nativeness" in the pronunciation class; in contrast, the same group showed the internalized power of Japanese-ness, to be more specific, the students' own practice of being a proper 4Ber. The two different pronunciation patterns occurred in a progressive English program at a Japanese tertiary institution, one that the students had entered with high hopes to be fluent, "native-like" speakers of English.

The data described in this chapter does not exclude numerous other viable interpretations, including L2 learners' diminished cognitive space and fear of achievement. Foucault's concept of power is an abstraction of humans' controlled behavior, inclusive of traditional psychological causes. Foucault's concept of power is a powerful tool in understanding complexity, including inconsistency, irregularity, and temporariness. Exactly such complexity is the interest of this chapter.

The purpose of the chapter is, of course, not to provide solutions to Japanized accent, nor to problematize nativeness in EFL. More importantly, the present chapter intends to highlight the characteristics of social bindings on local actors' bodies. The study suggests that top-down interventions are not likely to control local use of languages. Language is inherently a local practice (Pennycook 2010), which is a manifestation of internalized power. Power formed by subjects moment to moment, location by location, can be resistant to uniformed, decontexualized interventions by authorities. The investigation of how local actors form power to subjugate themselves reported in this chapter might provide some explanation as to why foreign language education policies or programs are unsuccessful. National and institutional revisions of EFL curricula are oblivious to the "how of power" in local language practices.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. (2003). English language socialization and dys-socialization in a college context in South India. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*, 601–626.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 9–34.

Dreyfus, H. (2004). *Being and power: Heidegger and Foucault* [Electronic Version]. Department of Philosophy, University of California. Retreived from http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~hdreyfus/html/paper_being.html.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics.* New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(3), 505–537.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge and discourse on language (A. M. Sheridan Smith,Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969)

Foucault, M. (1975/1995). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans., 2nd ed). New York, NY: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1976/1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977 by Michel Foucault*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, M. (1980). The eye of power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977 by Michel Foucault*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*, New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London, England: Falmer Press.
Gordon, C. (Ed.). (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977 by Michel Foucault.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
Imamura, I., & Kurihara, J. (1999). *Fuko [Foucault]*. Tokyo, Japan: Shimizushoin.
Katayama, A. (2008). *Borderland discourses of first-year junior college English majors in Japan: A situated qualitative study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University Japan Campus)
Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings: Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(4), 645–671.
Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Macdonell, D. (1986). *Theories of discourse: An introduction.* Oxford, England: Blackwell.
Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare. (2006). *Hakusho nenji hokoku tou [Whitepapers, annual reports, etc.]*. Retrieved September 7, 2011, from http://www.mhlw.go.jp/wp/hakusyo/index.html
Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics*, *15*(2), 115–138.
Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Rorty, R. (1998). *Achieving our country: Leftist thought in twentieth-century America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Sakurai, T. (2001). *Chi no kyokasho Fuko [The textbook of knowledge: Foucault]*. Tokyo, Japan: Kodansha.
Tanaka, S. (2009). *Kyoiku shiso no Foucault: Kyoiku wo sasaeru kankeisei [Educational thought on Foucault: Force and relatedness]*. Tokyo, Japan: Keiso Shobo.
Taylor, C., & Robinson, C. (2009). Student voice: Theorising power and participation. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*. *17*(2), 161–175.
Teiin ware shidai hojo 3 nen [Government subsidies to be cut in three years for private universities with poor enrolment]. (2003, June 23). Asahi Shimbun (p. 1). Tokyo.
Yano Research Institute. (2003). *Eikaiwa Shijo Nenshu [Annual Revenue of English Conversation School Businesses].* Retrieved March 6, 2006, from www.yano.co.jp/pdf/press/031106.pdf

Akiko Katayama
The University of Tokyo

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

1. Interviews
Researcher's comment: (   )
Nonverbal sound: ((   )) e.g., ((laugh))
Pause: +(short), ++(somewhat long), +++(long)

2. Classroom Data
Overlapping: [
Latching: =

Pause: +(short), ++(somewhat long), +++(long)
Elongated syllable :: e.g., Bi:g mistake :: extra colon for extended elongation
Rising intonation: ?
Emphatic stress: Capitalization except first person "I," e.g., Why don't YOU do that?
Nonverbal sound: (( )) e.g., ((laugh))
Researcher's comment: ( )
Japanese: Italicized with English translation in brackets, e.g., *nihongo de ittemo ii?* [May I say this in Japanese?]

RIEKO MATSUOKA

9. WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE

The Effect of Conference Participation on Students' L2 Apprehension

INTRODUCTION

Communication Apprehension in Speaking English

In a global society, English has become the international lingua franca and is regarded as a necessary language for being a member of the international community (Jenkins, 2007). Even in such a milieu, the high degree of communication apprehension has generated a lower level of willingness to communicate and consequently has impeded communicative competence among Japanese learners of English (Matsuoka, 2009).

Communication apprehension, the mental construct defined as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977, 78), has been identified as the strongest factor in reducing the level of willingness to communicate among Japanese college students (Matsuoka, 2009). Communication apprehension is also identified as a socio-psychological phenomenon called social anxiety. People experience this social anxiety when speaking in front of others, as Young (1991) has also observed. Accordingly, communication apprehension is hypothesized to be a primary reason for avoidance or disruption of communication.

In cross-cultural apprehension research (Klopf, 1984), Japanese were shown to be significantly more apprehensive than all other groups in the Pacific basin—Americans, Australians, Koreans, Micronesian, Chinese, and Filipinos. Although this study was based on the quantitative results from McCroskey's questionnaire, the high levels of communication apprehension may be regarded as one of the main causes for lowering communicative competence in English. Therefore, efforts to reduce communication apprehension might enhance communication behavior in English. Recently a growing number of Japanese nursing professionals work overseas as a part of international health aid, and an increasing number of foreigner migrants live in Japan (IMCJ, 2004). Because nursing students participating in the present study are eager to be active overseas as well as to work with foreign patients in Japan in their future careers, it seems crucial to find ways in which communication apprehension has impeded them from effective communication. In fact, when the author visited Cambodia for an international conference, the hotel staff, many

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 133–145.

of whom speak English after only one year of study, asked why Japanese cannot speak English "even though they are smart enough to develop advanced technical devices." Being aware that these remarks are mainly from an essentialist viewpoint formed by stereotypical, fixed perceptions, the author explained the possible social attitudes leading to their low communication competence, adding that there are many exceptional cases.

Some studies (McCrosky, Gudykunst, & Nishide, 1984), on the other hand, reveal that Japanese learners of English project high communication apprehension not only in English but also in their mother tongue, which might be caused by social factors. Similarly, Berger and McCroskey (2004) reported that a great number of pharmacy students have high communication apprehension, and the program developed for reducing their high communication apprehension turned out to be effective.

In this study, borrowing a content analysis approach for convenience, meaningful codes or units were elicited from the data composed of the participants' lived experiences (Brown, Dewey, Martinsen, & Baker, 2011) and the codes were categorized into concepts. These categorized concepts consisting of codes or units may explain the ways in which Japanese learners have built their sense of self. The focal point of this study is to find out the way in which the experiences of being interns at an international conference were successful in reducing the levels of communication apprehension of serious learners of English.

METHODS

Participants

Since the educational mission of the college includes training nurses to work globally, a large number of students are motivated in improving their English communication skills and they seek possible opportunities involving any activities using English. From the more than 400 students majoring in nursing at the national college, nine individuals volunteered to help at the Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) international conference as interns during three days in November 2008. Although the JALT international conference was held in Tokyo, seventy to eighty participants were native English speakers, and the participants in this study were expected to be exposed to an English-speaking environment and to use English during the JALT international conference sessions. Five participants were females and four males. Five of them (three female; two male) were third-year students whose ages ranged from 20 to 21; four of them (two female; two male) were first-year students whose ages ranged from 18 to 19. The average age was 19.67.

Four participants out of five third-year students had previously volunteered to work as interns at the same JALT international conference in 2007, and so they knew more or less what they were expected to do. One first-year female student was a returnee who had lived in the U.K. for two years while her father conducted his research in dentistry; the other first-year female student was not a returnee, but her aunt is a professional interpreter who travels overseas frequently and has given the student motivation to learn English. One of the first-year male students was from a high school designated as a "super English language high school" where most English teachers were native speakers, and most students had experience living or studying abroad. The other first-year male student, who was from one of the top high schools where English education was highlighted as a subject, confessed that he had high anxiety in speaking English. All three female third-year students had some experience traveling overseas and were interested in international nursing. One of two third-year male students, whose father is an English teacher, has native-like English pronunciation, though he had never been abroad and had no contact with native speakers. The other third-year male student was not eager to learn English but was always helpful and believed that his English was sufficient for communication with English-speaking attendees. Table 1 below shows the participants' backgrounds gained from interviews and observation.

For measuring English proficiency level, CASEC (Computerized Assessment System for English Communication) scores (full score: 1000) are listed. The college used this testing system from 2002 to 2010 to evaluate students' English proficiency. The details of this system can be found at their website (JIEM 2011).

Procedure

Nine participants joined a 120-minute meeting, and the conversation there was audio-recorded and transcribed. Because all of them are Japanese and their native language is Japanese, the meeting was conducted in Japanese. The questions asked at this meeting included a) whether they had any changes in their communication behavior in English, b) what sorts of difficulties or problems they had during the JALT international conference sessions, and c) how they felt in speaking English. In a relaxed setting with food and drinks, they were asked to express their feelings, reflecting frankly on their experiences. They also checked the findings of this study in order to confirm that the author's interpretations are accurate.

Content Analysis Approach

Bernard Berelson (1952), the initiator of content analysis, defined it as "a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of manifest content of communications," and it has been used to determine the presence of certain words, concepts, themes, phrases, character, or sentences within texts. However, more recent literature (Weber, 1990) has included qualitative description, as with the present study. This study also analyses data from other sources including participation observation and individual interviews, in order to avoid reductionism and employ an emic approach when possible.

Content analysis makes valid inferences from the text (Weber, 1990). In order to make valid inferences, Krippendorff (2004) postulates that the following six points

Table 1. Participants

ID Pseudonym	*Gender*	*Year*	*Age*	*English proficiency (CASEC scores)*	*Intern experience*	*Overseas experience*	*Remarks*
Akira	Male	1st	18	Lower intermediate (439)	None	None	From a top local high school
Ken	Male	1st	18	Advanced (805)	None	School trip to Korea	From a Super English high school
Mari	Female	1st	19	Lower advanced (612)	None	Lived in the UK	Father did research in the UK
Yoko	Female	1st	19	Lower advanced (631)	None	None	Aunt is an English translator
Taro	Male	3rd	20	Intermediate (564)	Yes	None	Father is an English teacher
Yutaka	Male	3rd	21	Lower intermediate (413)	Yes	None	Sociable and outgoing personality
Eri	Female	3rd	21	Intermediate (533)	Yes	Visited Kenya	Plans to work overseas as nurse
Rika	Female	3rd	21	Lower advanced (682)	Yes	Visited Indonesia	Hardworking
Keiko	Female	3rd	21	Advanced (700)	None	Visited India	Has English-speaking friends

need to be addressed: a) data, b) definition of the data, c) the population of the data d) context, e) the boundaries, and f) the target of the inferences.

The data for this present study were the transcribed text of the conversation at the focus-group meeting and were defined as the students' experiences as interns at the JALT international conference. The population of the data was the Japanese college students eager to improve their communication competence in English. The context was the JALT international conference where the participants helped as interns. The boundary of analysis exists in the contents affecting the participants' communication behavior in English. Lastly the target of the inferences was to explore the mechanism of reducing the Japanese learners' communication apprehension. The inferences are made through coding in order for the latent meanings to be elicited from the manifest contents. Although inferences are possible without coding, coding facilitates using the data to generate accessible strategies, which is pedagogically useful. As a final step, the elicited codes are categorized into viable concepts.

A hypothesis is also required for content analysis. The hypothesis of this study was "the participation as an intern at the JALT international conference can reduce the level of communication apprehension."

Findings: Experiences

Akira is from a local high school in the Tohoku area. It is one of the top high schools, and he seems to feel proud of this. He is a close friend of Ken, who is highly motivated in learning English, and decided to work as an intern. Since Akira was not confident in speaking English, he tried to work with Ken, who is a good speaker. However, because of the job assignment at the conference site, he was obliged to work alone at the publisher's corner. He said he was relieved that there were not many visitors at his assigned corner, but he was bored. In the process of being there, he started to feel he wanted to speak English more. He said he felt great when he could make himself understood with his simple English. He confessed he felt thankful when the English-speaking conference attendees were patient in trying to understand his English. He added that he was reluctant in being an intern at first, but he really enjoyed working there and would like to be assigned to a place where there were more opportunities to use his English.

Ken graduated from a special high school that is part of the Ministry of Education (MEXT) project entitled "Super English Language High Schools" (SELHi) and having the mission of encouraging more advanced English education at the secondary school level. He said that he had an inferiority complex as a first-year student at that high school because the majority of his classmates were good speakers of English. He was better in other subjects such as mathematics and chemistry, and his self-esteem was kept by his strength in these subjects instead of English. Through the education gained from native English speaking teachers and influence from returnee students with overseas experience, he became interested in learning and speaking English. In fact, he tried to find opportunities to use his English when the conference student interns were announced. In spite of his eagerness for speaking English, he confessed that he was overly conscious and unable to speak it sufficiently when he was seated between two good speakers of English at the information counter where he was assigned. He said he was surprised to find himself nervous in speaking English there and tried to conquer this anxiety. He felt more nervous in speaking English when other Japanese interns heard him. Noticing that he was overly afraid of making small errors, he tried to relax when using English. Surprisingly, he found himself able to speak it when the other interns were not present. Once he felt comfortable in using English, he started to be more relaxed and gained confidence. He realized that he does not have to worry about being perfect in communication, and also he does not have to compare himself with other interns. He concluded that he could do just what he could do without worrying about what he thought other people expected of him.

Mari is a returnee student and proficient in speaking English, though her English proficiency test score did not reflect this. She is outgoing and sociable and has been able to get along with other students in spite of her different background of living in the UK for a time. Because she is a native-like speaker, she was assigned to work as a helper on the equipment team with another first-year student from the same college. She said she enjoyed helping conference attendees with technical problems such as using the computer in the presentation rooms. However, she said that she was surprised to find herself overly nervous in speaking English in the presence of another conference intern who is a good speaker of English. Mari seems to be a carefree person, but she stated clearly that she felt highly apprehensive in speaking English in that intern’s presence. When I asked her why she felt that way, she tried to analyze her behavior and said that she might want to speak better English than the other intern and therefore was worried about her impression. The focus group meeting was held two months after the conference, and Mari and the other intern towards whom she felt competitive became good friends and have had some chances of getting together. Mari said she was surprised to find that the other intern felt the same.

Yoko has no experience living abroad, but she said she was influenced by her aunt, who travels a lot and has worked as a translator. According to Yoko, her aunt, who is in her mid-forties, has dyed blond hair and wears very short skirts, which makes her look different from other “ordinary” Japanese women. Her aunt is capable of speaking not only English but also Spanish and Portuguese, and her boyfriend is Portuguese. Yoko looks happy and even proud when she talked about her aunt. When she meets her at family gatherings, for instance, her aunt speaks English or other foreign languages on the telephone with her foreign friends. She said that she felt from her aunt’s example that she could expand her world speaking foreign languages, starting from English. Her good English pronunciation might be from hearing her aunt as well as her motivation to emulate her relative. She said she enjoyed working as an intern with Mari on the tech team. In her case, instead of feeling overly nervous in speaking English in the presence of other interns, she gained practical strategies in speaking English. In meeting minor emergencies, such as when a presenter was not able to use their prepared slides, she learned she did not have to construct grammatically precise English. She confessed that using the appropriate words without constructing a proper sentence worked well enough to help people in need during the conference sessions, and she felt happy and was able to feel some pride in her work.

Taro also has no experience living in or visiting foreign countries; however, he is motivated in learning English, and his English pronunciation is native-like. Similar to Yoko, he also has a family member who is good at English. In fact, according to Taro, his father quit working as an English teacher at a public school and has since worked as a taxi driver. He said that his father preferred to work independently and in his spare time teaches children in his neighborhood. He said that he was proud of his father. Taro helped at the conference in the previous year, when he worked mainly behind the scenes, since he has good computer skills. This year he worked as a guide to help conference attendees who were lost. He said that he enjoyed working as an intern more than the previous year because he was able to use his English. He confessed that it was a great experience to find his English good enough to communicate successfully.

Yutaka is outgoing and sociable, and seems good at being a leader as well. Different from other participants, he has not shown a strong eagerness to speak English, but he worked as an intern with Taro for two years. Together with Taro, he helped behind the scenes in the previous year and worked as a guide in 2008. The author thought Yutaka felt comfortable working behind the scenes, but his impression was almost the same as Taro's. He said that he had a better time being an intern than the previous year, since he enjoyed communicating with English-speaking attendees. He confessed that he felt confident when he managed to make himself understood in English. Through the experience as an intern, he said his willingness to communicate was raised and that he felt stronger motivation for learning English.

Eri helped as an intern in 2007 and worked as a helper for the JALT international conference committee members. She does not command a high level of English proficiency, but she seemed to have developed some strategies for the 2008 conference. Eri said that she has a strong desire to work overseas as a midwife, and she was aware of the importance of communicating in English. She said in the meeting that we do not have to be perfect in speaking and emphasized using her own repertoire in communication. She said that she usually does not worry about what other people may think of her. She said that the important thing is to believe in herself and to try her best whenever possible.

Rika scored higher on the English proficiency test than Eri, but in terms of speaking it seems that she became more nervous. She is a serious student, and she said that she tries her best not to make mistakes. At the meeting, Rika talked about the good experience of having dinner with some committee members at the JALT international conference, one of whom is a professor at a university in the Shikoku area. She met them while working as a guide with Keiko, and they were invited to have dinner together. There, Rika said, they could speak English and enjoyed the company. She seems to be very deliberate, and said that she had been afraid of making errors, but that she felt more relaxed in speaking English because of this dinner experience. She helped as an intern in 2007, but she said that she enjoyed being an intern at this JALT international conference better because of the dinner experience and also the nature of her assigned work.

Keiko is quite proficient in English and less nervous than other students. She said she has a pen pal who she met on the airplane while on a trip to India. In emailing exchanges with this pen pal, she uses English and seems to enjoy doing so. At the conference, she helped as a guide with Rika, and she also mentioned the dinner with some committee members, adding that this experience she enjoyed the most while working as an intern at the conference. She also said that helping the attendees using her English succeeded in making herself confident and assured her that her English was adequate.

ANALYSIS

The following five concepts were elicited from the codes provided by the data of the nine participants' experiences.

Competitiveness

Some codes leading to the concept of "competitiveness" were elicited from the conversation with good speakers of English, as Bailey (1983) reports from the diary data. The code [to be afraid of being evaluated as a poor speaker of English], was elicited from the reflections of Mari and Ken. Because these participants have been serious students and hard workers, they are more conscious of evaluation by others. It is also possible that they have been serious students and hard workers because they are more conscious of the other people's opinions.

As shown in the previous section, interestingly, Mari, who is a returnee student, confessed that she was overly conscious of her English when she was with another intern proficient in English. She emphasized that her communication apprehension became higher when talking in front of this student. Knowing that she is a returnee and sounds almost like a native-like speaker in spite of the test score (see Table 1), the author was surprised to hear what she said and asked her why she thinks she was nervous. She said she was more conscious of Japanese speakers of English, adding that she did not feel uncomfortable in speaking English with native speakers. She clarified that she felt competitive with the other intern with good speaking ability.

A similar reflection was made by Ken (from the "Super English Language High School") in Table 1, who said that he was overly conscious of speaking English when sitting between two interns who were seemingly professional interpreters (Japanese) at the information desk where he was assigned to help conference participants. Ken said that hearing good English spoken by two women sitting on both sides of him made him nervous in speaking English and more conscious in doing so. Both Mari and Ken said that it took some time to get over this anxiety, but once they learned strategies to control their attitudes, they felt more comfortable and confident in speaking English. From these two participants, the code of [to be overly conscious of other Japanese speakers of English] was elicited. This code can be subsumed into the notion of competitiveness.

Perfectionism

Another code [to try to complete English sentences] is from Yoko, who also helped in the equipment section. She said that at first she tried to give a complete English sentence in clarifying a presenter's needs, but the interaction did not work as well as she expected. So she started to focus on content words, and the communication went smoothly. The same code is also found with Akira, who said he always tried to make complete English sentences and failed to express himself in time. He said that he has an inferiority complex in speaking English, and his efforts in completing English sentences seem not to have worked. This feature can be subsumed into "perfectionism," and also indicated the relationship of learners and learning contexts as Norton (2000) points out. Yoko said that situations requiring her quick response did not allow her to take time to complete grammatically correct sentences, and she learned how to negotiate her language resources. Eri, on the other hand, with some overseas experiences, said that she was already aware that trying to make complete sentences in speaking is not useful in communication behavior, which has been also discussed in other studies (Gregersen & Horowitz, 2002).

Other-directedness

These concepts are accordingly categorized into a viable factor of "other-directedness," projected as competitiveness and perfectionism, as indicated in prior studies (Matsuoka, 2009). The notion of other-directedness is based on two sources. One is Kuwayama (1992) who argues that the Japanese sense of self is embedded in the other-directed orientation because it is relational, interactional, interdependent, situational, contextual, relative, collective, group-oriented, and social centered. The other is Lebra (2004) who postulates that Japanese people sense their self as "subject I"—the unique individual self—and as "object me"—the social self, which is affected by others. Lebra (2004) quoted Athen's "soliloquy" as the self, from George Mead who asserts that self emerges only through the internalization of others' perspectives and expectations by linking two sides of self, self as subject I and self as object me. As George Mead did not limit this nature to the Japanese sense of self, all humans have this sense of self.

However, Abe (2001) describes one prominent feature of Japanese society as *seken*, the society or world formed by people within. He argues that the notion of *seken* is important in the Japanese social and cultural context and deeply embedded in Japanese society. Sato (2001) points out that *seken* and *Lebenswelt* ("living world"), a term in phenomenology, are similar to each other suggesting that *seken* may not be unique to the Japanese context. Still the anecdotal data from the Cambodian hotel staff in 2010 suggests that some factors may impede Japanese communication behavior, and the data of this study imply that the socio-cultural features of other-directedness may have caused this. This feature, however, can function in a positive manner, as the case of Mari exemplifies. Based on how we perceive the expectations of other people, *seken*, we may feel the need to meet such expectations. Therefore, other-directedness can function both in negative and positive ways.

Self-Efficacy

Several meaningful codes elicited from the data seem to work on reducing communication apprehension levels. They may lead to the concept of "self-efficacy" (Bandura, 1997). Frequent codes from the participants were [to gain many more opportunities to use English than in their everyday lives], [to understand the importance of communication even when communication skills are not good enough], [to gain confidence of speaking English after making themselves understood in English], and [to feel confident and happy in speaking English]. These codes are in clear contrast with "competitiveness," "perfectionism," and "other-directedness," i.e., the Japanese being overly conscious of the outside world and other people (Kuwayama, 1992; Lebra, 2004, Maynard, 1997). These elicited codes may result in 'self-efficacy', reducing the communication apprehension levels.

The code [to gain many more opportunities to use English in everyday life] is based on the experiences that the students had during the conference sessions, and this code was heard many times from all nine participants. Taro and Yutaka, in particular, expressed happiness when they had many opportunities to use English compared with when they sat behind the scenes working as tech interns, which does not require communication with native speakers. Taro does not appear sociable and outgoing from the author's observation, though he commands good English with good pronunciation. Yutaka is sociable and outgoing, but he seemed to have avoided the occasions for using English because of his lack of confidence in English competence. Therefore, what they said surprised the author, and their positive efforts to speak English may function effectively in reducing the level of communication apprehension, which indicates that conference participation affected the participants positively. Through gaining many opportunities to communicate, people feel more confident and comfortable and less apprehensive in communication behavior, as shown in the program for pharmacy students (Berger & McCroskey, 1982).

The code [to understand the importance of communication even when communication skills are not good enough] is a cognitive one generated from their own efforts to overcome unnecessary perfectionism, the basis of which might partly be attributed to other-directedness as mentioned above. Japanese education may have encouraged a negative attitude and fear, because students are criticized when they make errors in school instead of being given positive support. Consequently, they are afraid to make errors and have tried unnecessarily to make perfect sentences even in oral communication. This attitude may have discouraged Japanese from expressing themselves in English. The code here indicates the process by which Ken, Yoko, Yutaka, and Rika conquered attitudes that impeded communication. They confessed that trying to be perfect did not work when helping attendees at the conference sites, and the motivation of helping facilitated them to communicate without hesitation, which may show the nature of language as a local practice (Pennycook, 2010). In classroom settings as well, provided by Gregersen and Horwitz (2002), perfectionism turned out to be an impeding factor for the learners' oral communication, though real language use is outside the classroom as Norton (2000) points out.

The code [to gain confidence in speaking English after making themselves understood in English] comes from the participants who experienced the previous code. Rika, in particular, confessed that she felt confident in speaking English, and this confidence made her more competent in communication, comparing her experience in the previous year when she volunteered as an intern to organize the registration line, a job that did not require impromptu communication. In a different context, Eri shared her experiences overseas. As shown in Table 1, Eri went to Kenya when she was a second-year student, and through this experience she said she learned how important it is to try to communicate in English overseas and gained confidence in speaking English after managing to make herself understood during the trip. As also stated earlier, Keiko encountered an English-speaking friend on the airplane from India and continued email communication with him. She added that email text communication is different from oral communication, but prompt email exchanges, which is similar to oral communication, is vital to keep their friendship going. She felt more confident in each email exchange. In addition to their positive attitude towards speaking English, their confidence in communication became stronger through the experience at the conference.

The code [to feel confident and happy in speaking English] is closely related to the above code; the participants experienced happy feelings after gaining confidence in speaking English in general. These experiences obviously have led to reducing their communication apprehension. Once learners have a chance to feel positive in speaking English, they are naturally more willing to communicate, based on both observation and interview data. During the conference sessions, Rika and Keiko were given a dinner invitation by conference committee members, all of whom are native English speakers. They confessed that they had a happy time at dinner and speaking English. They said this experience encouraged them to speak out and to build up their English-speaking confidence.

Strategy

Some codes were categorized into a concrete strategy helpful for pedagogy. The first elicited code is [to compromise oneself in using English instead of trying to reach idealized expectations]. The participants, Ken and Mari in particular, discussed the differences between English as subject and English as communication, and they argued that they have to compromise themselves in order to make their English resources usable in real communication settings. What they noticed from their experiences during the conference sessions seems to be closely related to the features of languages both Norton (2000) and Pennycook (2010) argue—that is, the observed relationship between language learners and the social world where that language is in use, where the language is located in a given space in a dynamic way and in time. In other words, language learning occurs in a certain context, as suggested in Brown et al. (2011) who use an ecological approach.

The second strategic code is [to adjust oneself in the given context]. Communication is the dialectic between interlocutors, and in the process of interacting with the other party one needs to adjust to the given context using one's resources. Akira and Mari discussed the interesting features of discourse in social life, and their points may fit Pennycook's (2010) notion of language as the social instead of the individual. These participants seem to regard language as a local practice.

The third code [to cut and try/ trial and error] is suggested by participants Akira and Ken. Even if a trial does not work, one can try again by modifying it a little. They said that by doing so they started to feel more confident in speaking English during the conference sessions. They learned how to modify their language and felt less apprehensive in talking.

The fourth one is [to use one's resources in an optimal way]. Almost all the participants said that it was great when some expressions they were not sure about worked well in real communication. Then they said that they gained sufficient courage to try other resources again in different contexts. By doing so, they had more opportunities to use English, and each time they felt more confident.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The data of experiences from nine participants provided five concepts: competitiveness, perfectionism, other-directedness, self-efficacy, and strategy. The participants, aware that attitudes for communication were impeded by competitiveness, perfectionism, and/or other-directedness, succeeded in gaining useful strategies through positive experiences enhancing their self-efficacy. Therefore, this study indicates that the participation as an intern at the JALT international conference can reduce levels of communication apprehension and enhance levels of willingness to communicate, and suggests that the Japanese sense of self, manifested as "other-directedness," could be positively utilized should there be optimal occasions of using English and experiencing self-efficacy. Furthermore, the concrete strategies of the participants in this study who experienced modification in their innermost sense of self provided valuable implications that will be useful in pedagogy. The codes derived from their experiences seem to be more rigorous than from language learners generally.

REFERENCES

Abe, K. (2001). *Gakumon to seken* [Scholarship and Seken]. Tokyo, Japan: Iwanami.

Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: Looking at and through diary studies. In H. W. Selinger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: Freeman.

Berger, A. B., & McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Reducing communication apprehension in pharmacy students. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *48*, 122–127.

Bernard B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Brown, J., Dewey, D. P., Martinsen, R. A., & Baker, W. (2011). Foreign language houses: Identities in transition. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *8*(3), 203–235.

Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, *86*, 563–570.

International Medical Centre of Japan. (2004). *Bureau of international cooperation.* Tokyo, Japan: IMCJ.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitudes and identity.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

JIEM. (2011). *CASEC*. Retreived from http://casec.evidus.com/english/

Klopf, D. W. (1984). Cross-cultural apprehension research: A summary of Pacific basin studies. In J. A. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology.* (2nd ed.). California, CA: Sage.

Kuwayama, T. (1992). The reference other orientation. In N. R. Rosenberger (Ed.), *Japanese sense of self.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Lebra, T. S. (2004). *The Japanese self in cultural logic*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Matsuoka, R. (2009). *Japanese college students' willingness to communicate in English.* Kohn: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Maynard, S. K. (1997). *Japanese communication: Language and thought in context.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research*, *4*(1), 78–96.

McCroskey, J. C., Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1985). Communication apprehension among Japanese students in native and second language. *Communication Research Reports*, *12*(2), 11–15.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning.* London, England: Longman.

Pennycook, A. D. (2010). *Language as a local practice.* London, England: Routledge.

Sato, N. (2001). *Seken-no genshogaku* [Phenomenology of *seken*]. Tokyo, Japan: Seikyu-sha.

Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, *75*, 426–439.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. (2nd ed.). California, CA: Sage.

Rieko Matsuoka
National College of Nursing, Japan

PATRICK ROSENKJAR

10. AN INTERNSHIP IN COMMUNICATIVE ENGLISH TEACHING

INTRODUCTION

This chapter reports on the genesis, ongoing development, and outcomes of a year-long high school English teacher internship that was established in 2005 at Temple University Japan Campus (TUJ) in Tokyo. The internship was originally created specifically for a veteran high school teacher of English who had been granted a one-year sabbatical by his prefectural school board for the purpose of sharpening his teaching skills in order to implement the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2003) mandate that Japanese high school English teachers should teach communicatively and with the goal of making students able to use English for real-world purposes. Based on experience with him, the internship was institutionalized as a regular option at TUJ, through which teachers can learn communicative pedagogy by working as assistants to master teachers in TUJ's pre-academic language program and participating in a variety of other activities. The chapter narrates how the internship began, what components it included, and how the first intern responded to the experience. The author, who invented the internship and supervised the first intern, relates his thinking during the process of establishing it. Since this teacher, in addition to frequent conferences with the internship supervisor, produced weekly journals during his internship year, the chapter also includes a large amount of material in his voice and in the voice of his internship supervisor, who responded in writing to his journal entries. (To retain the intern's authentic voice, journal entries are reproduced exactly as they were written, including the original grammar.) The chapter's focus is on the development of the intern's identity as a teacher learning new pedagogical methods and as a user of English and on the impact of the internship experience on his teaching after he returned to his school. In conclusion, the chapter also suggests that such internships can make a large positive contribution to the modernization of English language teaching in Japan.

In its (2003) "Course of Study for Foreign Languages," MEXT has mandated that Japanese students learning English should "develop...basic practical communication abilities such as listening and speaking, deepening the understanding of language and culture, and fostering a positive attitude toward communication through foreign languages" (MEXT, 2003, 1). In addition, MEXT has mandated that English classes should include "[c]ommunicative activities where, for example, students actually

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 147–166.

use language to share their feelings and thoughts with each other..."; and in such communicative activities "students should be able to perform language activities where they have to think of how to express themselves in a way appropriate to the specific situation and condition" (MEXT, 2003, 1). (For analysis of what constitutes good learning and teaching, see Matikainen, this volume.)

Most modern language educators familiar with current theories of second language acquisition and of contemporary foreign language pedagogy would applaud the goal of learning a foreign language for practical communication and would agree that lessons should include activities in which students actually use the target language for real communication. However, a number of factors, such as university entrance exams in English that are based on discrete-point, grammar-focused, multiple-choice items, militate against widespread adoption of communicative goals and forms of language pedagogy in high school English classes in Japan. Another major potential source of resistance to both the goals and new styles of pedagogy is the teachers themselves, who may not know how—or may be unwilling—to change their teaching style or feel threatened due to their own imperfect command of the language they are teaching. Nevertheless, in spite of these qualms, many Japanese high school teachers of English do sincerely wish to comply with the MEXT directive in order that their students may develop communicative competence in English. These teachers, who are generally very hard-working and devoted to their students' progress, simply need assistance with learning how to teach communicatively. It is this large group of reform-minded and sincere teachers who are likely to be the ones actually to implement the MEXT mandate, provided they receive the necessary help.

Temple University Japan Campus (TUJ) is well situated to offer training in teaching English for communicative purposes to Japanese teachers of English since it is a full-scale, English-medium university located in Japan. TUJ is a fully accredited branch of Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and has, in addition to various other programs, a well-regarded graduate program in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), offering both doctorates and master's degrees, a four-year undergraduate program offering associate's and bachelor's degrees, and the non-credit-bearing preundergraduate Academic English Program formerly known as the Academic Preparation Program (the APP).

For these reasons and aware of the resources of TUJ, a veteran high school teacher of English in Saitama prefecture and his unusually internationally minded principal approached the author of this chapter, a professor in the TESOL master's program and then the director of the APP, with the request that the teacher be allowed "to observe classes in the APP for a year." As the recipient of a year's sabbatical, he apparently believed that he could best achieve his goals of learning communicative teaching methods and improving his own English through spending his leave year at TUJ. The potential of such an arrangement was immediately obvious, but the APP director suggested that mere observing was not sufficiently interactive and proposed a menu of varied activities that would engage the teacher more actively. These included working as a teaching assistant to APP master teachers, teaching lessons to APP students under the supervision of the master teachers, auditing several undergraduate classes, taking for credit several TESOL master's classes, having frequent conferences with the APP director, and writing a journal of his experiences. Thus, the English teacher internship at TUJ was born; and this teacher spent the year from April 2005 through March 2006 as the first intern at TUJ. As evidenced by his journal entries, the teacher found the internship year extremely demanding but, in the end, extremely rewarding. Moreover, from this ad hoc beginning, the internship became an ongoing part of the community service offerings of TUJ.

This chapter will first take up evidence of the intern's views about language learning and teaching to illustrate new realizations he had about himself as a teacher. Then the focus will shift to his views and feelings about himself as a learner of new teaching methods and as a user of English. These two interrelated topics will show how this Japanese teacher developed a new identity through gaining knowledge of communicative teaching methods and how he struggled to integrate this knowledge into his own sense of himself as a teacher and user of English. (For a discussion of power and a teacher's identity, see Katayama, this volume.)

Though MEXT may have mandated communicative goals and methods, the standard pedagogical methodology in Japan remains very grammar-focused through the traditional translation-reading (*yakudoku)* method. (See, for example, Imoto & Horiguchi, this volume.) In addition, English teaching tends to be very teacher-centered and oriented to the transmission of information from the teacher to the students. This is the primary methodological issue that the intern faced and that is addressed first in this chapter. Thus, a typical English lesson takes a form described by the intern in his first journal entry:

> Japanese way of teaching
>
> Every day we focus on translation from English to Japanese because we have to prepare for difficult essays which will be on the entrance examination. We use textbooks authorized by Ministry of Education and Science. Our typical traditional procedure especially on reading class, which is still been used is as follows:
>
> First Stage: having the students listen to the tape
>
> Second Stage: checking the new words on the text
>
> Third Stage: having the students read after the tape or teacher
>
> Fourth Stage: students will translate the text sentence by sentence when he/she is called by the teacher
>
> Fifth Stage: teachers will explain the text by putting much emphasis on new sentence structure and grammar.
>
> Sixth Stage: students read the text aloud in chorus or independently.

> Seventh Stage: teachers give students some consolidated comments on today's key sentences. (Intern's journal, week 1)

In terms of contemporary second language acquisition (SLA) theory, such a lesson format represents a "focus on forms" (Long & Crookes 1992), which means that discrete grammar points constitute the organizing principle of the course syllabus. In addition, "expression, comprehension, and negotiation of meaning" (Lee 2000) are absent. Thus, the point of the lessons is to learn and practice grammatical features, and there is neither a communicative goal nor any actual use of the language to communicate meaningful ideas. This is exactly the methodological approach that MEXT has determined needs reform in Japanese foreign-language classes, since current SLA theory has established fairly robustly that communicative use of a target language is a necessary condition for its acquisition (Williams 1995; Williams 2005). The author's margin comment to the teacher's journal entry reproduced above makes this point:

> My question is why this style of teaching is used. I think the answer is that the course does not aim for communicative competence. What do you think? (Supervisor's journal response, week 1)

Presumably, the teacher's purpose in requesting to spend his sabbatical year at TUJ was to learn a different approach to teaching. He contrasted his previous classroom experience with what he initially saw in TUJ classes:

> On the contrary, the students of TUJ look to be very busy in speaking and writing all the time. They cannot find any time to rest. They are well-controlled by the teachers. Nobody look sleepy. They keep strong motivation all the time in class. I feel as if I were on the rollercoaster. The students look as though they find a new scene all of a sudden, turning the corner. The students of [teacher]'s class don't seem to worry about making mistakes. They keep on writing without consulting their dictionary. They look busy and still happy with writing. In my school, teachers tend to have students have more rote memorization. Our students never start writing or speaking even after many years rote memorization. (Intern's journal, week 1)

This teacher also began with a conscious view of how speaking and listening skills are acquired, which he articulated in his first journal entry:

> I started using this CD/book with a hypothesis that speaking ability must exist beyond the horizon of listening ability. I thought subconsciously that when the amount of English we have listened reaches a certain amount, we start speaking that language automatically. (I now think this hypothesis is wrong.)... When I talk with Patrick, I realized that my speaking ability didn't improve at all after these intensive listening training, and that speaking/writing should go side by side with listening/reading.

> …
>
> When I was a university student, I studied only an outline of linguistics. But as soon as I started teaching, I forget the mechanism of language learning. I could not combine theory and practice. I realize now that the practice without any theoretical background will go into a deadlock in the long run.
>
> When we think about English learning, we tend to forget that the language acquisition comes from the subconscious level. We cannot see the mechanism optically, so there are various kinds of hypotheses. It is very difficult to find the only one absolute theory but it is interesting for me to know about various different way of thinking on language. (Intern's journal, week 1)

This initial rumination about the relationship of theory and practice seemed very much to the point. Richards and Rodgers (2001) have argued for a framework for the description, evaluation, and comparison of methods, which the author believes to be a basic schema for integrating knowledge at any level of the TESOL field. Their framework consists of three levels: approach, the theoretical level about the nature of language and of language learning; design, the organizational level related to specifying the goals for and planning the syllabus of a language course; and procedure, the level of knowledge of specific teaching techniques. This notion underlay the supervisor's response to the teacher's thoughts on language acquisition hypotheses:

> I believe that a real master teacher knows much more than just a few recipes for lesson plans. He or she knows how to set realistic and worthwhile goals for a language course and how to relate these goals to a coherent and informed understanding of the nature of language use and of language learning. The next step is to know how to fashion lesson plans that implement all these understandings with a specific group of learners. In other words, a master teacher knows a lot of theory and applies the theory in his or her daily practice. (Supervisor's journal response, week 1)

In the second week, the intern responded to the supervisor's question about the purpose of the "Japanese way of teaching" described in the first journal. His comment on this topic clearly showed that he had adopted a goal of learning communicative teaching:

> His remark on my previous report on Japanese way of teaching hit the mark. In Japanese teaching environment, many teacher's stick to Grammar Translation Method. According to his answer, the course does not aim for communicative competence. I opened my eyes to read his answer. We have to turn our aim to communication. But we still have some points to clear to get over this obstacle.
>
> …

> I have observed [teacher's] and [teacher's] classes for two weeks. During these classes they both did not give students any sample sentences and they did not ordered the students to remember. As I wrote in my previous report, what we used is much useful and active than what we memorized. I must remember that learning by rote never lead to communication. (Intern's journal, week 2)

In week 3, the intern wrote about an inductive/deductive distinction between Japanese and American teaching styles. He wrote that the Japanese way is "inductive" while the American way is "deductive"; but the supervisor argued that the opposite is true. This exchange again shows the teacher's developing awareness of form-oriented versus communication-oriented pedagogy:

> [Teacher's] class is a typical example of deductive way. In his class, they "freewrite" without consulting a dictionary. The students have to write as many sentences as they can without stopping writing. After writing they start discussing the topic in their usable English. Their favorite expressions are used many many times as they use English and these expressions will become a core of their usable expression. Many Japanese teachers will worry about fossilization. But now I think it's not clever to exchange a chance to get speaking fluency for grammatical correctness. (Intern's journal, week 3)

> Maybe it's the opposite: TUJ's way is inductive and Japanese schools use a deductive way. (Supervisor's journal response, week 3)

In week 4, the intern noted in his journal that "the most impressive point for me is that they [APP students] speak very eagerly in English." (Intern's journal, week 4) He also wrote a longer passage, as follows:

> Having student use their brain

> [Teacher] and [teacher] both have students use their brains. For example, even in TOEFL listening training, [teacher] had his students rewrite the script so that another choice will be the right answer then he had his students present the rewrited script in front of the class. They must have never done it if they tried to do only mechanically. [Teacher] has his students summarize in their own original English. He divided the text into six parts and assign each student a particular part. A student explained the part in their own expression so that other group members can understand and write the content without looking at the text. (Intern's journal, week 4)

In all these journal entries, the intern seemed to be noting differences between the forms of pedagogy that he was observing and those with which he was familiar in the Japanese context. It is apparent that he was positively impressed by the new style that he was seeing. Since he was observing the supervisor's undergraduate class in humanities and his graduate class in TESOL methods, the intern wrote journal entries comparing them with the APP classes he was observing:

> Dr. Rosenkjar allowed me to observe his undergraduate class. I owe him a great deal. I understood the way to teach was different from the one in the graduate course in some ways. The writing on the board was also much easier to understand for the future reading.
>
> The most surprising point was that the students speak very fluent English compared with APP students. I became more interested than before in how APP students would reach that fluent level. …
>
> Methods and Materials I [a TESOL graduate class] I was allowed to listen to the presentation the other students gave. Most of the students of this class are very smart but some of them confused form-oriented and communication-oriented. I was surprised how difficult it is to put theory we studied into practice. While we studied the theory, we think we understand it. But we realize we didn't understand fully when we try to make a real syllabus. This is also an example of the difference between understanding passively and producing actively. Also this example show this class dealt with very difficult contents. (Intern's journal, week 4)

The intern noticed the level of communication in the classes he observed and reflected on that to make a decision about the relative value for language learning of focus on fluency versus on accuracy:

> Real communication in APP classes [Teacher] and [teacher] give their students topic and have their students talk to their partner(s). The students seem to enjoy exchange information itself. I think this is true communication. They used Japanese words to keep on talking when they don't pick up the suitable English words. Sometimes they speak fluently in Japanese accent because they cannot afford to control their accent while they are thinking in English. One of the students add Japanese "*dayo*" as if to try to relieve his anxiety as Malaysian add "*la*" at the end of the sentence. Their speech is not perfect, but my eyes, they appeared to be enjoying the conversation itself. They seemed to have forgotten the fact that they are studying English. They reminded me of the fact that language exists not for its own sake, but for communication.
>
> Fluency first policy vs. accuracy first policy. By observing TUJ's students speaking in class, I realized how important for teachers to facilitate them to communicate without worrying about making mistakes. If they feel nervous about making mistakes, they will be timid of speaking. Trying to be accurate cannot lead to fluency. On the contrary, if a speaker speak the same thing repeatedly he/she will notice his/her grammatical error. Fluency is necessary to speakers to notice their error. I guess the possibility of speaker's noticing their error may be more than 90% while the possibility of fossilization must be less than 10%. It's not clever to make students to try to speak perfect English. It's better for us to make students try to speak fluently. That's the only way

> to reach the stage they can evade making mistakes. Evading making error is contradictory for beginners. Evading errors exists beyond the horizon of fluency. My teaching attitude will change when I return to my high school. (Intern's journal, week 5)

It seems clear that the intern was gaining an appreciation of the need for actual communication in order to foster acquisition, but another comment in his journal shows some uncertainty about the relative importance of focus on form and focus on meaning:

> I have no intention of having students focus on avoiding errors but I am still interested in common errors because the errors must have derived from the logic of native language...I wonder if being interested errors do harm to my speaking attitude. Is it better to give up studying forms during this one year? This question is apparently inconsistent with what I written in the previous page. I feel ashamed. (Intern's journal, week 5)

The supervisor's response underscored the importance of a balanced focus on both form and meaning:

> I do not see any inconsistency at all. Language acquisition results from both a focus on meaning and a focus on form. (Supervisor's journal response, week 5)

Again, in week 8, the intern made a lengthy summary of various ways to teach the pronunciation of specific phonemes and of the stress, rhythm, and intonation of American English since he was taking a TESOL graduate course in phonology called The Sound System of American English, which used a textbook entitled *Teaching American English Pronunciation* (Avery & Ehrlich 1992). The supervisor's comment pointed out that it is legitimate to teach such features, but that these language points are elements of form:

> All of these ways of dealing with potential problems in your students' pronunciation of English are useful. However, it is also good to keep in mind that these kinds of exercises are inherently form-focused and need to be incorporated into meaning-focused activities in judicious amounts to avoid a "focus on forms." (Supervisor's journal response, week 8)

In addition to specific issues related to teaching a foreign language, the intern also observed and commented on more general aspects of the teaching style of his master teachers:

> Everybody is busy in class [Teacher] is busy in checking his students' homework while his students are busy in writing his/her "freewrite" or summary, or in talking about the content of the reading materials. This is a daily situation this class has. In ordinary Japanese high schools, teachers are busier than students because the flow of information is from teachers to students in Japanese education. By observing classes at TUJ, I understood that useful information

> can be exchanged among students and that the stimuli can be stronger than being given information from the teacher.
>
> Powerful stimuli vs. less powerful stimuli. While the whole students are busy doing writing or exchanging their opinions, [teacher] had each student come to his table to give him/her comments about how to improve his/her essay by communicating with the student individually. This work requires the teacher much energy but deserves the energy. Students didn't get a lot of advice in a limited time but the stimulus they get through communication with the teacher seemed very strong compared with the general advice from the teacher to the whole class. One or two pieces of strong and impressive advice are more useful to improve students essay than many weak and general advice. Once in a while this way should inserted into our teaching procedure. (Intern's journal, week 9)

The intern also critiqued the standard Japanese practice of translation, based on his observation of the master teacher's class. This comment shows the intern's intention to apply what he learned during his sabbatical to his teaching practice after returning to his high school. It also gave the supervisor the opportunity to validate the intern as a potential force for reform of English teaching methods:

> Understanding the content in English. I think Japanese English education spend much time for translation and grammar. In this case students think about the content in Japanese. The students don't have to concentrate on listening to English and thinking about the content in English. That's why Japanese people cannot speak English after "studying English for ten years"...[Teacher] often says to students that it's not important to understand the content 100% but it's much more important to understand the content in English as best as they can. In other words, understanding the content 60% in English is more important than understanding the content 100% with the help of Japanese. I think Japanese English education lacks this concept because most teachers give students the Japanese translation to every text.
>
> Dealing with a material from different directions [Teacher] have his students think about the content from different ways: annotation, freewrite, storyboard, DEJ (Double Entry Journal), summary, writing essays, talking about the content with the partner, writing critiques on partners essays, and so on. In these processes he doesn't give one and only answer to the content but he gives the hint or clue to think about the content. The students will have his/her own understanding about the text. The students will understand the content gradually through many activities gradually, naturally and surely before they know. Comparing this way and the way the teacher give students translation, I think the former is much better and it gives the students the ability to think and express in English naturally. I think Japanese English education should change attitude before it's too late. (Intern's journal, week 10)

> I think you will be one of the important catalysts for change in Japanese English-language education. (Supervisor's journal response, week 10)

The intern had worked in a beginning level TOEFL Preparation class and an intermediate class in Reading-Based Writing in the first term of his internship. In contrast, in the second semester (fall, 2005), he was assigned to an intermediate class in Vocabulary and Reading Fluency, an advanced class in TOEFL Grammar, and a highly advanced class in a special program by which students concurrently take a university content class and a special linked adjunct class that both prepares them to do the assignments for the content class and uses the context for general development of academic skills. In this case, the adjunct class in which the intern worked was paired with an undergraduate psychology course. For a description of the structure of the APP at that time, see Rosenkjar (2006). His first journal entry of the second semester provided reactions to these three classes:

> Impressions on observing the classes: Adjunct class [Teacher] explained how to read the textbook and take notes. She explained how the text is written by drawing a chart showing the construction of 'title' 'sub-title' 'heading' 'sub-heading.' She also said that taking good notes is crucial for students because they won't have enough time to read the textbook again before the term examination. I thought she explained the attitudes and tips to succeed in studying in undergraduate course because there were some students who were not from APP at TUJ. I think TUJ teaches *how* as well as *what* compared with Japanese universities. (Intern's journal, week 14)
>
> Timed Reading in V/RF [Teacher's] class put most emphasis on reading fluency. He explained how to improve reading fluency before he started making his students read the main text book. The most interesting point for me was that getting 7–8 right answers out of 10 questions to the text is the best and more than that score means you read too slow. Balance between speed and comprehension is the critical point. Japanese English education should adopt this kind of training more often. Japanese schools put more emphasis on comprehension rather than fluency. [Teacher] told me to join the students' discussion to improve my English. It required much energy and much anxiety.
>
> TOEFL Grammar [Teacher] never uses Japanese when she teach her students including small chat after her class. I have to learn this attitude to teach my students. She said students expect this class very much because this is the only chance for them to learn grammar. This is what I didn't think about before her explanation. She told me to check and write a comment on some of the students' paper they handed in. When I was doing it, I was very surprised to find that even P3 [the highest level of the APP] students know little about English grammar. In this class, she told me to join the class and give any advice to the students but for me it is very difficult because they are not my students. (Intern's journal, week 15)

In the APP curriculum, there are also "Content" classes in which students are expected to learn a specific academic content while simultaneously developing language and general academic skills. At a higher level, the undergraduate adjunct classes are also a kind of "content-based" language class. The intern wrote that he saw the connection between Content classes and "adjunct" classes:

> [Teacher] gave me a chance to teach psychology to the adjunct class students. For this experience I had about ten days to prepare. This class is basically categorized into "content based class" compared with usual method classes. Teachers must have certain knowledge on the content of the subject... In Japanese usual teaching, English teachers do not have to memorize the content of the textbook except for the lecture of English grammar. We can hold a textbook in the hand and look at every detail on the page. But so far as the content based teaching, teachers have to explain without looking at the textbook so that we want to get students' trust. (Intern's journal, week 18)

The supervisor explained the purpose of the APP content classes in this way:

> We hope to foster language acquisition through a meaning-focused environment in the content courses. In addition, content courses replicate the experience that students will have in the undergrad program and so prepare them for the challenges of undergraduate study. (Supervisor's journal response, week 18)

From the intern's comments written in his journal through the course of his sabbatical year, it is clear that he learned a wide range of new methods of teaching that he was able to evaluate in comparison with his insider's knowledge of teaching methods in Japanese high schools. It also seems apparent that he found the whole experience enlightening and valuable, because it contributed to a new identity for him as a professional English language teacher. However, the new identity did not come without struggle and some negative emotions. It is to his credit that he persevered in spite of the difficulties encountered. The following excerpts from his journals document the emotional aspects of developing his new identity as both an English teacher and an English speaker.

> There was a time I thought I could speak English. But now I thought it was an imagination...When I attend lectures at TUJ, I painfully realize my lack of immaturity in English. I feel as if I were drowned in a flood of English. I feel as if I were a baby again. I feel as if my brain is not mine. I am too busy in catching, thinking and responding in a short moment. Especially in an academic lecture, if I could catch the word phonetically, I need at least two seconds to process/understand the word. In two seconds, the speaker will say another four words. When I have to response the question, I need more than ten seconds to pick up the suitable words and compose the sentence. But I still have the anxiety that the sentence is awkward because the sentence is the original invention which has not been used by anybody in the world. (Intern's journal, week 3)

> I think such disorienting and discouraging feelings are a normal part of the process. (Supervisor's journal response, week 3)

With regard to the graduate course in Methods and Materials I, which the intern took in the first term of his internship, he wrote the following:

> It's very difficult for me to understand this class. There are so many technical terms whose definitions are very subtle one another. The definitions are sometimes different among books. Above all, my level of understanding notions in English is so poor that I was in chaos. (Intern's journal, week 4)

> I hope it is getting easier. Most students who take Methods I find it difficult. (Supervisor's journal response, week 4)

In trying to reconcile error correction with fluency development, the intern made the following comment in week 5 that showed his emotions at not having a firm grasp of what to do:

> I wonder if being interested in errors do harm to my speaking attitude. Is it better to give up studying forms during this one year? This question is apparently inconsistent with what I written in the previous page. I feel ashamed. (Intern's journal, week 5)

The supervisor responded with encouragement:

> I think you are making progress and will be very surprised and pleased in March when you compare your English skill with what it was last March. (Supervisor's journal response, week 5)

Since TUJ's academic year consists of three trimesters, studying is very demanding. The intern mentioned this in week 12:

> In this university one year is divided into three semesters. This system requires students and teachers concentrate on studying and try to make the given time most fruitful, I think. I realized how long these three months are and how tired I got from the concentration on studying.

(Intern's journal, week 12 [written at the beginning of the fall term])

> I hope you had a relaxing break in August and are refreshed for study in the fall. (Supervisor's journal response, week 12)

In week 18, the intern had the opportunity to teach a class under the supervision of one of his master teachers. He wrote the following about the experience:

> After the class, I asked [teacher] for her comments on my teaching. Her comment was that it was more teacher-centered than student-centered. Maybe I wanted to show off my knowledge and devotion to my preparation. In other words I wanted to be a star. I made handouts for students' use so I should

> have been more student-centered. The other main point for improvement is that I should have been more good at managing time. I did not reach the point I should reach. Of course this was partly because I took care of students' speed of understanding and doing on the handouts. I could not ignore their understanding. If I can find a good point, it was students' assistance. Thanks to them there was a bit of communication.
>
> It is the real experience that we can realize the true difficulties of teaching. I deeply grateful to TUJ for giving this rare opportunity to teach. This experience also improve my English speaking ability and active phrases to teach. (Intern's journal, week 18)
>
> It sounds as if it was not perfect but you did a good job and perhaps learned experientially about student-centeredness, in addition to the psychology content. (Supervisor's journal response, week 18)

In the middle of his internship year, as an assignment for one of his TESOL graduate courses, the intern was asked to write about "memorable moments of language learning and language teaching." He included his essay in his journal and discussed his time as an intern:

> The third memorable moment is my present experience...I also had a chance to be immersed in English speaking environment. English became a tool of communication and a means of getting information rather than the object of study. In this stage, meaning and the speed of processing information became more important for me than remembering "form." Before I came to TUJ, I didn't realize an easy fact that knowing English and using it is quite different...Now I feel as if I had lost three decades. The only way to improve my speaking and listening ability is to immerse myself in the environment I need to have true communication in English. I wrote about the series of my misunderstanding of my English learning and English teaching. Through these experiences I realized how important it is to study TESOL and various theories about English learning. I have decided to know English and teaching English much more because I am one of lovers of English... (Intern's journal, week 21)

The supervisor's response sought to validate the intern's new realization of himself as an English user and teacher:

> What you have written in this journal entry strikes me as a very important and basic change in your approach to English teaching and learning. I congratulate you on your willingness to change your ideas about that since it is not easy to accept new ideas that contradict what we have long believed. (Of course, there is still some role for focus on form...) As for your love of English, I am very glad (but not surprised) to hear it. I advise you to engage in reading for pleasure in English to continue getting meaning-focused exposure. (Supervisor's journal response, week 21)

In spite of his new realizations about himself as an English user and teacher, the intern also mentioned the stress he was experiencing in doing a TESOL graduate class in addition to the other internship requirements:

> Compared with the summer semester, this semester has been keeping me much more busy doing various things…I find it very difficult to have time and mental energy to write this journal. I believe I will get into the next stage if I don't give up this hardship. (Intern's journal, week 21)

> Perhaps you are also learning more…You're doing very well! Don't give up! (Supervisor's journal response, week 21)

With regard to the undergraduate class in American Studies, which was taught by the internship supervisor and which the intern was auditing, the intern wrote that he believed he was not doing well:

> I enjoy listening to the lecture because I like Dr. Rosenkjar's lecture and I am getting used to the autumn semester. This semester has been very different from the summer semester, and I have always been behind my schedule. I have always been frustrated and exhausted. I have been in the conditions that I have been losing my confidence every day especially when I find the rest students like [student] very capable. I am very appreciate Dr. Rosenkjar's overlooking my poor performance in this class. I am very sorry for this but there's no way out for now. (Intern's journal, week 22)

The supervisor responded:

> I am glad to know this because I am afraid that my course is too teacher centered. I do not think your performance has been poor. I merely think that there are limits to what even a dedicated and diligent learner like you can do without overstretching himself. (Supervisor's journal response, week 22)

Shortly before the end of the internship year, the intern wrote:

> These days I must be in a slump or depression. My reading speed won't be faster while a lot of readings are left waiting for me to read…I also cannot speak English fluently especially when I feel self-conscious or nervous…There is only one month left before I come back to my school. I am very nervous about what I can do in my class. When I just started this program, I was in high spirits but now I feel very sorry for my having Dr. Rosenkjar feel disappointed at my low performance although I have confidence that I have been doing my best up to the limit of my ability. I feel very very ashamed that I thought I had been doing so-so in my teaching at my school. (Intern's journal, week 36)

> Relax. I am NOT at all disappointed with you. (Supervisor's journal response, week 36)

On the very important issue of how to translate skills learned in the internship into practice in his school, the intern wrote this near the end of his year at TUJ:

> How I should apply what I have learned from TUJ to my students? I understand the difference between Japanese typical teaching and American – style teaching but I don't think it's easy for me to do what I have learned from TUJ in a real situation; class time is different, purpose is different, students' speaking ability is different. Should I tell my students not to use dictionary? Shall I say, "Talk to your partner in English." Or "Make a poster to show the class"? I need some time to think about how to apply teaching techniques I learned from TUJ to our school. I am getting busier and busier these days for both studying at TUJ and preparing for many things for the new school year. (Intern's journal, week 37)

Since carrying back into the Japanese system ideas and methods learned during the internship is the point of the program, this issue is crucial. The supervisor's response recognized that contexts are different and validated the intern's concerns:

> Yes, I think careful thought is needed to adapt TUJ teaching principles to the [Japanese] high school context...You are a devoted teacher and a thoughtful and diligent worker from whom students can learn much. (Supervisor's journal response, week 37)

The intern was awarded a certificate of completion during week 39. He wrote the following in summary of his year at TUJ:

> TUJ held an official ceremony of completion of the English Teacher Internship Program for me. It was an unexpected ceremony for me…Every day at TUJ is taken up studying much more than I could manage. I was not able to find any one day when I am free from trying to improve myself. I often felt depressed, this is mostly because I did not have any colleague here at TUJ who had the same situation as me and I have not be certain how I should behave myself…I could not thank them [TUJ staff] too much. What I can do now is to apply what I learned from TUJ to my real situation when I come back to my school. What can I do after coming back to my school? Only imitation and emulation cannot always lead to success in the real situation. Rejection symptoms may appear unless I can be sensitive to the reaction of my students...But I will do my best to act a bridge between TUJ and our school. (Interns' journal, week 39)

> I agree – it was very clear that you worked really hard all year! Successful curriculum development is a collaborative process. You will need to find a way to include your colleagues in the process, solicit their input, use their ideas (as well as you can), and make every teacher feel valued and part of the process even if their ideas are not actually used in the final product. This is a huge job that will take a lot of patience and tact; however, I am confident that you can do it well! (Supervisor's journal response, week 39)

As a coda to this story, the author of this chapter was invited to be an advisor to the high school from which the intern had come, since that school had been designated by MEXT as a "Super English Language High School." In connection with these duties, the author visited the intern's school after he had returned to it. It was very gratifying to learn that the intern had instituted two major changes as a result of his time at TUJ: he proudly informed the author that he had changed from using mainly Japanese in his own classes to using mainly English; and he had instituted a program of extensive reading in English for all the students of the school and was very eager to show off the library of graded readers available to his school's students. In the scheme of things, these are remarkable changes that show that this dedicated teacher did in fact adapt principles learned at TUJ for the improvement of instruction at his school. In this way, this intern made a great success of his sabbatical year and promises to contribute to the overall modernization of English language teaching in Japan.

REFERENCES

Avery, P., & Ehrlich, S. (1992). *Teaching American English pronunciation.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Lee, J. F. (2000). *Tasks and communicating in language classrooms.* New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, *26*(1), 27–56.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT). 2003. *The course of study for foreign languages*. Retreived from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/shotou/030301.htm

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenkjar, P. (2006). "I want to study TOEFL!" In T.S.C. Farrell (Ed.), *Language teacher research in Asia.* Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Williams, J. (1995). Focus on form in communicative language teaching: Research findings and the classroom teacher. *TESOL Journal*, *4* (Summer), 12–16.

Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Patrick Rosenkjar
Temple University Japan Campus

APPENDIX 1: DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERNSHIP

High School English Teacher Internships

High school English teachers interested in teaching English for actual communication and international understanding are invited to come to TUJ's Academic English Program (the AEP) as interns to learn modern methods of communicative pedagogy. This opportunity is especially designed for seasoned teachers who have earned a sabbatical year in which to develop their professional skills. The exact mix of activities is flexible and will be determined by the intern in consultation with the AEP director, but during their time at TUJ the teacher-interns will engage in the following activities:

- working as assistants to AEP master teachers 9 to 12 hours per week;
- having weekly conferences with the master teachers on aspects of the theory and practice of teaching the class in which they are working;
- doing a prescribed set of TESOL readings to be determined by the master teachers and the AEP director;
- writing a weekly dialogue journal for the master teacher and/or the AEP director reflecting on classroom interactions and events and commenting on the readings they have been doing;
- planning and teaching, under the supervision of the master teacher, one or more lessons for the class in which they are working;
- conferring with the master teacher about how the teaching session went;
- attending M.S.Ed. Distinguished Lecturer series weekends;
- attending other public events for the TUJ community;
- auditing one undergraduate class; and
- taking for credit one M.S.Ed. class.

Benefits to be gained by the teachers from participating in the internship program would include:

- improving their own English skills through extensive interaction in and exposure to English;
- learning modern techniques for teaching English;
- learning contemporary theory of second language acquisition;
- enriching their lives through exposure to the intellectual and cultural opportunities of TUJ;
- having access to the variety of international perspectives available at TUJ;
- developing friendships with members of the TUJ community; and
- becoming long-term members of the TUJ community themselves.

APPENDIX 2: HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHER INTERNSHIP ANNOUNCEMENT

Dear High School Principal:

I am writing to introduce Temple University, Japan Campus (TUJ) to you and to make you aware of an innovative professional growth opportunity at TUJ for your faculty members who teach English. TUJ is the branch campus in Japan of a well known American university officially recognized by Monbukagakusho. TUJ's mission is to:

- educate Japan's international leaders of the future;
- strengthen Japan's relationships with the United States and other countries;
- enhance foreign understanding of Japan; and
- contribute to the development of the Japanese educational system.

TUJ offers several graduate programs and a full four-year undergraduate program taught in English with a variety of majors and simple intra-university transfer procedures to other Temple campuses around the world. Our graduate programs include world-class master's and doctoral programs in teaching English as a second language (TESOL). In addition, TUJ's Academic English Program (the AEP) is a pre-undergraduate English and academic skills program that emphasizes communicative English to prepare students for English-medium university work. The professional growth opportunity for your teachers of English is the "TUJ English Teacher Internship," in which high school English teachers interested in teaching English for actual communication are invited to come to TUJ's AEP as interns to learn modern methods of communicative pedagogy. The internship is especially designed for seasoned teachers who have earned a sabbatical year in which to develop their professional skills. The exact mix of activities is flexible and will be determined by the intern in consultation with the AEP director, a member of TUJ's graduate faculty in teaching English. I am delighted to inform you of this opportunity and would like to request that you encourage your faculty members who teach English to consider applying for a sabbatical year in which to come to TUJ to hone their skills as teachers and as English users in this unique program. Further information is available in the attached sheet of "Frequently Asked Questions"; visit our website: www.tuj.ac.jp/aep; or email us at: esl@tuj.ac.jp.

Sincerely,
Patrick Rosenkjar, Ed.D.
Assistant Dean for English Language Education Director, Academic English Program

(FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT TUJ'S ENGLISH TEACHER INTERNSHIP)

1. *Who is eligible for admission to the internship?* All high school English teachers or other career-oriented individuals interested in teaching English may enter the internship, provided only that they be prepared to commit to a year of intensive, full-time work in improving their teaching skills and their own English ability.

2. *What activities are included in the internship?* The program includes the following activities for teacher-interns:

- working as assistants to AEP master teachers 9 to 12 hours per week;
- having weekly conferences with the master teachers on aspects of the theory and practice of teaching the class in which they are working;
- doing a prescribed set of TESOL readings to be determined by the master teachers and the AEP director;
- writing a weekly dialogue journal for the master teacher and/or the AEP director reflecting on classroom interactions and events and commenting on the readings they have been doing;
- planning and teaching, under the supervision of the master teachers, one or more lessons for the classes in which they are working;
- conferring with the master teachers about how the teaching sessions went;
- attending M.S.Ed. Distinguished Lecturer series weekends;
- attending other public events for the TUJ community;
- auditing one undergraduate class; and taking for credit one M.S.Ed. class.

3. *What is the schedule of the internship?* The internship begins at the beginning of April and ends at the end of March each year. If this schedule does not meet the needs of specific interns, special arrangements can be made, as needed.
4. *What benefits do participating high school English teachers get from the internship?* Benefits to be gained by the teachers from participating in the internship program would include:

- improving their own English skills through extensive interaction in and exposure to English;
- learning modern techniques for teaching English;
- learning contemporary theory of second language acquisition;
- enriching their lives through exposure to the intellectual and cultural opportunities of TUJ;
- having access to the variety of international perspectives available at TUJ;
- developing friendships with members of the TUJ community; and becoming long-term members of the TUJ community themselves.

5. *What are the qualifications of the internship mentors and supervisor?* The mentoring teachers with whom interns work on a daily basis are all professional English teachers with master's degrees in the field and many years of experience in teaching. They are all well versed in teaching English for actual communication for academic purposes. In addition, the overall internship supervisor is a veteran teacher of English who holds both a master's degree and a doctorate in second language education. He is a faculty member of TUJ's graduate program in Teaching English as a Second Language and is the director of the Academic English Program.

6. *What does the internship cost?* The annual fee for the internship is about ¥1,000,000. This includes all supervision fees, university facilities fees, the audit fee for one undergraduate course, and the tuition for one master's course in Teaching English as a Second Language. Partial scholarships are available and interested teachers are encouraged to apply for them.

NERIKO MUSHA DOERR

AFTERWORD

Change in pedagogy is more than a technical change in teaching method. It is a change in the purpose of learning. In the case of changes in English education in Japan, it is a change in understanding for what purpose Japanese speakers use English—when, with whom, and in what context. In this afterword I discuss this important issue of change in language pedagogy and policy through a running commentary on the chapters we have presented in this volume. I then consider how these topics raised issues that we might consider as the focus for further research and investigation.

This volume provides a detailed account of changing language education in Japan, incorporating an ethnographic method that reveals to us a detailed, nuanced, and contextual understanding of the issue. This volume illustrates how the changes in language education initiated by the state policies of the Japanese government have manifested themselves in various sites of schooling.

The chapters here have been a welcome contribution to the discussion of how changing policies affect education with the lens of analysis firmly focused on various contextual levels in Japanese education—policy, institution, classroom, and individuals. Using different approaches, each chapter sheds light on the formation and effect of language policy—the making of a certified, state-approved school textbook; the intersection of new policies with the institutional dynamics at both a weekend Japanese language school in the United States and university campuses in Japan; the reflection of policy in the perception of ideal teacher, ideal student, and actual practices in classrooms; and the encouragement of particular forms of confidence in individuals and communication practices and pedagogical approach because of policy change.

This volume also contributes to the debates in foreign language education regarding the effectiveness of the communicative approach with an in-depth ethnographic investigations and case studies of the processes in which this style of pedagogy is promoted and implemented. The viewpoints of the policy-makers and institutions as well as classroom dynamics and transformation of individuals are considered.

In what follows, I will focus on several specific topics with the intent of stimulating further discussions in the areas in which the chapters in this volume engage. The topics I address are what constitutes "language proficiency," the "native speaker myth," the gap between the rhetoric about and actual reception of individuals with English proficiency, the notion of English as a global language, and, finally, the implications of publishing this volume in English.

S. Horiguchi et al. (Eds.), Foreign Language Education in Japan, 167–178.

WHAT CONSTITUTES "LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY"?

With a change in language teaching methodology comes a shift in the notion of what constitutes "language proficiency." The big shift many of the chapters in this volume deal with is in how English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) education has changed from "conventional" grammar-translation and audio-lingual approaches to communicative methodologies. This is an important point of departure, from which we might investigate the power relations inherent in the construction of "language proficiency": Who decides what constitutes "language proficiency"? For what purpose? With what effect? Why should the state have the authority to decide what criteria define "language proficiency"? If the government does not have this authority, who should?

If linguists share the basic premise that "variation in language is so pervasive that each language is actually a continuum of languages from speaker to speaker, and from group to group, and no absolute lines can be drawn between different forms of a language" (Akmajian et al., 1995, 264), then how does one decide what is a "correct" form of language and hence what is meant by "language proficiency"? Pierre Bourdieu (1991) argues that the state assigns official language status to one language variety and then through the schooling process imposes it upon its citizens as the sole legitimate form, as the "standard." This legitimization process establishes a "linguistic community," in which there exists a pervasive (mis-)recognition of the standard as the only correct form even as access to this normalized form remains uneven. This standard form of language is usually that of the dominant group in the society (also, see Bauman & Briggs, 2000; Milroy & Milroy, 1991; Romaine 1997).

Such a standardization process is linked to the emergence of modern nation-states in which a nation is imagined as a homogeneous unit defined in relation to other nations (Anderson, 1991). In the late eighteenth century, Johann Gottfried von Herder argued that the possession of their own distinctive language constitutes the touchstone of a people, or Volk, essential to the construction of a national identity. Language is viewed as a homogeneous entity shared by the members of a homogeneous nation. Herder's idea thus became a model *for* nation rather than a model *of* nation, creating an ideology of one-nation, one-language in the nation-state (Balibar 1994; Bauman & Briggs, 2000). In this light, the centralization of Japan's education system is clearly the result of the particular historical development of a nation-state (Mashiko, 2003; Yasuda, 2003, 2006). Also, we need to ask who benefits and who is disadvantaged by this standardization.

In the area of Japanese-as-a-Heritage-Language education, Chapter 2 by Lee and Doerr examines the situation where administrators of a weekend Japanese language school in the United States negotiate two different criteria of "language proficiency"—the MEXT-set *kokugo* Course of Study and the locally produced *keishōgo* (heritage language) curriculum—in order to cater to diverse student body with diverse needs and aspirations. They show that different views of "language proficiency" are linked to the different assessment of what is possible to be gained at the weekend Japanese language school and different aspirations of students. However, to decide how much the Japanese government is responsible and thus should be involved became the matter of contention in relation to local administrators.

In Chapter 3, Thomas Hardy illustrates various textbook writers' concerns and negotiations regarding what should be the model of "language proficiency" to be learned by students. In this chapter we gain a glimpse into the clash between the writers' ideals and the anticipated reception by the government, boards of education, teachers, and students.

Chapter 5 by Imoto and Horiguchi provides a thorough description of the ways a standardization system—The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for Languages—was introduced (not as a government mandate), resisted, and finally failed at an educational institution. Imoto and Horiguchi detail various factors that contributed to the failure such as the diverse interpretations of the key CEFR notions and the various organizational needs. The chapter vividly illustrates how the notion of "learning subject" that is often taken for granted in the literature on pedagogy—such as the autonomous learner—is based on a particular imagining of what "language proficiency" is. It is reminiscent of the argument of Lynn Fendler (1998), who traces the historical change of such a "learning subject." Fendler argues that, in the era of neoliberalism, an "educated subject" is viewed as "motivated" and as having "positive attitudes." The notion of an autonomous learning subject that was resisted upon the implementation of CEFR this chapter analyzes is yet another notion of learning subject that was prevalent in the 2000s.

How do the relations of power affect the process? Relations of power is inherent in the use of a standard, which then defines what "language proficiency" means. Echoing Bourdieu (1991), James and Lesley Milroy (1991: 22–23) suggest that "standardisation is motivated in the first place by various social, political and commercial needs." For example, what is usually considered the standard of English in Great Britain, Received Pronunciation (RP), was developed in the nineteenth century based not on common or uniform pronunciation but on that of well-educated individuals. That is, the value of the standard spoken form was defined by the social status of its speakers and then imposed on others as an ideal (Crowley, 1989; Milroy, 1999).

Some may argue that we nonetheless need to evaluate students. However, centralized assessment, or even teacher-centered assessment, is not necessarily required in language teaching. There are various ways to provide assessment, including portfolio and peer evaluation (Sato & Kumagai, 2010). Then, a possible next question could be what the implementation of a standard of assessment, such as the CEFR, tells us about the power relations behind deciding what constitutes the standard of "language proficiency" (i.e., what items the learner needs to declare he/she "can do")—who decides it and what is included, whose view is excluded in that process, and who is (dis)advantaged by the adoption of a standard language.

In some chapters, the researchers themselves offer ethnographic insight into what should be considered "language proficiency." Chapter 8 by Katayama provides a fascinating analysis of how students' actions changed dramatically in two different classes—the class on Phonetics in which students produced "native-like" pronunciations and the Discussion class in which students spoke with the very same "heavy Japanese accent" that they sought to get away from in the Phonetics class. Katayama then interprets this situation as the local use of English reflecting internalized beliefs of how one is supposed to act. Drawing on Foucault, she understands this as the result of power relationships that forces the actors to internalize the ideal actions. Katayama then concludes that the reason for the lack of English proficiency among Japanese speakers and the prevalence of monolingualism in Japan is the fact that local power relations push Japanese to speak with a "heavy Japanese accent."

To this argument, several important questions need to be asked. Is "language proficiency" the same thing as "native-like pronunciation"? Do people who speak English with a "heavy Japanese accent" not count as English/Japanese bilinguals, thus furthering the prevalence of Japanese monolingualism? Does "English proficiency" mean communicative competence with particular kinds of interlocutors—"native speakers"—not various English-as-Foreign-Language and English-as-Second-Language speakers (Canagarajah, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2001) in what Kachru (1992) calls the Outer- and Expanded-Circles? I will come back to these questions later.

In Chapter 9, Matsuoka reports on the transformation of college students through volunteering at an international conference where they could communicate with conference attendees in English. Based on interviews in which students self-report their feelings as well as participant observation, Matsuoka argues that the experience reduced the communication apprehension the participating students had, and thus, allowed them to have increased confidence to communicate in English. Matsuoka's research question appears to have developed from the comment she received from a hotel staff in Cambodia who could speak "good English" after studying only one year: she asked Matsuoka "why the Japanese people cannot speak English even though they are smart enough to develop advanced devices" (p. 132). The answer Matsuoka suggests is communication apprehension, the cause of which Matsuoka attributes to the "other-directedness" that exists in the "Japanese sense of self" (p. 139). She suggests through discussion of her data that such communicative apprehension can be reduced through exposure to opportunities to communicate with English speakers.

I would pose some questions regarding some of the underlying assumptions in this chapter: Is "other-directedness" really a "Japanese sense of self" (p. 139)? Is there such a thing as a homogeneous "Japanese" sense of self? Is the confidence in using the language in verbal communication the sign of "language proficiency"? Deborah Cameron (2002) discusses a kind of linguistic imperialism in which a particular style of communication—such as to speak directly and positively, to negotiate, and to share feelings—is taught as the ideal way to communicate. The view that, in order to be considered proficient in English, one has to be able to communicate orally without apprehension, may be privileging a particular type of communication as legitimate or relevant. The researcher wields a performative power when assuming or suggesting exactly what constitutes "language proficiency." This volume reminds us of this from various angles.

Communication with Whom?: The Native Speaker Myth

When discussing the communicative approach, what needs to be asked is "to communicate with whom?" (Doerr & Kumagai, 2009). This is where we see manifestations of the "native speaker myth" in EFL education. The use of "native speaker" as a model for the students to emulate is assumed to the degree that the topic of discussion in language teaching is not on whether to use the "native speaker" as a model but on "which kind of native speaker should be the model for language teaching" (Cook, 1999, 188–189). The "native speaker" is used as the ideal model in many official pronouncements, such as ESL standards for pre-K–12 students in Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Vision of Effective Education for All Students as well as Speaking Guideline (ACTFL, 1999) and Writing Guideline (ACTFL, 2001) for foreign language teaching both in the United States (Doerr & Kumagai, 2009).

The "native speaker myth" consists of the belief that the "native speaker" has "a complete and possibly innate competence in the language" (Pennycook, 1994, 175). It is based on the idea that there is a bounded, homogeneous, and fixed language with a homogeneous speech community, which is linked to a nation-state (Pennycook, 1994, 2007b; Doerr, 2009).

As mentioned earlier, linguists agree that there is no homogeneous, bounded language or linguistic community, rendering it meaningless to consider "native speakers" as a linguistic community or stable standard model for students to emulate. Also, because as mentioned the deciding of what constitutes "language proficiency" is a political process, holding the "native speaker" as having the complete and innate "proficiency" in that language needs to be critically examined (Canagarajah, 1999b; Cook, 1999; Firth & Wagner, 2007; House, 2003; Jenkins, 2006; Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992).

Some of the chapters in this volume can be re-interpreted in terms of such a "native speaker myth," especially with regard to the "language proficiency" of the students. For example, the fascinating data presented in Chapter 8 can alternatively be understood as two different manifestations of the "native speaker myth." The case from the Phonetic class seems to show a straightforward manifestation of "native speaker" worship. On the other hand, from the student's comment that "good pronunciation" gets teased, the case from the Discussion class suggests a peer pressure "not to achieve," which often serves as bonding practice of sorts (Erickson, 1987; Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Willis, 1977). The student's comment points to such peer pressure. This peer pressure then is based on the perception that speaking with a "heavy Japanese accent" is "not to achieve," and speaking with a "native-like" pronunciation is "to achieve." This then is another manifestation of the "native speaker myth" that renders "native-like" pronunciation "proficiency" in the language. Thus, although Chapter 8 argues that "in Discussion, the students seem to be bound by a discourse of their own instead of the new, imported discourse of TESOL (p. 124)," we might also consider how students are strongly influenced by the TESOL discourse that considers "native speaker" pronunciation as the ideal.

The intriguing data presented in Chapter 8 suggests further alternative readings. Is it because of the type of class and what is judged in the class—Phonetic class teaches and evaluates pronunciation, whereas Discussion class is focused on the content? Or is it because of the teacher—the Phonetic class has a Japanese teacher, whereas the Discussion class has a "native speaker" teacher? Or is it something else, which can be figured out from interviewing students regarding the difference between these classes? In Chapter 10, Rosenkjar quotes a high school English teacher's view that sometimes people "speak fluently in Japanese accent because they cannot afford to control their accent while they are thinking in English" (p. 151). Could this be one of the reasons why students in Chapter 8 did not care about their pronunciation during the Discussion class?

Chapter 3, on the other hand, tackles this very question about the "native speaker myth." To suggest characters from Inner-, Outer-, and Expanding-Circles as the model for the students to aspire to in a textbook is to challenge the "native speaker myth" that valorizes the English of Inner-Circle variation (and, in particular, the Received Pronunciation of British English and the General American of American English). Hardy's chapter then shows the complexities of challenging such "native speaker myth." Although the debates on whether to use Inner-Circle English or Outer-Circle English ended with the former being taken up, the characters ended up coming from all Inner-, Outer-, and Expanding Circles, as if making up for the earlier loss. This is a move away from the older model that views the Inner-Circle variations as the only valid English toward a World Englishes model that treats all varieties of English as valid. However, what kind of English do these characters speak? Despite the fact that some come from the Outer- and Expanding-Circles, do they speak Inner-Circle English, according to the decision made about the kind of English to be represented? If so, the efforts to include characters from various areas do not have the effect of accepting diverse variations of English. Also, reminiscent of the critique of the notion of World Englishes (Canagarajah, 1999a; Pennycook, 2007a), even if these characters do use the variant closer to their local variant, it may still be one representation of probably more diverse variants spoken in the area.

The attraction of this chapter is in the debates which show the possibility that cutting-edge theories in language and power can be incorporated into a textbook. Therefore it is somewhat disappointing to see the compromise in the name of "appropriateness" or giving in to the perceived "resistance" from the more conservative sections. This is nonetheless a warning to those of us who conduct text analyses of textbooks that the textbooks are not mere representation of a single agenda but a result of debates between writers with various viewpoints.

Chapter 4 by Murata describes the implementation of government policies of the bilingual campus for economic purposes. It suggests that the use of English in the bilingual campus is not necessarily targeted towards "native speakers" but targeted towards international students who speak English as an additional language. English then serves as a lingua franca (Canagarajah, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2001). The chapter shows international students conducting a bricolage of English and Japanese and the perpetuation of Japanese as the norm in graduate seminars.

How do these ethnographic details relate to the two axes of hierarchical relationships that seem to exist in this context? The first axis is the hierarchical relationship between English and Japanese in Japan. English is often linked to progress, globalization, academic achievement (because it is one of main academic subjects), modernization, and fashionableness in Japan (Tsuda, 1990) whereas Japanese often, although not always, represents its opposite. This is reflected in the fact that we are not following a "speak-the-local-language" rule that would respect local practices – as in the case of Murata's chapter. This creates a situation where English "native speakers" do not have to learn another language even when he/she goes to another country. In contrast, Japanese L1 speakers need to speak English in their own country. This relates to discourses surrounding a recent resurgence of nationalism in Japan. The second is the hierarchical relationships between professor and students at Japanese universities. The students who speak English well may be perceived as a threat by the professor who speaks English "worse" than the student (see Rosenkjar in this volume regarding a similar sense of threat felt by Japanese English teachers about speaking English). The ethnographic data provided in Chapter 4 by Murata helps us to understand the intersections of these axes of hierarchical relations in bilingual classrooms.

Chapter 2 (Lee & Doerr) also suggests the consideration of in what occasion the students use the language. Moving away from the MEXT-based curriculum that focuses on the use of Japanese in Japan, a local need-based curriculum focuses more on the Japanese-as-Foreign-Language examination held in the United States high school among other things.

Rhetoric of English Proficiency and Reception of Proficient English Speakers

Another tension that becomes apparent by juxtaposing the chapters in this volume is the gap between *talking about* individuals with English proficiency and the actual *reception of* such individuals. While individuals with English proficiency have been enthusiastically embraced by the Japanese business sector in recent years, Chapter 4 (Murata) discusses the reluctance of firms to hire individuals who can speak English but lack proficiency in Japanese. That is, apparently the same business sector paradoxically appreciates the idea of individuals with English proficiency, but not the actual individuals with English proficiency. It may be that Japanese language proficiency is the default and English adds an additional edge.

Chapter 2 (Lee & Doerr) shows the gap between the rhetoric of the MEXT about supporting the knowledge of local area including English in the United States where the JHL students reside while learning Japanese in weekend Japanese language school, on the one hand, and lack of actual support for students, on the other. Chapter 3 (Hardy) illustrates the gap between the view of cosmopolitan Japan with various individuals from abroad and the fear of English speakers as cultural other. This gap can be, to some degree, examined by seeing how the textbook fared after its publication. Which board of education adopted it? Why? Was there any resistance to the textbook as some of the writers anticipated? Any feedback or survey from readers? It would be interesting to see how the "perceptions" of the writers and the actual reactions matched or not matched.

In Chapter 7, Tiina Matikainen reports on the perception of what constitutes good teachers and students from the viewpoint of Japanese university students learning English and their "native speaker" teachers. Matikainen argues that it is important that both students and teachers be aware of each other's views, which she calls, borrowing Jin & Cortazzi's notion, cultural synergy. The gap in perception between the students and teachers is quite fascinating. This gap then suggests to us a number of questions surrounding how these listed traits—such as "motivated" and "risk-taker"—play~~s~~ out in real life relationships between the students and teachers. Do certain positive traits overcome some negative ones? Do some students prefer certain traits in the teacher but not other students? Does quantifying such preferences miss something? Also, as she suggests the importance of teachers and students being aware of these disparities in perceptions, did Matikainen tell the participants about the findings and help them understand the disparities? What happened when she did that? What kind of difference did it make?

Chapters 9 (Matsuoka) and 10 (Rosenkjar) illustrate the cases of individuals who are willing to implement the new understanding that English proficiency means the ability to communicate orally in English. Chapter 9 traces the transformation of individuals from those lacking the confidence to communicate to those having such confidence. Chapter 10 shows the case of a teacher who is learning new pedagogy to match this new approach that views communicative competence as an important English skill. This is a case where the rhetoric of creating individuals with English communication skills is implemented. It traces the transformation of an intern (high school English teacher) from practicing the grammar-translation method to learning to appreciate and practice CLT by introducing his journal entries and his supervisor's (Rosenkjar) response to it during his year-long internship at Temple University's Japan Campus. Rosenkjar's step-by-step method of how the teacher was transformed is helpful for those who want to create a similar internship program. The additional questions we might pose relate to how to frame and analyze this change: Is this transformation from Japanese (grammar-translation method actually originated in Prussia; see Wong 2006) to American forms of pedagogy and a change from backward to progressive? Given that Rosenkjar acted as a mentor to the teacher/intern, in such action research situations how does this relationship affect what and how the teacher/intern wrote in his journal, written to be shown to the mentor?

ENGLISH AS THE GLOBAL LANGUAGE

When thinking about EFL education, it is important to situate it in the notion of English as a global language. Robert Phillipson (1992) argues that the spread of English as a global language is not a neutral phenomenon but the result of carefully orchestrated foreign policies of Great Britain and later, the United States. Alistair Pennycook argues that the perceptions about English are embedded in processes of globalization. The notion of English as a single entity creates a delusion that those who can speak it are promised social and material gain, although English is tied to particular class positions and possibilities of development. Also, despite the belief that English is a language of equal opportunity, English actually operates as an exclusionary class dialect, favoring particular people, cultures, and forms of knowledge and excluding others (Pennycook, 2007b). Explicit discussion of this aspect of the notion of English as the global language and the prevalence of English in Japan can deepen analyses in this volume.

Chapter 6 by Poole and Takahashi shows how the perception of English as a global language gets co-opted by elite parents as a marker of privilege given to MEXT-accredited schools in Japan, which renders the original aim of being a private "international school" a mere label of privilege given to almost-regular Japanese private schools. What seems to be occurring is the conflation of various pedagogies (e.g., open-class and critical literacy), their outcome (e.g., "global"-mindedness), and the language of instruction: English-medium education is assumed to be progressive education that produces global-minded individuals. This conflation can also be seen in the evaluation of schools; the language which the students end up using seems to be considered as a measurement of whether or not they become critical thinkers or global-minded individuals. What it means to be "global," what is considered the symbol of "global", and what languages "global" individuals speak are all important questions we need to investigate in particular contexts, as globalist ideology (Tsing, 2000) permeates. This chapter shows the localization of such globalism in schools, but also its influences our analytic frameworks.

It is worth noting here that, in the Japanese context, English has another dimension. English has been a school subject in Japanese middle and high schools for decades, thus English is not necessarily tied to the notion of globalization. However, it is worthwhile thinking about the effects of English privileged over other non-Japanese languages—the English-centrism—in the context of global linguistic imperialism of English. Chapter 5 in particular implicitly suggests such an analysis, as Imoto and Horiguchi mention the power relations between various foreign language subjects in Japan, zooming out from the focus on English education in Japan and situating English education in the education of various foreign languages in Japan. Especially, this chapter draws the readers' attention to the politics that involve teachers of non-English European languages that have been suffering from decreased popularity among students and their link to the increasingly popular non-Japanese Asian languages.

This linguistic imperialism of English is played out not only in the public domain of education but also in our research focus reflecting the debates in the public domain. Then, when discussing English education in Japan, looking at the assumption of English as the global language that lies behind the prevalence of English education in Japan helps us tackle the politics of language education more in depth.

Implication of Publishing about Japan in English

I would like to end this afterword by reflecting critically upon ourselves as authors and how we render our research and writing practices—in particular, the use of English as the medium of writing here in this volume. Although most of us have the ability to write in Japanese, why are we writing this volume about language policy in Japan in English, not Japanese?

The choice of language always includes certain people and excludes others. We need to be aware of not only who we are including in our readership, but also who we are excluding, which may or may not be intentional. Writing in English allows us to reach the readership of those who are not specialists on Japan (i.e., may not read Japanese) in the areas of policy, language, and education. But by doing so we exclude those who work on issues in Japan without reading English.

By writing this volume in English we are in a sense supporting the importance of English over Japanese as the medium of communication in academic writing. Some may argue that we are unwittingly supporting a global linguistic imperialism of English, and reflecting current change in government policies in Japan regarding the use of English. Certainly, a Japanese readership would benefit from the discussions in this volume, and so we as authors must continue the dialogue (proposed by the editors in the Introduction of this volume) in its true sense, translating and publishing this book in Japanese, as well as reflecting on the implications of this process. We would urge others who publish in English to also address this issue and to publish in the language of the people that the research is about. This is an attention to praxis (Freire, 1970) that researchers involved in the issues of language and beyond should pursue.

REFERENCES

ACTFL. (1999). *Proficiency guidelines: Speaking*. Retrieved October 30, 2015, from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/Guidelinesspeak.pdf

ACTFL. (2001). *Proficiency guidelines: Writing*. Retrieved October 30, 2015, from https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/writingguidelines.pdf

Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K. & Harnish, R. M. (1995). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). London, England: Verso.

Balibar, E. (1994). *Masses, classes, ideas: Studies on politics and philosophy before and, after Marx*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (2000). Language philosophy as language ideology: John Locke and Johann Gottfried Herder. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cameron, D. (2002). Globalization and the teaching of "communication skills". In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*. London, England and New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999a). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999b). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). Lingua Franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 923–939.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly,* 33, 185–209.

Crowley, T. (1989). *Standard English and the politics of language*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Doerr, N. (Ed.). (2009). *The native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of "Native speaker effects"*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter

Doerr, N., & Kumagai,Y. (2009). Towards teaching diversity in the second language classroom. In N. Doerr (Ed.), *The native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of "native speaker effects"*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*, 335–356.

Fendler, L. (1988). What is it impossible to think? A genealogy of the educated subject. In T. S. Popkewitz & M. Brennan (Ed). *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research (Republication from (1997). *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 285–300). *The Modern Language Journal,* 91, 757–772.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of 'Acting White'. *Urban Review, 18*,176–206.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

House, J. (2003). English as a lingua Franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*, 556–578.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 157–181.

Kachru, B. (1992/1982). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Mashiko, H. (2003). *Ideologii to shite no "Nihon": "Kokugo," "Nihonshi" no chishiki shakaigaku ["Japan" as an ideology: Sociology of knowledge of "National language," "Japanese history"]*. Tokyo, Japan: Sangensha.

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1991/1985). *Authority in language: Investigating language prescription and standardisation*. London, England: Routledge.

Milroy, L. (1999). Standard English and language ideology in Britain and the United States. In T. Bex & R. J. Watts (Eds.), *Standard English: The widening debate*. London, England: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London, England: Longman.

Pennycook, A. (2007a). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London, England: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2007b). The myth of English as an international language. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Romaine, S. (1997). World Englishes: Standards and the new world order. In L. E. Smith & M. L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Sato, S., & Kumagai, Y. (2010). *Asesumento to Nihongo Kyoiku: Atarasii Hyoka no Riron to Jissen [Assessment and Japanese Language Education: Theories and Practices]*. Tokyo, Japan: Koroshio.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 133–158.

Tsing, A. (2000). The global situation. *Cultural Anthropology, 15*, 327–360.

Tsuda, Y. (1990). *Eigo Shihai no Kozo: Nihon-jin to Ibunka Comyunikeshon [The structure of English dominance: Japanese people and cross-cultural communication]*. Tokyo, Japan: Daisan Shokan.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Wong, S. (2006). *Dialogic approaches to TESOL: Where the ginkgo tree grows*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yasuda, T. (2003). *Datsu "Nihongo" eno shiza [Perspectives towards post "Japanese language"]*. Tokyo, Japan: Sangensha.

Yasuda, T. (2006). *Togogenri toshiteno Kokugo: Kindai Nihongoshi Saiko [National language as a unifying principle: Rethinking the history of modern Japanese]*. Tokyo, Japan: Sangensha.

APPENDIX

Discussion Questions

(Note: L1=first language, L2=second language)

CHAPTER 2

Lee and Doerr

Overseas Japanese Weekend School

What do you think are the general differences in the needs of short-time resident children, long-term resident children, and permanent-resident children studying Japanese outside Japan?

What is the role of languages—L1 and L2—in the formation of children's social identity? What role, if any, should the government of a home country have in the formation of a national identity among the children of expatriates?

CHAPTER 3

Hardy

Writing a Textbook

Who are the ideal persons to author a junior high school language textbook in Japan? Discuss the authors' language backgrounds, educational backgrounds, professional experiences, and other qualities you deem important.

If you were to write a junior high school English textbook (for Japan or for your home country), what kinds of people and places and what variety of English would you choose for the book? Why?

CHAPTER 4

Murata

JSL for Non-Japanese Graduate Students and Corporate Employees

At research universities in Japan planning to internationalize their graduate programs in science, what kinds of language training are necessary for:

1. L1-Japanese faculty and graduate students?
2. non-L1-Japanese faculty and graduate students?

How might the all-English policy implemented at some major Japanese corporations affect the employees in terms of their L2 development, and of their morale in general?

CHAPTER 5

Imoto and Horiguchi

CEFR

What do you think of the adoptability of CEFR's three principles-—plurilingualism, autonomy, and communicative language—in your particular teaching or learning context?

How would the existence of a "dichotomized tension" in the ideologies of language education such as the one described in this chapter affect the learners at the institution?

CHAPTER 6

Poole and Takahashi

International Primary School

Former Education Minister Ibuki Bunmei stated that English should not be taught at the elementary level because it would diminish the Japanese sense of values (see Introduction). What do you think of this statement?

If a friend or yours, who is a monolingual Japanese, consulted with you about sending her L1 Japanese child to an international school in Japan, what kind of advice would you give to the friend, and why?

CHAPTER 7

Matikainen

Good English Teacher/Learner

Who is the best language teacher you have had in your life? Explain in what way(s) the teacher was “good.”

In your particular teaching or learning context, what do you think are the differences between the teachers’ expectations and the students’ expectations and assumptions about good teachers/learners of a language?

CHAPTER 8

Katayama

Pronunciation

In your particular teaching/learning context, what is considered to be “good” English pronunciation and what is “bad” pronunciation? What are the reasons for these beliefs?

Outside the classroom, who is the audience of students’ spoken L2 in your professional or educational context?

What are the advantages, if any, of having an accent when speaking in an L2?

CHAPTER 9

Matsuoka

Volunteering and Willingness to Communicate

In your experience using an L2, what kind of out-of-class activities reduced, or increased, your communication apprehension, and why?

The study reported that other-directedness could enhance willingness to communicate. What are some occasions when perfectionism and competitiveness may raise the learner’s willingness to communicate?

CHAPTER 10

Rosenkjar

Teacher Internship

What difficulties would teachers face when trying to introduce to a Japanese compulsory school context instructional methods such as communicative language teaching (CLT), which were not developed in Japan?

What kinds of training might be effective for in-service high school English teachers in Japan, most of whom are overworked and can spare only limited time for professional development?

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Neriko Musha Doerr holds a Ph.D. in cultural anthropology from Cornell University. Her research interests include language and power, politics of difference, and education in Japan, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the United States. She is also interested in these topics as they pertain to study abroad and alternative break trips. Her publications include *Rethinking Language and Culture in Japanese Education* (2014, coedited with Shinji Sato); *Constructing the Heritage Language Learner* (2013, coauthored with Kiri Lee); *Heritage, Nationhood, and Language* (2011, editor); *The Native Speaker Concept* (2009, editor); *Meaningful Inconsistencies: Bicultural Nationhood, Free Market, and Schooling in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (2009); and articles in journals such as *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, Compare*, *Critical Asian Studies, Critical Discourse Studies,* and *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education.* She currently teaches at Ramapo College in New Jersey, USA.

Thomas Hardy is an associate professor at the Faculty of Nursing and Medical Care, Keio University, Tokyo, Japan. He received his Ph.D. in anthropology from the New School for Social Research in New York. His areas of research include language education and materials development, the anthropology of education, urban communities, identity, and Japan. Since 1995, he has worked closely with the publisher of English language textbooks for Japanese junior high school and high school students. He describes his ongoing research project based on this experience as steps toward an ethnography of a language textbook. Thomas' most recent publication is "International Education: The Beginnings" (2015) in Mock, Naganuma, and Kawamura (eds), *The Impact of Internationalization on Universities in Japan: Is Japanese Higher Education Really Changing?*.

Sachiko Horiguchi is an assistant professor of anthropology at Temple University Japan Campus. She obtained her M.A. in English Language Studies and Methods from the University of Warwick in 2001 and D.Phil. in Social Anthropology from the University of Oxford in 2006. Her main areas of research include youth mental health issues, globalization of education, and multiculturalism in Japan. Her publications include "Fostering Learning Through Unlearning Institutional Boundaries: A 'Team Ethnography' of a Liminal Intercultural Space at a Japanese University" in *Ethnography and Education* (2015, coauthored with Yuki Imoto) and "Hikikomori: How Private Isolation Caught the Public Eye" (2012), in Goodman et al., eds, *A Sociology of Japanese Youth*.

Yuki Imoto received her doctorate degree in social anthropology from the University of Oxford in 2009 and is currently an assistant professor at Keio University. Her research and teaching is mainly focused on ethnographic approaches to education and transnational identity in Japan; topics that she has covered include Japanese higher education, early childhood English language education, and community-based alternative learning. Her main publications include *A Sociology of Japanese Youth—From Returnees to NEETs* (2011; coedited with Roger Goodman and Tuukka Toivonen) and "Producing the 'International' Child: Negotiations of Language in an International Preschool in Japan" in *Ethnography and Education* (2011).

Akiko Katayama is an assistant professor at the Center for Global Communication Strategies at the University of Tokyo. In addition to teaching academic English, she manages the on-campus writing center, Komaba Writers' Studio. Since receiving a doctorate degree in education from Temple University in 2008, she has conducted various qualitative studies, mainly using ethnographic and narrative approaches, to investigate discourses of English and English education in Japan. She also collaborates with other researchers on mixed-method studies about language education. Her interests also include the philosophy of research, especially poststructuralism and postmodernism.

Ryuko Kubota is a professor in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Her research focuses on critical approaches to applied linguistics. She is a co-editor of *Race, Culture, and Identities in Second Language: Exploring Critically Engaged Practice* (2009) and *Demystifying Career Paths After Graduate School: A Guide for Second Language Professionals in Higher Education* (2012). Her publications also appear in such journals as *Applied Linguistics, Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education, Journal of Journal of Second Language Writing, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Linguistics and Education,* and *TESOL Quarterly.* She has also (co-) edited special topic issues for academic journals and published numerous chapters in edited books.

Kiri Lee is a professor of Japanese at the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, Lehigh University, Pennsylvania, USA. She received her Ph.D. in linguistics from Harvard University in 1993. Her research areas are heritage language education and Japanese pragmatics. In heritage language education, she has collaborated with Neriko Doerr on publications that include "Why Bother Continue Learning Heritage Language?: Towards Policies of Valuing Heritage Language in the Mainstream," in *Education in a World of Migration: Implications for Policy and Practice* (2014), and *Constructing the Heritage Language Learner: Knowledge, Power, and New Subjectivities* (2013). Her recent publications in pragmatics include

"Beyond 'Power and Solidarity': Indexing Intimacy in Korean and Japanese Terms of Address" (*Korean Linguistics*, 2013, coauthored with Y. Yu Cho).

Tiina Matikainen is an instructor in the English for Liberal Arts program at International Christian University (ICU) in Tokyo, Japan, where she mainly teaches academic writing and critical thinking to Japanese learners. She received her Ed.D. from Temple University Japan Campus in Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education with specialization in TESOL. Her dissertation was entitled *Semantic Representation and Development of L2 Lexicon in Japanese University Students.* Tiina's research interests include L2 lexicon, English for Academic Purposes programs, academic writing for L2 students, and teacher and student beliefs.

Rieko Matsuoka is a professor of applied linguistics in the Department of Human Sciences at the National College of Nursing, Tokyo, Japan. Her areas of research include willingness to communicate, medical discourse analysis, linguistic relativity in *rakugo* translation, and autonomy in computer-assisted language learning. She is one of the founders of the Japan Association of Medical Interpreters (JAMI). Rieko's publications include "Japanese University Students' Willingness to Communicate in English: The Serendipitous Effect of Oral Presentations" (*Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 2014, coauthored with Kahoko Matsumoto, Gregory S. Poole, and Misato Matsuoka); "Does Language Form our Thoughts?" (*East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 2014); "Exploring the Optimal Employment of Digital Pedagogy in the Japanese English Classrooms from Socio-psychological Perspectives" (*ELT Quarterly*, 2013); and *Japanese College Students' Willingness to Communicate in English* (2009).

Akiko Murata is an associate professor of Japanese language and culture at the Global Education Center, Hosei University, Tokyo, Japan. Her area of research includes the anthropology of education, Japanese language, and fieldwork education. Her publications include "Constructing the Third Space for International Students through SNS Networking" (*Intercultural Education*, 2014); "An Analysis of the Career Development of Highly Skilled Foreign Workers" (*Intercultural Education*, 2011); and "The Meaning of Bricolage in Pluri-lingual Situations: The Analysis of Two Engineering Communities" (*Literacies*, 2011).

Gregory S. Poole is a professor of sociocultural anthropology and Dean of The Institute for the Liberal Arts at Doshisha University. Prior to coming to Kyoto, he was a faculty member in the Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Tsukuba. His areas of research include the anthropology of education, language, and Japan, and his publications include *Reframing Diversity in the Anthropology of Japan* (2015, coedited with John Ertl, John Mock, and John McCreery); "International' Higher Education In Japan: Expanding Intracultural

Knowledge or (Re)defining Intercultural Boundaries?” (2015, in Mock, Naganuma, and Kawamura, eds, *The Impact of Internationalization on Universities in Japan: Is Japanese Higher Education Really Changing?*); *The Japanese Professor: An Ethnography of a University Faculty* (2010); *Higher Education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the Professoriate* (2009, coedited with Ya-chen Chen); and “The Japanese University in Crisis,” (*Higher Education,* 2005, coauthored with Ikuo Amano).

Patrick R. Rosenkjar is a full professor of English Education in the College of Liberal Arts, Temple University Japan Campus, Tokyo, Japan. He teaches undergraduate courses in humanities, literature, and linguistics and graduate courses in TESOL methods. He is a former director of Temple’s Academic English Program, in which capacity he created and oversaw the internship program for Japanese teachers of high school English. His areas of research include classroom-based research, needs analysis for curriculum development, second-language reading processes and strategies, genre and stylistic analyses, and case studies of second-language curriculum and course design. His publications include “American English as Cultural Expression: Designing a New Course in Linguistic Analysis of Culture for EFL Undergraduates in Japan” (2006, in Snow & Kamhi-Stein, eds, *Developing a New Course for Adult Learners*); “Adapting a Japanese High School Textbook to Teach Reading Microskills Communicatively” (2009, in Savova, ed, *Using Textbooks Effectively*); and “Poetry in Second Language Task-Based Learning” (2010, Shehadeh & Coombe, eds, *Applications of Task-Based Learning in TESOL*).

Hinako Takahashi is a lecturer at the University of Maryland University College in Okinawa where she teaches courses on education and language. She earned a M.A. in Applied Linguistics from the University of Massachusetts Boston and a Ph.D. in Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies from the University of New Mexico. Her interests include second-language education, bilingual education, heritage language, and Vygotsky’s sociocultural theories. While living in the U.S. for almost 20 years, she was a lecturer at New Mexico Highlands University, an elementary school teacher for over 10 years, and also worked for a school reform consulting organization as the literacy specialist. Hinako was born in Japan, lived in Spain as a teenager, and in the U.S. as an adult.

INDEX