INTERROGATING THE PRESENCE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE *NIHONJINRON* DISCOURSE IN JAPANESE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL EFL CLASSROOMS

By

JEREMIE BOUCHARD

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham
for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English Literature
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
November 2015

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive
e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This Modular PhD research project investigates the relationship between *nihonjinron* and EFL classroom practices in Japanese junior high schools. Its overarching concerns are *Can traces of nihonjinron be found in the body of data gathered for this module?* and *How important are these traces to observed EFL practices?* By adopting a social realist approach to critical social research, attention is brought to agentive processes – as revealed through ethnographic means of inquiry – in the study of ideological discourse. In the process, the gaps and contradictions between what people say and what they do emerge as important research concerns, and as points of interest in the analysis of the complex links between structural and agentive processes shaping Japanese EFL education in secondary schools. Analysis of the data collected for this module reveals that the presence of *nihonjinron* in, and its importance to, observed EFL practices is marginal.

49,932 words (excluding cover page, abstract, acknowledgments, table of contents, lists of illustrations and tables, in-text tables and figures, reference list, and appendixes)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Joe Bennett for acting as my supervisor midway through this modular PhD research project, for helping me in countless ways, and for providing me with valuable advice on how to make this project a reality. My special gratitude to Dr. Alison Sealey, my first supervisor, who introduced me to social realism and to the central interrogation in this project, which is the complex relationship between what people say and what they do. At no less a level of appreciation, I would also like to thank my co-workers at Hokkai Gakuen University, who are always very patient and supportive. I am also greatly indebted to the four devoted Japanese EFL teachers who took part in this study. Without their help, generosity and willingness to explore various aspects of their everyday experiences as language learners and teachers, this project would simply not have been possible. Finally, I owe my deepest gratitude to my wife, Toyo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction 1

1.1 Research questions and general research approach 3

2 Two theoretical perspectives grounding this module 6

2.1 Linguistic ethnography 6

2.2 Critical classroom discourse analysis 9

3 Data and method 11

3.1 Data collection 11

3.2 Types of data 15

3.2.1 Audio-recording of classroom discourse 16

3.2.2 Field notes 17

3.2.3 Textbooks and printed classroom materials 19

3.2.4 Teacher interviews 21

3.2.5 Teacher and student surveys 23

3.3 Data analysis 25

3.3.1 Data selection 25

3.3.2 Data transcription 27

3.3.3 Data coding 29

3.3.4 Linking data segments within and across data sources 30

3.4 Translation 33

3.5 Data triangulation 36

3.6 Reflexivity 38
3.7 Ethical considerations 42

4 Exploring the Japanese JHS English classroom 45
4.1 The language classroom: discourse, socialization and power 45
4.2 The foreign language classroom 51
4.3 Japanese JHS 52
4.4 Public and private JHS 54
4.5 Japanese JHS English classrooms 55
4.6 Japanese JHS English teachers 56
4.7 EFL students in Japanese JHS 58

5 The study 61
5.1 Dominant features in the data 66
5.1.1 Teachers' choice of language in the classroom 67
5.1.2 Code-switching 71
5.1.3 Use of English with simultaneous translation 81
5.1.4 Use of English without translation 86
5.1.5 Culture teaching 92
5.1.6 Challenges faced by English teachers 104
5.2 Perspectives held by teachers and students in regards to EFL education 109
5.2.1 Teachers' views on MEXT policies 110
5.2.2 Teachers' views on culture teaching 111

5.2.3 Teachers’ views on monolingual EFL education 120

5.2.4 Students’ views on EFL education 122

5.2.4.1 Statements related to the EFL classroom 124

5.2.4.2 Statements related to the *nihonjinron* discourse 125

5.3 Explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse 128

5.3.1 ‘Unique Japan’ and ‘traditional Japan’ 130

5.3.2 Cultural polarization 144

5.3.3 Japanese students as monolingual 149

5.3.4 Contradicting the *nihonjinron* discourse 154

5.4 Links between *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices 161

5.4.1 Linking *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices through data triangulation 161

5.4.2 Insights from work conducted in previous sections 165

5.4.3 Insights from work conducted in Section 5.3 168

5.5 Relevance of the findings to observed EFL practices 171

5.5.1 Exam pressures, CLT and grammar translation 172

5.5.2 Code-switching 174

5.5.3 The act of ‘performing English’ and the reproduction of the English language 180

5.5.4 ‘Traditional Japan’ and the demand for recognition 185

5.5.5 Influences outside the classroom 192

6 Relevance of the current study to *nihonjinron* research 195

6.1 Contradictions in the data 196

6.2 Revisiting *nihonjinron* 207

6.3 Implications for the critical work on *nihonjinron* 212

6.4 Moving beyond *nihonjinron* 215

7 Conclusion 223

References 226

Appendix 1: Data gathering documents 243

Appendix 2: Sample of classroom transcript 252

Appendix 3: Field note template 256

Appendix 4: Interview questions (with interview dates) 258

Appendix 5: Interview transcript sample 262

Appendix 6: Student attitude survey 273

Appendix 7: Survey on teachers' use of language in the classroom 275

Appendix 8: List of codes 277

Appendix 9: Analyzed excerpts 278

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1 72
Figure 2 73
Figure 3 73
Figure 4 73
Figure 5 74
Figure 6 74
Figure 7 75
Figure 8 76
Figure 9 77
Figure 10 78
Figure 11 79
Figure 12 81
Figure 13 81
Figure 14 82
Figure 15 83
Figure 16 84
Figure 17 87
Figure 18 89
Figure 19 92
Figure 20 93
Figure 21 95
Figure 22 96
Figure 23 98
Figure 24 99
Figure 25 105
Figure 26 105
Figure 27 106
Figure 28 107
Figure 29 107
Figure 30 112
Figure 31 113
Figure 32 113
Figure 33 115
Figure 34 116
Figure 35 116
Figure 36 117
Figure 37 118
Figure 38 118
Figure 39 120
Figure 40 131
Figure 41 132
Figure 42 133
Figure 43 134
Figure 44 135
Figure 45 136
Figure 46 137
Figure 47 138
Figure 48 140
Figure 49 143
Figure 50 145
Figure 51 146
Figure 52 149
Figure 53 150
Figure 54 151
Figure 55 153
Figure 56 155
Figure 57 155
Figure 58 156
Figure 59 157
Figure 60 158
Figure 61 159
Figure 62 159
Figure 63 160
Figure 64 176
Figure 65 179

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Insight expected from analysis of specific data sources 16

Table 2 Functional distribution of L1/L2 in teacher talk, in relation to total teacher talk 70

Table 3 Statements of significance in the student survey 123

Table 4 Distribution of *nihonjinron*-related codes in the data 162

1. INTRODUCTION

In this Modular PhD research project, I investigate the relationship between *nihonjinron* and EFL classroom practices in Japanese junior high schools (JHS). I devoted Module One to an exploration of *nihonjinron* and its critiques, proposed five central research questions and outlined seven challenges in this modular project. In Module Two, I developed a theoretical and methodological approach to conducting CDA research in line with social realism. I also analyzed recent MEXT policy documents pertaining to junior high school EFL education with regards to *nihonjinron*. I concluded that, while recent MEXT policy discourse on EFL education contains traces of *nihonjinron*, the ideology does not appear to guide policy discourse. This conclusion was reinforced by ample evidence in these documents of other discourses contrasting with *nihonjinron*.

In this third and final module, I analyze observed EFL classroom practices with reference to *nihonjinron*. Specifically, I ask *Can traces of nihonjinron be found in the body of data gathered for this module?* and *How important are these traces to observed EFL practices?* By adopting a social realist approach to critical social research, I bring attention to agentive processes – as revealed through ethnographic means of inquiry – in the study of ideological discourse. The research approach for this module – hereby presented as an ethnographically-based critical classroom discourse analysis of *nihonjinron* in Japanese EFL classrooms – aims to narrow the critique of *nihonjinron* to the level of classroom practice. In the process, the gaps and contradictions between what people say and what they do have emerged as important research concerns. These gaps have emerged through a stratified investigation, revealing insight into the complex links between structural and agentive processes shaping Japanese EFL education in secondary schools.

Before initiating the analysis in this module, it is important to provide a short definition of *nihonjinron* and summarize the aims and rationale of the study. Drawing from the literature on *nihonjinron* and the discussion in Module One, I take *nihonjinron* to be an approach to conceptualizing and presenting Japanese people, language, society, culture and nation as 'uniquely unique' entities, as possessing a 'heart' or essence that is the exclusive possession of people of Japanese ethnicity. *Nihonjinron* (日本人論) contains four symbols, the first three referring to 'Japanese people' and the suffix 'ron' (論) referring to 'theory'. It can also refer to 'opinion', 'view', 'way of thinking', 'reasoning', 'comment', 'discussion', and 'argument'. In the critical literature on *nihonjinron*, five arguments have been identified as characteristic of the *nihonjinron* rhetoric: racial, geographical, climatic, linguistic, and psychological arguments. The emergence of *nihonjinron* is said to have occurred slightly before and during the Second World War, a period of Japanese history fraught with antagonism towards the West and English, which represented the language of the enemy. After the war, attitudes towards English education in Japan changed, although the economic boom is said to have created a social and cultural context in which *nihonjinron* was able to flourish.

To explain the struggles faced by social agents in the Japanese EFL system in adjusting to recent trends in academic research and educational practice observed in other EFL nations, some researchers have identified *nihonjinron* as a main 'culprit'. To a large extent, this project is a response to criticisms of the Japanese EFL system which suggest that a) the dominant approaches to EFL education in Japan are motivated by a said need to protect Japaneseness, and b) these ideologically motivated approaches ultimately constrain Japanese EFL learners in their attempts to become successful target language users. In light of this, the central objective of this module is to interrogate the potential link(s) between Japanese junior high school EFL classroom discourse and practice and the ideological discourse of *nihonjinron*. To meet this objective, the project provides an ethnographic account of *nihonjinron* in the Japanese EFL educational context, and in the process provides insight into the ideological nature of contextualized foreign language education.

1.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND GENERAL RESEARCH APPROACH

Analyzing observed EFL classroom practices with reference to *nihonjinron* requires analytical movements between broader structural realities and detailed aspects of the data. Instead of focusing exclusively on *nihonjinron* traces in the data, this investigation also requires an initial look beyond the scope of *nihonjinron* to reveal the various processes happening in observed EFL classrooms. This process helps situate subsequent analyses of *nihonjinron* in the body of data, and address a crucial concern in this module: the importance of the ideology to observed EFL practices.

To guide the investigation in this module, I propose the following five questions:

1. What are the dominant features of the English classes in the schools where data is collected (e.g. objectives, materials, activities, teaching approaches, learner participation)?
2. What range of perspectives do teachers and students hold in regards to the English classroom, their actions in it, and EFL education in general?
3. Based on the work done to answer Questions 1 and 2, to what extent does Japanese JHS English classroom discourse includes explicit references to concepts related to *nihonjinron*, as discussed in Sections One and Two of Module One?
4. What conclusions can be drawn about the nature of the relationship between *nihonjinron* and EFL practices in Japanese JHS, if such a relationship does exist?
5. How, and to what extent, does this potential relationship affect the way English is taught in Japanese schools?

Together, these questions address the two overarching interrogations in this module: *Can traces of nihonjinron be found in the data?* and *How important are these traces to observed EFL practices?* To answer Questions 1 and 2 above, I provide a general view of pertinent internal and external conditions and realities shaping observed EFL practices, combining insight drawn from the literature with evidence gathered in the field. This investigation serves to situate the findings gathered from answering Questions 3, 4 and 5. To answer Question 3, I look at specific elements in the body of data selected on the basis of the discussion on *nihonjinron* conducted in Modules One and Two. Answering Questions 4 and 5 involves drawing connections between observations gathered from answers to Questions 1, 2 and 3 and theoretical concepts available in the existing research on foreign language education and ideology.

Analysis of the data in this module will reveal that the presence of *nihonjinron* in, and its importance to, observed EFL practices is marginal. On the other hand, the various – and at times conflicting – processes observed in the data will be revealed as the outcomes of multiple factors of both discursive and material natures which, in part, include *nihonjinron*. In the next chapter, I summarize two ontological perspectives grounding the work in this module.

2. TWO THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES GROUNDING THIS MODULE

As stated at the onset of this module, a crucial analytical concern in this module is measuring the importance of *nihonjinron* to observed EFL practices. Yet, as mentioned in Section 3.3.1.1 of Module One, there is simply no definite empirical approach to determining whether or not *nihonjinron* has a direct and debilitating impact on EFL classroom practices. However, one can theorize about the importance of the ideology to EFL practices through triangulation of data and approaches to analysis.

I begin this section on theory by discussing two perspectives which a) emphasize triangulation and reflexivity, and b) help ground the methodology used in this module: linguistic ethnography (LE) and critical classroom discourse analysis (CCDA). While not comprehensive summaries of either perspective, the following two sections focus on elements from LE and CCDA aligned with a social realist approach to critical social research. These elements, or issues, include: a) the need in ideology critique for evidence of both discursive and material natures, and b) the combination of multiple data sources and research approaches.

2.1 LINGUISTIC ETHNOGRAPHY

To conduct the analysis in this module, I adopt aspects of LE, defined by Wetherell (2007: 661) thus: “linguistics takes language as its object while ethnography, of course, privileges culture.” LE combines these two core components in order to clarify "the intersection of communicative practice with social and cultural process" (Rampton, 2007: 595). For most of the analysis in this module, however, I sidestep LE's formal linguistic approach to studying language and patterns of communication, and instead consider its ethnographic focus on small social groups through participant observation and other more or less unstructured and adaptable research methods (Hammersley, 2007). My analysis of teachers' code-switching practices in Section 5.1.2, on the other hand, includes a stronger emphasis on how speakers use language, which is a core concern in LE. In sum, various aspects of LE are useful at different points throughout this module.

Pivotal to the work in this module is the debate over the relevance of linguistic research to a study of people's identity, beliefs and subjectivity. This debate focuses mostly on the range of insight emerging from analyses of spoken and/or written text. Wetherell (2007: 671) argues that "[a]ll we have access to is language-in-use. We do not have access to people's mental states, only to how they describe these states moment to moment." However, as ethnography makes it possible to gather evidence of both discursive and material natures, it would be mistaken to assume that discourse constitute the only source of data about social processes. In contrast to Wetherell's position, I argue that social realities including identity, beliefs, subjectivity and ideology are not exclusively discursive articulations: they are also related to material and structural conditions (Joseph, 2002). In the current study, this requires studying *nihonjinron* in a range of ethnographic data, through a combination of research approaches. From a critical angle, it also means that the potential for ideology to constrain people's words and actions is not negated simply through engagement in alternative discourse practices. We are not entirely free to extricate ourselves from constraints through discursive means, or as Archer (2012: 126) puts it, "constructing our biographies […] as we please."

Wetherell (2007) points out that the ethnographer's task is not to simply describe reality as it appears, but to theorize "about the nature of the mind at any time" (p.672). While this argument is central to LE research, it suggests that certain aspects of social reality can only be accessible through theorization. A danger in uncritically accepting this argument is that analysts can blur the distinction between making sense of the data and making knowledge claims (Fairclough, 1992, 2010; Sealey, 2007). Nevertheless, because the Japanese EFL classroom contains aspects which may not be empirically observable, theorizing remains a crucial element at the analysis stage of this module.

Developing core principles grounding LE, Maybin & Tusting (2011: 12) specify that

> researchers need to think through the complexities of […] mechanisms by means of which these different levels of reality can influence one another. The underlying understanding of how reality works and how we can know about it, that is, the ontological and epistemological framings of the research, shape how these relationships and mechanisms are understood.

As indicated in Section 1 of Module Two, a realist approach to social research looks at society from a stratified perspective, and warns against conflating different strata – or levels of knowledge. In her proposal for an analytical separation of structure, culture and agency in LE, Sealey (2007) stresses the need to study each stratum to understand how the others operate. She specifies that ethnographic work does not necessarily provide access to structural processes, arguing that LE “cannot account for the pre-existing structural properties and powers which are experienced as constraints and enablements by these social actors: different kinds of research methods are needed to explore this dimension of social reality” (p.641). This argument is central to justifying the use in this module of a) data and method triangulation, and b) a stratified approach to critical social research.

In the next section, I summarize key elements in CCDA, the critical study of classroom discourse and practice.

2.2 CRITICAL CLASSROOM DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Writers including Christie (2002), Kumaravadivelu (1999), Sadeghi et al. (2011) and Bloome et al. (2005) provide multiple perspectives on CCDA. Generally speaking, CCDA attempts to overcome the shortcomings of discourse analysis (DA) and conversation analysis (CA) by providing strategies for analyzing the links between broader realities and observed classroom practices.

Seven interrelated principles, taken from works by Kumaravadivelu (1999) and Bloome et al. (2005), are parallel to social realist research. I divide these principles in two sets, with the first set defining classroom discourse as:

a) both distinct from, and drawing from, other types of discourse – as well as material conditions – found in the social world;

b) jointly constructed between classroom actors, often politically motivated and historically determined;

c) showing articulated or unarticulated processes of social reproduction as well as a range of manifestations of resistance against power structures and hegemonic discourse;

d) revealing certain power structures which facilitate both the learning process and the interpersonal relations between classroom actors, events, institutions, and ideologies.

The second set of principles defines CCDA as a process of:

a) taking into account discourse participants' views, expectations, beliefs, identities, and anxieties towards the object of learning;

b) identifying and understanding the links and mismatches between actions and intentions of classroom actors, as well as their interpretations;

c) considering how much can be known from classroom data, how much attention can be paid to things not evident in the data, and the type of methodology useful to achieve these tasks.

Together, these principles help reinforce this ethnographically-based critical classroom discourse analysis, and provide avenues for exploring the presence of *nihonjinron* in – and its said importance to – observed EFL practices in Japanese JHS. In the following chapter, I describe the data and methods used to conduct the investigation in this module.

3. DATA AND METHODS

In this chapter, I describe the data and methods used to conduct the work in this module. Topics include: data collection, types of data, data analysis, translation, data triangulation, and reflexivity in critical social research.

3.1 DATA COLLECTION

This ethnographically-based critical classroom discourse analysis is essentially concerned with specific local contexts where EFL education is conducted, and not with EFL education in all Japanese JHS. As such, it does not attempt to provide data and findings which are representative of the entire population of Japanese JHS teachers and students, nor does it aim to hold strong statistical relevance. Although the data samples do not represent educational discourses and practices observed within the entire population of Japanese JHS classroom actors, they nevertheless provide valuable information about discourses and practices which have taken place in these specific local contexts.

Due to the stratified nature of this investigation of *nihonjinron* in context, the data sample selection process required initial considerations for the range of possible evidence needed to reflect processes observed at the level of structure, culture and agency. These considerations resulted in the selection of the types of data listed and described in Section 3.2 below. While statistical relevance was not a concern in this study, it was nevertheless important that the data selected would represent the specific subgroups within the Japanese JHS system. Hence, I adopted a stratified random sampling, which led me to select 3 public schools and one private school as representative of the relevant characteristics of the Japanese JHS system. However, the body of data used in this study represents English education as conducted in local JHS, and is not necessarily representative of how EFL education is conducted in other JHS or across Japan. These schools are located in Sapporo, Japan's fourth largest city and the capital of the northernmost island of Hokkaido. I selected these four schools out of a total of 6 possible schools, with administrative concerns impeding further work at 2 schools. Because time and resources were limited, I decided to focus on one group of students at each school, taught by one teacher. Furthermore, because I wanted students to have some degree of language learning experience, and because I wanted to look into the cultural content of EFL education in JHS, I chose to exclude classes in the first year simply because these tend to concentrate on rudimentary knowledge of the target language while overlooking contents related to target cultures. Finally, analysis of printed texts focused principally on the textbooks and teacher-produced materials that were used during the observed classes, which means that I did not analyze textbook and material contents not covered during the classes recorded.

Following recommendations for reasonable ethnographic database proposed by Walsh (2006) and Seedhouse (2004), I audio-recorded 10 classes of 50 minutes each, at each school, for a total of 40 classes, or approximately 2,000 minutes (33.3 hours) of audio-recorded data. 20 of these classes were at the 2nd year level and the remaining 20 were at the 3rd year level. I did not record classes conducted at the 1st year of JHS because classes at this level generally focus on rudimentary knowledge of English. In each school, I focused on one Japanese EFL teacher teaching to one specific group of students. The average number of students per group was 32. The data collection stage began in early May 2013 and ended February 2014.

Discussing ethnographic research in educational contexts, Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) specify that obtaining access to ethnographic data is a lengthy process which involves “the discovery of obstacles to access, and perhaps of effective means of overcoming them” (p.41). Three main issues surfaced during the data collection stage. First, after an extensive preliminary search, few teachers in the Sapporo area were willing to open their classrooms for 10 relatively consecutive classes. This reluctance among Japanese school teachers to participate in research projects is also noted by Kanno (2008). One reason is that most classroom-based studies in Japan are not ethnographically-based: they are usually short term studies based on observation of one or two classes, and prioritize the use of questionnaires and discrete point tests as data collection instruments. To facilitate the data gathering process, I produced five core documents in both Japanese and English (see Appendix 1):

1. a research project summary (approximately 1,000 words)
2. an information sheet (approximately 1,800 words)
3. a consent form for teachers (approximately 500 words)
4. a consent form for students (approximately 500 words)
5. a consent form for parents (approximately 500 words)

The principals were given a few days to review these documents. Other elements which facilitated my access to their schools were a) my post as a full-time EFL lecturer at Hokkai Gakuen University, the second largest university in Hokkaido, b) the reputations of the teachers and professors who initially recommended me, c) my Japanese-speaking ability, d) my research interest in JHS education, and e) the international scope of my research. All four principals asked for my help in improving English education in their school, a symbolic request denoting acceptance and trust. In parallel, three of the four teacher-participants requested help and advice on their teaching practices. The four teacher-participants were relatively committed to pedagogical innovation and improvement of their teaching practices. I still keep contact with these four teachers, although Ms. Inoue of Asahi JHS has been extremely busy of late, and has not returned some of my emails.

To collect the ethnographic data necessary for my research, I was largely dependent on co-workers and professional acquaintances for developing the necessary contacts. The general process began with an individual teacher agreeing to let me observe his or her classroom. This initial consent was obtained through face-to-face communication, after which it became much easier to convince school administrators and principals. The latter’s primary concerns were protecting students’ privacy and anonymity and keeping the integrity of the classroom and curriculum. After formal introductions, I was able to work more independently with each teacher. From then on, work was very smooth due to active collaboration from everyone involved. All my requests for personal interviews were granted, and scheduling issues were always considered in a very professional and timely fashion. Upon advice from peers and experienced researchers, I generally tried to avoid dealing with the large bureaucratic entity that is the local Board of Education. As a result, bureaucratic matters were greatly facilitated by awareness of mutual goals and positive interpersonal rapports between teacher-participants and me.

Due to the challenges in collecting a large body of data from student interviews – legal limitations, logistical concerns, students' generally limited experience with and understanding of their EFL experience – a significantly greater proportion of data reflecting agentive processes in the ethnographic contexts under scrutiny was collected from teacher interviews and classroom data. This means that the strong version of agency adopted in this module resulted in a greater epistemological emphasis on teacher agency. Because students' voices were less prominent in the data, the scope of the current module was limited to some extent. In the next section, I discuss the different types of ethnographic data analyzed in this module.

3.2 TYPES OF DATA

The work in this module is based on both quantitative and qualitative data gathered from five sources: classroom audio-recordings, field notes, textbooks and printed classroom materials, teacher interviews, and teacher and students surveys. The combination of a range of data sources and methods through triangulation facilitates a stratified approach to answering the five research questions stated in Section 1.1. Table 1 summarizes these five data sources and what I expect to find as a result of analysis.

Types of data	Insight expected to be gained
audio-recordings/ transcriptions of classroom discourse/field notes	● evidence of how EFL education is conducted in actual JHS classrooms ● teaching problems and possible solutions to these ● evidence of how classroom discourse is constructed ● implicit and explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse
textbooks and printed classroom materials	● evidence of how policies, macro and micro objectives are transformed into actual teaching materials ● implicit and explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse
audio-recordings/ transcriptions of teacher interviews/teacher surveys	● evidence of JHS English teachers' views on their own teaching, classrooms, students, learning materials, EFL education in general, and language and cultural issues pertaining to Japanese and English ● JHS English teachers' interpretations of selected segments of classroom discourse. ● implicit and explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse
student surveys	● evidence of learners' views on their own language learning process, classrooms, teachers, learning materials, EFL education in general, and language and cultural issues pertaining to Japanese and English ● implicit and explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse

Table 1 – Insight expected from analysis of specific data sources

I now summarize each type of data and their relevance to the current study.

3.2.1 AUDIO-RECORDINGS OF CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

Due to considerable challenges in fulfilling the obligations specified by the Personal Information Law of Japan for the protection of students' privacy, I refrained from using a video camera in the classrooms. In addition, the school administrators and principals would have been more reluctant to grant permission had I elected to use a camera in their classrooms. Moreover, as the focus of inquiry in this module is not necessarily on the non-verbal aspects of classroom discourse, I consider audio-recordings as appropriate for the purposes of this study.

In the transcriptions of audio-recordings and field notes, I indicated non-verbal information only when pertinent to analysis. To record classroom discourse, I used the Olympus LS-100 high quality multi-track recorder as my principal recording equipment. I placed this recorder either at the front of the class, next to the blackboard or on a side shelf. The recordings were saved as MP3 files for easy access. Multiple data backups were completed after each data recording session. I then transcribed segments of classroom discourse of relevance to the five research questions. Over 36,400 words of classroom transcripts were produced (see Appendix 2 for classroom transcript sample).

3.2.2 FIELD NOTES

As a participant-observer, I was always present in each classroom. Depending on the discretion of each teacher, I was a) an assistant language teacher, b) a model for target language use, c) a source of target culture knowledge, and most often d) a quiet observer. Sometimes I fulfilled two or three roles simultaneously.

My extensive field notes included what I saw and heard (see Appendix 3 for field note template). These detailed notes allowed me to record analytical decisions, ongoing reflections, and explanations of classroom practices during and after each class. They also allowed me to identify and take notes of possible instances of *nihonjinron* discourse within context. I also jotted down students' views expressed during class.

In line with Geertz's (1973) approach to thick description and thick explanation, these field notes were first structured by broad strokes, then by details deserving further analysis. Notes were then structured into analytic vignettes, which Creese (2002: 604) defines as capturing "the substantive focus and intent of the observations by portraying sights and sounds in sequence and noting the typicality or atypicality of particular instances." Field notes included:

1. references to schools and teachers;
2. date and time of class;
3. sequence of each class out of 10 classes;
4. environmental conditions of each class;
5. class contents and objectives;
6. references to *nihonjinron* and/or other types of discourses of relevance;
7. detailed descriptions of classroom activities, events;
8. other relevant observations.

I also recorded pertinent observations and information (e.g. techniques, activities, games, etc.) in order to provide teacher-participants with advice on how to improve their teaching practices.

In the classroom, I was always able to move around freely between students' desks and help or interact with them. I frequently used English with the students, although I tended to speak in Japanese during grammar-based activities. Because students often talked to me in Japanese, I also used Japanese to a) facilitate understanding and b) bond with them. Teachers did not ask me to discipline students or do classroom management. On very few occasions at Asahi JHS (Ms. Inoue's class), I told a few boys to quiet down and concentrate on their work.

3.2.3 TEXTBOOKS AND PRINTED CLASSROOM MATERIALS

Browne & Wada (1998: 105) argue that MEXT-approved textbooks "are not necessarily a clear reflection of the Course of Study Guidelines." They cite a study by Knight (1995), who identifies gaps between structure and repetition-oriented activities found in textbooks and communicatively-oriented policies. The authors also argue that these gaps are further exacerbated by EFL teachers' general lack of formal training, their infrequent use of lesson plans, and the fact that every MEXT-approved textbook comes with a teacher manual that emphasizes translation and drill-focused teaching techniques. Komatsu (2002: 50) states that "local education authorities and schools recently have more authority concerning the determination of what is the best curriculum for students." However, the author also states that "following the prescribed national curriculum has been traditionally strictly enforced by the national government in Japan, with the consequence that the MEXT has had a very direct and especially powerful role in Japanese schooling" (p.51).

Since the local Board of Education directly specifies which MEXT-approved textbook is to be used in the roughly 100 JHS in Sapporo, textbooks are hereby understood as important structural elements in Japanese JHS English education. Yet, while input from teachers and school administrators matters less at the policy design stage, implementation of MEXT policies through the teaching of textbook contents depends largely on teachers' and school administrators' interpretations and beliefs about EFL education. However, textbooks remain perhaps the most reliable sources of information about the impact of MEXT policies on classroom practice. In Japan, local authorities are responsible for purchasing textbooks and distributing them free of charge. In addition, while printed classroom materials are often locally-produced, they also reflect how government policies are interpreted on the ground. Together, EFL textbooks and classroom materials are crucial to understanding observed classroom practices because they remain tangible evidence of structural realities within the Japanese EFL system.

To analyze textbooks and classroom materials, I do not replicate my approach to analyzing printed text in Module Two, nor do I analyze all the printed data made available. First, the current module affords little space to do so. Second, the more fine-grained approach to CDA in Module Two is inadequate for an analysis of the large body of data gathered for this study. Finally, my principal interest in this module is to analyze the comsumption of textbook and material contents, which means correlating only the contents pertinent to observed practices, or finding out how materials are used by classroom actors. To facilitate this process, I use field notes to record information about how textbooks and other materials are used in class, how classroom activities are constructed with reference to these materials, and finally the presence of textbook and material contents in classroom discourse.

3.2.4 TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Teacher-participant interviews are another rich source of data for the current study. According to Sealey & Carter (2004: 191),

> [i]nterviews about people's beliefs and attitudes […] must be deemed to convert something which can never be directly perceived (an attitude) into something which can (a statement or response). This is one of the strengths of ethnography as a means of finding out what people actually do […] as opposed to what they say they believe.

As with field-notes, however, interviews only provide a limited range of perspectives. Maxwell (2012: 106) argues that, “[w]hile interviewing is often an efficient and valid way of understanding someone’s perspective, observation can enable you to draw inferences about this perspective that you couldn’t obtain by relying exclusively on interview data.” In this module, interview data is particularly relevant to an analysis of the gaps and contradictions within discourses and between discourse and observed practices.

Throughout the data collection stage, I exchanged with participant-teachers on a variety of topics through face-to-face, telephone and email communication. This allowed me to pilot-test interview questions and survey statements. Interview questions (see Appendix 4 for list) centered on a wider range of topics pertaining to how teachers understand:

a) themselves as language learners and their roles as EFL teachers;
b) students as EFL learners;
c) the presence of English in Japan and its impact on local cultures;
d) the relationship between EFL policies, textbooks and their classrooms; and
e) current problems facing the Japanese EFL system, and possible solutions.

Interviews were generally informal and semi-structured. English was the main language of communication, although there was extensive code-switching. In conducting these interviews, I considered Labov & Fanshel's (1977) point that interviews are mostly heterogeneous – i.e. they are not solely structured by question-answer sequences. They are a mix of Q&A and everyday conversation discourse, coalescing into narratives. I also considered Mishler's (1986) notion that both interviewer and interviewee construct meaning collaboratively. Even if interview questions provided a somewhat rigid communicative structure, they were often open-ended, thus encouraging teachers to elaborate. This often led to new and unscripted questions. Analysis of interview data did not focus only on what was said but also on how it was said. As a result, there was a need for greater engagement with reflexive issues on my part – a central topic in this modular PhD research project discussed in Section 2.4 of Module Two, and developed further in Section 3.6 of this module.

As the interviewer, I tried to adopt an unassuming and accepting approach, and provided non-threatening suggestions when solicited (Hobbs & Kubanyiova, 2008). I chose to avoid words such as ‘ideology’ and ‘*nihonjinron*’ during these interviews because they are rather abstract and can potentially lead to face-threatening situations. I considered Maxwell’s (2012: 104-105) argument that “[t]he development of good interview questions (and observational strategies) requires creativity and insight, rather than a mechanical conversion of the research questions into an interview guide or observation schedule, and depends fundamentally on how the interview questions and observational strategies will actually work in practice.” Instead of explicitly focusing on *nihonjinron*, I was more interested in teachers’ general and detailed views on their day-to-day practices and on EFL education at the JHS level.

Overall, approximately 19 hours of recorded interview data were collected, yielding approximately 60,000 words of transcribed interview data (see Appendix 5 for interview transcript sample). The length and frequency of each interview depended on the availability of each teacher. As indicated earlier, teachers were very generous with their time, often allowing me to interview them after class or during weekends and holidays. Some interviews – especially those conducted immediately after class – were between 10 or 15 minutes long and up to 2 hours.

3.2.5 TEACHER AND STUDENT SURVEYS

During the classroom data collection stage, I handed out an attitude survey to students (see Appendix 6) in order to gain greater insight into their beliefs towards their English learning experiences, their English course, and to EFL education in Japan. This survey included a set of 26 statements in Japanese, all positively worded (e.g. *It is easy for any Japanese person to learn English*; *I can learn about foreign cultures from my English teacher*). Respondents were asked to circle a number from 1 to 6 on a Likert scale identifying degrees of agreement (1 = strong disagreement; 6 = strong agreement). These statements were selected from a pool of roughly 50, and extracted through gradual refinement of the language and concepts expressed (i.e. reconceptualization or removal of problematic items). Much like the questions used in the interviews, these statements were formulated with reference to a) informal conversations and interviews with teacher-participants, b) classroom audio-recorded data, and c) the discussion on *nihonjinron* in Module One. Following these 26 statements, I included one open-ended question aimed at eliciting comments or questions from respondents either in English or in Japanese. None of the students elaborated on their responses; instead, many of them simply stated that they had enjoyed having me in their classes for a few weeks. In general, this survey took respondents approximately 15 minutes to complete in class. I was never present when these surveys were completed. Instead, I gave instructions on how to conduct the survey, and each teacher was free to conduct it depending on their schedule.

As revealed in Section 5.1, one of the most prominent elements found in the body of data collected for this module is teachers' use of language in the classroom. When the prominence of this element became clear to me, I designed an additional survey in May of 2014 to explore a range of issues related to teachers' use of language in the classroom, including teachers' awareness of their own choice of language (see Appendix 7). Among the four teachers who participated in this study, only Ms. Inoue (Asahi JHS) failed to send her responses back.

In the next section, I outline the various steps taken to analyze the body of ethnographic data describe thus far.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

Once the ethnographic data was collected, the analytical process involved:

1. selecting segments from the data;
2. transcribing these segments;
3. devising a coding scheme;
4. coding the transcribed data;
5. linking segments of transcribed data within and across data sources, namely by locating points of convergence and divergence.

I describe each process in the following sections.

3.3.1 DATA SELECTION

As discussed in Section 3.3.2 of Module One, categorizing discourses into types has its challenges because, for one, the limits of ideological discourse are not easily decipherable. Van Dijk (1995: 22) points out that, in conducting a linguistic analysis of ideology in text, “we have no a priori theoretical grounds to exclude any textual structures from expressing underlying ideological principles. Indeed, virtually all discourse structures are involved in the functional expression of mental models of events or communicative contexts, and, therefore, of the opinions that are part of such mental models." This argument has direct implications for linguistic analysis, and helps understand the complications involved in analyzing ideological discourse in relation to social practices.

To facilitate my investigation of the potential presence and prevalence of *nihonjinron* in the data, I select relevant segments of data by looking for elements indicating that:

a) particular characterizations of Japanese people, language and culture in relation to English and foreign cultures are expressed or inferred;
b) identities or roles are assigned by classroom actors to classroom actors;
c) particular ideologies (related to or beyond *nihonjinron*) are formulated in classroom discourse.

In part, these possibilities fall within what Grad & Rojo (2008: 11) call a tension between assimilation and differentiation as a basis for identity construction. They are also aligned with van Dijk's (1995: 22) suggestion that the structures of ideologies "are often articulated along an *us* versus *them* dimension, in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms." However, my analysis does not aim only to pinpoint elements reflecting *nihonjinron* tendencies in the data, but also to locate traces of the ideology in context. This requires a broader perspective into the body data, one which begins with an account of the prevalent or dominant features in the data.

I determined the prevalence of elements in the data by combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Initially, a theme was deemed prevalent when the total number of elements under that theme surpassed that of other themes. However, certain comments, situations, activities or particular events of considerable salience to the research questions surfaced very few times in the data. Consequently, I complemented this quantitative strategy by considering the conceptual saliency of particular data segments to both the overall body of data and to the research questions. This complex process of determining the salience of segments *vis-à-vis* research questions implied minor re-formulations of research questions and methodologies, underscoring the need in critical social research for a back-and-forth movement between the data and the research questions (Maxwell, 2012; Sealey & Carter, 2004).

3.3.2 DATA TRANSCRIPTION

The data transcription task was rather straightforward, especially with the interviews. All transcripts were WORD processed and then saved as PDF files. This process also facilitated a) translation from Japanese to English when necessary, b) labelling of sections of selected data into codes, and c) data access and retrieval, mainly through the ‘Find’ function in WORD.

In transcribing short segments of audio-recorded data, I used standard orthography and did not focus explicitly on the finer details of speech. I therefore provided denaturalized transcriptions. In this type of transcription, “accuracy concerns the substance of the interview, that is, the meanings and perceptions created and shared during a conversation” (Oliver et al., 2005: 1277). Because the focus of inquiry is not necessarily on how speakers use a particular language but on the content of their utterances, a rigorous and fine-grained transcription of the data (including phonological markers, pauses and so forth) would impose information of limited relevance. To retain a clear idea of the context in which specific sentences and conversational exchanges are embedded, I transcribed segments of interests rather broadly, much like a script for a play. All the lines in these scripts are numbered, and interlocutors are specified next to each interlocution. I also included, when pertinent, general notes on events and non-verbal behaviours pertinent to the dialog in parentheses. The column on the right was used for coding. I also underlined the areas in the scripts to link codes with transcribed data. Finally, I used pseudonyms in all transcripts – and throughout the analysis which follows – to ensure anonymity of places and people. Finally, I used lower-case italicized roman characters for Japanese utterances, and included English translations (see Section 3.4 for a review of translation issues in the current study).

While transcripts used in this module contain most of the information needed for analysis, they somewhat de-contextualize the data. Partly because the transcriptions I provide are approximations, they are also ‘new texts’. The transcription process is consequently marked by reflexivity, or what Bucholtz (2000: 1440) calls “scholars' increasing awareness that ethnographies, the textual products of their disciplinary practice, are not transparent and unproblematic records of scientific research but are instead creative and politicized documents in which the researcher as author is fully implicated.” As such, the transcriptions used in the current Module are understood not as neutral renditions of the data but as important elements in the data interpretation and analysis process (Bucholtz, 2000). Decisions involved in data transcription are thus contingent on the context and purpose of the current study.

Referring back to the original audio-recorded data throughout the analytical process has been very helpful in developing a clearer understanding of relevant segments as embedded in larger stretches of discourse and situated practices. Also of importance was the need for each transcribed segment to remain comprehensible on its own. As Tesch (1990: 117) points out, “text segments must be carved out of their context in such a way that they retain meaning, even when they are encountered outside their context.” When necessary, I went back to the original data source and further contextualized each segment as part of the analysis.

3.3.3 DATA CODING

Each code used to identify segments of interest in the body of data is a combination of three different sets of symbols (all alphabet letters) separated by hyphens (e.g. ‘C-*Ed*-alt’, for classroom discourse, references to EFL education, and references to assistant language teachers) (see Appendix 8 for list of codes). The first symbol refers to the source of data (“I” for data from teacher interviews, “C” for data from classroom audio-recordings, “T” for data from textbooks, “M” for data from classroom materials, and “S” for surveys). This is followed by an italicized two-letter symbol referring to a main theme: *Ni* for *nihonjinron*-related elements, *Ed* for elements related to EFL education (i.e. how English is taught), and *UE* for elements related to teacher use of Japanese or English or both. The data coding process initially yielded an extensive list of codes. At first, I predicted two main categories to emerge: references to *nihonjinron* (*Ni* codes) and references to EFL education in general (*Ed* codes). However, I soon realized that teachers' choices of language (*UE* for teachers' use of English in the classroom) were even more prominent in the recorded classroom data, and consequently of interest to the current study. The final set of symbol is a three or four lower case letter abbreviation of a particular – and more precise – theme (e.g. "alt" for references to assistant language teachers, "gram" for references to grammar-translation). After the data was coded, 35 nodes (sub-codes) emerged from these three general coding categories: 21 for *Ed*, 11 for *Ni* and 3 for *UE*. Developing these codes was an iterative process – i.e. codes were initially tentative and further refined throughout the data review process. For the purpose of analysis, I considered seven codes from the *Ed* category, seven from the *Ni* category, and three from the *UE* category.

3.3.4 LINKING DATA SEGMENTS WITHIN AND ACROSS DATA SOURCES

After transcription, translation (when necessary) and coding of segments of interest, I then concentrated on the links between the various units contained in each theme (i.e. finding the common threads binding all the segments of data within a theme). This constitutes the data triangulation phase of the analysis. Tesch (1990) calls this process of revealing the characteristic patterns of each theme a re-contextualization of the data. Since these constituents are of different nature (segments of classroom dialogs, individual sentences on printed materials, one-off comments, non-verbal messages, etc.), I uncovered characteristic patterns across data type by producing a narrative, or a comprehensive account, of each theme. This allowed me to further explore the connections between emerging patterns within themes and broader theoretical constructs as well as the central research questions. However, these comprehensive accounts did not serve to eliminate inconsistencies by relating segments to increasingly uniform themes. As patterns began to surface within each theme, I also conducted discrepant case analyses – i.e. going back to the original data to see if some other elements challenged emerging patterns. In this way, discrepant case analysis allowed for a return to the original data.

To link segments of transcribed data within and across data sources, I followed a thematic approach to analysis. As general analytical themes emerged, I further categorized data into more refined themes. This research strategy included the following four analytical stages (Burns, 2000):

1. collecting ethnographic classroom discourse data
2. building a network, or system, of ethnographic data classification
3. analyzing ethnographic data
4. writing an ethnographic account of observable classroom practices

As for data coding, this process was iterative – i.e. moving between broad and more detailed observations. The resulting work can hopefully reveal more about the complex nature of the Japanese EFL classroom through analysis of how local and global issues are interrelated, and how broader cultural/situational factors and organizational/institutional circumstances both enable and constrain observed pedagogical practices (Breen, 2001).

So far, I have discussed strategies for sorting out and analyzing ethnographically gathered data. Absent is data collected from students and teacher surveys. Because participant views were analyzed through responses on numerical Likert scales, I analyzed survey data separately through a quantitatively-oriented approach.

Survey results tend to yield limited insight because a) there is little flexibility in terms of responses, b) some items may be difficult for students to comprehend, and c) follow up inquiries are difficult. Nevertheless, survey data revealed tendencies, or ranges of opinions, amongst students and teachers in regards to the 26 statements. I grouped these 26 statements into 5 different categories:

1. EFL classroom learning experience
2. personal reasons & motivations to learn English
3. English language and culture
4. Japanese people and English
5. Japaneseness

These topics are contained within the *Ni* and *Ed* themes discussed earlier. I did not include statements regarding the *UE* theme in the second survey given to the four teachers because the relevance of this theme surfaced only midway through analysis, after results from the first survey were compiled.

In the next two sections, I focus on translation, data triangulation, and reflexivity, three methodological issues which, to some extent, reveal some of the biases in this ethnographically- based critical classroom discourse analysis of *nihonjinron* in EFL classrooms.

3.4 TRANSLATION

In the previous section, I referred to some of the problems involved in doing transcriptions of recorded data. Bucholtz (2000: 1461) points out that “transcription is inevitably a creative, authorial act that has political effects, and many of these effects cannot be anticipated.” In this module, the process of translating segments of classroom discourse and interviews from Japanese to English is understood in similar terms.

Translation was needed for two main reasons. First, the current study focuses on a Japanese educational context, and is written as a requirement for a doctoral degree at an English-speaking university. Its readership is therefore more likely to be English-speaking. Also, considering that Japanese JHS English classes are conducted mostly in Japanese (Gorsuch, 1999; Hino, 1988; LoCastro, 1996), analyzing only the English sections in the body of recorded data would considerably limit the range of data and the scope of inquiry.

Translation – described by Temple & Young (2004: 167) as “speaking for others”, and Ieţcu-Fairclough (2008) as a recontextualization of a text from one cultural context into another – has its own set of problems. Ieţcu-Fairclough (2008: 69) points out that “it is through recontextualizations of texts in new contexts, by agents having specific purposes and goals, that the possibility of ‘ideological’ appropriation arises.” Temple & Young (2004: 164) argue that “there is no neutral position from which to translate.” This is because the translator’s role in the research is, like the researcher’s, bound to his/her socio-cultural positioning towards the research itself and the researched. These issues have direct relevance to research validity, and are best dealt with through greater engagement with issues of reflexivity.

Temple & Young (2004) contrast two different epistemological views on translation in social research: the positivist view (predominant in social research) which promotes the notion of a neutral and correct translation, and the social constructionist view, which emphasizes translation as already one layer of interpretative analysis, and therefore sees the translator as making a crucial contribution to the research. The former view would consider English translations of Japanese classroom discourse as valid data for CDA, whereas the latter view would instead prioritize the source language as the only valid object of analysis (Fairclough, 1999). This perspective contrasts with that of Mahdiyan et al. (2013: 38), who argue that CDA “should be applied to both primary ST [source text] and secondary TT [target text].” Temple & Young’s (2004: 166) critical perspective on translation highlights the important issue of “how the expediency of translation reinforces the invisibility of the source language”, an argument which helps explain why the source language is preferable in CDA research. Failing to problematize English translations in CDA research not only portrays speakers of the translated language as fluent English speakers, it also promotes the notion that the source language is largely irrelevant to the research.

In light of these issues, I critically analyze data in the source language. When Japanese is the source language, I provide the Japanese text written using the Roman alphabet, followed by an English translation. To do this, I either provide the equivalent, or its literal meaning, in English when equivalency is possible. Otherwise, I follow Squires' (2009) notion of *conceptual equivalence*, which refers to a translator providing "a technically and conceptually accurate translated communication of a concept spoken by the study's participant" (p.279). Croot et al. (2011) explain that conceptual equivalence is valuable in cross-language research because "some terms may be translated accurately in their literal sense but a literal translation may fail to convey the ideas or attitudes inherent in the original choice of words" (p.1003). As I mentioned in Section 3.3.7.1 of Module One, even if I do not possess expert knowledge of Japanese, my current knowledge of the language is sufficient to conduct field research and interviews, and produce reliable field notes. I am also capable of fulfilling the need for translation for three reasons: a) my ability to communicate in both English and Japanese using complex sentence structures, b) my familiarity with Japanese EFL classroom discourse, and c) my ability to provide comprehensible circumlocutions in both languages. While these may not necessarily be recognized criteria for translation skills necessary in legal contexts, for example, they remain sufficient for the purpose of informing the English-speaking readers of the current study about the processes observed in the data.

3.5 DATA TRIANGULATION

The stratified approach used in this ethnographically-based critical classroom discourse analysis requires consideration for points of convergence and divergence within and across data. In this module, data triangulation occurs when evidence of a particular reality – e.g. *nihonjinron* – is located in more than one source of data. This approach is particularly important to the inquiry regarding the potential importance of *nihonjinron* to observed EFL practices, as the notion of importance gains pertinence when evidence of the ideology can be located in multiple data sources. Data triangulation is also necessary in this study because, while certain aspects of interest might be found at particular points in the data, they are not necessarily fixed or permanent elements. Classroom and interview discourses – like any other form of discourses – occur in a temporal context (Mercer, 2010). Therefore, certain types of data can make sense at specific times and in specific contexts, but not necessarily in others. In sum, triangulation constitutes a pivotal element in the approach used in this module.

Pertaining more specifically to the study of discourse and identity work, Argyris & Schön (1974) argue that people's beliefs should not be observed and analyzed from what they say they believe but from their actions. To some extent, this echoes Bourdieu's notion of ideology located at the level of practice (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992). While this argument highlights gaps between espoused beliefs and actions in the real world, it also underscores the danger of committing an *epistemic fallacy* (Bhaskar, 1998, 2008) – i.e. the idea that people's words and actions are accurate reflections of beliefs and realities in the material world. Instead of prioritizing actions over word, both can be seen as vital data for analysis. This choice implies looking for points of convergence and divergence between what people say and what they do. From this perspective, analytical focus should not be limited to the observation and reporting of similarities and differences but also on how seemingly disparate elements are combined together to create – or influence – particular social realities (Maxwell, 2012).

Another benefit of data triangulation is that it provides additional contextualization of the data. In this module, I also analyze the data collected from teacher interviews through narrative analysis (Barkhuizen, 2007; Ezzy, 2002), which is largely interpretive and holistic, and a reflective inquiry into meaning-making and change. Like identities and ideologies, narratives are also contextualized. As Archer (2004: 39) argues, "because lives are lived and narratives are recounted in society, they must also be coherent with their context." This type of analysis, which borrows from Ricoeur's (1991) view of identity as built by narratives, concentrates more on the meaning and less on the structure of the text. Moreover, as Parker (1998: 17) states, "by experimenting with different narratives, by telling different stories of who we are, we search for a narrative which empowers us to deal more effectively with our circumstances". Analyzing teacher narratives is valuable because they not constitute recounts of past events but also ways to act, see and feel (Parker, 1998) as well as processes of empowerment. However, my inclusion of narrative analysis in the current module is tangential, and is not based on the assumption that identities and ideologies are meaningful only when discursively articulated. Instead, what people say about their lives is analyzed a) with regards to other types of ethnographically-gathered data, b) through triangulation of both data and methods, and c) with reference to a range of issues and concerns involving both discursive and material facts of life which include findings from the literature on ideology research, *nihonjinron,* and on EFL education in secondary schools.

While the body of recorded and printed data analyzed in this module is considerable, it nevertheless falls within what is observable. Consequently, I do not claim to provide a fully comprehensive account of people's beliefs, intentions and involvement in identity work. Because attention must also be paid to elements not obviously discernible in the data, triangulation is an effective way to strengthen analysis and ensure an appropriate degree of reliability.

3.6 REFLEXIVITY

This critical inquiry into EFL education in Japanese JHS is not neutral: like all ideologies, it contains biases towards events and processes in the real world. Bloome et al. (2005: xix) point out that "any research effort is a fashioning, a way of looking at the world that simultaneously frames the world while enabling one to learn about it" (p.242-243). In her approach to analyzing classroom discourse, Christie (2002: 22) argues that

> discourse itself is never neutral, and discourse analysis is also not neutral, for it necessarily involves the imposition of some interpretation upon events. Indeed, the very transcript of the classroom talk (and the video record from which that is drawn), is already removed from the reality, and itself an interpretation of it.

As the current study possesses both descriptive and transformative features, it is aligned with what Ricoeur (1970) calls a historical science, or an interpretive approach to science which “does not aim at the truth, but at a truth that is valid” (Simms, 2003: 63). Regarding critical social research, Lather (1986: 65) argues that, “[b]ecause we are not able to assume anything, we must take a self-critical stance regarding the assumptions we incorporate into our empirical approaches.” The author identifies a set of “self-corrective techniques that […] check the credibility of our data and minimize the distorting effect of personal bias upon the logic of evidence” (p.16). For her, rigorous self-awareness – i.e. reflexivity – in empirical research is crucial throughout the refinement of epistemological, theoretical and methodological perspectives. In essence, reflexivity in critical social research considers reliability and validity not necessarily as supports to interpretative conclusions but more as critical perspectives towards interpretative work. Lather (1986) proposes the following guidelines for ensuring greater validity and reliability in post-positivist research:

1) triangulation of data – combining multiple data sources, methods, and theoretical schemes, looking for points of convergence and contradiction;
2) construct validity – balancing theory with people’s everyday experiences;
3) face validity – integrating participants’ reactions to the tentative results;

4) catalytic validity – re-orienting the research so that participants are empowered through greater self-awareness.

Reflexivity is made possible by clarifying choices researchers make in structuring research projects. In previous sections, I have attempted to clarify the choices leading to the creation of this ethnographically-based critical classroom discourse analysis from a reflexive viewpoint. These choices should be understood not as extraneous additions or convenient bifurcations of challenges or responsibilities, but as inherent contingencies in the research process.

Following Sealey's (2007: 643) definition of reflexivity as "awareness that the ethnographer himself or herself is a factor in the inquiry", I henceforth provide a summary description of my presence as a researcher in the current inquiry. I am a white, non-Japanese, middle-aged, male classroom participant-researcher and trained EFL instructor. I was considered an 'outsider' in the classrooms I observed (although I was already known at St-Maria J&SHS, especially by the staff). In this sense, it is plausible that my presence may have been somewhat threatening to both teachers and students. It is also possible that students' engagement in classroom activities may have been limited as a result of my presence. Of course, teacher-participants may have been more self-conscious (e.g. worried about their English skills, their teaching skills, wanting to make a good impression on me). Moreover, being a trained teacher/researcher, these teachers most likely saw me as an authority figure constantly evaluating their performances. This could have motivated them at times to 'put on a performance' for me.

Furthermore, I believe that my Caucasian features, or ‘whiteness’, may have contributed to my identity as both an ‘outsider looking in’ and a valuable ‘resource’ in the EFL classroom (see Section 2.4 of Module Two for a reflexive discussion of ‘whiteness’ and native-speakerism (Houghton & Rivers, 2013) in this modular PhD project). Due to these considerations, I conceptualize my ‘whiteness/non-Japaneseness’ as having a likely influence not only on the data, but also on the decision to focus on *nihonjinron*. This module also goes beyond the interrogation of the potential links between *nihonjinron* and educational practice: it is an attempt at understanding some of the issues and difficulties I have been facing as a non-Japanese EFL teacher in Japan over the years. As many critics have identified *nihonjinron* as a disruptive element in the Japanese EFL context (as discussed in Module One), and considering that *nihonjinron* prioritizes an essentialized notion of Japaneseness as positive force in Japanese social practices, my interest in this particular topic also stems from a desire to find a place within the Japanese EFL system and in Japanese society which somehow transcends alterity, or the tendency among humans to construct identities in relation to, or reaction against, an Other (Nealon, 1998).

Rampton (2003) discusses the problematic tendencies among teachers-ethnographers to 1) overemphasize agency, 2) assume that all ontological concepts are empirically measurable, 3) fail to engage in deeper theorization of wider processes, and 4) over-emphasize arguments for critical pedagogy. While I acknowledge these tendencies in my research and their potential limitations, I also recognize the importance of agency in the study and critique of ideology, while stressing the need to analyze agentive processes with references to their structural or material conditions. As such, I adhere to the social realist view towards ontology which stipulates that, while ontology and epistemology are two closely related strata of knowledge – i.e. mutually constitutive – the two are not to be conflated. As for Rampton's third point, I do not characterize the work in this modular PhD project as a 'hunt' for *nihonjinron* in the data, but instead as an exploration of the complex processes involved in EFL education in Japanese secondary schools and as a discussion on the need for researchers focusing on ideological discourses to actively explore theoretical and methodological issues grounding their research, including greater engagement with issues of reflexivity. Finally, while I agree that critical pedagogy is crucial to improving Japanese EFL education, and while it is my hope that the current study be used for social transformation, my goals in this module are both descriptive and transformative. By interrogating a) the potential links between *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices, and b) the potential importance of the ideology to such practices, I also consider problems with observed EFL approaches and suggest ways in which they can be improved.

3.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Drawing from the University of Birmingham's Code of Practice for Research, the ethical guidelines proposed by the Social Research Association, and the British Association for Applied Linguistics' recommendations for good practices in applied linguistics student projects, I obtained valid consent from research participants by first providing teachers, school administrators, students and parents with pertinent information about the research project. Relevant documentation clarified the grounds on which participants could then make educated choices as to their level of involvement in the research project. The participants' information sheets, following a question-answer structure, framed the research program from their point of view. These sheets clarified the risks and benefits of the research program, from the perspective of the participants. This documentation was written in Japanese and English, and specified ways in which participants could make inquiries regarding the research project. I also provided research participants with opportunities to review the information and clarify potentially confusing aspects of the research project. All participants signed the consent form. After obtaining all signed consent forms from teachers, school administrators, students and parents (proxy consent), I began to collect the data depending on the availability of teachers.

As this module is an ethnographically-based critical classroom discourse analysis in Japanese JHS, with special emphasis on the links between ideological discourse and observed EFL practices, I presented my research project as an interrogation of the various discursive processes in EFL classrooms and how these relate to educational practices on the ground. I specified that, due to the stratified nature of my research, my principal goal throughout the data collection process was to gather as much data about the various aspects of the EFL classrooms under scrutiny, seen from different angles (e.g. production and consumption of policy discourse, classroom discourse, textbook content and situated use, etc.). Doing so allowed me to clarify to my interviewees that I would not put them under ideological or pedagogical scrutiny in such a way as to cause them discomfort or distress. Furthermore, I made sure that the four teachers who took part in this study understood that, while a researcher doing ethnographic work in classroom context, I was as much a part of this context as teachers and students. Although three out of the four teachers wanted me to provide them with teaching advice, I also had to retain a somewhat non-evaluative stance. Overall, my research did not pose any threat or caused any disruption to the regular flow of the classrooms under investigation.

The reflexive work achieved in this section hopefully provides greater insight into the ideological underpinning of this research project. Having outlined a methodological approach to answering the overarching concerns *Can traces of nihonjinron be found in the data?* and *How important are these traces to observed EFL practices?*, I now discuss the research context under focus and the social actors in this context by referring to the literature on the Japanese EFL system and classroom-based research.

4. EXPLORING THE JAPANESE JHS ENGLISH CLASSROOM

In this chapter, I describe the Japanese JHS English classroom with reference to the academic literature. By clarifying and unpacking core elements in the current research, this section facilitates the interrogation of the links between *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices in Section 5 below. Topics include classroom discourse, socialization and power, the foreign language classroom, public and private Japanese JHS, English classrooms at the JHS level, and Japanese JHS teachers and students.

4.1 THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM: DISCOURSE, SOCIALIZATION AND POWER

Classroom learning is crucial to the way most of us develop as both individuals and social beings. As van Lier (2001: 130) points out, "our personal identities as learners within a group derive much from [classroom] experience. This is due to the fact that our public learning selves have been molded by a continual and explicit evaluation of *our worth as learners.*" The author adds that both teacher and students often evaluate each other, not exclusively as people, but as members of a specific community of practice (Wenger, 2000). In this way, pupils engage in identity work and learn about the world and their place in it. The classroom is also a place where both teachers and students collaborate on common endeavors, or as Mercer (1995: 6) calls it, a "shared version of educational knowledge". This means that education is a form of social learning, or a process of learning social rules and conventions. As such, teachers and learners have particular expectations of one another, and evaluate each other accordingly. Mercer (1995) describes a classroom as both a cultural context and a place where resources are combined to create culture.

From a critical standpoint, classrooms are seen as places where “the prime elements of education – ideas and ideologies, policies and plans, materials and methods, teachers and the taught – all mix together to produce exclusive and at times explosive environments that might help or hinder the creation and utilization of learning opportunities” (Kumaravadivelu, 1999: 454). Bernstein (1975) and Foucault (1980) see the classroom as a field where ideology education is most prevalent due to the embedding of instructional discourse in regulative discourse. Regarding issues of identity, classroom discourse becomes a process which “both creates and regulates social relations and social identities” (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001) largely through the reinforcement of ideological structures. While I recognize the importance of this perspective to my research and much of the critical work on *nihonjinron* in Japanese EFL education, one of my principal tasks in this module is to question – through a combination of ethnography and critique – the assumption that an account of the ideological contents of classroom education is sufficient to gain a comprehensive view of educational processes found in Japanese JHS.

Contrasting with Mercer’s (1995) vision of classroom discourse as fluid and democratic, classroom talk has often been characterized in the literature as rigid and formulaic. Fairclough (1992: 154) argues that “[m]any questions in the classroom are ‘closed’, requiring ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answers or minimal elaboration.” Mercer (1995) explains this by listing three reasons: 1) classroom talk is about teaching and learning, 2) teachers have more power to guide such talk and responsibilities to fulfill, and 3) teachers must follow a curriculum. For Bloome et al. (2005: 52), classroom learning "is mostly about how to 'do school', 'do lesson', 'do learning'." The authors, however, specify that students and teachers are not simply following pre-determined structures: they "may modify, adapt, and transform those cultural practices, or they may import cultural practices from other social institutions and from other domains of cultural life" (p. 52). Echoing this perspective is Creese's (2008: 231-2) argument that "people do not just follow cultural rules but actively and non-deterministically construct what they do." In short, while teachers guide classroom discourse to a large extent, and while the classroom provides structures for learning, learning is understood in this module less as a top-down process than as a collaborative effort between teachers and students.

Lynch (1996) lists several techniques by which teachers modify and control interaction. These include the following seven strategies:

1. confirmation checks (verifying whether the teacher has understood students' output);
2. comprehension checks (confirming learners' understanding of teacher's output);
3. repetition;
4. clarification requests (asking learners to clarify their utterances);
5. reformulation (putting a learner's utterance in other words);
6. completion (of learner's utterances); and
7. backtracking (going back to an earlier segment of discourse deemed

important).

Focusing on language learning, Chaudron (1988) explains that language teachers usually simplify their vocabulary use and tend to avoid complex idioms. They also use shorter and simpler grammatical constructions, often in the present tense. In addition, their speech is usually slower and clearer, combined with ample gestures and facial expressions.

Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975) initiation – response – feedback (IRF) model has long been identified as a central aspect of classroom discourse. Mercer (1995) labels this conversational structure between teacher and pupil as an example of the guided construction of knowledge, yet explaining how it "can be used by teachers to narrowly constrain the contributions of pupils" (p.38). Thus, the IRF format can be interpreted as teacher-centered classroom interaction, and as indication of power imbalance in the classroom. Van Lier (2001: 96), however, explains that "IRF is frequently used to draw on students' prior experiences and current background knowledge to activate mental schemata and to establish a platform of shared knowledge that will facilitate the introduction and integration of new knowledge." Long and Sato (1983) indicate that questions can help interlocutors signal turns and facilitate understanding. Perhaps most importantly for EFL learners, and as was observable in the body of recorded classroom data, questions can facilitate learners' participation in classroom target language use.

Clearly, however, the IRF model is a good indicator of power imbalance. Jaffe (2006) states that the IRF format denotes the indexical relationship between evaluative language and speaker authority, pointing out that teachers and students' awareness of this relationship "is an essential condition for the conduct of classroom behavior and the management of classroom activities and identities. We can see this awareness on the part of students every time they orient towards the third slot in the [IRF] sequence as being about evaluation" (p.6). But while power is often understood as limiting, Bloome et al. (2005) propose the *power-as-caring relationship* model which defines power as a structuration of interpersonal relations, events, institutions, and ideologies. Accordingly, power can also be conceptualized as enabling educational relationships and processes instead of simply limiting them.

Nevertheless, overusing the IRF format may prevent learners from initiating turn-taking moves and guiding topic development. Van Lier (2001: 96) argues that "prolonged use of the IRF format may have a negative effect on intrinsic motivation and cause a decrease in [students'] levels of attention and involvement." Alternatively, Mercer (1995) suggests teachers to use other strategies, including teachers' reflective observations, requests for elaboration, and encouraging questions from learners.

While a somewhat simplistic dichotomy, language classrooms can be categorized as either traditional or communicatively-oriented. In traditional classrooms, power is markedly concentrated in the hands of the teacher: the teacher is the holder of knowledge and shares it with students in a comprehensible and incremental fashion. Teachers in traditional language classrooms tend to prioritize summative testing – e.g. information about a particular subject is delivered throughout a semester, and students' retention of that information is measured in a final test. Teachers are active agents while learners remain passive recipients.

In contrast, learning in communicatively-oriented classrooms is a complex and ongoing process of discovery, with teachers acting as guides or facilitators. Classes tend to be structured by tasks to be achieved usually in collaboration with classmates. The teacher is an authority figure, although she most often responds to learners needs surfacing as collaborative activities unfold. Assessment is both formative and summative, and includes tests, interviews, notebooks, logs and products of both individual and group projects. Communicatively-oriented classrooms are environments where roles are negotiated through discursive practices, *in situ*, between classroom actors, making classroom discourse a mutual sense-making process. Slimani (2001) argues that classroom power is actually more evenly distributed: "lessons are 'co-productions' and 'socially- constructed events' brought to existence through the 'co-operative enterprise' […] of both parties" (p.288). Walsh (2006: 47) adds that "[t]here is evidence […] that the more formal, ritualized interactions between teacher and learners are not as prevalent today as they were in the 1960s; today, there is far more learner-initiated communication, more equal turn-taking and less reliance on teacher-fronted and lockstep modes of learning."

Understandably, the potential for conflicts and tensions between classroom actors can be increased when power is less fixed and more negotiable. While teachers may prescribe specific speech acts and distribute or interrupt turns – i.e. students may be told to be more quiet, speak more clearly, stop talking with classmates and focus on a particular task – students may also exercise some control over topics and turns by requesting the teacher to repeat a sentence, clarify meaning, provide examples, and even to speak more clearly. They may also disagree with the teacher, even reject or resist her instructions. These possibilities underscore the fluid nature of classroom discourse as the outcome of – and to some extent the engine behind – the complex interactions between structural and agentive processes. In the next section, I focus more specifically on the foreign language classroom.

4.2 THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

The foreign language classroom can be distinguished from other types of classrooms in communicative terms. Walsh (2006: 57) cites van Lier (2001) and lists four types of L2 classroom interactions:

1. less topic-orientation, less activity-orientation (similar to everyday conversation, less structured);
2. more topic-orientation, less activity-orientation (one-way interaction in which information is provided, as in a lecture);
3. more topic-orientation, more activity-orientation (exchange of information in a specific and pre-determined structure, such as an interview or a story); and
4. less topic-orientation, more activity-orientation (substitution drills, pair work and activities with specific procedures).

Other distinguishing features of foreign language classroom pedagogy include learners a) learning language, b) learning *through* language, and c) learning *about* language, all at the same time. Walsh (2006: 3) states that “[c]ommunication [in the language classroom] is unique because the linguistic forms used are often simultaneously the aim of a lesson and the means of achieving those aims.” In other words, meaning and message in the foreign language classroom can be the same thing.

However, not all foreign language classrooms successfully merge object of learning with pedagogical means (e.g. language classrooms emphasizing grammar-translation teaching). Van Lier (2001) suggests that, while the language classroom has its own communicative potential and can provide learners with authentic meta-communicative purposes, it “may be a relatively inefficient environment for the methodical mastery of a language system, just as it is limited in providing opportunities for real world communication in a new language” (p.138). Bourdieu & Passeron (1990) are more pessimistic, arguing that classroom learning talk can, over time, become a form of theatrical performance. By being placed in L2 communicative situations, some language learners may find L2 classroom talk a burden, while others might simply end up parodying L2 use. Throughout this module, I address these possibilities with reference to the data. More specifically, I discuss what I call the ‘act of performing English’ in Section 5.5.3. Below, I focus on Japanese JHS English classrooms.

4.3 JAPANESE JHS

JHS education lasts three years and is the last stage of compulsory education in

Japan. Many analysts including Aspinall (2011, 2013), McVeigh (2002) and Sato (2004) argue that it is a strongly egalitarian system, where very few students fail to graduate. Aspinall (2013: 123) states that egalitarianism in compulsory education is “one of the few concepts in post-war theory and practice that has found vocal support from the Left and the Right of the [Japanese] political spectrum and is therefore very difficult to challenge.” But while it is true that most Japanese pupils graduate regardless of academic performance, this view fails to capture the broader scope of the Japanese secondary school education system. While in a typical Japanese JHS classroom, children of varied ability are grouped together, and while Japanese students do not fail in principle, the Japanese education system is rather rigidly hierarchical. For one, the marked emphasis on preparing pupils for high school entrance examinations shows that JHS education is highly competitive. Indeed, schools are often ranked with regards to their ‘ability’ to place students in reputable high schools or universities. Aspinall (2013: 139) himself points out that “[t]he removal of Saturday schooling in 2002 in the state sector allowed private schools the opportunity to offer an extra day of schooling as a competitive advantage”, a statement which gives emphasis to the competitive nature of Japanese secondary school education. Moreover, evidence from policy discourse underscores the presence of principles contradicting egalitarianism by privileging already proficient learners (see Section 4.2.4 of Module Two). One possible consequence of learning a foreign language in a markedly hierarchical and competitive system is that classroom actors may not necessarily consider the acquisition of communicative L2 skills as their primary goal. Instead, performing well in the race for admission to a reputable university may supersede other pedagogical goals.

4.4 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JHS

The large majority of Japanese JHS are public institutions. MEXT (2012) states that 93% of all 10,699 Japanese JHS in 2012 were public (the same percentage is reported for numbers of Japanese JHS students in public schools). Since the first postwar constitution of Japan, compulsory education has included elementary and JHS education. Each public JHS school caters to all children, regardless of economic or social background. Children in areas surrounding a particular school are eligible for enrollment at that school.

As of 2010, 7% of all JHS in Japan (only 758) were private institutions (the same percentage is reported by MEXT (2011b) for numbers of Japanese JHS students in private schools). Not counting the few international schools, schools for immigrants and schools for special needs students, private JHS schools are, like public JHS, considered Article 1 institutions of learning, meaning that they come under MEXT’s direct guidance and supervision. Unlike public school teachers, however, private school teachers can face different kinds of pressures, as the quality of education can influence both public image and enrolment figures. Because of the falling birth rate and faltering economy, it is increasingly more difficult for Japanese private schools to recruit enough students. Consequently, private schools try to maintain their public image by engaging in curricular innovations. While some of these innovations are unique to specific schools, most private schools look for MEXT-generated policies and initiatives for guidance. One indication of private schools’ marked emphasis on EFL education and public image is the overwhelming presence of private JHS school students in English speech, presentations and recitation contests across the nation.

While public JHS cater to all children, private JHS tend to cater for the children of the Japanese elite, as their tuition fees are often high. As Aspinall (2013: 67) points out, “the private sector is available for those dissatisfied with public provision.” As indicated in the previous section, the author states that “[t]he removal of Saturday schooling in 2002 in the state sector allowed private schools the opportunity to offer an extra day of schooling as a competitive advantage” (p.139). This change bears relevance to EFL education, as many private schools prioritize their EFL programs due to their marketing value. As a result, parents who want their children to develop strong English skills are likely to consider private schools, if they can afford the usually high tuition fees.

4.5 JAPANESE JHS ENGLISH CLASSROOMS

Most JHS classrooms – in both public and private schools – include approximately 40 pupils, forming a ‘homeroom’. In general, a very strong emphasis is placed on community work and life, a value reinforced by having students in one homeroom study all subjects with the same classmates. While public schools do not stream students according to English ability level, private schools usually do.

Over the years, many analysts have characterized Japanese EFL classrooms as rigid and unfavorable to communicative language teaching (CLT), mainly because of the marked emphasis placed on entrance exam preparations. This forces many EFL teachers to place a strong emphasis on grammar-translation. Aspinall (2013) lists four characteristics of the Japanese EFL classroom which he sees as obstacles to CLT: a) the norm of deference to the authority of the teacher (i.e. excessive learner passivity), b) the emphasis on humility in social rapports (i.e. learners' reluctance to express themselves), c) the commonly accepted notion that there is a single correct answer to every question, and finally d) what he calls the strong emphasis on egalitarianism in the Japanese education system. To some extent, this description echoes Yoneyama's (1999) portrayal of Japanese classrooms as formal, rigid, autocratic and stifling places in which students "largely do not expect things like understanding, respect and personal care from teachers" (p.244). While these depictions are somewhat simplistic, ample evidence found in the literature and provided by MEXT does show that most Japanese EFL pupils fail to develop L2 communicative skills upon graduating from JHS. In the next two sections, I concentrate on JHS teachers and students.

4.6 JAPANESE JHS ENGLISH TEACHERS

Japanese JHS English teachers must first be of Japanese nationality and possess teaching certification issued by a prefectural board of education. Very few private JHS employ non-Japanese teachers as regular staffs, with most being hired as assistant language teachers (ALTs). From a legal point of view, however, non-Japanese teachers are allowed to seek appropriate accreditations from prefectural governments. In the public school system, Japanese EFL teachers are a migrant workforce, usually moving from school to school within a prefecture every few years.

All EFL teachers become homeroom teachers at one point in their career, i.e. they are also responsible for monitoring their homeroom students' progress in all subjects and for informing parents of their children's progress. Furthermore, multiple reports indicate that JHS teachers of all subjects devote approximately one third of their work day to classroom teaching and teaching-related work, and two thirds to administrative tasks or work unrelated to specific academic subjects. Outside the classroom, teachers often supervise club activities and student counseling. Shimahara (2002) explains that non-teaching related work is important because it is perceived as more beneficial to both the students and the school.

Aspinall (2013: 93) argues that "[t]he secondary level (JHS and SHS) is the only level of the education system in Japan where the teachers are thoroughly trained and professional in their approach to foreign language teaching." Browne & Wada (1998: 105) offer a contrasting perspective, stating that public school English teachers usually do not receive extensive TESOL training at the university level, nor are they required to demonstrate oral English competence. Yet, changes have occurred since Browne & Wada's study. Nowadays, most schools (especially private schools) require evidence of L2 communicative ability during the hiring process. However, Miyazato (2009) reported that only 8.3 percent of Japanese JHS English teachers have attained the MEXT-required TOEIC score of 730, or a TOEFL score of 550. According to MEXT's (2014) more recent policies, this English language proficiency requirement has been raised to either Grade pre-1 on the STEP Test, B2 level on the CEFR Test, between 6.5 and 7.0 on the IELTS Test, 80 on the TOEFL iBT test, or approximately 800 on the TOEIC Test. This language proficiency requirement is expected to rise in the future. Despite these requirements, Aspinall (2013) points out that most JHS teachers currently working in the system would not qualify for undergraduate study at most universities in the English-speaking world. These figures underline a considerable problem in the system, especially considering the growing tendency in MEXT policy discourse to prioritize a monolingual approach to EFL education in secondary schools. I explore this issue from Section 5.1.1 to Section 5.1.4 below.

4.7 EFL STUDENTS IN JAPANESE JHS

On average, Japanese public and private JHS students receive three to four hours of English classes a week, or 270 hours of classroom English in three years. According to Aspinall (2013), this is only 12% of the total amount of time necessary for students to become successful L2 communicators. Despite the introduction of English classes at the fifth and sixth grades of elementary school in 2011, these disappointing figures explain to a large extent why most Japanese JHS graduates fail to demonstrate basic L2 communicative ability. While the STEP Test should not be considered a fully comprehensive means of measuring L2 communicative skills, the majority of the 653,871 JHS students who took the test in 2011 failed to reach Level 3, the level prescribed by MEXT for all JHS graduates. This suggests a strong idealistic tendency in recent MEXT policies.

Also of importance, learners hold diverging, if not contradictory, views towards EFL education. MEXT (2011b) reports a widespread belief amongst JHS students that the mastery of English is far beyond their reach. On the other hand, it has also found that

85% of the roughly 3.5 million JHS students believe that English is an important language for them. MEXT has also revealed 70% of the 3,225 JHS students surveyed expressing agreement with the notion that knowledge of English will improve their chances to secure employment in the future. But while a large number of students expressed these views, only 11% of them stated wanting to find employment necessitating knowledge of English, with 43% stating that they do not want such employment.

These views are reflected in a paper by Kubota (2011) which looks at the links between knowledge of English, career advancement and the economic development of a nation. Focusing on a rural Japanese town with a population of approximately 160,000, Kubota (2011) found these links to be tenuous. In her interviews of Japanese employees working in the manufacturing, sales and healthcare industry, the author reveals that knowledge of English in fact plays a minimal role in the day-to-day work of the workers in that city. She suggests that the EFL industry, operating largely on language testing, creates a demand for English education not because it is actually needed in the workplace, but because it stands as a measure of people's efforts to learn the target language. This argument is also made by Seargeant (2009) who holds that the 'true object' of motivation to learn English in Japan is "an engagement with the processes represented by English language learning – and by the status and meaning that the language has in contemporary Japan" (p.131). Aspinall (2013: ix) is more critical: "English is taught in Japan in the same way that Latin has been taught in European countries for centuries, as a dead language which provides a mechanism for sorting out those with certain intellectual skills."

In sum, the fact that Japanese JHS learners’ views towards English – as gathered by MEXT – are conflicting, and more broadly speaking, the fact that the gap between policy discourse and educational practice seems to be widening, strongly suggest that a) contradictions exist in the Japanese EFL system, and b) the human agents active in that system are, at different times and in different contexts, differently invested. This possibility has direct implications for an understanding of Japanese classroom actors’ beliefs, views and actions, and in the context of the current study, to observed discourse and practice.

Based on the conceptual work conducted thus far, I now analyze the data gathered for this module in reference to the five research questions stated in Chapter 1.

5. THE STUDY

I begin this analysis by listing the most frequent elements in the data across schools and data types, achieved through coding and sorting. While high frequency indicates the numerical prevalence of certain codes in the overall body of data, the significance of particular codes to the current Module is also determined with regards to the relevance of particular codes to the five research questions. As such, since quantity is not the only marker of salience in this study, less frequent codes have been selected for consideration due to their relevance to issues addressed in these questions.

After transcribing all the data, three groups of codes emerged as most relevant to the five research questions: elements related to EFL education (*Ed*), *nihonjinron*-related elements (*Ni*), and elements related to use of English by the teacher in the classroom (*UE*). The following lists these codes as gathered across schools and data types, from most frequent. In all, seven were gathered in the *Ed* category, seven in the *Ni* category, and three in the *UE* category.

1) *Ed* – Elements related to EFL education (21 codes, 461 occurrences in total)

- *cult* – references to the teaching of culture (67 occurrences)
- *chal* – references to challenges faced by English teachers (49 occurrences)
- *text* – references to textbook (38 occurrences)
- *mext* – references to EFL policies published by MEXT (33 occurrences)

- *gram* – references to grammar teaching (32 occurrences)
- *alt* – references to ALTs (29 occurrences)
- *actl* – references to active learning (26 occurrences)

2) *Ni* – *nihonjinron*-related elements (11 codes, 237 occurrences in total)

- *juni*/*cdif* – references to Japan as unique nation, 'traditional Japan'/references to cultural differences (78 occurrences)
- *cont* – references to discourse(s) contradicting the *nihonjinron* discourse (32 occurrences)
- *esop* – references to English speaking opportunities for Japanese people (30 occurrences)
- *jeng* – references to Japanese people's difficulties in speaking English, and Japanese people as monolingual individuals (22 occurrences)
- *foim*/*fost* – references to foreign countries as imagined entities/foreign cultures as 'interesting' or strange (19 occurrences)
- *fodj* – references to foreigners discovering Japan (18 occurrences)
- *enfl* – references to references to English as *lingua franca* (16 occurrences)

3) *UE* – elements related to use of English by the teacher in the classroom (3 codes, 544 occurrences in total)

- *code* – use of code-switching (263 occurrences)

- *uewt* – use of English without Japanese translation (150 occurrences)
- *uest* – use of English with simultaneous Japanese translations (131 occurrences)

In the *Ed* category, codes possess relative conceptual autonomy, removing the need to collapse some codes with other codes. Nuances both within and across codes are revealed throughout the following analysis.

In the *Ni* category, the two codes labeled *juni* and *cdif* were collapsed due to conceptual proximity, thus making the new *juni/cdif* code the most frequent one in the *Ni* category. Similarly, the relatively infrequent *foim* and *fost* codes were also collapsed due to conceptual proximity, as both refer to impressions of foreign people, nations, languages and cultures.

Finally, the *UE* category clearly contains the most frequent occurrences of codes. However, this category is different from the other two categories in that the amount of language necessary for an individual code to be assigned to the *UE* category was greater than for codes in the *Ed* and *Ni* categories. First, *UE*-related codes were almost exclusively assigned to data from classroom recordings, which constitutes the largest body of transcribed data. Second, while some *Ed*- and *Ni*-related codes were also assigned to data from classroom recordings, their frequency was considerably lower because they required broader stretches of discourse. Third, *UE*-related codes were numerically far more prominent because, as teachers showed a clear preference for grammar-translation teaching, an approach which is dependent on transfers between the L1 and the L2 with the L1 often serving as the matrix language, the frequency of such transfers in the data was bound to be greater.

To provide a rough thematic structure for the analysis below, I reiterate the five central research questions for the current Module, and for each, I indicate pertinent codes (see Appendix 8 for descriptions of codes).

① *What are the dominant features of the English classes in the schools where data is collected (e.g. objectives, materials, activities, teaching approaches, learner participation)?*

Six relevant codes: *code*, *uest*, *uewt*, *juni/cdif*, *cult*, *chal*

② *What range of perspectives do teachers and students hold in regards to the English classroom, their actions in it, and EFL education in general?*

Fourteen relevant codes: *juni/cdif*, *cult*, *chal*, *text*, *mext*, *cont*, *gram*, *esop, alt, actl, jeng, foim/fost, fodj, enfl*

③ *Based on the work done in Questions 1 and 2, to what extent does Japanese JHS English classroom discourse includes explicit references to concepts related to nihonjinron, as discussed in Sections One and Two of Module One?*

Fourteen relevant codes: *juni/cdif*, *cult*, *chal*, *text*, *mext*, *cont*, *gram*, *esop, alt,* *actl, jeng, foim/fost, fodj, enfl*

④ *What conclusions can be drawn about the nature of the relationship between nihonjinron and EFL practices in Japanese JHS, if such a relationship does exist?*

Fourteen relevant codes: *juni/cdif*, *cult*, *chal*, *text*, *mext*, *cont*, *gram*, *esop, alt, actl, jeng, foim/fost, fodj, enfl*

⑤ *How, and to what extent, does this potential relationship affect the way English is taught in Japanese schools?*

Fourteen relevant codes: *juni/cdif*, *cult*, *chal*, *text*, *mext*, *cont*, *gram*, *esop, alt, actl, jeng, foim/fost, fodj, enfl*

Drawing from the research questions listed above, the following five sections survey:

- the dominant features in the ethnographic classroom data (Section 5.1)
- the range of perspectives held by teachers and students in regards to the English classroom, their actions in it, and EFL education in general (Section 5.2)
- explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse in the data (Section 5.3)
- the relationship between the *nihonjinron* discourse and the way in which EFL education is conducted in the classrooms under focus (Section 5.4)
- possible implications for EFL education as observed in the four schools where

data was collected (Section 5.5)

Finally, in Section 6, I explore the relevance of the current module to *nihonjinron* research. Depending on the range of issues raised throughout the following analysis, some codes will be treated together while others will be treated independently. Throughout the following analysis, I include the most important extracts as figures (i.e. extracts which show clear evidence of themes in the data), and leave the more peripheral excerpts in Appendix 9, which contains all analyzed excerpts in this module.

In the next section, I provide answers to Research Question 1: *What are the dominant features of the English classes in the schools where data is collected (e.g. objectives, materials, activities, teaching approaches, learner participation)?*

5.1 DOMINANT FEATURES IN THE DATA

Answers to Question 1 are crucial to this module because they a) reveal the various processes happening in observed EFL classrooms, and b) help situate subsequent analyses of *nihonjinron* in the overall body of data, thus laying the ground for the inquiry into the said importance of the ideology to observed EFL practices in Sections 5.5. In short, to look at the dominant features in the data, I must bifurcate momentarily from *nihonjinron*-related data and issues in order to gain a broader view of the overall body of data, which will then help contextualize the *nihonjinron*-related elements within it.

In this section, I analyze three *UE* codes: code-switching (*code*), use of English with simultaneous translations (*uest*) and use of English without simultaneous translations (*uewt*). I interpret *translation* as an act of restating words already said or read, or a strategy of a) restating in the students’ own language L2 units perceived by teacher and/or students to be difficult; or b) restating L1 units in the L2 in order to check learners’ comprehension of target language features. I interpret code-switching as the practice of moving more or less freely between two (or more) languages within a sentence or speech event.

I then focus on references to culture teaching in the data. These references provide an initial view of the *nihonjinron*-related elements in the data. I end Section 5.1 by reviewing references to challenges faced by English teachers. As specified above, I refer to ‘dominant features’ as segments in the data which are important not only with regards to the five research questions stated above but also in terms of frequency and salience to EFL practices observed at the four schools. Initially, a theme was considered prevalent based on the frequency of related codes in the data. Then, I considered less frequent codes which bore direct relevance to the research questions. While the term ‘predominant’ is reiterated throughout this study, conceptually equivalent terms include 'salient' and 'significant'.

5.1.1 TEACHERS’ CHOICES OF LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM

To uncover how much English and Japanese were used by the teachers in the classroom, I looked at the first four recorded classes at each of the four schools (twelve classes overall), and calculated the proportion of teacher use of Japanese in relation to the total teacher speaking time. This was done with the use of a chronometer. Results show that Japanese was the main language used by all teachers except Ms. Tanaka (St-Maria J&SHS), and that English tended to be used more at the beginning of the class, with Japanese gradually gaining prominence as the class unfolded. Mr. Ono (Sakura JHS) spoke 55.1% of the total classroom time and used Japanese 66.9% of the time. Ms. Tanaka (St-Maria J&SHS) spoke 68% of the total classroom time and used Japanese only 39.2% of the time. Ms. Inoue (Asahi JHS) spoke 43.9% of the total classroom time and used Japanese 85.6% of the time. Finally, Ms. Ishida (Heiwa JHS) spoke 58% of the total classroom time and used Japanese 58.4% of the time. The average teacher talk was 56.25% of the total classroom time. This significant proportion suggests a) 'over-teaching', and b) teachers struggling to provide information and/or giving instructions constantly in the L2, which can prompt the use of the L1.

The average use of Japanese by the four teachers was 62.5%, a figure similar to Kaneko's (1991) reported 70% L1 use by Japanese secondary school EFL teachers. More recent studies, however, provide conflicting results. Miyazato (2009) claims that only 3.9% of Japanese JHS English teachers in their study conducted English classes mostly in English. On the other hand, MEXT (2014b) reports a majority of senior high school English teachers using English 50% of the time in grammar-oriented classes, while Tsukamoto & Tsujioka (2013) report a similar figure in Oral Communication classes and only 10% in grammar-oriented classes. The authors reveal that English is used by teachers most often for classroom instruction, greetings and warm-up activities, and that very few teachers use the L2 to provide grammar explanation. The data collected for this module shows that, while the amounts of teacher talk were relatively similar at all four schools, teachers' use of Japanese varied considerably. For example, Ms. Tanaka spoke English more than twice the amount spoken by Ms. Inoue. In sum, 62.5% is a broad approximation and does not reveal the considerable discrepancies between the four teachers who participated in this study.

Regarding the links between communicative functions and teachers' choice of language, Macaro (1997) identifies three main purposes for foreign language teachers' L1 use: to give instructions, to provide feedback, and to translate and check learner comprehension. Duff & Polio (1990) underline four purposes: translating unknown words, explaining difficult grammar points, managing the classroom and doing discipline, and showing empathy/solidarity towards students. Similar purposes were also found by Jingxia (2010). Coplan & Neokleous (2011) provide a more extensive list:

- logistics (organizing)
- explaining/revising language skills and systems
- giving instructions
- questioning and answering
- reprimanding
- joking
- praising
- translating
- providing hints
- giving opinions
- discourse markers

Table 2 provides a functional distribution of Japanese and English in teacher talk as observed in the data. However, since communicative functions in recorded teacher talk were not always mutually exclusive, my distribution is, to a minor extent, based on subjective judgment. All numbers in Table 2 refer to percentages of specific functions in relation to total teacher talk (100%).

Functions	**Mr. Ono (Sakura JHS)**		**Ms. Tanaka (St-Maria J&SHS)**		**Ms. Inoue (Asahi JHS)**		**Ms. Ishida (Heiwa JHS)**	
	Japanese	**English**	**Japanese**	**English**	**Japanese**	**English**	**Japanese**	**English**
Classroom instruction	13.3	3.1	5.1	15	23.3	5.4	27.9	5.8
Classroom management	3.2							
Double checking understanding		2.2			15.4		4	
Grammar explanation	35.2		23.2	1.8	14.6		18	
Tangent/personal story	7							
Class opener		5.1	2.3					
Games		4.7						
Random exchange with students		3		2.3			1.9	
Giving feedback			3.3	1.6	24.2			
Requesting feedback from students							2.3	
Giving dictations			4.1	4.7				
Chorus practice				16.4				14.5
Reading practice				6.5		2.6		
Requesting translation	2.7				3.1		1.2	
Providing translation							2.2	

Table 2 – Functional distribution of L1/L2 in teacher talk, in relation to total teacher talk

From this table, we can see that teachers usually provide classroom instructions in Japanese, although Ms. Tanaka used three times more English to achieve this purpose. Grammar explanations were almost exclusively provided in Japanese. Except for Ms. Inoue, few teachers provided feedback in either language, suggesting that student output was limited. Both Ms. Tanaka and Ms. Ishida emphasized chorus practices in the L2 – i.e. they placed importance on L2 verbalization (e.g. chorus practice, reading aloud, scripted dialogs with prompts, etc.). However, while not noticeable directly from the data presented in the above table, data from field notes reveal evidence at St-Maria J&SHS of active negotiation of linguistic meaning between teacher and students. Ms. Ishida did try on a few occasions to initiate similar exchanges in the L2 with her students. However, these attempts were largely unsuccessful because the students almost always remained silent. Mr. Ono's impromptu exchanges with his students were almost always in the L1, while Ms. Inoue's students rarely spoke out, even during chorus practices.

Not evident in the above analysis are accounts of teachers' code-switching practices. In the next section, I analyze their prominence in the classroom data.

5.1.2 CODE-SWITCHING

Code-switching, identified by Wei (2006) as common practice among bilinguals, is a form of talk characterized by changes from one language to another in the course of conversation. It usually takes place between people sharing some degree of knowledge of at least two languages. These shifts do not usually involve a balance between two sets of grammatical rules, but instead one language providing a grammatical 'frame' within which particular items from another language (words, tags, phrases, etc.) are fitted. In short, one language serves as the 'matrix language' whereas the other becomes the 'embedded language' (Myers-Scotton, 1992). Code-switching is generally categorized, on the one hand, as intersentential – i.e.

maintaining sentence or clause boundaries – and on the other as intrasentential – switches within clause or sentence. Tag switching, or emblematic code-switching (Poplack, 1980), where tag forms in one language are inserted into utterances of another language, are considered a separate kind of code-switching. All three types were found in the data. Finally, Hosoda (2000) uncovers four main purposes of code-switching in Japanese EFL teacher talk: explaining prior utterances in English, defining unknown words, giving instructions, and providing positive and negative feedback. According to the author, these constitute teachers' responses to students' behaviors. Her main finding is that code-switching and translation are effective ways to restore the flow of interaction in the L2 between classroom actors, and as such can be regarded as generally beneficial to language learning.

I uncovered 126 instances of intersentential code-switching, many of which were found in the data collected at Heiwa JHS. However, this figure remains approximate due to the occasional difficulty in distinguishing instances of intersentential code-switching which clearly belonged to the *code* label and those which belonged to the *uest* label (for use of English with simultaneous translation). The excerpt included in Figure 1 shows the difficulty in distinguishing *uest* instances ('*san kai'* and '*hitori de'*) from *code* occurrences ('*hai ja* let's start'), both types of instances produced within the same short stretch of teacher talk.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Inoue:	OK. Thank you. So first uh practice	
2		speaking three times *san kai*. Only	Three times
3		you *hitori de*. *hai ja* let's start.	Alone / Yes, well

Figure 1 (Excerpt 5.1.2.1) – Asahi JHS (August 28)

However, Figure 2 below can be identified more explicitly as a *uest* occurrence, where an English instruction is provided, then immediately followed by its translation.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Inoue:	The first check your	
2		preparation. Ah *ja yoshuu*	Well, let's check your
3		*check kara ikimasu*.	preparations

Figure 2 – Asahi JHS (August 28)

This excerpt shows a more or less direct translation of an instruction provided first in the L2. Figure 3 is a different example of intersentential code-switching involving translation.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Ishida:	*dewa ima mazu saishou ni minna*	Well, first what I want
2		*san de yatte itadakitai no ha tadashii*	you to do is to circle
3		*to omou hou ni maru shite kudasai.*	the ones you think are
4		Which one is bigger? Look at the	right.
5		picture. Oh, the dog is bigger than	
6		the cat. OK? So, make a circle. Write	
7		down a circle, make a circle. OK?	
8		Next, number two. OK? Let's go.	
9		Circle circle. One minute. Hurry up.	

Figure 3 (Excerpt 5.1.2.3) – Heiwa JHS (December 18)

It begins with an L1 instruction followed by an L2 utterance which is not a literal translation of the previous utterance but both a paraphrase and an elaboration. Figure 4, on the other hand, shows a more dynamic combination of the L1 and the L2.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	In pairs, give your partner three hint	
2		words. Man wear the jacket, woman	
3		cleans the glasses. *muzukashii wa*	Today it's really
4		*kyou. metcha muzukashii.*	hard. It's really really hard.
5	S1:	*yada.*	I don't like this.
6	Ms. Tanaka:	*ii?* Difficult, yes. Fold the paper like this.	Good?
7		Everyone, then in practice, practice in	
8		pairs. Today's speaking training is very	
9		difficult. *hai*. Now, start practice in pairs.	Yes.

Figure 4 (Excerpt 5.1.2.4) – St-Maria J&SHS (May 23)

Here, Ms. Tanaka uses English to give instructions, and then uses Japanese to claim that the task is difficult. She reinforces this message with the English translation further down. In the process, the L1 and L2 are kept largely separate, except for the emblematic code-switch in line 9.

The most common form of code-switching in the data was intrasentential, with 171 instances. These occurred with both English and Japanese serving as matrix language, although the most frequent occurrences involved Japanese sentences with embedded English words or phrases. Figure 5 shows intrasentential code-switching with Japanese as the matrix language.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	*hai* good very good. *dewa tsugi.*	Yes / Alright, next. How
2		*aruku koto ga nan desu ka*?	do you say 'walk'?
3	Chorus:	Walk.	
4	Mr. Ono:	*de* the *wo tsukete* the walk *dozo*.	And you put the for the walk. Go ahead.
5	Chorus:	The walk.	

Figure 5 (Excerpt 5.1.2.5) – Sakura JHS (May 29)

The utterance "good very good" communicates a separate meaning, and is framed by the L1. This is a good example of grammar-translation involving transfers from the L1 to the L2, then back to the L1. It also shows how grammar-translation tends to be combined with L2 chorus practice. In contrast, Figure 6 shows intrasentential code-switching with English as the matrix language.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Inoue:	*hai ja* ah next pair work uh please	Yes, well /
2		*janken*. Please play *janken* uh you win	Rock-paper-scissors Rock-paper-scissors
3		orange part, you lose uh green part.	
4		*hai* three times let's start.	Yes

Figure 6 (Excerpt 5.1.2.6) – Asahi JHS (August 28)

As for Figure 1 above, this passage also shows the difficulty in distinguishing *uest* instances from *code* occurrences in the same stretch of teacher talk.

Finally, there were 127 instances of tag, or emblematic, code-switching, many of which were found in the data collected at St-Maria J&SHS. These usually included Japanese tags such as *hai* (yes), *ja* (well), *ne* (right), *eto* (well/huh), *unto* (well/huh), and *dewa* (right), as can be seen in Figure 7.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	We Go. The name of that shop *ne*? And	Right?
2		(student's name) had a break time with	
3		Bennyapa on that on Saturday. Let's focus	
4		on Bennyapa. This is (student's name)'s	
5		story *deshio*? Let's focus on Byu *hai*.	isn't it? / Yes.
6		Byu's story. Byu is a Thailand student.	
7		She wanted to go to Japan. And finally,	
8		she came to Japan on Mar- in May. This	
9		May. And she was accepted by (student's	
10		name)'s family. And she- we call her	
11		Bennyapa Byu *hai*. Let's change to	Yes.
12		passive voice.	

Figure 7 (Excerpt 5.1.2.7) – St-Maria J&SHS (May 21)

Here, Ms. Tanaka's main goal is to reinforce knowledge about how the passive voice is formulated in the L2. She does this by conveying communicative meaning through a narrative about a visiting Thai student named Bennyapa. Instead of using a decontextualized sentence such as *The students cleaned the classroom* to be reformulated as *The classroom was cleaned by the students*, she uses a real-life example. Interestingly, she does not translate words or expressions deemed difficult. In the process, however, she makes extensive use of Japanese tags (e.g. *hai* and *deshio*), something which she does on numerous occasions. Thus, while Ms. Tanaka is relatively successful at using the L2 to convey linguistic meaning and teach grammar, she also relies heavily on L1 tags. Figure 8 shows how an EFL teacher can use English predominantly and use L1 tags to maintain the presence of the L1, thus anchoring messages in what can arguably be considered the lived experience of learners.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	OK, girls. *hai*. Thank you very much. OK,	Yes.
2		look at the front. (student's name) *san*.	(honorific suffix) /
3		OK, thank you. Stop doing that. *hai* OK.	Yes.
4	S1:	Now, Q&A time. Q&A time.	
5	Ms. Tanaka:	Q&A time. So, tell me. What do you	
6		know about Thanksgiving Day?	
7		Anything. Anything is OK. What do you	
8		know about Thanksgiving Day?	
9	S1:	(student's name) *san*.	(honorific suffix)
10		On Thanksgiving Day fourth Thursday in	
11	Ms. Tanaka:	November.	
12		Thanksgiving Day is the fourth Thursday	
13		in November. So, the date will be	
14		changed year by year, probably. *ne* not	Right
15		fixed date.	

Figure 8 (Excerpt 5.1.2.8) – St-Maria J&SHS (June 18)

So far, the analysis has provided tentative answers to questions regarding the *where* and *how* of code-switching practices at the four schools. For instance, intrasentential code-switching – the most common type in the data – was more prominent at Sakura JHS and Asahi JHS, whereas inter-sentential code-switching was more prevalent at Heiwa JHS and at St-Maria J&SHS, with tag code-switching being predominant in the data collected at St-Maria J&SHS. Below, I focus on *why* teachers code-switched.

Mahootian (2006) distinguishes between conscious/intentional and unconscious/ unintentional code-switching, and identifies the latter as most common in bi- and multilingual speech communities. Conscious code-switching practices are understood as usually planned communicative strategies deployed by speakers to achieve particular communicative goals – e.g. directing a message to a particular recipient (Gumperz, 1982, p. 77). Examples of this type of code-switching in the data include instances of teachers tailoring their message so as to maximize learner comprehension. Figures 7 and 8 above include examples of this.

In the data, while this process most often involved simultaneous translations of English utterances into Japanese (an aspect of the data which I discuss in the next section), directing a message to a particular recipient through code-switching can also involve instances where interlocutors code-switch to foreground particular identities. This is noticeable in Figure 9, where the insertion of "…next page 12. Look at page 12" in Mr. Ono's explanation delivered mainly in Japanese shows how he balances the learners' L1 and the L2 by foregrounding L2 expressions that are well-known to them.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	*tokoro de kondo ne*- next page	By the way, right, next
2		12. Look at page 12. *miru to*	page 12. Look at page 12.
3		*zenzen kono kanke nai desu yo*	Looking at this, we see it's
		ne…	totally unrelated, right…

Figure 9 (Excerpt 5.1.2.9) – Sakura JHS (May 1)

By limiting his use of the L2 to known phrases such as "Look at page 12" and rarely venturing into unfamiliar L2 discourse, Mr. Ono can be said to index EFL learner identities. Because the L2 emerges mainly through formulaic chunks well-rehearsed and understood, it is possible to suggest that learners' identity as potential L2 communicators is not being fully recognized by the teacher.

EFL learner identity/ies can also be indexed by the teacher's use of the L1. Above, I considered Ms. Tanaka's extensive use of Japanese tags in her predominantly L2 classrooms. As was pointed out, this practice asserts the presence of Japanese in the EFL classroom, and in the process, highlights the fact that learners are non-native English speakers engaged in the task of learning English. As such, code-switching can be understood as a strategy to maintain the presence of the L1 in the EFL classroom, thus framing students as learners not fully competent in the target language (Ng, 2014).

Two additional conclusions can be drawn in regards to code-switching practices in the data. First, they may constitute strategies to facilitate student comprehension of teacher talk. Second, they can also be seen as minimizing the potential impact of the L2 on EFL learners' affective filter (Krashen, 1985). Judging from Ms. Tanaka's use of Japanese tags in Figure 8 above, code-switching events appear to be 'useful' or convenient L1 interruptions in a discourse conducted principally in the L2. More broadly speaking, the use of the L1 for linguistic support or back channels can create an environment where EFL learners feel they still possess some degree of control over classroom discourse, hence the notion of 'lived experience of learners' mentioned earlier.

Preceding Mahootian (2006), SØndergaard (1991) focuses on unconscious/ unintentional code-switching and proposes the notion of *spontaneous code-switching*, defining it as a switch to another language occurring when particularly strong emotions are involved. For instance, when a bilingual speaker experiences strong emotions (e.g. anger, surprise) while using one language, certain terms, idioms or utterances in another language may be more readily accessible. In Figure 10, Ms. Tanaka does not express a particularly strong emotion, instead only feeling mild irritation due to her students' perceived lack of engagement with the task at hand.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Do you know her name?	
2	S1:	Lucy.	
3	S2:	Rose.	
4	Ms. Tanaka:	No.	
5	S3:	Ms. White.	

6	Ms. Tanaka:	*zenzen chigau*.	Totally different.
7	S4:	Laura.	
8	Ms. Tanaka:	*shiranai ne*.	Don’t know her name, do you?
9	S4:	Laura.	
10	Ms. Tanaka:	Laura *ja nai yo*. her name- she is-	It’s not Laura.
11	S5:	Laura.	
12	Ms. Tanaka:	Tammy.	

Figure 10 (Excerpt 5.1.2.10) – St-Maria J&SHS (June 25)

The rather strong rejection *zenzen chigau* (totally different) in line 6 clearly expresses disappointment. The segment “Laura *ja nai yo*” in line 10 further amplifies the teacher’s emotion. The excerpt in Figure 10 mirrors Myers-Scotton’s (1993) account of code-switching as a means to express authority, anger and/or annoyance. Code-switching can also occur spontaneously when the teacher realizes (s)he has made a mistake, as the excerpt in Figure 11 also shows.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Don’t forget to write Japanese meaning, from	
2		number 6.	
3	S1:	Uh?	
4	Ms. Tanaka:	Number 6.	
5	S1:	(inaudible, in Japanese)	
6	Ms. Tanaka:	Please, write. (laughing) *gyaku da*. Number 7	The opposite.

Figure 11 (Excerpt 5.1.2.11) – St-Maria J&SHS (May 23)

In sum, the two excerpts above demonstrate how code-switching is linked to particular emotional states, which are events happening inherently ‘in the moment’, often without interlocutors being aware of them. They also exemplify SØndergaard’s (1991) linking of code-switching with the affective domain of language use.

Results from the second survey assessing teachers’ degree of awareness of their own choice of language in the classroom revealed that teachers made accurate estimates of their overall use of English and Japanese (estimates within less than 10% of actual measures). But when it came to estimating specific functions of teacher talk (e.g.

giving instructions, feedback, providing grammar explanations, etc.), their assessments were mostly inaccurate. Mr. Ono (Sakura JHS) estimated giving instructions 90% of the time in English, whereas the opposite was true. However, he did recognize using the L1 for grammar explanations. Ms. Tanaka (St-Maria J&SHS) more or less accurately assessed her use of English versus Japanese when it came to giving instructions, but made inaccurate assessments in terms of giving feedback and providing grammar explanations. Interestingly, while often code-switching intrasententially and using many Japanese tags in her talk, she claimed that she never code-switched within sentences. This apparent lack of awareness, however, could be due to limited understanding of the notion of code-switching. Like Mr. Ono, Ms. Ishida (Heiwa JHS) estimated a 90% use of English when it came to giving instructions, while the opposite was the case. She did, however, make somewhat accurate evaluations of both her code-switching practices and her extensive use of Japanese during grammar explanations.

In sum, teachers do not appear fully aware of their own choices of language codes *in situ*, especially in terms of particular functions of classroom talk. Furthermore, they are generally unaware of their own code-switching practices. While it is quite normal for bi- or multilingual people to be unable to accurately identify patterns in their choices of different languages, this ability is arguably important for foreign language teachers, especially considering MEXT’s recent proposal to transform the Japanese English classroom into a monolingual environment (MEXT, 2014a). In the next section, I focus on teachers’ tendency to simultaneously translate L2 utterances in the L1.

5.1.3 USE OF ENGLISH WITH SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION

In the data, two characteristics of teacher talk are evident: a) the prevalence of code-switching practices, and b) the predominance of the L1 as matrix language, especially in terms of intrasentential code-switching. In addition, as all teachers showed a marked preference for grammar-translation, the L1 often served as frame for target L2 utterances, producing the 'L1 → L2 → L1' discourse structure. In grammar-translation teaching, the L2 is the object of study, while the L1 is used as the general frame. Figure 12 illustrates how this structure unfolds during chorus practices.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Chorus:	What do you want to be in the	
2		future?	
3	Ms. Ishida:	*to kiite kudasai*. *moshi mo watashi*	This is what you hear. If
4		*ga* singer *ni naritai, aite wa* I want	I want to be a singer,
5		to be a singer *tte iuttara nante iu*	and I answer I want to
6		*kotae aru no ka?*	be a singer, what kind of
7	S1:	Wow!	responses are there?
8	Ms. Ishida:	*mou hitotsu*?	Another one?
9	S2:	Great.	

Figure 12 (Excerpt 5.1.3.1) – Heiwa JHS (October 17)

In lines 3, 4, 5 and 6, the teacher uses the L1 to frame a target L2 structure. This effectively distances learners from L2 communication, as it becomes entirely possible for learners to understand the teacher's message without having to process information in the L2. In Figure 13, English is used to initiate an instruction, which is immediately translated into Japanese.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Inoue:	OK, sit down please. *suwatte*. *hai* look	Sit down. / Yes
2		up your face. *hai, kao agete*. *hai*	Yes, look up. Yes

Figure 13 (Excerpt 5.1.3.2) – Asahi JHS (September 18)

The Japanese tag *hai* both ends Ms. Inoue's two separate instructions – sit down and look up – and serves as signal for students to act. Yet, the two excerpts above are similar in that L2 input does not necessarily have to be processed by the students, who can simply rely on the L1 when produced. One can also see from Figure 13 and Excerpt 5.1.3.3 (see Appendix 9) that teachers' English instructions are not always grammatically accurate, suggesting that teachers may choose to simultaneously translate their own utterance in order to avoid confusion. In short, simultaneous translation may be triggered by teachers' awareness of their L2 limitations, linking this discursive process to the affective domain of language use.

While the 'L1 → L2 → L1' discourse pattern is common in most grammar-translation classrooms, the most frequent translation structure in the data was 'L2 → L1', where a message – e.g. an instruction, a target L2 form – is first delivered in the L2, then simultaneously translated in the L1. This pattern was found extensively in the data. In Figure 14, Mr. Ono provides a personal example to highlight past tense verb inflections.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	On May 5th, I went to my uncle's	
2		house. When I arrived there, when	
3		*te iu koto ga itsu janakute nani nani*	When doesn't mean
4		*no toki da*. Arrive *ga touchaku*	when, but during or as.
5		*shita*. *watashi ga tsuita toki*	Arrive means reach.
			When I got there…
6		the phone was ringing. (makes a	
7		ringing sound; some students	
8		laugh) I ate sushi. I ate sushi there.	

Figure 14 (Excerpt 5.1.3.4) – Sakura JHS (September 18)

The teacher uses English confidently, although he interrupts his message with a simultaneous translation of one of its aspects. Also in Excerpt 5.1.3.5 (see Appendix 9), taken from the same class at Sakura JHS, the teacher provides the most important information in the L1. Most of this L2 exchange takes place between Mr. Ono and I, with the students being passive recipients. When the learners are spoken to, it is in the L1. In other words, a symbolic distance is thus placed between the students and the target language.

In light of the evidence in the data, simultaneous translations can be interpreted as distancing learners from the L2. As Figure 13 and Excerpt 5.1.3.3 show, affective elements of foreign language use can also be considered possible triggers. Evidence found in Figure 15 suggests the latter.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Inoue:	*hai* what's the meaning? (taps on the	Yes
2		blackboard with chalk) *ko iu imi nan*	What's the meaning?
3		*dake*? *ue shita dochi*?	Top or down? Which?
4	S1:	*ue shita shita*.	Top down down.
5	Ms. Inoue:	*shita. hai shita*.	Down. Yes, down.

Figure 15 (Excerpt 5.1.3.6) – Asahi JHS (September 11)

In this relatively simple exchange, Ms. Inoue begins in English. Yet, as she realizes that the students are not paying attention, she taps on the blackboard with her chalk and quickly translates her initial question. The rest of the exchange is conducted in Japanese. Incidentally, the students are never asked to process or produce meaning in the L2. Kang (2008) argues that foreign language teachers use the L1 mainly out of consideration for their students' level of interest in the classroom, or their motivation to learn the target language. Accordingly, if learners are motivated to learn the L2, then the teacher is likely to use more of it. If they are not, the teacher may opt to create a greater distance between the L2 and the learners. The data collected at Asahi JHS and Heiwa JHS seems to support these assertions.

Ms. Ishida's shifts between the L1 and the L2 are worth discussing at this point. Even if she often translated L2 forms to facilitate understanding, her chorus practices almost always involved an idea first formulated in the L1, which was immediately followed by an L2 utterance produced by students in chorus, as seen in Figure 16.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1 2 3	Ms. Ishida:	*… riyuu wo gakkou he ikitai, koukou he ikitai, san nensei no tokoro kara* (inaudible) *san hai.*	…the reason why you want to go to school, go to high school, because you are in the third year (inaudible) three, go.
4	Chorus:	I want to go to high school.	
5 6	Ms. Ishida:	So why? *ima made dattara sugu* because *de kotaemashita.* I want *san hai.*	Right after this, we put ‘because’ to answer / three, go.
7 8	Chorus:	I want to go to high school because I want to study more.	
9 10 11 12	Ms. Ishida:	*kore wo* because *de tsukawanai de ikimashio. ii?* (inaudible) because *de tsukaimasen. moto* simple *ni iimasu. san hai.*	Let’s try without using ‘because’. OK? Without using ‘because’. Saying it more simply. Three, go.
13 14	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to study more.	
15 16 17 18 19	Ms. Ishida:	Very good. *riyuu ga iro iro kawatte kimasu ne. motto benkyou shitai kara. kore ha tomodachi wo tsukuru tame ni koukou ikitain da. san hai.*	We can change the reason, right? Because I want to study more. Also, I want to go to high school because I want to make friends. Three, go.
20 21	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to make friends.	
22 23	Ms. Ishida:	(inaudible) *koushien ni ikitain da.* Ready, go.	I want to take part in the national baseball tournament.
24 25	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to play baseball.	
26	Ms. Ishida:	*daigaku ikitain da.* Ready, go.	I want to go to university.
27 28	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to go to college.	
29	Ms. Ishida:	To go to university.	

Figure 16 (Excerpt 5.1.3.7) – Heiwa JHS (October 24)

In these types of chorus practices, the students’ translation work was essentially guided by prompts provided on handouts or in the textbook, explaining students' consistently accurate chorus responses.

In sum, teachers' uses of English were almost always followed, and sometimes framed, by Japanese. This constitutes clear indication that grammar-translation was the preferred approach at the four schools, a preference widely reported in the literature as well as by MEXT (2011a). Additional evidence of this can be observed in the ways both Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue used the blackboard. Turning their backs to the students on multiple occasions during class, these two teachers usually filled the blackboard with notes containing approximately ten or twenty percent English words and sentences, with eighty percent Japanese translations and explanations. This common practice can also be noticed in teacher-produced handouts, with the goal being to provide Japanese support at both the language comprehension and language production stages.

Teachers and students at the four schools never strayed too far away from their L1. Students usually accessed the L2 either before or after an L1 utterance was provided as frame, thus rarely having the chance to experience linguistic ambiguity or confusion. Explaining this tendency, Tsukamoto & Tsujioka (2013) report that over 70% of Japanese EFL teachers in their study thought that conducting monolingual English classes is difficult, although 11% of them identified their own linguistic limitations as cause. In contrast, 56% thought that monolingual EFL education is challenging because of their students' linguistic limitations.

In Section 5.2.3, I discuss teachers' views on monolingual EFL education. In the next section, I focus on teachers' use of English without translation, which provides a glimpse into how monolingual EFL education actually took place at the four schools.

5.1.4 USE OF ENGLISH WITHOUT TRANSLATION

In arguing that teachers use the L1 mainly out of consideration for their students' level of interest or motivation, Kang (2008) effectively places learner motivation as the precondition for teacher's use of the L2. This means that if students are motivated, the teacher may be encouraged to use more of the target language. Evidence showing the opposite was found in the data found at both Sakura JHS and at St-Maria J&SHS. At these two schools, teachers started every class in the L2, which seemed to motivate learners to listen more attentively and participate more actively. As noticeable in both classroom recordings and in field notes, Mr. Ono's extensive and detailed instructions in Japanese led students to become passive and unfocused, whereas his use of English seemed to trigger more active responses. In Excerpt 5.1.4.1 (see Appendix 9), for example, Mr. Ono introduces me to his students in English, and students react positively to both my presence and to what the teacher is saying in English. One student asks me an impromptu question, while another one simply yells out "Woahh".

Students' generally positive reactions to teachers' use of English were common at the beginning of class when the energy level was usually high. In Figure 17, students energetically respond to Ms. Tanaka's English questions, which are always repeated at the beginning of each class immediately after the class opening prayer, also conducted in English.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Good morning girls.	
2	Chorus:	Good morning Ms. Tanaka.	
3	S1:	(calling another student's name)	
4	Ms. Tanaka:	How are you today?	
5	Chorus:	I'm fine, thank you. And you?	
6	Ms. Tanaka:	Fine. How is the weather today?	
7	Chorus:	It's sunny.	
8	Ms. Tanaka:	Sunny. Then what is the date today?	
9	Chorus:	It's May 9, 2013.	
10	Ms. Tanaka:	OK. Please have a seat.	
11	Students:	(talking out loud)	
12	Ms. Tanaka:	Shhh. OK, please. Let's do our	
13		vocabulary test. OK?	
14	S2:	Ah *kyou yattenai tango*.	Ah, I didn't do the vocabulary task.
15	S3:	(inaudible question, in Japanese)	
16	Ms. Tanaka:	Why? After the test. (student's name),	
17		hurry up and get ready. (another	
18		student's name, repeated twice), Here	
19		you are.	
20	S4:	*sensei, matte kudasai*.	Teacher, please wait.
21	S5:	*sensei*?	Teacher?
22	Ms. Tanaka:	*hai*.	Yes.
23	S5:	All's well that ends well *tte nan desu*	What does 'All's well that ends well' mean? What's 'end'?
24		*ka*? End *tte* (inaudible)?	

Figure 17 (Excerpt 5.1.4.2) – St-Maria J&SHS (May 9)

While their exchange gradually moves from the L2 to the L1, we can see students' enthusiasm from lines 20 to 24, triggered by the teacher's use of English. In this particular case, one student uses this as an opportunity to ask a tangential question about a rather difficult English expression, suggesting greater involvement in the learning task.

These energetic 'L2 moments', however, were almost always very short, sporadic, and most often consisted of formulaic L2 phrases already well-known by the students.

Teachers often preferred L2 verbalization exercises potentially because these allow learners to actually produce L2 utterances without having to deal with linguistic ambiguity. This raises another issue of concern, which is that English may not constitute a necessary language for communication in the socialization experiences of Japanese EFL learners (Ng, 2014). This gap between language learning and real-life communication creates a paradox for both language learners and teachers. To provide a sense that students are indeed using the L2 for communicative purposes, key L2 phrases and expressions are taught repeatedly and rehearsed through various chorus activities. Over time, learners become familiar with these expressions, and when cued, they can produce appropriate responses in chorus with limited effort. This practice can also give the impression that students can use the L2 successfully. Arguably, the simulation of L2 communication through L2 verbalization exercises can gradually blur the distinction between real and imagined L2 communication.

Among the four teachers, Ms. Tanaka was the only one able to maintain a relatively continuous exchange with the students in the L2, most notably when teaching grammar structures using flashcards. In Excerpt 5.1.4.3 (see Appendix 9), she attempts to reinforce the syntactic structures '*… is easy to…*' and '*… is not easy to…*' In this excerpt, Japanese is used mostly emblematically and is never used to introduce or translate L2 forms. In line 18, the teacher repeats a student's L1 utterance, and in line 27 she performs an intrasentential code-switch. However, while the L2 is dominant in this excerpt, it is maintained precisely because the learners are engaged in an L2 verbalization exercise with flashcards providing the necessary cues. In short, we are still not dealing with impromptu L2 classroom discourse.

Later on in the same class, however, Ms. Tanaka and her students are engaged in a successful – and unrehearsed – exchange of meaning in the L2, this time about professional Japanese baseball players.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	OK, so does anybody know about Ichiro,	
2		what do you know about Ichiro Suzuki?	
3		Baseball player.	
4	S1:	Baseball player. Yes. He’s not a soccer	
5	Ms. Tanaka:	player.	
6		Professional.	
7	S2:	Professional baseball player. He was not	
8	Ms. Tanaka:	the first major league player. He was not	
9		the first major league player. But he was	
10		the first Japanese outfielder in the major	
11		league. Outfielder *nani*?	What?
12	S1:	*gaiya senshu*.	Outfielder.
13	Ms. Tanaka:	*gaiya senshu*. *sono mae ni mo* before	Outfielder. Also before him
14		him, many Japanese players went to	
15		America and became a major league	
16		player. But he was the first outfielder,	
17		Japanese outfielder. And where is he	
18		now? Where does he play now?	
19	S3:	America.	
20	Ms. Tanaka:	*ya* America *nan dayo*. America	Of course
21		(inaudible) *desu*. More specific. Which	America.
22		area? Which city?	
23	S4:	Seattle.	
24	S5:	Mariners.	
25	Ms. Tanaka:	A la la la la la Seattle. He used to play in	
26		Seattle. But not any *ne* anymore.	Right?
27	S6:	(inaudible)	
28	Ms. Tanaka:	*hai* New York. *doko*?	Yes. / where?
29	S7:	New York.	
30	Ms. Tanaka:	New York?	
31	S4:	Manhattan.	
32	S6:	Yankees.	That’s right.
33	Ms. Tanaka:	Yankees. *so*. For the Yankees. Who	
34		used to play in New York Yankees?	
35	S1:	Matsui.	
36	Ms. Tanaka:	Matsui. Yes. Matsui.	

Figure 18 (Excerpt 5.1.4.4) – St-Maria J&SHS (May 9)

In lines 11 and 28, Ms. Tanaka uses the L1 momentarily to quiz students about key words in her narrative. The resulting exchange is more or less a rapid and effective L2 exchange between Ms. Tanaka and her students. Such examples of spontaneous L2 exchange are not found in the data collected at other schools, where the L2 is used mostly to state or refer back to target L2 forms to be learned.

To sum up, the *UE*-related codes analyzed above were numerically most prominent in the data. Below are 14 observations drawn from analysis of *UE*-related codes.

- Grammar-translation is clearly the preferred approach at all four schools.
- The most frequent translation structure in the data is 'L2 → L1', indicating a) a strong tendency amongst teachers to remove the responsibility for students to figure out L2 meanings unassisted, and b) students' lack of opportunities to experience L2 ambiguity.
- Japanese was the main language used by teachers, most often used as support during both comprehension and production stages.
- English tended to be used more at the beginning of the class.
- Used extensively by the teachers, the L1 can also be characterized as a mitigating entity, keeping the L2 at a certain distance.
- At both Sakura JHS and at St-Maria J&SHS, teachers' L2 use seemed to motivate learners to listen more attentively and participate more actively.
- There was limited evidence of impromptu, personalized L2 meanings produced by teachers; almost none of the students produced extensive utterances in English.

- Ms. Tanaka and Ms. Ishida emphasized chorus practices of L2 forms (L2 verbalization).
- Teachers' lack of confidence in their own L2 proficiency and learners' limited interest in the L2 task are two possible reasons explaining teachers' choices of language.
- There was ample evidence of intersentential, intrasentential, and emblematic (tag) code-switching.
- Intrasentential code-switching (Japanese as matrix language) was the most prevalent type found in the data.
- While Ms. Tanaka used English much more often than the other teachers, she also performed the greatest number of emblematic (tag) code-switches.
- Teachers' use of the L1 as matrix language (during intrasentential code-switching), well-rehearsed L2 phrases, and L1 tags, can be interpreted as strategies to index EFL learner-teacher identities.
- Teachers are generally unaware of their own code-switching practices, and are largely unable to identify and qualify various functions of their own classroom talk, suggesting that code-switching practices amongst teachers are by and large unintentional, and potentially related to particular emotional states.

In the next section, I analyze four additional codes of thematic significance in the data, found in all data sources: references to the teaching of culture (*cult*), cultural differences (*cdif*), Japan as unique nation or ‘traditional Japan’ (*juni*) and challenges faced by English teachers (*chal*).

5.1.5 CULTURE TEACHING

The four codes analyzed in this section – *cult*, *cdif*, *juni*, and *chal* – were not necessarily prominent numerically, although their relevance to the current inquiry into *nihonjinron* in context is clear. Since these codes include references to culture teaching, their analysis provides an initial view of the *nihonjinron*-related elements in the data. For this reason, I simultaneously describe and analyze the data with reference to broader processes and findings from the literature. Below, I begin by focusing on approaches to culture teaching amongst teacher-participants, and follow with a focus on policy documents and textbooks.

In the classroom data, there were few instances of teachers introducing cultural elements beyond the content specified in textbooks. Of interest here is Mr.Ono’s tendency to reproduce MEXT’s view on culture teaching during interviews. In Figure 19, while discussing the aim of culture teaching in his classroom, Mr. Ono emphasizes the element of Otherness.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Mr. Ono:	the aim is to let students surprise. [mmh] So [(laughing)] funny
2		or strange culture. [Ah OK] Yeah.
3	Bouchard:	So you want students to be kind of impressed [Yes] or
4		shocked.
5	Mr. Ono:	Yes.

Figure 19 (Excerpt 5.1.5.1) – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Here, the teacher conceptualizes culture teaching as a form of entertainment, and as such, minimizing the role of culture teaching in the EFL classroom. However, no clear evidence from classroom data shows that he taught cultural aspects in class. This is also seen in Figure 20.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	they are quite interested in the origin of Halloween or how
2		to celebrate [uh] Christmas or Halloween in America. [uh
3		huh] And how different from Ja- Japan in Japan, or so.

Figure 20 (Excerpt 5.1.5.2) – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Here, Ms. Tanaka hones in on the aspects of cultural comparison and of cultural folklore as beneficial to the development of cultural awareness. Before moving on to other excerpts in the data, it is important to critically unpack the above samples with reference to the literature.

By focusing on cultural differences and on the traditional – or folkloric – aspects of foreign cultures, the Other is essentialized and exoticized. This Other – a monolithic western culture represented mainly by the U.S. but also by Australia and the U.K. – becomes understandable from the angle of cultural differences, and thus as an opposing force to Japaneseness. In these excerpts and in policy documents and textbooks, there are also traces of *self-orientalism* (Iwabuchi, 1994), or the discursive construction of oneself as the oriental ‘Other’. The main problem with such approaches to teaching intercultural competence is that Otherness tends to be presented as a) inherently different from ‘native culture’, and b) an alternative to national identity instead of a complement to it. Furthermore, approaching culture teaching thus can reinforce learners’ ethnocentric attitudes (Byram, 2008). Almost two decades ago, Kamada (1996) decried this problematic approach to culture teaching in the Japanese EFL context, arguing that,

> many students have well defined ethnocentric and stereotypical viewpoints limiting their ability to objectively evaluate new or unusual ideas. Many often resort to narrowing things down to over-simplistic categories of either “good” or “bad” rather than viewing other ideas, peoples or cultures in a total context. Japanese students also have a tendency to reduce things to a common consensual agreement, rather than developing and expressing their own individual ideas (p.154).

Identifying students’ lack of experience and techniques for engaging with cultural themes and in the language classroom, the author highlighted the need for them to “recognize the value of diversity in cultural perspectives in differing peoples between and within cultures” (p.154).

Coming back to the data, while Mr. Ono almost never taught cultural aspects during his classes, the other three teachers sporadically addressed aspects of both Japanese and foreign cultures, notably British and American cultures. In Excerpt 5.1.5.3 (see Appendix 9), Ms. Tanaka quizzes her students on their knowledge of Thanksgiving in the U.S. The focus is less on cultural content than on linguistic content, as students’ ability to locate specific information in the text is being tested. In lines 28 and 29, Ms. Tanaka asks a student to utter the target sentence without looking at the text. As such, the focus is not on text interpretation but instead on memorization of key L2 structures. The teacher’s questions about Thanksgiving then serve as linguistic cues for L2 verbalization. The relative absence of translation of L2 forms, however, suggests that the teacher is only referring to cultural information by assuming that learners already understand the cultural content in the text. The exchange in Figure 21, however, is somewhat different.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	OK, girls. Look at the blackboard. July	
2		4th.	
3	S1:	*kyou*?	Today?
4	Ms. Tanaka:	Uh. July 4th. What day is today? *kyou*	What day is today?
5		*ha nan no hi*?	
6	S2/S3:	*natsu no hi/ umi no hi*.	It's Summer Day/Sea Day.
7	Ms. Tanaka:	*umi no hi*? A la la la la la la la la. *hai*.	Sea Day? / Yes.
8	S4:	*kyou ha* (inaudible) *no hi*	It's (inaudible) Day
9	S5:	*kyou ha dokuritsu kinenbi*.	Today's Independence Day.
10	Ms. Tanaka:	Oh! Great.	
11	S6:	*so na no*?	Is that so?
12	S7:	National-	
13	Ms. Tanaka:	Ah, wait. (student's name), *kenkoku*	Like Nation-building Day or, Independence Day- yes.
14		*kinen toka, dokuritsu ni- hai.*	
15		In English please.	
16	S1:	In- in-	
17	Ms. Tanaka:	In-	
18	S1:	In- in- in-	
19	Some	(laughing)	
20	students:	Indentopod-	
21	S3:	Independence.	
22	S4:	Ah *so so so so*.	That's right. (X4)
23	S6:	(writing on the board) Independence	
24	Ms. Tanaka:	Day. OK. Do you know- do you	
25		remember, this year is very important	
26		in America.	
27	S1:	(inaudible, in Japanese)	
28	Ms. Tanaka:	*ne*. Why is this year important in	Right.
29		America?	
30	S2:	America become a inde-	
31	Ms. Tanaka:	Pardon?	
32	S2:	America become independent.	
33	Ms. Tanaka:	Good. (writing on the board) America	
34		became independent.	

Figure 21 (Excerpt 5.1.5.4) – St-Maria J&SHS (July 4)

Here, Ms. Tanaka asks her students to explain the importance of July 4th in American history. A few weeks earlier, Ms. Tanaka and her students reviewed a text entitled "The Spirit of '76", and in it were the sentences "1776 was an important year in American history. America became an independent nation in that year." In this text, no mention is made of July 4th as being the important date in question. This suggests that students had either learned about it on their own, in history class, or from Ms. Tanaka who expanded on the information found in the textbook. At this point, Ms. Tanaka goes beyond a focus on memorizing L2 forms to focus on culture teaching. This type of interpretive work conducted in the L2 is more evident in Excerpt 5.1.5.5 (see Appendix 9) from the same class, although this L2 extrapolation from the core text is quickly transferred to the L1. In short, while there is evidence of Ms. Tanaka investing in culture teaching, her pedagogical focus remains essentially on target L2 forms.

Ms. Ishida also overlooked culture to focus on L2 forms, as shown in Figure 22.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1 2 3	CD recording:	I always say people in one country can’t live a day without the help of people in other countries.	
4	Ms. Ishida:	*hai*.	Yes.
5 6 7	Chorus:	I always say people in one country can’t live a day without the help of people in other countries.	
8 9	Ms. Ishida:	*aru kuni no hito bito, ta no kuni no hito bito*.	People in one country, people in other countries
10 11 12	CD recording:	People in Japan, for example, must think of people in China when they wear clothes.	
13	Ms. Ishida:	*hai*.	Yes.
14 15 16	Chorus:	People in Japan, for example, must think of people in China when they wear clothes.	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Ishida:	*tatoeba nihonjin ha tte iutte mo nihonjin tte iu hajimechatta no de for example tte iu kotoba ha tatoe tte iuttemasu yo. de iro fuku wo kiru toki ni sore wo tsukutta chuugoku no hito bito no koto kangaenakereba dame deshio*.	“People in Japan” begins the sentence, followed by the expression “for example”. Also, when we wear all kinds of clothes we must think of the Chinese people who made them.
24	CD recording:	They must also think of people in	

25		Africa and south America when	
26		they eat chocolate and feel happy.	
27	Ms. Ishida:	*hai*.	Yes.
28	Chorus:	They must also think of people in	
29		Africa and south America when	
30		they eat chocolate and feel happy.	
31	Ms. Ishida:	Chocolate *wo taberu toki ni ha*	When we eat
32		Africa *no hito bito* eh *minna ni*	chocolate, we must
33		America *hito bito no koto*	think of African people
34		*kangaenakereba dame datta*. OK?	and uh Americans.

Figure 22 (Excerpt 5.1.5.6) – Heiwa JHS (November 26)

In this sample, cultural content is provided in the L2 in a recording. The message being communicated here is clearly in response to a statement in Section 9 (MEXT, 2010: 8) specifying that “materials should be useful in deepening the international understanding from a broad perspective, heightening students’ awareness of being Japanese citizens living in a global community and cultivating a spirit of international cooperation.” Unfortunately, the content is never reviewed and explored substantially. Instead, it is merely repeated in chorus by the students first, and then translated by Ms. Ishida in the L1. The teacher is therefore concerned with the grammatical aspects of the recording in question. The discursive marker “OK?” in line 34 serves as an abrupt signal to move on to other things.

Ms. Ishida, however, sometimes included cultural content in creative ways. In Excerpt 5.1.5.7 (see Appendix 9), she introduces a song by the British singer Sting, and discusses the British identity of the ALT at Heiwa JHS. All of this, however, is achieved in the L1. She then distributes a handout containing the lyrics in both English and Japanese. The students simply look at the handout and follow as the song is being played. Ms. Ishida then brings students’ attention to the comparative adjective ‘brighter’ from the line “At night a candle's brighter than the sun”. Immediately afterward, she moves on to a review of a listening test focusing on the comparative structure. This example demonstrates a superficial focus on culture content in the EFL classroom. Excerpts 5.1.5.8 and 5.1.5.9 (see Appendix 9) are similar in this respect. In Excerpt 5.1.5.8, Ms. Ishida formulates a question in the L2, and immediately translates it in the L1. She does not wait for students to respond and provides the answer '*setsubun*', with a student merely repeating the word. This leads to a second question, first formulated in the L1, and then in the L2. A student answers in the L1. In this short exchange, the L2 is not actually used for communicative purposes. Also relevant to the current discussion, the focus remains on traditional aspects of Japanese culture. In Excerpt 5.1.5.9, a similar approach to culture teaching is adopted by Ms. Inoue. The cultural content here is on national foods, but only basic knowledge is reviewed. By asking students to rephrase '*nihon shoku*' into '*wa shoku*' – rudimentary knowledge for any Japanese junior high school student – she is effectively teaching the L1 and not the L2.

Another code in the data of relevance to the current analysis is *juni*, or references to Japan as unique nation. However, only the classroom data collected at Sakura JHS and at Heiwa JHS included single *juni* codes. One sample at Sakura JHS included a student mentioning to the teacher the recent designation of Mt. Fuji as a World Heritage Site. Figure 23, however, is more revealing.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Mr. Ono:	*ja koko de watashi ga kyoumi no*	OK, I have a question I
2		*shitsumon ga arun desu*	want to ask.
3		*keredomo* (writing on the board)	
4	S1:	Japan?	
5	Mr. Ono:	Mmh, *datte nihon ni sunderu no*	Well, you know he is
6		*wakaru shou?*	living in Japan.
7	S2:	*sunderu no?*	He lives in Japan?

8	Mr. Ono:	*datte itsumo mai shuu gakkou ni*	Well, he always comes to
9		*kiteru shi Hokkai Gakuen no*	school every week, and
10		*sensei da tte iu no wa wakaru*	he is a teacher at Hokkai
11		*kara*	Gakuen University, so you know.

Figure 23 (Excerpt 5.1.5.10) – Sakura JHS (May 14)

It shows an exchange between Mr. Ono and his students which occurred after I had given three example sentences about my own life using the gerund form '*–going to*'. While students were aware of my identity as a foreign English teacher/researcher and full-time lecturer working in a local university, some of them seemed to overlook the fact that I am, by default, also a resident of Japan. This underscores an assumption about non-Japanese people in Japan as migrant workforce, or as foreigners temporarily 'passing through'.

Figure 24, which includes a segment from a YouTube video of Keisuke Honda (a professional player recently contracted by Inter Milan), is also of interest.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Honda:	Uh, I never meet a samurai–
2	Audience of journalists:	(laughter)
3	Honda:	So I don't know that is true. But I think Japanese
4		uh is uh never give up and strong mentality and
5		we have good discipline. So I think I have, too.
6		So just I want to show that spirit on the pitch.

Figure 24 (Excerpt 5.1.5.11) – Heiwa JHS (January 30)

In this sample, Mr. Honda is responding to an Italian journalist asking him to respond to popular characterizations of him as possessing a 'samurai spirit'. This sample of classroom audio material is simultaneously a rejection of a Japanese stereotype – the samurai – and an assertion of a 'Japanese spirit'. Soon after having played this segment of the interview, Ms. Ishida commented that Honda's statement "I never meet a samurai" had surprised her, and that despite his imperfect English he could successfully convey humor in the language. She then used this as an opportunity to argue that, even with imperfect English, EFL learners can communicate their thoughts to people all over the world. This instance, however, also shows how a focus on culture content can rapidly shifts to a focus on language-related issues. This sample is discussed further below.

The samples of classroom discourse analyzed so far show how culture teaching is not a priority at the four schools where data was collected. Byram (1989) discusses the detriments of superficial approaches to culture teaching, and argues that teaching culture by simply providing information about a foreign country unfortunately bypasses the crucial element of attitude change in culture teaching, a pedagogical element also underlined by Kamada (1996). Evidence in the data also suggests that attitude change amongst pupils is unlikely to take place when cultural traditions are prioritized. This is because traditions tend to be presented as fixed realities distant from the lives of young learners. I revisit this point in Sections 5.3.1 and 5.5.4.

Even if academic articles proposing strategies for conducting culture teaching in the classroom have been published (Cullen & Sato, 2000; Dai, 2011, Guest, 2002; Kamada, 1996; Kilickaya, 2004; Kodotchigova, 2002), very few studies have been devoted to clarifying the role of culture in the language classroom. Guest (2002: 154) argues that,

> much EFL cultural research has had the unfortunate result of misinterpreting foreign cultures by reinforcing popular stereotypes and constructing these cultures as monolithic, static ‘Others’, rather than as dynamic, fluid entities. Such representations are often considered by […] critics to be politically-motivated constructs that

> serve to ‘essentialize’ and ‘exoticize’ this ‘Other’.

Thus, EFL practitioners and learners are not only offered an insubstantial view of cultural processes (Omaggio-Hadley, 1993), they are not provided with useful strategies for linking culture and language.

Analysts including Guest (2002) and Kubota (1999) have argued that the most problematic aspect of observed approaches to culture teaching is the tendency amongst language teachers to discuss cultural aspects of foreign and native cultures through dichotomies, placing one as the mirror opposite of the other. This mirrors the problematic notion of *cultural determinism* (Kubota, 1999) in students’ emerging understanding of cultures. Guest (2002) points out that placing an exclusive focus on contrasts between cultures can not only lead to the reinforcement of stereotypes but also be seen as a strategy to support and promote exclusionary purposes, thus potentially contributing to the exacerbation of cultural adversity rather than cultural tolerance, respect and acceptance. This process can also be disadvantageous in that it can lead learners to conceptualize cultural knowledge *as* knowledge of differences. As such, dichotomist approaches to teaching culture can counter one of the core objectives of foreign language education as specified by MEXT (2011a), which is to facilitate communication between people of different cultures. In their extreme manifestations, these approaches can arguably lead to a form of intercultural paralysis.

While no sample of classroom discourse in the data corroborates the views formulated by these analysts (except perhaps for Figure 50 below), limited supporting evidence can be found in policy discourse and textbooks. Looking at data gathered principally from MEXT policy documents and MEXT-approved textbooks, the focus of culture teaching is placed principally on the students' native culture (I analyze relevant data samples in Section 5.3). Arao (1998) argues that, due to increasing internationalization, Japanese pupils need to be able to explain Japanese culture to foreigners. She then provides a vocabulary-based approach to explaining what she calls 'exotic Japanese culture'. These perspectives indicate that the general approach to integrating cultural elements in Japanese EFL education in secondary schools – at least from a structural viewpoint – is somewhat ethnocentric. In MEXT-approved textbooks and policy documents, one can find traces of ethnocentric discourse. The prioritization of national interests in Japanese policy discourse can be observed in a statement found in MEXT (2014a) which prioritizes the enrichment of "educational content in relation to nurturing individual's sense of Japanese identity (focus on traditional culture and history among other things)." Here, a Japanese national identity is assumed to emerge as a result of greater understanding of traditions and history. No clear description is provided regarding the nature of this identity, and no argument is made to justify the need for a stronger sense of Japanese national identity. Instead, the source, constituents, purposes and importance of a Japanese national identity are simply taken for granted.

As the work in Module Two has demonstrated, however, Japanese policy discourse is somewhat inconsistent. While the prioritization of Japanese culture is prevalent in many MEXT statements, The CJGTC document of 2000 contains the following statement which promotes the goal of exploring the universality of Japanese culture in education:

> It is a fundamental fallacy to believe that cherishing the Japanese language precludes studying other languages or that caring for Japanese culture requires rejecting foreign cultures. If we treasure the Japanese language and culture, we should actively assimilate other languages and cultures, enriching Japanese culture through contact with other cultures (CJGTC, 2000: 20-21).

Here, while Japanese culture is a focus, it is not defined as impermeable to outside influences. In the Five Proposals (MEXT, 2011a: 3), a more outward-looking argument can be found:

> globalization intensifies the need for coexistence with different cultures and civilizations as well as international cooperation"; and "Foreign language proficiency required in global society can be defined as capability of smooth communication with people of different countries and cultures using foreign languages as a tool. The capability of smooth communication implies, for example, confident and active attitude toward communication with people of different countries and cultures as well as accurate understanding of partner's thoughts and intentions based on his/her cultural and social background, logical and reasoned explanation of one's own views.

Foreign language education is hereby promoted as a vehicle for the fulfillment of both social ideals (i.e. cooperation) and individual identity development (i.e. attitude change).

Yet, absent from the two quotes above are explicit strategies for teaching culture. In Section 9, however, policy makers recommend the creation of learning materials which can address this need: "materials should be useful in deepening the understanding of the ways of life and cultures of foreign countries and Japan, raising interest in language and culture and developing respectful attitudes toward these"

(MEXT, 2010: 8). In other words, while the need for materials focusing on the teaching of both foreign and Japanese cultures is expressed, the teaching of culture remains under-defined. Teachers are assumed to be capable of teaching cultural content effectively as long as the material is made available to them. Also problematic here is the assumption that culture is inextricably embedded in language, diminishing the need for an explicit focus on culture teaching.

Again, I revisit the issue of culture teaching with specific reference to *nihonjinron*-related elements in the data in Section 5.3. In the following section, I analyze the last code of prominence in the data: *chal*, or references to challenges faced by English teachers. Analysis of this particular code reveals that the problems observed on the ground are largely traceable to immediate contingencies and not necessarily to *nihonjinron*-related ideological constraints.

5.1.6 CHALLENGES FACED BY ENGLISH TEACHERS

References to challenges faced by English teachers can be found almost exclusively in recorded interview data. The main concern for all teachers was limited time to 1) concentrate on language teaching, 2) plan and conduct a variety of classroom activities, 3) gather and create additional learning materials, and 4) join in-service training programs. As discussed in Section 3.3 of Module Two, many analysts identify foreign language teaching training programs in Japanese universities as ineffective (Amano, 1990; Browne & Wada, 1998; Hahn, 2013), Browne & Wada (1998) report that 92% of Japanese EFL teachers are dissatisfied with their training experience, a situation which is unlikely to be resolved due to limited opportunities for teachers to attend in-service seminars (Sato, 2011).

In the interview excerpt included in Figure 25, Mr. Ono expresses particularly critical views regarding his own teacher training experience.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Do you think it was you had enough training? When you
2		began your job as an English teacher, do you think you were
3		ready?
4	Mr. Ono:	Mmh. I’m sorry for college teachers. (laughing)
5	Bouchard:	Why?
6	Mr. Ono:	You are college teacher (laughing) yeah oh very bad.
7		(laughing)
8	Bouchard:	Why?
9	Mr. Ono:	Very bad (laughing) [(laughing)] because mmh of course
10		university is theory theory *riron* (theory) theory and school is
11		*jissen* (practice) practice yes. Uh but much uh different [mmh]
12		much much much much different.
13	Bouchard:	So did you have a shock?
14	Mr. Ono:	Yes very shocked.

Figure 25 (Excerpt 5.1.6.1) – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Likewise, Ms. Inoue indicates specific weaknesses in her own teacher training experience (see Excerpt 5.1.6.2 in Appendix 9). She also underlines the almost exclusive focus in training programs on the notion of the ideal learner which, in her opinion, does not prepare teachers to conduct classroom management effectively. In contrast, Ms. Ishida was somewhat satisfied with her training, although her focus was less on institutionalized training than self-directed training. This perspective is noticeable in Figure 26.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	when you began teaching English, do you feel that your
2		teacher training [mmh] prepared you? Or did you have a big
3		learning curve?
4	Ms. Ishida:	Not big curve. [Ah OK.] Mmh and uh of course we had uh
5		some training in the Board of Ed- City Board of Education.
6		[mmh] But uh most of us [mmh] maybe our self-study. [mmh]

7		And uh during the class during the class, I try to use it. [mmh] I
8		wanted to use it. So I have to I had to speak English [mmh]
9		and using it.

Figure 26 (Excerpt 5.1.6.3) – Heiwa JHS (February 10)

Overall, Ms. Ishida, Ms. Inoue and Mrs. Tanaka are actively engaged in in-service training (e.g. attending TESOL conferences, workshops organized by the local Board of Education, giving presentations). In Figure 27, Ms. Tanaka also emphasizes self-directed teacher training, especially in reference to policies promulgating monolingual EFL education.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Tanaka:	probably each English teacher [uh] try harder uh is has to try
2		harder [uh] because they stay in English they have to explain
3		grammatical things grammatical things in English. If they
4		haven’t done yet, [uh] they have to try harder and they have to
5		train themselves.

Figure 27 (Excerpt 5.1.6.4) – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Excerpts 5.1.6.5 and 5.1.6.6 in Appendix 9 show Ms. Tanaka expressing a critical understanding of the Japanese EFL system. Also noticeable in Excerpt 5.1.6.6 is Ms. Tanaka discussing culture teaching: by recommending teachers to travel abroad, she advocates an ethnographic approach to self-directed training. Nevertheless, limited time is also a problem for her.

Like Ms. Inoue, Mr. Ono identified entrance test preparation as a considerable source of pressure and a threat to successful implementation of CLT approaches (see Excerpt 5.1.6.7 in Appendix 9). Similarly, Ms. Inoue argues that, because most entrance tests assess learners’ knowledge of L2 vocabulary and structures, teachers are often unable to steer language education towards CLT (see Excerpt 5.1.6.8 in Appendix 9). In Figure 28, she explains how this impacts the teaching of L2 grammar.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Inoue:	*ma mazu* (well, first) first uh translate translate *shite rikai shita*
2		*ue de* (once they understand the content and can translate it)
3		[uh] *de naiyou* content (then we can focus on content).
4	Bouchard:	Mmh mmh. So it's difficult to go to the content area.
5	Ms. Inoue:	Uh yes. Content area.
6	Bouchard:	So you teach the grammar. And when they understand the
7		grammar [*so*] then you want them to produce. [mmh] But there
8		is little time to produce.
9	Ms. Inoue:	Yes.

Figure 28 (Excerpt 5.1.6.9) – Asahi JHS (September 4)

Due to limited time for L2 output, Japanese EFL teachers tend to limit language production activities to L2 verbalizations (e.g. group choruses, reading out loud). Since prosody is not assessed, teachers tend to overlook this aspect of the L2. Only Ms. Tanaka and Ms. Ishida included pronunciation practices. In addition to institutional pressures, Ms. Inoue saw her personal shortcomings as problematic, as can be denoted from Figure 29.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Inoue:	(laughing) *so nakanaka ima* (somewhat) uh I have uh it's it's
2		my fault. I have no time to uh prepare the the good activity.
3		[uh] *mo* uh *dakara chotto*- (it's somewhat-)
4	Bouchard:	Ah OK.
5	Ms. Inoue:	*nan ka dekinakatta* (I can't quite do it yet). [OK.] Or the *ato ha*
6		test *no kangaeru koto ga*- (and there are the tests to think
7		about.)

Figure 29 (Excerpt 5.1.6.10) – Asahi JHS (September 4)

While she identified limited time as a problem, she saw her inability to manage time successfully as a main source of concern. In Excerpt 5.1.6.11 (see Appendix 9), she is even more self-critical: even if textbooks and policies are problematic, and even if students can be difficult at times, she feels responsible for the problems in her classroom. Similarly, Mr. Ono held somewhat negative views of his own teaching. After the eighth class I observed – which was devoted to reviewing the midterm test – Mr. Ono was clearly disappointed with the class average of 62%, and blamed himself for his students’ poor results. During an unrecorded exchange, he stated that JHS teachers are usually evaluated by how well their students perform of tests, implying that this is a source of concern for him.

In all, limited time was identified by all four teachers as the cause of various problems in their classrooms. In terms of weekly scheduling, Mr. Ono works 60 hours a week on average, and reported devoting 20 hours only to English teaching. Ms. Tanaka works approximately 50 hours a week, and 30% of this time is spent on English teaching. Ms. Ishida works 45 hours a week. While she did not specify how much time she devotes to English teaching, she mentioned ‘other duties’ as often being overwhelming. The teacher who was most concerned with the time issue was Ms. Inoue. She outlined a herculean work schedule: from 5:30 a.m. to 8 p.m., sometimes as late as midnight. According to her, this goes on seven days a week, with only Sunday afternoons as time off. While at work, she only devotes 12% to 15% of her time to English teaching. These findings show that challenges faced by Japanese English teachers are largely due to institutional constraints.

To sum up Section 5.1, the dominant features of the English classes in the schools where data was collected included teachers’ choices of language and code-switching practices. Findings show that a) these choices appear to be made unconsciously and potentially related to particular emotional states, b) teachers are largely unaware of the language functions they achieve in both languages, while at the same time c) teachers’ choices of language seem to be strategic at times. Of particular interest was the possibility that framing the L2 in the L1, and using emblematic code-switches, simultaneously bring learners’ L1 identity to the surface and pushes their potential bilingual identity in the background. Other dominant features included problematic views on culture teaching – e.g. overemphasis on linguistic content of cultural texts by teachers and presence of cultural dichotomization in MEXT policies and approved EFL textbooks – and challenges faced by English teachers – e.g. entrance exams, limited time and limited teacher training. These prominent features in the data provide a broader view of EFL processes observed at the four schools, from which an analysis of *nihonjinron* in context becomes possible.

In the next section, I broaden the scope of the current discussion, and analyze the range of perspectives held by teachers and students in regards to the English classroom, their actions in it, and EFL education in general. This investigation reveals indications as to how structural constraints and enablements are dealt with at the level of human agency.

5.2 PERSPECTIVES HELD BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN REGARDS TO EFL EDUCATION

Above, I summarized data revealing teachers’ understanding of, and perspectives towards, the most challenging aspects of their work. The four teachers shared a general dissatisfaction with their teacher training program. In addition, entrance examinations and limited time were identified as complicating the improvement of professional practice.

In this section, I answer Question 2 – *What range of perspectives do teachers and students hold in regards to the English classroom, their actions in it, and EFL education in general?* To answer this question, I consider prominent themes surfacing in teacher interviews and in the student survey, and compare findings with evidence found in other data sources to locate points of convergence and divergence. Themes include teachers' views on MEXT policies, culture teaching and monolingual EFL education, and students' views on EFL education.

5.2.1 TEACHERS' VIEWS ON MEXT POLICIES

Somewhat contrasting with Browne & Wada's (1998) findings that one third of Japanese EFL teachers do not read MEXT policy documents, the four teachers mentioned referring to the MEXT policies on average 4 times a year, and attending periodical workshops focusing on policy and classroom practice. They felt that certain aspects of the policies were useful, notably the range of vocabulary words to teach, clarifications of textbook contents, and links between grammar and communicative functions. They estimated that 60% of the new Course of Study is included in textbooks. For them, textbook content is crucial because it provides the materials necessary for entrance exam preparations. The recent MEXT policies, on the other hand, are less important to their everyday teaching practice because, according to them, they lack concrete strategies for implementation, are often abstract and unclear, and are generally too ambitious for allocated classroom time. Mr. Ono saw some value in the MEXT policies, although he argued that teachers rely almost exclusively on textbook content for guidance. In his opinion, however, policy content and entrance exam content are very similar. Regarding the newest revision of the Course of Study, Mr. Ono used expressions such as “very well written document”, “clear and important aims”, and “good set of guidelines”. In contrast, he criticized the Course of Study as impractical and somewhat unrelated to the reality of the classroom. He stressed that, aside from periodical workshops organized by the Board of Education, no verification system is currently in place to ensure that policies are implemented locally. According to him, teachers and school administrators enjoy a certain degree of freedom when following governmental guidelines. In short, completion of textbook content and test results seem to be the only evidence of whether or not a teacher actually follows the policies and language learning content specified by MEXT.

5.2.2 TEACHERS’ VIEWS ON CULTURE TEACHING

As mentioned earlier, culture teaching was not a priority at the four schools. Instead, the linguistic content of culturally-oriented materials took precedence. When culture-related issues were dealt with, they mostly involved traditional aspects of Japanese culture. Of particular interest here is Ms. Ishida’s claim that she has limited understanding of the concept of culture. This response mirrors findings gathered by Stapleton’s (2000) attitude survey measuring Japanese teachers’ views on culture teaching, and his suggestion that teachers fail to integrate culture content in their language classroom in part because of limited understanding of what culture is, what its relationship to language learning is, and consequently how it should be integrated in the language classroom.

In the interview data, teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the cultural content in textbooks. In Figure 30, Mr. Ono expresses strong (although inconsistent) views on the subject.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Ono:	I hope the company will wrote more good Japanese points.
2		For example [mmh] uh *sakura* (cherry blossom) is only
3		Japanese. [mmh] Eh of course America or and so on. [mmh,
4		have this] take take cherry trees [mmh] but uh I think
5		Japanese is very very good, *hanami* (flower viewing) is uh
6		good. [mmh] So uhm I want them to write more Japanese
7		good point. [mmh] Because oh always newspaper and TV
8		said now's children is self-confident is low. Self-confidence
9		[ahh] is low. But Japan is good country. [mmh] But oh we said
10		we heard we often heard Japanese bad news. [mmh] For
11		example uh children is reduced or children. [There are less
12		children] Less yeah or uh when we graduate college [mmh]
13		we have no job. [mmh] Or and so on. But Japan is very very
14		good good. For example this is uh I think this is a long history
15		[mmh] and *hanami* (flower viewing) is uh very very good point.
16		For example talking or uhm for example unknown people's
17		friendly. [mmh] Or and so on. So uh of course uh I think
18		*hanami* (flower viewing) or Japanese many good points.
19		[mmh] So at first the thema the theme for example this is a
20		Kyoto [mmh] and *hanami* (flower viewing) uh it's OK but more
21		good points in Japan.

Figure 30 (Excerpt 5.2.2.1) – Sakura JHS (May 8)

In short, he sees great value in promoting positive aspects of Japanese culture, especially its traditions. By arguing that young Japanese people's self-confidence is low because the positive features of the nation are not promoted enough, he is drawing a causal relationship between Japanese ethnicity and the nation, as represented by a unified Japanese culture. The essentialization of Japanese culture as structure guiding thoughts and behaviors becomes clearer with the juxtaposition of traditional events/elements such as *hanami* (flower viewing), *sakura* (cherry blossom) with particular behaviors (e.g. friendliness with strangers in lines 16 and 17). I revisit this excerpt later, as it constitutes an explicit reference to the *nihonjinron* discourse.

Even more dissatisfied is Ms. Ishida who identified cultural stereotyping in MEXT-approved EFL textbooks as a problem, as can be seen in her use of the ‘box’ metaphor in Figure 31.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Ishida:	I use media. [mmh] Mmh TV and uh newspaper [uh] mmh as
2		a like a sort uh we live in uh we live in the America [mmh] and
3		uh Canada [mmh] and uh foreign country. As we can use
4		English. [mmh Ah] (pointing to the textbook) This this is a very
5		simple box a kind of box [mmh] So-
6	Bouchard:	Limiting yeah this textbook.
7	Ms. Ishida:	Yes limiting [mmh] Mmh we are in a box. [mmh] I feel.
8	Bouchard:	What’s the box?
9	Ms. Ishida:	Now?
10	Bouchard:	Mmh is is the box the school? Is the box Japan? [Ah] Is the
11		box-
12	Ms. Ishida:	Maybe sometimes like uh hospital. [Ah] (laughing) So bad
13		image. But uh I think it’s uh clean. [Ah] This is clean. No
14		smoke. [mmh] No alcohol. [mmh] Very clean. But uh very
15		limited. Mmh.

Figure 31 (Excerpt 5.2.2.2) – Heiwa JHS (February 10)

To counter this problem, Ms. Ishida often creates original materials in order to introduce her students to how English is used in the real world. However, while she sees the textbook as somewhat devoid of real-life examples, she also believes that its cultural content is appropriate (see Excerpt 5.2.2.3 in Appendix 9). Again, her focus is on language instead of culture. Ms. Inoue also expressed contradictory views on the subject, as can be denoted in Figure 32.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	Which is most important, foreign culture or Japanese culture
2		in these textbooks?
3	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh anything this textbook uh I think is uh the most uh
4		important is uh mmh fo- uh first my Japanese.
5	Bouchard:	Uh Japanese is more important yeah?
6	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah. First [OK] first uh we have uh Japanese people [uh] uh
7		have to uh the explain our [uh] culture [uh huh] in other
8		language. *demo nihongo demo yappa tsutae nakute ha nai,*
9		*sonna koto kara kyuu uh hoka no hito ni hoka no bunka kiite*

10		*kyuushu suru to otagae ni totte ii no kana* (Even in Japanese
11		it’s important to communicate our culture, and from this we
12		hear about other people other cultures and learn from each
13		other like sponges).
14	Bouchard:	So it’s important for Japanese young Japanese students to be
15		able to discuss and explain [mmh] their Japanese culture
16		[mmh] before learning other cultures. [mmh] Or can you learn
17		at both at the same time?
18	Ms. Inoue:	Mmmh both.

Figure 32 (Excerpt 5.2.2.4) – Asahi JHS (October 5)

She underlines the evident focus on Japanese culture in the textbook, and argues that Japanese people need to explain their own culture in other languages. In this way, Ms. Inoue’s views are aligned with recent MEXT policy documents. She adds that the process of explaining Japanese culture to a foreign audience can also lead Japanese people to discover other cultures, concluding with the argument that knowledge of Japanese culture does not have to precede knowledge of foreign cultures. This agreement directly contradicts her position expressed in lines 3, 4 and 6, 7 and 8. In sum, Ms. Inoue seems to answer some interview questions by ‘collaging’ a range of arguments together.

In the interview data, both Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue sometimes reproduced popular views uncritically, a process which at times led to contradictions. To some extent, ‘collaging’ fomulaic arguments is similar to stereotyping: it renders complex issues more manageable. In Excerpt 5.2.2.5 (see Appendix 9), Ms. Inoue discusses the emancipatory role of English in Japanese society, and expresses views reinforcing particular stereotypes about Japanese people as language learners. Not only is it difficult for anyone to assert whether her students express ‘true feelings’ in either Japanese or English, if we consider the very few instances of students producing messages in English beyond L2 verbalizations, it becomes clear that Ms. Inoue’s argument is less about describing particular realities in her classroom and more about giving the impression that she understands the issues being discussed.

In this sense, teachers 'collaging' arguments can be seen as an avoidance strategy. Similar to this, but divergent to some extent, is the process of *assemblage*, defined by Kingfisher (2013: 14) as

> understanding something newly emergent in light of what is received, framing an idea from elsewhere in terms of what is known here, connecting theoretical frames and practices in new ways – all in light of an array of agendas related to making sense of the world, devising programs of action, asserting power and control, or just getting through the day.

This process of drawing from broader discourses on Japanese culture is more apparent in Figure 33.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Inoue:	Japanese people uh *nihon ha* [uh] uh Japan is island, so uh I
2		don't in uh I uh they aren't interested in *kanshin ga* (interest)
3		indifferent for the other country.

Figure 33 (Excerpt 5.2.2.6) – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Defining Japan as an island, Ms. Inoue implies that people of Japanese ethnicity are geographically and culturally disconnected from the rest of the world. Ms. Inoue is justifying what she sees as a lack of interest in foreign countries and cultures among young Japanese people by drawing a direct link between nation as geographical entity and individual. As this constitutes another explicit *nihonjinron* reference in the data, I analyze it further below.

In Figure 34, Mr. Ono also reproduces the 'Japan-as-island' argument to explain Japanese EFL learners' apparent lack of interest in the outside world.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	Are you saying that it's it's uh difficult to expect Japanese
2		students to become proficient [Yes] in English [Yes] Ah OK.
3		OK. Because Japan is an island country.
4	Mr. Ono:	Yeah it is only one point for example [mmh] oh for ex- other
5		other reason is for example oh Japanese uh oh you know uh
6		ten or twenty years ago [mmh] many Japanese students
7		wanted to go abroad [mmh] and exchange programs and so
8		on. [mmh] But nowadays [mmh] uh younger students don't try.
9	Bouchard:	Why do you think?
10	Mr. Ono:	Mmh we are rich [mmh] rich. And mmh it is unnecessary to go
11		abroad.

Figure 34 (Excerpt 5.2.2.7) – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Again, Japan is defined as an archipelago both geographically and culturally separated from other nations, an environment unsuitable for foreign language learning and intercultural exchanges. Moreover, because Japanese people are said to be wealthy, they do not need to exchange with the rest of the world. In this argument, traveling abroad to explore foreign cultures is seen from a utilitarian perspective – i.e. to find very few elements which cannot be found in Japanese society.

While not all four teachers held such views, they all agreed with the idea that Japanese EFL students live in an environment where English plays a very limited role. This view is expressed by Mr. Ono in Excerpt 5.2.2.8 (see Appendix 9). Later on in the same interview, Mr. Ono added that English is useful only when Japanese people come in contact with non-Japanese people. In Figure 35, a similar utilitarian view is expressed by Ms. Inoue with regards to culture.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	Do you see [mmh] Japanese society and culture changing
2		because of English education? [mmh] Or not changing?
3	Ms. Inoue:	I think it's a little uh change [uh] because uh mmh to be a to
4		uh for job hunting [uh] or career up or job [uh] and uh pass the
5		school [uh] I change. But mmh I uh something uh something I

6		don’t change uh the Japanese mood [uh] because uh-
7	Bouchard:	The Japanese mood doesn’t change.
8	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh.

Figure 35 (Excerpt 5.2.2.9) – Asahi JHS (October 5)

In lines 5 and 6, she makes a reference to a perceived Japanese ‘spirit’ or ‘essence’ in the phrase ‘Japanese mood’. Ms. Ishida, however, contradicts this view in an excerpt included in Figure 36.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Do you think English education in Japan has an impact, an
2		effect, an an influence on Japanese culture?
3	Ms. Ishida:	Mmh we can see and the listen [uh] and uh everywhere [uh]
4		any time [uh] and uh using using English [uh] uh even uh
5		Japanese [OK.] even Japanese (inaudible).

Figure 36 (Excerpt 5.2.2.10) – Heiwa JHS (January 28)

Incidentally, a similar argument is made by Mr. Ono (see Excerpt 5.2.2.11 in Appendix 9) in reference to the widespread use of *katakana*, a syllabary used principally for integrating foreign language words into Japanese.

Clearly, arguments expressed by individual teachers and between teachers are conflicted at times. While common-sensical to some extent, and without arguing that there is something inherently wrong with people expressing conflicting or contradictory views, what is important to remember here is that teachers seem to reproduce popular arguments in patchwork fashion or as assemblages, and that the resulting views are not always consistent. In Section 6.1, I explore contradictions within discourse and between discourse and practice, as they provide valuable insight into agentive processes observed in the data.

While Mr. Ono, Ms. Ishida, and Ms. Inoue seemed confused when cultural topics were discussed, Ms. Tanaka did not exhibit much interest in such issues, and often brought the conversation back to more local concerns (see Excerpt 5.2.2.12 in Appendix 9). In Figure 37, she discusses the presence of English in Japan.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	do you think that the more Japanese people will learn English
2		the more Japanese culture will change?
3	Ms. Tanaka:	Japanese culture.
4	Bouchard:	Mmh.
5	Ms. Tanaka:	Japa- uh that's not the English problem. IT (laughing) IT
6		probably change Japanese culture. [(laughing)] *sumaho*
7		(smartphone) or *sumaho* (smartphone) or Internet [uh] those
8		are common language English [uh] in that in that meaning [uh]
9		in that sense, English can have the big impact *tte iu ka* IT *ne*.

Figure 37 (Excerpt 5.2.2.13) – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Here, Ms. Tanaka addresses broader issues mainly in regards to new developments in telecommunication as potential sources of social and cultural changes. This suggests that, for her, the presence of English in Japan is relatively neutral.

To sum up, teachers tend to express somewhat confused perspectives towards culture teaching, while at times expressing the need to prioritize Japanese culture above foreign cultures. Similar perspectives are also found in MEXT policy documents. Also observed is the tendency among the four teachers to conflate cultural issues with language issues, as can be denoted from Figure 38.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Which is more important for you: teaching about Japanese
2		culture or teaching about foreign cultures in your classroom?
3	Ms. Ishida:	Both.
4	Bouchard:	Both are equally important yeah? [mmh] Ah OK. Very good.
5	Ms. Ishida:	Because we are Japanese. [uh] And when I teach to students
6		[uh] the grammar [uh] but I have to I have to explain both 'as
7		tall as' *onajii gurai se ga takai* (about as tall as). [mmh] But uh
8		now we are now two girls, we are too short. [uh] But uh in
9		English *onajii gurai se ga takai* (about as tall as) 'as tall as'
10		(laughing). [mmh] So very interesting uh language culture.

Figure 38 (Excerpt 5.2.2.14) – Heiwa JHS (January 28)

Also noticeable in this excerpt is the argument “Because we are Japanese” in line 5, which draws a direct connection between approaches to language and culture teaching and national identity. Together, these findings suggest tendencies among teachers to a) view culture teaching from a somewhat ethnocentric perspective, b) reduce culture to language-related concerns, and c) construct views on culture teaching in patchwork fashion or as assemblages.

Limited research has explored how Japanese EFL teachers understand culture content. Stapleton (2000) reports that ‘native’ English speaking teachers working in Japan believe that culture should indeed be part of EFL education. In practice, however, these teachers have been shown to explore culture more randomly than other aspects of their teaching (e.g. grammar and communication). Stapleton reports on a study by Duff & Uchida (1997), who studied four Japanese EFL teachers’ approaches to teaching culture in their EFL classroom. Their study revealed that the ways in which teachers indexed sociocultural identities were complex and often contradictory, and that teachers’ awareness of their implicit transmission of cultural messages was limited. In other words, while teachers may recognize the importance of culture teaching in EFL education at some level, this acknowledgment may be more discursive than substantial. In the following section, I summarize teachers’ views on monolingual EFL education, gathered mainly from the second survey given to teachers.

5.2.3 TEACHERS' VIEWS ON MONOLINGUAL EFL EDUCATION

In the second survey, all four teachers agreed that the new English-only policy is unnecessary, especially when complex information needs to be communicated to the students. However, Ms. Tanaka expressed perhaps strongest support for monolingualism, although this was limited to her own classes and not to all EFL contexts in Japan. The other teachers did not support or enforce the new monolingual policy.

Of particular interest here is that the four teachers generally do not consider students' L2 output as 'genuine' or 'necessary' communication, instead seeing it as forced L2 output. In Figure 39, Mr. Ono argues that much of the L2 content students focus on is not necessary communication.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	What's your impression of your students when they use
2		English?
3	Mr. Ono:	Uh at first I became a teacher at first [mmh] I only have
4		activities. For example mmh when we study do you like. So
5		apple, orange [mmh] and so on. [mmh] So hello. [Hello.] Do
6		you like apple? Yes. [Yes I do.] Do you like orange? [So yes]
7		uh yes. But it's not necessity necessity.

Figure 39 (Excerpt 5.2.3.1) – Sakura JHS (June 21)

In Excerpt 5.2.3.2 (see Appendix 9), he adds that real communication involves elaboration on a topic in the L2, and concludes by saying that his students cannot elaborate in class because of limited available time. This might explain to some extent the choices of language made by teachers and learners.

The issue of teachers' use of English and/or Japanese in the classroom has recently gained prominence in Japanese language policy discourse. However, this debate is not unique to the Japanese context. Littlewood & Yu (2011) point out that “the monolingual principle has been embodied in the guidelines of many countries,” including Hong Kong, Mainland China and South Korea, the latter having introduced the somewhat controversial TETE policy in 2001. In recent MEXT policy documents, Section 9 (MEXT, 2010) specifies that, for foreign language education in JHS, “English *should* be selected in principle” (p.8). Four years later, in a MEXT policy document entitled ‘English Education Reform Plan Corresponding to Globalization’ (MEXT, 2014a), the language is less suggestive: English classes in JHS “*will* be conducted in English in principle.” This shift in modality suggests stronger approval of English-only EFL education. The expression ‘in principle’ is used in both the 2010 and the 2014 documents to distinguish between junior and senior high school education, where a strict monolingual policy is promulgated. Implementation of The Reform Plan began in fiscal year 2014, with full scale implementation to be expected by 2020, concurrently with the Tokyo Summer Olympics.

On the ground, however, monolingual policies are generally seen as problematic. Coplan & Neokleous (2011) report a shared belief among four Cypriot EFL teachers that the L1 is counterproductive to the L2 learning process, but that on certain occasions it is a necessary recourse. This echoes Yavuz’s (2012) argument that English teachers “emphasize the necessary use of L1 in structural teaching and prefer the "teach English in English" motto in communicative teaching in general” (p. 4339). In other South-East Asian nations, similar stances against monolingualism among educators are observed by Littlewood & Yu (2011), with Rabbidge & Chapelle (2014) reporting strong disagreement with the TETE – Teach English through English – policy among many South Korean EFL teachers. As argued earlier with regards to the data gathered for this module, the marked preference for grammar-translation among EFL teachers may provide some explanation. Also important to remember here is that, with greater pressure from governments to transform the English classrooms into English-only milieus, translation tends to be under-reported by teachers.

The three sections above surveyed teachers' views on a range of EFL-related subjects. I now focus on students' views on their EFL experience, and in the process, enrich the current perspective on agentive processes observed in the data.

5.2.4 STUDENTS' VIEWS ON EFL EDUCATION

To reiterate, students' views on EFL education were gathered from an attitude survey conducted separately at the four schools, soon after my tenth and final visit. Each survey was administered by teachers during class time, and took about 15 minutes to complete. The survey contained 26 opinion/value statements in Japanese on the left, without identifying numbers. To the right, students had to indicate degree of agreement with each statement on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strong disagreement) to 6 (strong agreement). 13 of the 26 statements were aligned with a *nihonjinron* perspective (i.e. based on the work conducted in Module One) while the other half pertained to issues relevant to their language learning experience. Overall, 113 students filled out the questionnaire. Findings reveal that most statements elicited either mild disagreement (3) or mild agreement (4), thus failing to reveal noticeable stances towards the contents expressed in each statement.

In light of this, I selected statements which elicited the strongest positions and disregarded those which yielded either mild agreement or mild disagreement. I chose statements with averages of 2.7 and below (for disagreements) and averages 4.5 and above (for agreements). The following table shows the eight statements which emerged as potentially significant to the current analysis:

Statement	**Response**			**Result**
	Average	**Mode**	**Median**	
I enjoy my English class.	4.5	6	5	agreement
It's important for me to learn about foreign cultures.	4.5	6	5	agreement
I can learn about foreign cultures from my English teacher.	5	5	5	agreement
It is important for me to learn how to speak and write in English well.	5	6	5	strong agreement
I can learn about foreign cultures from my English textbook.	4.5	4	5	moderate agreement
There are many differences between the English language and the Japanese language.	5	5	5	agreement
Only Japanese people can understand Japanese culture well.	2	3	2	disagreement
Only Japanese people can understand the Japanese language well.	2.7	3	3	moderate disagreement

Table 3 – Statements of significance in the student survey

Broadly speaking, the first five statements can be said to relate to students' language and culture learning experience, whereas the last three statements can be categorized as somewhat related to the *nihonjinron* discourse. While the issue of *nihonjinron*'s possible presence in the data is explored further in Section 5.3, I now include a summary analysis of students' responses to these statements.

5.2.4.1 STATEMENTS RELATED TO THE EFL CLASSROOM

Overall, students at the four schools agreed with Statement 1 – *I enjoy my English class*. Strongest agreement with this statement came from students at Sakura JHS, and weakest agreement came from students at Asahi JHS. The statement *It is important for me to learn how to speak and write in English well* elicited general agreement amongst students. Strongest agreement came from students at St-Maria J&SHS, while weakest agreement came from students at Asahi JHS. As indicated earlier, Ms. Tanaka used the L2 considerably more often than Ms. Inoue, suggesting that teachers' L2 use may increase students' perception of L2 fluency as an important learning objective. The statement *It's important for me to learn about foreign cultures* gathered general agreement among students. Strongest agreement with this statement came from students at St-Maria J&SHS, and weakest agreement came from students at Asahi JHS. If we consider that the textbook used at St-Maria J&SHS included more cultural content than the textbook used at Asahi JHS, we can assume that learners see cultural content as important when it is made more explicit to them. However, students' responses were, like those of their teachers, sometimes inconsistent. This can be observed in students' responses to the statement *I can learn about foreign cultures from my English teacher*, which gathered general agreement, and the statement *I can learn about foreign cultures from my English textbook*, which gathered moderate agreement. Strongest agreement with the latter statement did not come from students at St-Maria J&SHS, even if their textbook contained considerably more cultural content than textbooks used at other schools. Instead, strongest agreement came from students at both Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS. Reasons why respondents expressed somewhat diverging views include the possibility that the issues under focus were too complex or that they did not fall within the respondents' range of interests.

However, because a) weakest agreement with the statements *I can learn about foreign cultures from my English teacher* and the statement *I can learn about foreign cultures from my English textbook* came from students at Asahi JHS, and b) Ms. Inoue's classes almost never deviated from the linguistic content found in the textbook, it is likely that a more explicit focus on cultural content in both teacher talk and in the textbook can lead learners to view foreign cultures as important to their learning experience. As such, EFL learners' conceptualization of their learning experience seems to be influenced by frequency and method in which information is presented to them.

5.2.4.2 STATEMENTS RELATED TO THE *NIHONJINRON* DISCOURSE

As indicated earlier, the processes of Otherization and cultural dichotomization were noticeable especially in the textbook data, although Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue expressed parallel views. However, there is no clear evidence of students' views being influenced by these. For example, there was general disagreement among students with the statement *Only Japanese people can understand Japanese culture well*. Strongest disagreement with this statement came from students at Asahi JHS, and weakest disagreement came from students at St-Maria J&SHS. Similarly, students expressed moderate disagreement with the statement *Only Japanese people can* *understand the Japanese language well*. Strongest disagreement with this statement came from students at Asahi JHS, and weakest disagreement came from students at both Sakura JHS and St-Maria J&SHS. Of interest here is that, while students at Asahi JHS seem to have held generally more negative views towards their language learning experience in general than students at other schools (see previous section), they did not appear to view Japanese culture or language as inherently unique, thus only accessible to inner-group members.

If we consider that Mr. Ono expressed perhaps strongest support for the promotion of traditional Japanese culture in EFL textbooks, we can propose the notion that the teacher’s views on culture, as well as those promulgated in the textbook, may not have much of an impact on the development of students’ overall views of culture and related pedagogy. This suggestion contradicts the notion that EFL learners’ conceptualization of their learning experience may be influenced by how often and in what ways information is presented to them.

Two possibilities should be mentioned at this point. First, the ways in which culture is presented by the teacher and in the materials may focus on superficial information – i.e. cultural stereotypes and formulaic views on Japanese and foreign cultures. Related is the possibility that only sporadic teaching of cultural issues may construct the image of cultural content in language pedagogy as marginal and of limited relevance. Second, students may already have their own perspectives on Japanese and foreign cultures unaligned with *nihonjinron* which may not be significantly challenged by how teachers and textbooks present cultural information.

Students' apparent disagreement with views reinforcing cultural dichotomization, however, is not consistently reflected in their response to other statements in the questionnaire. In fact, the statement *There are many differences between the English language and the Japanese language* gathered general agreement among the students. Strongest agreement came from students at St-Maria J&SHS, and weakest agreement coming from students at Asahi JHS. So while we can see that students at Asahi JHS generally do not support the linguistic argument in *nihonjinron* (see Module One for explanation), there are signs that students see English and Japanese in dichotomous ways. However, while most students do acknowledge the differences between both languages, they do not see these differences as proof of a Japanese uniqueness accessible only by people of Japanese ethnicity.

To sum up, teachers and students hold a wide range of perspectives in regards to the English classroom, their actions in it, cultural content, and EFL education in general. The four teachers tend to view culture teaching from a somewhat ethnocentric perspective, and consider cultural issues as language-related issues. They acknowledge the importance of English education to the development of the development of cultural awareness amongst learners, although the notion of culture remains somewhat unclear to them. Most prominent is their tendency to formulate complex, fragmented and sometimes contradictory views of culture teaching. They do not see the monolingual approach to EFL education as necessary, and do not see learners' classroom L2 output as necessarily genuine communication. Students, on the other hand, do not appear to see the Japanese language and culture as unique or inaccessible to non-Japanese people. This suggests that learners have their own perspectives which may or may not be congruent with those of teachers.

The work in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 has provided this module with both a broad and a detailed view of a range of processes taking place at the level of structure and agency. This work helps situate the *nihonjinron* elements in the data, and provide grounds from which an inquiry into the importance of the ideology to observed EFL practices becomes possible. In the next section, I build on the work conducted thus far, and answer Question 3: *to what extent does Japanese JHS English classroom discourse includes explicit references to concepts related to nihonjinron?*

5.3 EXPLICIT REFERENCES TO THE *NIHONJINRON* DISCOURSE

To explore the extent to which observed EFL classroom discourse includes explicit references to concepts related to *nihonjinron*, I considered all 11 *Ni* codes in the data and 5 *Ed* codes: *alt, text, mext, gram,* and *actl* (see Appendix 8 for a description of each code). As these 16 codes are considered in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 below, they constitute the basis for much of the critical work in this module.

I begin this section with a review of key theoretical concepts facilitating the analysis of explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse in the data. In Module One, I discussed five aspects of Japanese uniqueness – race, geography, climate, language, and psychology – all coalescing into a Japanese ‘essence’ or ‘heart’. Notions such as core essences and timelessness in *nihonjinron* can also be found in Hall’s (1996b) five aspects of narratives of national culture:

- the narrative of the nation as ‘body’ and the notion of a national destiny
- the focus on origins, traditions and permanence/continuity
- the creation of traditions transforming chaos into community
- the myth of origin, the lost mythical past
- the notion of an original and pure people

Related to Renan’s (1995, in Wodak et al, 2009) concept of *Kulturnation*, which describes a nation as possessing a ‘soul’ created by both a shared heritage and by a common desire to preserve it, this process of de-historicization contributes to the creation of a solid, unified and recognizable national/cultural identity. Narratives of national culture are created through *selection*, or a focus on certain features found in the national culture deemed to reveal the essence of that culture, and *generalization*, or the assumption that everyone belonging to this national culture possesses these features. In this sense, *selection* is not simply a process if choosing from a set of options but also a form of construction: in the process of selecting cultural elements, these are also ‘made’ or ‘created’. In addition, narratives of national culture are further strengthened through *categorization*, or through ‘*us* versus *them*’ distinctions. In the final section of this module, I analyse the relevance of the current study to *nihonjinron* research, and refer to recent studies of nationalist discourses to explore the links between language and nation more explicitly.

The work in this section has revealed four pertinent themes:

1) ‘unique Japan’ and ‘traditional Japan’ (EFL education to raise students’ awareness of the national culture)
2) cultural differences/polarization
3) Japanese students as monolingual/limited opportunities to use English
4) contradictions to the *nihonjinron* discourse

While these themes overlap to some extent, and while excerpts can be characterized as belonging to more than one particular theme, the main goal in the current descriptive analysis of *nihonjinron* elements is to reveal the multiple facets of the ideology in the data. To achieve this task effectively, I analyze data segments according to these four themes. Finally, while relevant segments of data were found principally in textbooks and classroom materials, data from other sources are also considered.

5.3.1 ‘UNIQUE JAPAN’ AND ‘TRADITIONAL JAPAN’

In this section, I draw on excerpts gathered from textbooks and classroom materials to explore how linguistic elements, or lexico-grammatical processes, are included in sentences and larger stretches of written discourse to promote the ‘traditional Japan’ concept. I first look at sentences or short texts, and follow with short dialogs.

In the data collected from textbooks and classroom materials, there is ample evidence indicating that traditional aspects of Japanese culture, customs, foods and historical sites are seen as important aspects to JHS English education. The implied uniqueness of these locations, objects and practices is further amplified in stories or dialogs portraying non-Japanese people (foreign students, foreign teachers, host family members, etc.) admiring the beauty of both tangible and intangible aspects of traditional Japanese culture. Especially through the use of strong positive adjectival phrases (e.g. *exciting, beautiful, too beautiful to use, interesting, great, popular, very traditional, very long* (history), *healthy, lovely, famous*) and positive stative and linking verbs (e.g. *love, be interested in, enjoy, learn about*), the various manifestations of ‘traditional Japan’ in the data suggest a belief in a Japanese ‘mood’ or ‘feeling’ – i.e. Japaneseness.

Figure 40 shows a textbook sentence in the passive voice, and showcases the stative past tense verb *to be* in the passive form. It also describes a fact in Japanese history.

Line#	**Content**
1	Himeji Castle was built by Ikeda Terumasa in 1609.

Figure 40 (Excerpt 5.3.1.1) – Progress in English 2, page 98 (textbook used at St-Maria J&SHS)

This textbook sample does more than exemplify a particular L2 lexico-grammatical structure: it introduces a fact from Japanese history. In doing so, it contributes to the construction of a national narrative, here embodied by Himeji Castle as an important cultural symbol in Japan. While not particularly reinforcing the notion of a mythical origin or a lost mythical past, as underlined by Hall (1996) in his description of national culture narratives, this sentence is aimed at preparing EFL learners to promote traditional aspects of Japanese culture to an English-speaking audience.

On page 95 of the same textbook, in a text entitled “Ichiro and Me”, we can find examples of Japanese people and culture presented as unique. In Excerpt 5.3.1.2 (see Appendix 9), we find sentences similar to the one in Figure 40 in that they also state historical facts. However, instead of promoting traditional aspects of Japanese culture, these sentences project the notion of ‘unique Japan’ in that they promote achievements and/or status of contemporary Japanese people, positioning them as worthy of international attention and admiration.

The text included in Figure 41 is aimed at teaching relative clauses. Here, a fictional character named Mike (an American student in a Japanese school) gives a speech in his art class about *manga* – a Japanese style of comics characterized by González (2007) as emphasizing representations of culturally idiosyncratic values, customs and objects.

Line#	**Content**
1	Look at these pictures of animals playing together.
2	They are called *Choju-giga*, or “Cartoons of Birds and Animals.”
3	When I first saw them a few days ago, I was very interested in them.
4	I especially like this scene of the frogs and rabbits enjoying wrestling.
5	I read about *Choju-giga* yesterday on the Internet.
6	I learned that the pictures were drawn about 700 years ago.
7	Some people say they’re the oldest *manga* in Japan.
8	If it’s true, the history of *manga* in Japan is very long.

Figure 41 (Excerpt 5.3.1.3) – Sunshine 3, page 61 (textbook used at Asahi JHS)

Noteworthy, the title of Mike’s speech is “Let’s talk about things Japanese”. This title does not specify the content of the speech but rather foregrounds the notion that Japanese ‘things’ are inherently unique.

Excerpt 5.3.1.4 (see Appendix 9) is an article segment prepared by Ms. Ishida. Published in the Japan News, a venture of the Yomiuri Newspaper and one of Japan's largest English-language newspapers, the article is written in relatively simple English, and discusses a large paper lantern at Sensoji Temple in Asakusa, Tokyo. As Ms. Ishida and her students read the article, she focused on both the vocabulary content of the article and on how the passive voice is used to describe the object of interest. Yet, while her pedagogical emphasis is on language, the teacher does see 'traditional Japan' as an important topic in her class. The text in Figure 42 also emphasizes Japanese history and related objects, and showcases both the conditional form beginning with "If you…", and various aspects of L2 modality.

Line#	**Content**
1	If you come to Yokosuka in the fall, you must go to Kannozaki. You can
2	see a tall man in a Gulliver's costume at the festival.
3	If you come to Sapporo in the winter, you should go and see the Snow
4	Festival. You'll enjoy beautiful scenes.
5	If you come to Saga, go to Yoshinogari Park. When you are at the park,
6	you'll learn about Japanese history.

Figure 42 (Excerpt 5.3.1.5) – Sunshine 2, page 50-51 (textbook used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

These five textbook and classroom material samples showcase aspects of Japanese culture deemed worthy of interest to both a Japanese and non-Japanese public. They include sentences to be learned by Japanese EFL learners as a means of promoting mainly traditional aspects of Japanese culture. They can thus be linked to sections of policy documents which promulgate the dissemination of Japanese culture abroad. If we consider Section 9's (MEXT, 2010) statement that classroom materials should be designed in order to deepen "the understanding of the ways of life and cultures of foreign countries and Japan, raising interest in language and culture and developing respectful attitudes toward these", as well as the Five Proposals' (MEXT, 2011a) claim that there is a "need for dissemination of information overseas", it is possible to conclude that the dissemination of information overseas a) entails the teaching of particular aspects of traditional Japanese culture deemed worthy of attention and admiration, and b) should be conducted by Japanese EFL learners.

I now analyze excerpts depicting non-Japanese characters demonstrating strong interest in particular aspects of traditional Japanese culture. The material in Figure 43 is aimed at teaching email opening, body and ending. The theme is “writing an email to your host family.”

Line#	**Content**
1	Dear Mr. and Mrs. Greenwood,
2	Hello. My name is Sato Hiroko.
3	I’m a junior high school student in Fukuoka, Japan.
4	Today I heard you will be my host family.
5	I’m very happy and excited now.
6	This will be my first trip to a foreign country.
7	I want to study English and make a lot of friends in the U.S.
8	Do you want to know anything about Japan?
9	Are you interested in Japan?
10	I’m looking forward to your email.
11	Take care.
12	By for now,
13	Hiroko

Figure 43 (Excerpt 5.3.1.6) – Sunshine 2, page 62 (textbook used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Here, the writer is a Japanese student writing to her American host family. She writes her family name first and her given name second, a convention recognized mainly by people who are familiar with Japanese etiquette. Furthermore, while the said interest among non-Japanese people for ‘traditional Japan’ is not explicitly stated here, it is anticipated by the questions in lines 8 and 9, thus highlighting the assumption that a Japanese student traveling abroad should anticipate interest in Japaneseness among non-Japanese people.

Later on in the same textbook, we find a short example of a speech on the topic of future dreams. In Excerpt 5.3.1.7 (see Appendix 9), the emphasis is on the beneficial aspects and quality of Japanese food. We can denote the presence of reductive views of both Japanese and American cultures in the sentence *People in America love Japanese food because it's healthy*. This sample of text reveals the twin processes of *specification* and *genericisation* (Grad & Martin Rojo, 2008), or what Befu (2001) identifies as the *selection* of cultural details (e.g. Japanese food as healthy) and *generalization* (e.g. people in America loving Japanese food), two notions labeled by the author as characteristic of the *nihonjinron* discourse.

Figure 44 represents a clear depiction of patriotism, defined by Karasawa (2002) as a love of the homeland.

Line#	**Content**
1	Look at the next picture. It was drawn by Jatariuc, 15, in Romania. This
2	picture shows the flag of her country. She says, "The most important thing
	to me is *my* country."

Figure 44 (Excerpt 5.3.1.8) – Sunshine 3, page 77 (textbook used at Asahi JHS)

The italicization of the possessive pronoun 'my' in the text suggests support for the idea of a nation as the possession of its citizens. The importance placed on the flag as symbol of Romania, further amplified by a statement by a young fictional 15 years old character as 'the most important thing' for her, underscores Renan's (1995, in Wodak et al, 2009) concept of *Kulturnation.* Here, the 'soul' of the Romanian nation is embodied by the young girl's drawing of a Romanian flag filled with maxims about the nation's history, surrounded by a large sun, two castles and a large river. In this way, the 'soul' of Romania is depicted as a shared heritage, and the superlative phrase "the most important thing to me is *my* country" further promulgates the idea that there is such a thing as a national 'soul', and that it is a priority among citizens of other countries. Of interest here is the fact that a fictional Romanian student – not Japanese

– is quoted as expressing patriotism, suggesting that the textbook writers do not especially promote nationalistic views or beliefs in a nation's superiority over others (Karasawa, 2002). Instead, we can see that the publishers aim to foreground national identity as a desired mode of categorization and identification through what Bucholtz & Hall (2006) refer to as *adequation*, or a combination between *equation* and *adequacy.* By using the example of the Romanian student, textbook writers and publishers aim to promote a general sense of patriotism, or love for the Japanese nation, amongst Japanese pupils.

I now analyze sample textbook dialogs. Figure 45 is similar to Figure 40 above in terms of syntax and content.

Line#	**Content**
1	A: Look at that.
2	B: Oh, it's beautiful.
3	A: That is *the temple* built by Ashikaga Yoshimitsu in 1397.
4	B: You call it Kinkakuji, right?

Figure 45 (Excerpt 5.3.1.9) – Sunshine 3, page 62 (used at Asahi JHS)

The difference is that the use of the word 'beautiful' is added to communicate an aesthetic appreciation of the object in question. Statements about historical facts contribute to a national narrative in that they emphasize the notion of origin and tradition as structuring social elements. Historical facts constitute points of reference which ground core aspects of a particular society and/or culture within a continuous timeframe. Embedded in EFL textbooks or EFL classroom materials, these statements promulgate the message that Japanese EFL students should know these facts and be ready to communicate them to a foreign audience.

It is worth pointing out here that the dialog in Figure 45 does not specify the ethnicity of the speakers, which differentiates this dialog from most dialogs in textbooks and classroom materials. Indeed, most textbook dialogs take place between a Japanese person and a non-Japanese person. The Japanese participant often teaches knowledge about Japanese culture to the non-Japanese participant, who also demonstrates strong interest in such knowledge. Excerpt 5.3.1.10 (see Appendix 9), taken from a worksheet produced by Ms. Inoue, is a good example of this. It showcases a young Japanese character asking a non-Japanese character about his knowledge and interest in sumo, Japan's national sport. In this excerpt, the Japanese character begins by inquiring about the non-Japanese character's knowledge of sumo. Then, he provides information about the sport, and as such, takes on the role of teacher. The focus is, again, on Japanese people imparting knowledge of traditional Japan to a foreign audience. What is interesting in this excerpt, however, is the focus on Mongolian sumo wrestlers, which goes against the idea that Japanese traditions are emphasized in MEXT-approved EFL textbooks specifically to reinforce a sense of Japanese uniqueness. Figure 46 is an extension from a dialog entitled "*Sushi*-Go-Around in the World", which appears two pages earlier in the textbook.

Line#	**Content**	
1	Mr. Oka:	*Kaiten-zushi* has an interesting history. The first *kaiten-zushi*
2		bar was opened by Mr. Shiraishi Yoshiaki, a *sushi* chef, in
3		Osaka in 1958. It made *sushi* more popular in Japan.
4	Pat:	Really? How did he get the idea?
5	Mr. Oka:	He got the idea when he saw bottles at a beer factory. They
6		were traveling on a conveyor belt.
7	Pat:	Is that true?
8	Mr. Oka:	Yes. The *kaiten-zushi* belt moves at eight centimeters a second.
9		That's the perfect speed for customers to pick up plates.
10	Pat:	That's great. Mr. Shiraishi was a man of ideas. His idea helped
11		to make *sushi* more popular in the world.

Figure 46 (Excerpt 5.3.1.11) – Sunshine 3, page 55 (used at Asahi JHS)

As in the previous sample, a Japanese character provides information about an aspect of traditional Japanese culture to a non-Japanese participant. The last comment by the non-Japanese character suggests that traditional aspects of Japanese culture should not only be explained to foreign audiences, but that doing so can lead to greater recognition, appreciation and popularity of Japanese culture abroad.

There are, of course, exceptions to such pattern. As Figure 41 above shows, Japanese characters are not always the source of knowledge related to traditional Japanese culture. On June 19, Mr. Ono reviews the spring mid-term test. In Section 10 of the test sheet, there is a conversation (also found on p.9 of the Sunshine 2 textbook) between two characters named Yuki and Ms. Wood (see Excerpt 5.3.1.12 in Appendix 9), and it is the latter who teaches the former about an aspect of traditional Japanese culture.

This excerpt, however, also projects the idea that traditional Japanese culture is of interest to non-Japanese people. This notion is communicated more explicitly in Figure 47.

Line#	**Content**	
1	Lisa:	Tom, I am going to play tennis with my friends tomorrow. Why don't
2		you join us?
3	Tom:	Sorry, but I can't. My friend's father teaches me Japanese every
4		Saturday. I started learning Japanese last month.
5	Lisa:	Oh, that's nice. Do you like studying Japanese?
6	Tom:	Yes. It's difficult but it's interesting. I can learn about many famous
7		places in Japan. I am going to visit Kyoto with my friend's family
8		next month.
9	Lisa:	That's great. Well, why do you learn Japanese?
10	Tom:	I love Japan. It's a beautiful country. I want to work in Japan.
11	Lisa:	Oh, really?

Figure 47 (Excerpt 5.3.1.13) – Worksheet produced by Ms. Inoue

In this worksheet, two non-Japanese characters are discussing their plans for the following day. One of them professes a love for Japan and the intention to work – and by implication, to live – there. This projects the notion that non-Japanese people can also be part of Japanese society and culture. Finally, Tom's justification for studying the Japanese language is that Japan is a 'beautiful country' worthy of love. In this way, love for Japanese culture and nation is justified in aesthetic terms.

The foregrounding of aesthetic aspects of Japanese culture – potentially understood as a manifestation of markedness (Bucholtz & Hall, 2006) – serves to construct social categories within which cultural comparison is facilitated. To explain this process, Bucholtz & Hall's (2006) notions of *adequation* and *distinction* are useful. The first "involves the pursuit of socially recognized sameness […] potentially salient differences are set aside in favor of perceived or asserted similarities that are taken to be more situationally relevant" (p.383). Following *adequation* is *distinction*, a "mechanism whereby salient difference is produced" (p.383). Once symbols and social categories have been adopted as inherently Japanese through *adequation*, they serve to reinforce the process of *distinction*, or cultural differences as source of cultural knowledge. The aesthetic aspects of traditional Japanese culture therefore serve to index cultural sameness amongst Japanese and produce – or reinforce – cultural contrasts with non-Japaneseness.

Excerpt 5.3.1.14 (see Appendix 9) also looks at the aesthetic aspects of traditional Japanese culture by focusing on *ukiyoe,* a Japanese woodblock printing technique. In this excerpt, we find additional evidence of this recurring characterization in textbooks of traditional aspects of Japanese culture as ‘beautiful’. However, as for Figure 45 above, no mention is made regarding the ethnicity of speakers A or B. Figure 48 is a dialog between Jiro, a Japanese student who is staying in the U.S. for a few months, and Mrs. Green, his host mother.

Line#	Content	
1	Mrs. Green:	Oh, what a beautiful plate! Thank you so much, Jiro.
2	Jiro:	My mom sent it. It’s traditional Japanese pottery.
3	Mrs. Green:	It’s lovely! What’s it used for?
4	Jiro:	Sweets are served on it.
5	Mrs. Green:	It’s too beautiful to use. I think I’ll hang it on the wall.
6	Jiro:	I guess it can be used as a decoration, too.

Figure 48 (Excerpt 5.3.1.15) – Progress in English 2, page 124 (used at St-Maria J&SHS)

A strong positive emotion towards ‘traditional Japan’ is expressed through the use of adjective phrases ‘beautiful’, ‘lovely’, and ‘too beautiful to use’. We can also denote a re-contextualization, or appropriation, of a traditional Japanese artifact by a non-Japanese character, which elicits Jiro’s somewhat ambivalent reaction in line 6.

In retrospect, ample evidence from textbooks and classroom materials shows that a core objective in JHS English education is the promulgation of ‘traditional Japan’ to a foreign audience. Furthermore, the noticeably positive aesthetic emphases on these aspects appear to be aimed at prioritizing an image of Japanese culture and nation as beautiful and ‘exotic’. Iwabuchi (1994) identifies this approach as part of the broader process of *self-orientalization*, or *self-exoticization*. The indexation of the learners’ native culture as exotic, beautiful and worthy of admiration by outsiders suggests a marked tendency to describe oneself in relation to an Other, or through the exclusion of the Other (van Leeuwen, 1996). Iwabuchi (1994) adds that self-orientalization in the Japanese context underscores “the exclusion of the voices of the repressed such as minority groups like Ainu, Koreans and *burakumin* (Japanese ‘Untouchables’). This can be denoted in the data, as all depictions of Japanese culture exclusively showcase aspects of the majority culture. In contrast, these textbooks include references to repressed communities in other parts of the world – e.g. the segregation of African-Americans in U.S. history, climate change affecting the habitat of Polynesian communities, Mother Teresa’s work for the poor of India, etc. The Sunshine 2 textbook, for example, includes 42 dialogs and texts of approximately 100 words each. 22 of these pertain to, or include references to, the majority Japanese culture, and all of these references are of a positive nature. Most of these 42 dialogs and texts involve Japanese characters (especially students) explaining an aspect of Japanese culture to foreign visitors. Many Japanese words like *juku, ukiyoe and sakura* – which may not be understood by people unfamiliar with the Japanese language – are written without English equivalents or explanations. It is therefore unclear if the pedagogical goal here is to promote Japanese culture to English-speaking audiences, or simply to raise awareness of these cultural aspects among young Japanese students.

Additional evidence belonging to the ‘traditional Japan’ and of ‘Japan-as-unique’ themes can be found in samples collected from teacher interviews. Of particular interest here is the view shared by Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue that, by instilling greater awareness of the national culture among students, the latter’s sense of self-confidence can be improved. This point was raised with reference to Figure 30. A different yet related view is found in the Five Proposals (MEXT, 2011a), which include a mention that young Japanese people nowadays are inward-looking, and that “this inward-mindedness is caused not only by young people's mind but also by various other factors" (p.2). To build self-confidence, Japanese learners of English are advised to use English as a means of communication. In this case, it is not awareness of the national culture but knowledge and use of English in the real world that is promoted as remedy to young Japanese people's said inwardness. What is clear, however, is that Mr. Ono's claim that textbooks do not include sufficient positive references to Japanese culture does not reflect the evidence found in MEXT-approved textbooks.

In my previous analysis of Figure 30, I suggested that Mr. Ono's argument draws a causal relationship between the individual of Japanese ethnicity and the Japanese nation as represented by a unified Japanese culture. This unified culture is further transformed into an essence or a structure which guides individual thoughts and behaviors. This association of culture with individual states of mind is made visually more explicit through Mr. Ono's emphasis on traditional elements (e.g. *hanami* and *sakura*), symbolically representing the essence of Japanese culture. It also demonstrates the merging of the geographical – Japan as place where cherry blossoms originate – and psychological arguments in the *nihonjinron* discourse. Later on in the same interview, Mr. Ono confirmed his support for these particular views (see Excerpt 5.3.1.16 in Appendix 9).

Perhaps the most explicit reference to the *nihonjinron* discourse is the 'Japan-as-island' argument expressed by Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue (see Figures 33 and 34 above). In Figure 49, Mr. Ono argues that it is difficult to expect Japanese students to become proficient in English because Japan is an island nation.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Mr. Ono:	Japanese English ability is low [mmh] because you you know
2		Japan is communicate with the Ja- around Japan sea. [mmh]
3		(drawing a picture of Japan on a paper) So we can't go
4		[mmh] other places.

Figure 49 (Excerpt 5.3.1.17) – Sakura JHS (June 21)

It is worth noting here that Mr. Ono's use of the deictic expression 'we' constitutes both an addressee-exclusive form and a 'we-body' or 'national body' form – also noticeable in Ms. Ishida's comment '*Because we are Japanese*' (see Figure 38).

In another interview excerpt, he expands this argument further by saying that, because Japan is a rich island-nation, it is unnecessary for its citizens to go abroad. As was denoted from Figure 33 above, Ms. Inoue voiced similar views by maintaining that her students are not interested in foreign countries and cultures because they live on an island. In short, Japan's geographical and climatic characteristics are said to be the sources of Japanese people's said unique psychological traits, which include ethnocentricity and poor language learning aptitudes. Her multiple references to said unique Japanese cultural traits almost always of a negative nature (e.g. English 'allergy', inability to express one's 'true' feelings in Japanese). She refers to these traits as innate to her students, or as she puts it, "something they've had since birth." This combination of *differences*, *deficits* and *innateness* indicates that these views do not reinforce the notion of Japanese culture as superior to other cultures, a hallmark of nationalist discourses.

The focus on geography in the 'Japan-as-island' argument echoes processes related to *cultural integration*, or the promotion of the "image of culture as a coherent pattern, a uniform ethos or a symbolically consistent universe” (Archer, 1996: *xvii*). It reinforces the view of Japan as a geographical entity populated by a single and unified ethnic group, or a ‘tribe’ of islanders (in contrast to continental people, jungle people, desert people, artic people, etc.). This creates the image of an integrated community from which particular beliefs and practices are said to emerge uniformly in the people who populate this community. Therefore, in the ‘Japan-as-island’ argument, the word ‘island’ has both geographical psychological connotations.

This section has focused mainly on how elements in the data promulgating traditional aspects of Japanese culture underscore an apparent need in EFL education to reinforce Japanese national identity. I have also indicated contradicting elements which highlight the fractured nature of the ‘traditional Japan’ discourse in the data. In the next section, I review elements in the data showing how Japan – the culture, the society, the people – is positioned as diametrically opposed to other essentialized nations/cultures/peoples.

5.3.2 CULTURAL POLARIZATION

In Section 5.2.4, I reviewed students’ responses to statements pertaining to both *nihonjinron* and EFL education, and suggested that while they do not see Japanese culture as inherently unique, they also believe that Japanese and English are two very different languages. In contrast, cultural polarization was noticeable both during teacher interviews and, to a lesser extent, in classroom materials.

Figure 50 – a sample of classroom discourse – shows Mr. Ono contrasting Japanese and American cultures.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Mr. Ono:	*hai ja ikimasu.* Look at the blackboard	Yes, well let's go.
2		please. Rea- reading practice. Reading	
3		practice let's go. *de eto ni danraku kono*	about this
4		*mae ga iimashita yaku de* (inaudible) *ni*	paragraph, I
5		*danraku natte nihon to* America *no*	translated that
6		(inaudible) *tai sareteru yo*.	before, and it was about the differences between America and Japan
7		This is a contrast Japan and America.	
8		OK so let's go. I went to Sakura Park	
9		*dozo*.	Go ahead
10	Chorus:	I went to Sakura Park.	

Figure 50 (Excerpt 5.3.2.1) – Sakura JHS (May 1)

In his opinion, differences are an important source of information because students respond more positively to them. During our May 8 interview, Mr. Ono introduced this idea thus: "*So I think uh in Japan and fo- foreign countries much uh difference is gives students interest*." In other words, he conceptualizes culture teaching as a source of entertainment, and in this way, as opposed to 'more serious' language teaching. This perspective is echoed to some extent by Ms. Tanaka, who claimed that her students are interested in the origin of western traditions and events, and how they are different from those found in Japanese culture. Likewise, Ms. Inoue also stated that cultural differences were an important teaching element, but countered this view by adding that both differences and similarities are equally important (see Figure 32). She even states at one point that it is important for students to understand other culture and see things from different perspectives, an important stage in the development of intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997). In other words, teachers do not appear to view the maintenance of Japan's cultural autonomy and independence from foreign cultures as particularly important. Also important is Ms. Ishida not expressing any particular views towards these issues, which suggests that teachers may not see these issues as fully relevant to their everyday practice.

Looking at textbooks, few examples of the process of cultural polarization were found. However, on page 97 of the Sunshine 2 textbook, this emphasis is clear.

Line#	**Content**	
1	Mike:	I once had a similar experience in Japan.
2	Momoko:	Oh, did you? Tell me about it.
3	Mike:	My host mother always made Western food for me.
4	Momoko:	Always? But I hear you like Japanese food better than Western
5		food.
6	Mike:	Yes, I like rice the best for dinner, but she always gave me bread.
7	Momoko:	She probably thought you liked bread the best. She was treating
8		you as a guest.
9	Mike:	I understand that now. She was just trying to be polite to me.
10	Momoko:	Each country has its own customs. We have to understand the
11		differences.

Figure 51 (Excerpt 5.3.2.2) – Sunshine 2, page 97 (used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

This sample is the second part of a dialog starting on page 95, one which takes place between a Japanese character and a non-Japanese character. While there are indications of a belief in Japan’s cultural superiority in the comparative statement *you like Japanese food better than Western food*, the focus in this dialog is on the importance of developing greater awareness of cultural differences in intercultural understanding. The interpretation of the host mother’s cultural behavior in lines 7 and 8 underlines the assumption that customs are instantiations of principles found at the heart of a particular culture. Framed thus, customs also serve to confirm the uniqueness of that culture. Cultural understanding is hereby reduced to a matter of understanding cultural differences.

Of particular importance to this theme is the moderate tendency among teachers (more pronounced in textbooks and classroom materials) to depict Japanese culture as opposed to an idealized American culture. The U.S. is often positioned as both the representative of the outside world and as Japan's Other. Generally speaking, the U.S., Australia and Finland are portrayed in a positive light. On page 21 of the Sunshine 2 textbook, Finland is said to be 'famous for good designs', and on p.36, Australia is portrayed as a 'beautiful country', echoing similar views in regards to Japan. However, portrayals of other nations – especially neighboring Asian countries such as China and North and South Korea – differ considerably. Positive representations of these nations only involve comments regarding their cuisines, and on page 11 of the Sunshine 2 textbook, traditional dance. More importantly, with recurrent mentions of Japanese citizens doing volunteer work abroad, developing nations tend to be depicted as environments populated by children in need of help from Japanese people. In other words, non-European/North-American nations are shown as relatively unsafe and unstable.

In retrospect, the data samples reviewed thus far indicate a moderate tendency among three of the four teachers towards valuing cultural polarization in discussions about culture. They also indicate a tendency among teachers (especially Mr. Ono) to conceptualize cultures as integrated systems. When the process of cultural polarization is deployed, it almost always involves contrasts between Japanese and American cultures, the latter representing both 'the West' and foreign cultures. With the U.S. representing all western cultures, Japan's process of internationalization becomes easier to trace. As Seargeant (2009: 66) points out,

> it is often said that Japan has historically had a problematic relationship with the rest of the world – a relationship characterized by a process of regulating contact with the West – and that this process has perpetuated an insular self-image and led to an internationalization programme which has more to do with absorbing foreign influence than interacting with the international community.

The process of cultural polarization (Yoshino, 1992), identified as the second most prominent *nihonjinron*-related theme in the data, draws from theoretical concepts widely used in cross-cultural research which have made their way into popular parlance. These include dichotomous cultural constructs such as *individualism vs. collectivism* and *high vs. low context cultures*. While these concepts have been challenged in the literature, they have informed a considerable portion of research in comparative cultural studies, and often serve as reliable analytical tools. Providing additional conceptual understanding, Byram (1997) makes an important distinction between the willingness to engage with ‘otherness’ from an ‘egalitarian basis’ – i.e. with the aim of engaging in and improving intercultural contacts – and the attitude of seeking out the exotic, which is more about the forging of local identities through an ‘*us* versus *them*’ perspective. Accordingly, cultural differences may be seen as more interesting at a surface level, while underlying processes may involve the maintenance of cultural autonomy and independence from foreign cultures.

In the next section, I return to the topic of monolingualism with regards to other *nihonjinron* elements in the data. In the process, I attempt to reveal further insight into the complex process of identity indexation observed in the data.

5.3.3 JAPANESE STUDENTS AS MONOLINGUAL

Perhaps the most obvious evidence in the data depicting Japanese students as monolingual individuals comes from a worksheet produced by Mr. Ono, which includes the statement "Japanese use one _____. It's Japanese" (the answer being "language"). Figure 52 includes a sample of classroom discourse which exemplifies this conflation between nationality and language.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	Korea Korean Korean can't Ja- can't	
2		understand Japanese. So in- we need	
3		interpreters.	
4	S1:	*tsuyaku*.	Translation.
5	Mr. Ono:	Very good. Very good. Very good.	

Figure 52 (Excerpt 5.3.3.1) – Sakura JHS (June 26)

Here, the monolingual paradigm is applied to suggest that a) all Korean people can only speak Korean, and b) communication between two people of different cultures requires a third party – the interpreter – whose responsibility is to ensure mutual intelligibility.

The view of EFL learners as monolingual individuals is also expressed, albeit indirectly, in a text found in the Sunshine 2 textbook about a magic pillow (see Excerpt 5.3.3.4 in Appendix 9). Three problematic notions can be identified in this excerpt: 1) language learning is a difficult and time-consuming endeavor; 2) this challenge can somehow be overcome through magic; and 3) language learning is both an individual and unconscious process. Together, these elements present language learning as something outside one's realm of immediate linguistic experiences, these being characterized by monolingualism.

The monolingual paradigm was evident when, during classroom time, Mr. Ono interpreted what I said, as Figure 53 shows.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	Bouchard sensei is this the small	
2		letter OK? Sakura Park.	
3	Bouchard:	No. It has to be a big letter.	
4	Mr. Ono:	Big letter.	
5	Bouchard:	Big letter.	
6	Mr. Ono:	(to students) Big letter *janakya*	It has to be a big letter.
7		*dame nan desu*.	
8	Bouchard:	That's right. It's a name.	
9	Mr. Ono:	We say only park I go to the park is	
10		small letter.	
11	Bouchard:	That's right. The park means any	
12		park. But Sakura Park is only one	
13		park.	
14	Mr. Ono:	Ahh. *naze ka te iu to tatoeba*	The reason is that when
15		*watashitachi tada koen itta tte iu*	we go to a park we can
16		*toki wa ikutsu mo kangaeraremasu*	go to many different
17		*yo ne. tatoeba chikaku ni mitsu*	parks. For example,
18		*gurai aru dore ka ittan da na te iu*	there can be three parks
19		*kangaerareru desu kedo-*	nearby, so we need to
			specify which.
20	S1:	Oh.	
21	Mr. Ono:	*sakura koen tte iu no ga kore ga*	If we say Sakura Park,
22		(inaudible) *ga itta koen ga hitotsu*	there is only one park
23		*te iu koto nano de oomoji ni suru*	named like that, so we
24		*yo*.	use capital letters.
25	S1:	Oh.	
26	S2:	*hai hai*.	Yes yes.

Figure 53 (Excerpt 5.3.3.2) – Sakura JHS (May 8)

By immediately translating what I said, Mr. Ono removes the chance for learners to process messages in the L2, and at the same time, positions learners as monolingual individuals lacking the skills to process L2 messages independently. In Excerpt 5.3.3.3 (see Appendix 9), the students and I are engaged in a simple exchange in the L2 about their school trip. Near the end of this excerpt, Mr. Ono says "*eigo wa muzukashii*", or "English is difficult", which expresses a relatively defeatist comment about language learning.

In the interview data, the four teachers did not express views explicitly framing Japanese EFL learners as monolingual individuals. However, one comment made by Mr. Ono – found in Figure 54 – is particularly revealing.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Mr. Ono:	some students said. For example, Yuki is Japanese girl, [uh]
2		but the CD is very very co- uh like foreigner.
3	Bouchard:	Mmh, her voice?
4	Mr. Ono:	Like English speaking yes.

Figure 54 (Excerpt 5.3.3.5) – Sakura JHS (May 8)

Here, Mr. Ono is referring to a Japanese character in the Sunshine 2 textbook – Yuki – who speaks English fluently. Mr. Ono commented that he and his students believed that a native English speaker had been hired by the publisher to record Yuki's voice. This reveals two problematic assumptions: a) fluent Japanese English speakers are clear exceptions – i.e. they possess foreign features, and b) EFL students are unlikely to attain Yuki's L2 ability level.

While Mr. Ono commented that a few students at his school might work abroad and become bilingual in the future, he also stated that very few of them might actually do so. To some extent, his view reflects that of his students who, in their attitude survey, expressed mild disagreement with the statement "I think I can become a bilingual Japanese-English speaker." During our sixth interview, Mr. Ono justified his opinion by stating that English does not play a particularly important role in his students' lives (see Excerpt 5.3.3.6 in Appendix 9). Conversely, three of the four teachers believed that some of their students could eventually become bilingual. Ms. Inoue stated that bilingualism may be required for certain occupations. Ms. Tanaka argued that bilingualism depends on personal volition, adding that her students already have ample opportunities to learn and use English at St-Maria J&SHS. Ms. Ishida was more ambivalent on the issue, simply expressing hope that her students would eventually become bilingual. Together, these views reflects findings form a study conducted by Matsuura, Fujieda & Mahoney (2004) which reveal that a majority of Japanese EFL teachers do not see individual bilingualism as the goal of EFL education in Japan. They also underscore the presence of the monolingual paradigm in the Japanese EFL context, particularly with regards to the positioning of Japanese EFL learners as monolingual individuals in constant need of L1 support.

The issue of monolingualism in Japanese EFL education can be explored from the perspective of language ideology. In the data collected for this module – e.g. Mr. Ono’s worksheet which includes the statement “*Japanese use one* _____. *It’s Japanese*” – we can denote traces of ideological positionings of the Japanese nation and its citizens as possessing one language. Ideologies linking language and nation essentially highlight national languages as pivotal to the construction of national identities. Byram (2008) states that national languages possess cognitive, affective and behavioral importance: “Cognitively it is crucial for further learning within and beyond school. Affectively it symbolizes national identity and is associated with iconic texts and national culture. Behaviorally it is a skill that has to be honed in order to acquire work and economic independence within the national society” (p.104). The consequence for national educational policy and practice is that the national language becomes a pedagogical priority, making it both a taken for granted entity and a vital possession of the state requiring protection from outside influences.

From the perspective of modernist language ideologies, Japanese is considered to be the first non-western language to have been modernized to become a recognized national language. According to Heinrich (2012), however, this particular legacy has been somewhat problematic for the internationalization of Japanese society:

> Language becomes ideologically loaded by the linking of language with non-linguistic matters, some of the most important of these links being concerned with history and society. Of the historical connections, there exists the idea that all Japanese speak Japanese and that they always have done. Another such belief asserts that Japanese is and has always been the first language of all Japanese, and also that it is the only language of Japan. Thus, Japanese constitutes a common bond between all Japanese since time immemorial, as well as a barrier between Japanese and non-Japanese (p.172).

In this account, we can find elements from Hall's (1996b) description of narratives of national culture, namely the myth of origin and the notion of an 'original people'. To a large extent, these accounts clarify the linguistic and psychological aspects of some of the *nihonjinron* traces in the data.

However, while evidence in the data seems to support these theoretical perspectives, it would be mistaken to assume that depictions of Japanese students as monolingual individuals in the data are fully consistent. Figure 55 shows Mr. Ono expressing views which contradict some of his other statements.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Mr. Ono:	for example in Japan oh some companies [mmh] are used in
2		English [mmh] uh oh sorry English is used in some
3		companies [mmh] major companies. [mmh] So when they
4		have a meeting they only use English.

Figure 55 (Excerpt 5.3.3.7) – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Even more explicit is a comment he made as we were about to enter his class: "*You can use English wherever you go in the world*," adding "*If we know English, we do not have trouble anywhere in the world. We must respect all countries, languages, cultures and people. English is the best*." Consequently, it is more appropriate to conclude that the evidence in the data includes a range of views – some of them conflicting – regarding Japanese EFL learners as monolingual individuals. We can also characterize the *nihonjinron*-oriented views analyzed in this section in similar fashion. These conclusions suggest that the interaction between structural and agentive processes is essentially complex, and fragmented at times, further problematizing the causal links between ideology and observed practice.

In the next section, I analyze evidence in the data which contradicts *nihonjinron*-oriented perspectives, starting with textbooks and classroom materials, then with classroom discourse and finally with teacher interviews.

5.3.4 CONTRADICTING THE *NIHONJINRON* DISCOURSE

Earlier, I underlined some of the problematic approaches to culture teaching in MEXT-approved EFL textbooks and teacher-produced materials. However, two samples of EFL materials can be categorized as aligned with the inclusion of intercultural communication competence (Byram, 1989, 1997, 2008; Houghton, 2012) in Japanese secondary school EFL education. In Figure 56 (note that the answer in line 9 is "understand"), we can denote traces of universalism and cultural relativism in lines 4, 5, 9 and 10.

Line#	**Content**
1	Ken passed the test again when he was eighteen years old.
2	He went to Australia and became friends with some students.
3	Ken and his friends talked about sports, music and dreams.
4	He learned that students in Australia and Japan felt and thought in the same
5	ways.
6	He really enjoyed his life in Australia.
7	After coming back to Japan, he talked about his life in Australia to his friends,
8	teachers and family.
9	He said to them, “People can become good friends if they learn to _______
10	each other.”

Figure 56 (Excerpt 5.3.4.1) – Worksheet (used at Asahi JHS)

Also, this sample contrasts with the notion of cultural polarization discussed earlier. More evidently, there is a clear connection between language learning and the development of intercultural communication skills through active interaction with ‘Otherness’. Figure 57 includes a section from an interview of a then young Canadian-Japanese girl named Severn Suzuki reminiscing on her famous speech at the UN Earth Summit of 1992.

Line#	**Content**
1	The Earth Summit was a big event and it changed my life.
2	I became famous.
3	I had a lot of chances to meet and talk with people around the world.
4	I always say, “People in one country can’t live a day without the help of
5	people in other countries.” People in Japan, for example, must think of
6	people in China when they wear clothes. They must also think of people in
7	Africa and South America when they eat chocolate and feel happy.

Figure 57 (Excerpt 5.3.4.2) – Sunshine 2, p.67 (used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

In this interview, the young Suzuki communicates a message of international cooperation and individual responsibility. In the classroom, however, this content was largely overlooked; instead linguistic content was once again prioritized over cultural content. On November 26, Ms. Ishida reviewed the grammar content found on pages 65 and 67, and included chorus practices for each statement of Mrs. Suzuki’s interview. Before students rehearsed each line in chorus, she provided Japanese translations.

In the recorded classroom data, there were few references to both *nihonjinron* and discourses contradicting *nihonjinron*. In Figure 58, Ms. Ishida is commenting on the use of English by Keisuke Honda, a famous Japanese soccer player (see Figure 24).

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Ishida:	*tokoro de desu ne, watashi ha*	By the way, from this clip
2		*kore wo tori ageru no ha kare no*	you can notice that he
3		*eigo ga iro iro machigae ga*	makes a lot of mistakes.
4		*arimasu. satte ano gokai shite*	But I don't want you to
5		*hoshikunai no ha kare no*	misunderstand that I am
6		*machigae wo shite ki suru tame*	showing you this clip to
7		*ni yatterun janakute,* eh *kare no*	point out his mistakes. I
8		*eigo kiku no toki kimitachi kiki*	think you can all
9		*toru da to omoimasu.* oh *naru*	understand his English. Oh
10		*hodo naru hodo. ma chuugakkou*	I get it I get it. I want you to
11		*eigo zenbun jinsei zen sekai ni*	remember that even with
12		*tsutaeru koto ga dekirun da tte iu*	imperfect English we can
13		*koto ga shite hoshii tte iu hitotsu.*	communicate our thoughts to people all over the world.

Figure 58 (Excerpt 5.3.4.4) – Heiwa JHS (January 30)

The statement "even with imperfect English we can communicate our thoughts to people all over the world" clearly challenges the view of Japanese people as poor language learners. Also, while Ms. Ishida almost always focuses on the grammar aspects of the L2, she also demonstrates awareness that her EFL classroom is about developing the skills to communicate in a foreign language (i.e. not simply about passing entrance exams), and the willingness to make this goal clear to her students. In short, Ms. Ishida sees particular aspects of EFL education as opportunities to teach about culture and to frame the task of language learning within a broader sociological context.

In Figure 59, Mr. Ono is referring to a dialog on page 19 of the Sunshine 2 textbook in which the people of Finland are said to speak three languages.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	*kouyougo tte nani ga tte oyake*	What's an official
2		*oyake tte sou iu ne ano sono*	language? The notion of
3		*kuni de koushiki ni tte iu ka*	official in a country, the
4		*nihon de tsukawareteiru no*	official language in
5		*koushiki tte nihongo desu.*	Japan is Japanese. You
6		[name of student] *ga minasan*	all watch the news, so
7		*de* news *miteiru kara wakaru to*	you know that, unlike
8		*ori tatoeba* UniQlo *to ka*	regular companies,
9		Rakuten *to ka sou iu kaisha de*	companies like UniQlo
10		*kaigi ga zenbun nihon ni aru*	and Rakuten conduct
11		*kaisha nano ni kaigi ga eigo de*	their meetings in
12		*yaru. iuttemasu. sou iu no mo*	English. Like that,
13		*aru de no touri eto kouyougo*	English is considered an
14		*ga kouiuhun ni shite eigo de*	official language in some
15		*natte mo eigo ga machi no*	places where people
16		*naka de tsukawareteru yo tte iu*	use it on the streets and
17		*ohanashi.*	so on.
18	Some students:	Mmh.	
19	Mr. Ono:	*chotto sono atari rikai shinikui*	Maybe that's a little hard
20		*kamoshiremasen.*	for you to understand.

Figure 59 (Excerpt 5.3.4.3) – Sakura JHS (May 15)

With this example, Mr. Ono is directly countering the ideology linking language and nation discussed earlier. Unfortunately, even if students express understanding in line 18, Mr. Ono chooses not to pursue his explanation, claiming that this particular sociolinguistic issue might be too complicated for students. This example shows how opportunities for teachers to challenge *nihonjinron*-oriented notions *in situ* were missed, partly as a result of teachers assuming that learners' linguistic and/or cognitive abilities are insufficient.

On May 28, slightly before the class, I asked Mr. Ono to comment on the focus on Finland in the textbook. He answered that it is important for his students to know about countries other than the U.S. and England, countries which do not use English as their official language. As we entered the classroom, and as I began to speak with some of his students in English, Mr. Ono chose to speak to one of the students in Japanese. This student replied jokingly “English, please. English, please”, to which Mr. Ono replied “*muri desu*”, or “It’s impossible”. In short, the occasional contradictions between teachers’ stated views and actions are not necessarily the results of *nihonjinron*-oriented ideological constraints but rather the results of particular assumptions by teachers regarding learners’ linguistic and/or cognitive abilities.

In the interview data, Ms. Inoue refers to the need to frame language learning within a broader context. Noteworthy in Figure 60 is her view that students occasionally expressing strong (or critical) opinions can be interesting pedagogical opportunities.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Inoue:	*ato yappari eigo no sensei de aru to nan daro eigo ha kore*
2		*kara mo hitsuyou dashi tte iu* (when you are an English
3		teacher, you need to explain why learning English is
4		necessary) [uh] *hanashi ni ya kana ja imasu ne* (there are
5		some students who say they don’t like English) [mmh] *eigo no*
6		*sensei da to eigo yada nan de shinakya ikenai no tte*
7		*iwaretara* (when teacher are asked by students why do we
8		need to study English?) [mmh] Mmh *demo so janakute eigo*
9		*ga ma shuudan de attari oisagetetara ottoshitara de au*
10		*kamoshirenai omoshiroi kikai shinatteiru ja nai ka* (however,
11		not only that, groups of students can quickly develop strong
12		opinions, and this can be an interesting opportunity too)
13		[mmh] *mo chotto kaji tte mite kan no hou ga iin ja nai tte*
14		*itsumo iimasu* (I’m always telling them wouldn’t it be better if
15		you tried a little harder at it).

Figure 60 (Excerpt 5.3.4.5) – Asahi JHS (October 19)

There are elements of critical pedagogy in this statement. Unfortunately, because no such opportunity surfaced in the classroom data collected at Asahi JHS, Ms. Inoue’s views do not appear to reflect classroom practice. In the same interview, Ms. Inoue reinforced the notion that teachers have the responsibility to broaden their students’ worldviews.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Inoue:	*sore wo ningen no hanashi to okikaeru tte iu ka* [uh] *hito to*
2		*onaji tte iimasu* (I tell them that humans are all the same
3		everywhere). [mmh] *moshi nigate dattara* (if English is their
4		weak point). [uh] *mada sono men shika mietenai janai no kai to*
5		*ka* (I ask them whether they are now only looking at the
6		surface of it or not). [mmh] *iutteru* (That's what I tell them).
7		Mmh *sugoi sa- rei ga chotto hen desu kedo* (Maybe it's strange
8		to say so but) [mmh] *de hito ha yada na to omou hito ga iru*
9		*kamoshirenai kedo* (there are some people who don't like
10		other people but), [mmh] *sono men shika mietenai kara ya ni*
11		*mieru dake de* (they feel so because they only focus on the
12		surface) [mmh] *sono hito mo subete shite wake ja nai yo tte*
13		*iutte ageru surun desu* (I tell them that this is not all there is
14		about them). [mmh] *eigo mo sore onaji kana to omotteite* (I
15		think it's the same with English) [mmh] *ma nigate na koto*
16		*subete ni oite* mmh- (this applies to all our weak points-)

Figure 61 (Excerpt 5.3.4.6) – Asahi JHS (October 19)

In similar fashion, she expressed more complex views about education and about the presence of English in Japan. In Excerpt 5.3.4.7 (see Appendix 9), she places English education as part of a development of pupils' intercultural communication competence and overall personal growth. Later on in the same interview, she states that young Japanese people nowadays are more globally-minded. Her outlooks expressed in Figure 62 contradict her view analyzed earlier that young Japanese people are uninterested in foreign countries.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	So ten years ago, the mood in Japan changed-
2	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh I think so.
3	Bouchard:	Towards island thinking [mmh] towards more international
4		kind of [uh yes] thinking. Ah OK.
5	Ms. Inoue:	Uh compared to uh my junior high school or high school [Ah
6		OK.] *to ka kurabetara kekko sekai hanashi to ka*
7		(comparatively, we have become more internationally-
8		minded).

Figure 62 (Excerpt 5.3.4.8) – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Yet, not all teachers expressed inconsistent views. Figure 63 shows Ms. Tanaka positioning the EFL teacher as a cultural ambassador.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Tanaka:	as an English teacher we should go outside and go to uh
2		experience different cultures. [uh huh] So and so we can
3		share [uh] with students those experiences.

Figure 63 (Excerpt 5.3.4.9) – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Having known and worked with her for more than ten years prior to this interview, I can say with certainly that Ms. Tanaka's views expressed in this sample reflect reality. Almost every year, she travels to different countries and regions of Japan and brings back pictures and artifacts to show her students.

In sum, the data analyzed in Section 5.3 reveals four prominent traces of *nihonjinron* in the data: 'unique Japan' and 'traditional Japan', cultural differences/polarization, Japanese students as monolingual individuals, and contradictions to the *nihonjinron* discourse. We can therefore notice four out of the five *nihonjinron* arguments in the data: racial uniqueness, geographical uniqueness, linguistic uniqueness, and psychological uniqueness. However, these traces a) surface sporadically in the data, and b) are often contradicted by other forms of discourses and practices. Considering that other types of discourse can be characterized similarly, evidence of *nihonjinron* in the data should not be interpreted as proof that the ideology inevitably impacts practice on the ground. Other inquiries are necessary to ascertain the importance of *nihonjinron* to observed practice.

In the following section, I answer the fourth research question: *If nihonjinron is to be found in the data, how important is it to the way in which EFL education is actually conducted at the four schools?*

5.4 LINKS BETWEEN *NIHONJINRON* AND OBSERVED EFL PRACTICES

Sections 5.4 and 5.5 constitute the culminating point for this module, as I interrogate the presence of *nihonjinron* in the data – or lack thereof – by exploring the potential links between the ideology and observed EFL practices, as well as the said importance of the ideology to practice. In large part, this section serves as a response to Yoshino's (1992) warning that the *nihonjinron* critics "fail to pay attention to the 'receptive' or 'consumption' side of the *nihonjinron*" (p.4).

Studying the consumption of ideology, however, is complicated because a) ideologies are themselves the results of consumption of other texts and ideologies, and b) the consumption of ideology produces new texts, new ideologies. In response to these challenges, the following section sheds light on the potential links between the ideology and observed EFL education through data triangulation (i.e. verifying if *Ni* codes surface in multiple sources of data). I begin by providing a quantitative account of the *Ni* – or *nihonjinron*-related – codes. More specifically, I verify if *Ni* codes are present in multiple sources of data through data triangulation. I complement this approach with further qualitative analysis of the data which in part involves summarizing elements from the analysis conducted thus far.

5.4.1 LINKING *NIHONJINRON* AND OBSERVED EFL PRACTICES THROUGH DATA TRIANGULATION

The object of the following quantitative analysis is to uncover particular *Ni* codes which a) are numerically significant, and b) occur in multiple data sources. Codes which meet these two criteria are then considered potentially salient because they are more frequent than others and they are more consistent manifestations of the ideology in the overall body of data.

The left column includes the eleven *nihonjinron*-related codes. In the center, four groups of columns specify the frequency at which these codes surfaced in the data collected at the four schools, with numbers frequency of occurrence in specific data sources (“C” for recorded classroom discourse, “I” for teacher interviews, “M” for classroom materials, and “T” for textbooks). Finally, the column on the right indicates the total frequency for each code across data sources.

	Sakura JHS				**St-Maria J&SHS**				**Asahi JHS**				**Heiwa JHS**				**Total across schools**
	C	**I**	**M**	**T**	**C**	**I**	**M**	**T**	**C**	**I**	**M**	**T**	**C**	**I**	**M**	**T**	
cdif	2	4				3				9	2		1			4	25
cont	6	2	1	3		4		1	1	6	1	1	2	3		1	32
enlf	1	4		1		3		1		1	2		1	2			16
esop		9		3		5				6	2			4		1	30
foim	5									2				1		2	10
fost		2	1							2	3			1			9
fodj			1	2	1			1			3	2			2	6	18
jeng	3	7	1	1		4			1	1	1		2	1			22
juni	6	4	3	3		1		5		12	2	6	2	5	1	3	53
nain		2				1				1			3				7
nasp	2	2			1	2			1	3			1	3			15

Table 4 – Distribution of *nihonjinron*-related codes in the data

Considering that the *nihonjinron*-related codes were significantly much less frequent than *UE* codes and *Ed* codes, they can be said to be numerically marginal in the data. One reason is that none was observed consistently in all four schools and across data sources. Because interview questions specifically focused on cultural themes – and indirectly on *nihonjinron*-related issues – interview data includes a greater number of

Ni instances. Despite this limited frequency, however, some codes are more significant because they pertain directly to the research questions. The *juni* code was the most frequent, especially at Asahi JHS. It was, however, marginal in the data collected at St-Maria J&SHS. It was also observed in all EFL textbooks and in all teacher interviews. Nevertheless, because it was not observed consistently in classroom discourse, it is possible to suggest that the *nihonjinron*-related elements in the data lack significance to observed EFL practice.

In the interview data, all teachers identified limited opportunities for Japanese students to use English (*esop*), as well as their said difficulties in speaking English (*jeng*). Three teachers referred to cultural differences (*cdif*) between Japan and other English-speaking nations. If we exclude the *cont* references (references contradicting *nihonjinron*), we notice that Mr. Ono (Sakura JHS) and Ms. Inoue (Asahi JHS) formulated roughly twice the number of *nijonjinron* references than Ms. Tanaka (St-Maria J&SHS) and Ms. Ishida (Heiwa JHS) combined. But as mentioned earlier, Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue contradicted their own views at times.

Regarding less prominent codes, all textbooks included references to foreigners discovering Japan (*fodj*). References to native-speakers as ideal models of L2 use (*nasp*) were observed more or less consistently in the interview and classroom data. This suggests relatively consistent support for the native-speakerist ideology by teachers and textbook publishers, although its importance to the way English education was conducted at the four schools is limited. While Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue asked me to read textbook segments and provide occasional comments about specific linguistic and cultural issues, my input as the ‘native-speaker-researcher’ was only marginal, and almost never affected these teachers’ decisions and practices. However, since all forty recorded classrooms were conducted without the presence of visiting ALTs, it is difficult to reach any firm conclusion regarding the presence of the native-speakerist ideology in the data.

The least prominent codes were *foim* (references to foreign countries as imagined entities), *fost* (references to foreign cultures as 'interesting' or strange), and *nain* (references to links between Japan as a nation and people as individuals). While these codes overlap to some extent, they are negligible. One the other hand, while not the most frequent code in the data, *cont* (references to discourse(s) contradicting the *nihonjinron* discourse) was found in all data sources. At St-Maria J&SHS, these references were scarce largely because Ms. Tanaka (and Ms. Ishida to a large extent) was mainly focused on teaching-related issues.

These preliminary findings echo some of the conclusions reached in Module Two in regards to recent MEXT policies on EFL education, notably how *nihonjinron* elements surface sporadically in the data, are complex and fragmented, and are not necessarily consistent with one another. The following section attempts to reveal more about *nihonjinron* in the data by summarizing the work done in previous sections and by providing qualitative insight into the complex links between *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices.

5.4.2 INSIGHTS FROM WORK CONDUCTED IN PREVIOUS SECTIONS

The following fourteen observations – grouped into four categories – can be made about the data collected at the four schools.

Use of English in the classroom

- Due to the marked preference for grammar-translation among teachers, English was almost always followed – sometimes framed – by Japanese, making the L1 the primary means of communication in the L2 classroom. This structure was also visible in teachers' code-switching practices, as the L1 most often was the matrix language.
- Because L2 verbalization exercises were prioritized by teachers, and that there was limited evidence of impromptu and personalized L2 meanings being formulated by classroom actors, learners rarely experienced linguistic ambiguity or confusion during both L2 input and output stages.
- The two previous observations suggest that teachers could have used the L1 extensively to limit communicative ambiguity and confusion, and in the process, keeping the L2 'at a distance'.
- All four teachers agreed that an 'English-only' policy – as advocated by MEXT – is unnecessary.

Culture teaching

- With the teachers' prioritization of linguistic knowledge, cultural content was most often glossed over. When culture content surfaced, usually in the materials, a focus on traditional aspects of Japanese culture was evident. This focus on ‘traditional Japan’ can also be found in MEXT policies.

- Ms. Ishida criticized EFL textbooks for promulgating cultural stereotypes. While she produced culture-related materials, her main focus was on linguistic content.
- Teachers’ limited and somewhat superficial approaches to culture teaching, as well as their tendency to ‘collage’, or assemble, formulaic arguments in regards to culture teaching, denote either limited understanding of, or limited interest in, culture teaching, or both.

Challenges faced by EFL teachers

- Teachers devote a lot more time to administrative work than to language teaching, a problem identified by all of them.
- Teachers saw their textbooks as important sources of linguistic and cultural information, while the Course of Study was of marginal relevance to their teaching practice.

Nihonjinron and pedagogical practices

- Mr. Ono expressed consistent support for the promotion of positive aspects of Japanese culture (especially traditional aspects) in textbooks as a strategy for raising students’ self-awareness and confidence. However, he did not explore such aspects in his teaching.
- Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue expressed the ‘Japan-as-island’ argument to justify particular positions, including a) the view that Japanese students are geographically and culturally disconnected from the rest of the world, and b) the

view that learning English and/or going outside Japan is somewhat unnecessary.

- Students did not appear to view Japanese culture or language as inherently unique, thus only accessible to inner-group members. They recognized differences between English and Japanese, although they did not see these as proof of Japanese uniqueness.
- Mr. Ono's expressed views on culture may not have much of an impact on the development of students' overall views towards culture, Japanese or otherwise.
- Students may have pre-existing perspectives on Japanese and foreign cultures unaligned with the notion of Japanese uniqueness, and which are not particularly challenged by the cultural information presented by teacher and textbook.

Considering that observed EFL practices were essentially about teaching the linguistic aspects of the target language, it is fair to say that learners interacted with the target knowledge only from limited (and clearly defined) parameters, mainly determined by textbook and exam contents. Arguably, this can be said to limit students' development of linguistic knowledge, regional knowledge (knowledge of one's own culture) and intercultural competence – three macro-objectives referred to in recent MEXT policies on EFL education in secondary schools. Yet, no evidence in the data clearly indicates that any particular approach to EFL education adopted by the teachers is part of a broader strategy to keep the target language and culture from impacting a said shared sense of Japanese uniqueness. While Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue emphasized the need to integrate aspects of Japanese culture in their teaching, they also underscored the importance of cultural and linguistic exchanges between their students and people of other countries. Also, while the notion of a shared Japaneseness surfaced during interviews, no evidence shows that the protection of a national identity is in fact a focus of EFL education in JHS. Moreover, even if teachers chose to use the L1 during most of the allocated classroom time, this fact is more suggestive of a desire on their part to avoid confusion amongst students than a desire to protect students' native language and/or culture. The only element in the data which may indicate a desire among teachers to protect Japanese culture is the notion of 'traditional Japan'. But as argued earlier, none of these perspectives were instantiated in actual classroom practices.

In short, the *nihonjinron*-oriented references in the data are not elements coalescing into one particular discourse type reinforcing a shared sense of Japaneseness, and certainly not one which leads to actions on the ground. Instead, *nihonjinron* is only one of the many discourses observed in the data, one which bears limited relevance to the ways in which EFL education was conducted at the four schools.

5.4.3 INSIGHTS FROM WORK CONDUCTED IN SECTION 5.3

Section 5.3 above explored explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse in the data. Analysis of the four main themes which emerged is summarized thus.

- Elements related to the four *nihonjinron*-related themes were found principally in government-approved textbooks and some classroom materials.
- Evidence gathered from MEXT policy documents and MEXT-approved textbooks indicates that the dissemination of 'traditional Japan' (e.g. customs, food,

historical sites) is a concern for both policy makers and textbook publishers. As one of the stated objectives in policy documents, and as reproduced by both Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue during interviews, this trace of *nihonjinron* can be said to exist at three different levels, but not in classroom practice.

- Within this discourse on ‘traditional Japan’, Japanese people and culture – excluding minority groups and cultures – are presented as unique in the world, worthy of international attention and admiration, and as cultural ambassadors.
- There was no clear focus on nationalistic views – i.e. views expressing the (perceived) superiority of Japanese society/culture over other societies/cultures.
- There is evidence mainly from textbooks of Japan and the U.S. being depicted as solid and unified entities, and as opposites.
- Non-European, non-North-American nations were portrayed in textbooks as relatively unsafe, unstable, poor, and in need of help from Japanese volunteer workers.
- The ‘Japan-as-island’ argument was expressed twice by Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue to justify both positive and negative views of an ethnocentric nature.

These observations clearly show that, while present in the data, *nihonjinron*-oriented perspectives were at times contradictory, and were not found consistently across data sources. Moreover, traces of *nihonjinron* were found principally in views expressed by Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue during interviews, although they did not translate into actual pedagogical practice. On the other hand, *nihonjinron*-oriented perspectives were more evident in textbooks.

Mr. Ono’s comments about instilling greater awareness of the national culture among students in order to elevate their self-confidence deserves further attention here because it creates a direct link between individual and nation, and as such, constitutes a more explicit example of national identification than the example in Figure 44. Wodak et al. (2009) discuss this link between individual and nation thus:

> The process of national identification is promoted by the emphasis on ‘national uniqueness’. By raising individuality […], the governing representatives of a political system mostly conceal their forcible act of homogenization and erasure of differences which is manifested in the epithet ‘national’. In addition, national uniqueness, which is assigned entirely positive attributes, compensates for the unfulfilled need for individual uniqueness (p.27).

Unlike Wodak et al.’s (2009) argument, however, the ethnic attributes of Japanese people constructed and promoted in the data do not always place Japaneseness in a positive light. Instead, even negative aspects of Japaneseness (e.g. Japanese JHS students’ perceived poor language learning aptitudes) can be referred to in order to reinforce a sense of collective national identity. Pigott (2015) – a *nihonjinron* critic – identifies perceived negative cultural traits as source of ethnic identity: “the discourse of Japanese uniqueness can be seen to instill in the learner the notion that there is something quintessentially Japanese in failing at English” (p.216). Echoing a general consensus amongst the *nihonjinron* critics that the *nihonjinron* foundation of the Japanese EFL system undermines its stated purposes, the author extends his argument thus: “Japan’s English education policy can therefore be seen to be covertly undermining the ideologies it purports to support: failing at English is simultaneously an act of resistance against globalization” (p.217). However, there is no indication that *nihonjinron* traces in the data are evidence of acts of resistance against globalization.

Aside from the promotion of positive Japanese cultural features, observed EFL practices appear to be justified – and conducted – with consideration for the need for greater internationalization of Japanese pupils.

In sum, the above analyses have so far revealed limited evidence of *nihonjinron*-oriented views in the data, and no clear links across data sources indicating that the ideology had any noticeable impact on observed EFL practices. Instead, random traces of *nihonjinron*-related elements were found at the levels of structure and agency, but without clear connections binding them together. Thus, *nihonjinron* does not appear to be driving EFL practices on the ground, or be a significant factor in observed practices.

To a large extent, this section has dealt with the consumption aspect of *nihonjinron*. In the next section, I answer the question *How, and to what extent, does this potential relationship affect the way English is taught in Japanese schools?* In the process, I remain focused on the consumption aspect of *nihonjinron*, and move from agentive processes to broader aspects of English education in Japan.

5.5 RELEVANCE OF THE FINDINGS TO OBSERVED EFL PRACTICES

I begin this section by exploring the relevance of the findings to observed EFL practices with reference to the following themes: exam pressures, CLT and grammar translation, code-switching, the act of ‘performing English’ and the reproduction of the English language, 'traditional Japan’ and the demand for recognition, and possible influences outside the classroom. These themes coalesce together to provide insight into the current inquiry into *nihonjinron* not simply as a phenomenon observable in the system but as an entity (said to be) part of complex causal mechanisms in Japanese secondary school EFL education.

5.5.1 EXAM PRESSURES, CLT AND GRAMMAR TRANSLATION

In Section 1.1 of Module 1, I referred to critiques of the Japanese EFL system identifying test pressures as a major hurdle. In Section 2.4.4 of the same module, I also referred to arguments by the *nihonjinron* critics that such focus is the product of a *nihonjinron*-oriented approach to EFL education. I mentioned their argument that orienting EFL education towards testing effectively creates a symbolic distance between pupils and the target language (Kawai, 2007; Kubota, 1998, 2002; Liddicoat, 2007a,b; McVeigh, 2002), thus protecting Japaneseness from outside influences. As was determined in the above analysis, however, there is no clear evidence in the data corroborating the latter perspective.

As discussed in Module Two, one of the aims of recent MEXT policies on EFL education is to mitigate exam pressure by fronting communication-oriented goals and practical language use. If we look at more recent developments in EFL education at the elementary school level (MEXT, 2014a), for example, one of the principal justifications for early English education in Japan (at least at the policy level) is to counter the negative impact of entrance exam pressure on the system (Fennelly & Luxton, 2011). However, there is evidence showing that both EFL students and teachers see success on L2 proficiency exams – not communicative abilities in the target language – as the core objective of EFL education. While two diverging perspectives on EFL education can be said to exist simultaneously within the Japanese EFL system, the reality is that entrance exam preparation remains a central motivating force in the Japanese EFL system.

The potential for a test-oriented system to exacerbate social divisions based on achievement cannot, however, be overlooked. At the same time, while testing only provides the conditions for social divisions in educational settings to occur, the importance placed on testing by human agents remains the actual cause of the problem. In her investigation of the self in adolescent foreign language learning, Taylor (2013: 16) recognizes this nuance: “perhaps the most consequential influence that classmates can have on a teenager’s academic identity […] is the so-called ‘norm of low achievement’ or ‘law of generalized mediocrity’, which results in peers being penalized by the group for their achievement strivings.” This brings the author to the argument that importance placed on competition creates few winners and many losers. In this situation, adolescents can adopt a range of behaviors of resistance, which can lead to the reinforcement of a culture of low academic achievement, or mediocre conformity.

Yet, this pressure is not necessarily negative. Mr. Ono states that test content and CLT are not necessarily contradictory, claiming that exam contents often provide teachers with more reliable points of reference for classroom teaching than those found in policy documents. While evidence in the data reveals that exam pressure is a challenge for these teachers, they did not explicitly identify it as an obstruction to teaching, nor did they claim that it creates a symbolic distance between their pupils and the L2.

Nevertheless, exam preparations at the four schools had a more negative than a positive impact on everyday classroom practices. This becomes clear when looking at the fact that much of what went on in the classrooms focused on the mastery of particular L2 forms found in tests. Possibly, teachers did not identify test pressures as an obstruction to their teaching because test-oriented language pedagogy is a prominent aspect of their work, and thus of their realm of known experiences.

5.5.2 CODE-SWITCHING

As stated at the onset of this module, the most prominent element in the data was teachers' use of English and/or Japanese in the classroom. If we consider the fact that Mr. Ono most often ended his class with grammar-translation tasks, we realize that the L1, not the L2, was more dominant. Another observable fact in Mr. Ono's English class was that many students – especially boys – tended to speak English in a marked *katakana* pronunciation. Similar behaviors were also observed in classes led by other teachers, including Ms. Tanaka. As argued above in regards to teachers simultaneously translating L2 input, constantly referring back to the L1 through extensive code-switching can have negative effects on learners' L2 learning and use. While translation can be understood as a valuable aspect of language learning in a globalized world (Cook, 2010), and while code-switching practices are recognized as inherent elements in intercultural communication, constantly framing the target language within the L1 can keep students from engaging with – and communicating directly in – the target language.

As discussed in Section 5.1.2, manifestations of code-switching in the data can be linked to identity processes. The argument was that, by maintaining the presence of the L1 in the L2 classroom, the L2 learning experience remains within the domain of what learners know best. Kramsch (1998) defines code-switching as “the verbal strategy by which bilingual, or [multilingual] speakers change linguistic code within the same speech event as a sign of cultural solidarity or distance, as well as an act of cultural identity” (p.125). Tag code-switching has specifically been identified in the literature as an effective means of adjusting one’s speech to meet specific community norms, and in the context of foreign language education as a way to fine-tune one’s L2 speech to suit learners’ L1 communicative ability and/or style. As Poplack (1980: 589) argues, this type of code-switching is “often heavily loaded in ethnic content and would be placed low on a scale of translatability.” The author notes that bilinguals who are not fluent in the L2 tend to engage in emblematic code-switching more often than more fluent bilinguals. As such, switching back to the L1 allows speakers to both change footing and show cultural, ethnic, linguistic, or racial solidarity while using another language.

Gumperz (1982) defines the act of alternating between languages as a “password for ethnic identity and solidarity of the community” (p.72). From this perspective, code-switching becomes a means for people to achieve social positioning in specific verbal interactions because it is rich in contextualization cues that can be understood by interactants of similar backgrounds. Throughout this process, interlocutors can align themselves with other interlocutors whom they identify as part of the same group or community. Konidaris (2010: 288) claims that “individuals who feel a strong sense of belonging to a group, strive to conserve the linguistic forms which are characteristic of the particular group.” In short, certain structures of interpretation are, in particular social contexts, likely to be valued and drawn upon by individuals who see themselves as sharing perceived cultural attributes. As language(s) is/are used by people to situate themselves in context and perform acts of identity (Taylor, 1994), code-switching practices can be understood as "cultural acts of identity" (Kramsch, 1998: 49).

The data shows that learners and teachers appear to engage in this constant back and forth between the L1 – the more prominent language – and the L2 to negotiate and develop L2 knowledge and use. Consequently, a more viable explanation for code-switching practices in the data involves teachers and students’ limited L2 abilities and time. According to Ogane (1997), people can code-switch due to insufficient linguistic resources or ability in a particular language (i.e. limited knowledge of vocabulary, syntax, etc.), making code-switching a compensatory strategy. Tarone, Cohen & Dumas (1983) suggest that code-switching is also an avoidance strategy. Figure 64 shows how the teacher avoids using the L2 when communication with her students appears to fail.

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Bouchard:	Who, who is Paul Wilson, by the way?	
2	Ms. Inoue:	Uh, I don’t, I don’t know Paul Wilson.	
3		Do you know?	

4	Bouchard:	I think he is an old American singer.	
5	Ms. Inoue:	Old American singer?	
6	Bouchard:	Yeah. Like-	
7	Ms. Inoue:	For example?	
8	Bouchard:	Folk singer. Folk singer. You know,	
9		guitar, something like that.	
10	Ms. Inoue:	Ah.	
11	Bouchard:	I don’t know.	
12	Ms. Inoue:	Paul Wilson *shiteru hito*?	Anybody knows Paul Wilson?
13	S1:	*dare*? *dare*?	Who? Who?
14	Ms. Inoue:	Paul Wilson.	
15	S2:	*dare*?	Who?
16	S3:	*kashuu*?	A singer?
17	Ms. Inoue:	*kashuu rashii. kashuu rashii*.	Looks like he’s a singer. (X2)
18	S1:	*shiranai*.	I don’t know.
19	Bouchard:	OK.	
20	Ms. Inoue:	*maa, you na, maa ato de, hai*.	Well, like that, later anyway, yes.

Figure 64 (Excerpt 5.5.1) – Asahi JHS (September 2)

It begins in the L2 as a genuine exchange of linguistic meaning in the L2, initiated by both Ms. Inoue and me. Midway through, however, she decides to code-switch when addressing the students (line 12), then uses the L1 exclusively in response to the students’ lack of response. In a bilingual setting, the move back to one’s first language can be considered a “non-cooperative communicative strategy” (Cook, 1991: 68) deployed by a speaker to avoid or deal with difficulties in communication. Koll-Stobbe (1994) dubs this ‘non-fluent switching’.

These possible interpretations bring us to a question with theoretical and methodological implications: how can we determine if all – or even particular – code-switching practices are a) part of a strategy to protect learners’ native language and culture, b) gestures of avoidance, c) learning strategies, or d) all of them? While common-sensical, the following two points must also be made: 1) expressing one’s ethnicity through ethnic contrasts may not always be of vital importance to foreign language learners and educators, and 2) the desire for ethnic expression may not be inevitably expressed through code-switching practices. Complicating the issue further is the fact that, while code-switching has widely been described in the literature as an interactional strategy, thus presuming conscious control of one's language use, ample evidence in the literature – and in the data analyzed in this module – shows that multi-lingual interlocutors are not always aware of, or consistent in, their own code-switching practices. Moreover, while code-switching was prominent in the data, specific types of code-switching did not occur consistently. In short, understanding code-switching practices is possible when these are defined as complex and situated practices, and not necessarily as proof of resistance against the intrusion of foreign language and culture.

But even if we accept the possibility that code-switching constitutes a manifestation of identity work in the context of foreign language education, which identity/ies is/are being indexed? Are teachers and learners code-switching to assert bilingual/bicultural identities or to display allegiance to their native language and culture? In the data collected for this module, there are traces of teachers potentially asserting bilingual/ bicultural identities through code-switching to display full communicative competence (Romaine, 1990). While Excerpt 5.5.2 (see Appendix 9) is not particularly strong evidence of this, it does show Ms. Ishida navigating quickly and effectively from one language to another while providing instructions to her students. Figure 65 is another example of this fluid transfer from one language to another, performed by both teacher and pupils.

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Uh, in America *toka*. *hai*. One more	Like / Yes.
2		question. One more question. Why in	
3		*ichi nana nana roku*, in 1776, why did	One seven seven six
4		they go to America, from England?	
5		Why did they go to America?	
6		(inaudible)?	
7	S1:	They are religion belief.	
8	Ms. Tanaka:	Ah, they are religion freely (writing on	
9		board) They are religion freely.	
10		*chotto chigau*. *kou iu toki nani ga*	A little different. / What
11		*tsukau kai*? They went to America	do we use here?
12		mmmh they are religion freely, no.	
13		*oboeteru*? Somebody. In order to-	Do you remember?
14	S2:	They wanted to practice-	
15	Ms. Tanaka:	*hai*, they wanted to-	Yes.
16	S2:	Practice-	
17	Ms. Tanaka:	Practice-	
18	S2:	Their religion freely	
19	Ms. Tanaka:	Oh, *yoku wakaru*. (writing on board)	You understand well.
20		Practice their religion freely. OK?	
21		They wanted to practice their religion	
22		freely. *onajii koto wo*, in order to	Same thing,
23		practice their religion freely. *ne*? Both	right?
24		are OK.	

Figure 65 (Excerpt 5.5.3) – St-Maria J&SHS (July 4)

While these two classroom discourse samples can be interpreted as strategies deployed for rhetorical and interactional effects (Woolard, 2006), and as displays of linguistic agility on the part of teachers, they could arguably be labelled as displays of allegiance to a native culture. Again, this type of analytical decision seems somewhat arbitrary without accounting for intentionality in language use.

This raises the issue of *indexicality* which, in the context of situated language use, refers to how language forms point to specific processes beyond the realm of discourse. The issue of the type of insight drawn from evidence found in text has been a recurring theme throughout this modular PhD project. As was reiterated on multiple occasions, evidence of ideology and/or identity work is not immediately visible from a surface analysis of classroom discourse: it can only be inferred by means of data triangulation. Bakhtin (1986) mirrors this view by arguing that the links between linguistic forms and ideological processes can be estimated through a study of people’s intentions, not necessarily the linguistic markers decipherable in texts, which are only the traces of such intentionality. In parallel, Bucholtz & Hall (2006) see language use as reflexive rather than constitutive of social identities. These issues are central to the current module, and are discussed further in the final section.

5.5.3 THE ACT OF ‘PERFORMING ENGLISH’ AND THE REPRODUCTION OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Looking at the data, teachers may have used the L1 predominantly as a way to manage a possible sense of malaise with regards to L2 use. While not obvious from transcribed classroom discourse, there were few occasions during Mr. Ono’s class, for example, when L2 use by both teacher and students resulted in some form of ‘acting up’, or an act of ‘performing English’ (e.g. marked *katakana* pronunciation, repetition of particular L2 forms in humorous or cynical tones, more pronounced laughter and excitement during L2 use). Earlier, I referred to Bourdieu & Passeron’s (1990) argument that classroom learning talk can, over time, become a form of theatrical performance. Arguably, using English may feel strange or unnatural to EFL learners, partly because the L2 may not be particularly important to their everyday lives. Byram (2008: 136) argues that “in the classroom, the new reality is experienced for short periods, and learners are immediately returned to their familiar reality.” As such, the act of using English can, for Japanese EFL learners, become a manifestation of this sense of detachment. For some, these acts of ‘performing English’ among classroom actors may also be expressions of negative feelings towards the L2 experience. Thus, underlying cultural perceptions and representations of target language and culture may lead to certain language (and learning) behaviors aimed at resisting the impact of the target knowledge on a collectively shared identity.

While these are only possibilities supported by very limited evidence in the data, they bring attention to the links between structural and agentive processes. The act of using English can indeed be understood as a contribution to the maintenance and reproduction of the English language. As such, for Japanese EFL learners to make such a contribution may not be as common-sensical as, let’s say, for Malaysian or Taiwanese EFL learners, in whose countries English occupies a more important social, political, cultural and economic presence. This explanation takes from Giddens’ (1979) structuration model and the notion of *duality of structure.* In the context of language use, the latter implies uttering a sentence in a language and simultaneously reproducing both the language and related social structures. While these new structures possess certain enabling resources, their rules are also constraining, especially for language learners with limited confidence. Sealey & Carter (2004: 9) interpret Giddens’ structuration model thus:

> structure and agency are intrinsically united through social practices. When people interact with each other, they draw upon a vast range of skills and resources: cognitive, linguistic, perceptual, physical. Many of these will have been acquired through experience, through their routine practical application in the living of a life (how to ride a bike, how to make yourself understood in a common language). Other skills and resources will, however, be part of a stock of socially shared knowledge and skills (how to chair a department meeting, how to get an article published).

As the authors point out, however, individuals do not blindly reproduce social knowledge: they interpret it, and in doing so they modify their circumstances. In other words, while the notion of *duality of structure* is useful in explaining the role of agentive processes in structural reproduction, the ideological reproduction of English by Japanese EFL learners and educators is not indubitably problematic. This reproduction would be problematic, however, if the L2 and associated structures served as dominating forces. If it were so, we would likely see signs of it in EFL learners 'performing English' as a form of resistance. Instead, it is important to remind ourselves as analysts that structure and agency retain distinct and emergent properties, and that while intricately related, these layers should not automatically be conflated or theorized as irreversibly entangled.

Therefore, the act of 'performing English' (and in the same vein, teachers and students' choices of language *in situ*) should not be categorized as proof of students resisting oppressive power structures. For one, they may be performing English simply because others are doing it, and that in the moment these performances are seen as humorous. Also, 'performing English' may be a form of play which, while involving L2 use, may not have much to do with the target language. In addition, learners may 'perform English' as they 'perform Japanese' or 'perform gym' – i.e. as part of the learning process. A parallel possibility – this one involving underlying cultural perceptions and representations of target language and culture – is for EFL learners to 'perform English' precisely because English is a novelty in their lives, and that dealing with new things involves play.

In other words, ‘performing English’ can be an act of identity not irrevocably related to power struggles in EFL education. These possibilities underscore the importance of agency in analyzing particular forms of language use. Similarly, Sealey & Carter (2004: 113) argue that “if we want to explain why many adolescents are in the vanguard of linguistic change, and why some are not, we need to introduce a strong notion of social agency – an acknowledgement that people have some degree of choice over what they do, including how they speak." Thus, analyzing teenagers’ strong agency, as displayed in their performances of English for example, “requires the use of social categories that recognize the relevance of actors' own understandings” (Sealey & Carter, 2004: 113).

Binding these explanations, however, is the notion that ‘performing English’ is a manifestation of a process of agency drawing from a range of available structural resources. As such, it is also a reproduction of these resources. At the same time, this type of reproduction should not be seen as structural imposition. As Archer (2012: 7) points out, “constraints and enablements derive from structural and cultural emergent properties. […] However, the activation of their causal powers is contingent upon agents who conceive of and pursue projects upon which they would impinge.” The author adds that “the effect of these structural and cultural causal powers is at the mercy of two open systems; the world and its contingencies and human agency’s reflexive acuity, creativity and capacity for commitment.” In other words, we can conceptualize ‘performing English’ as an act of identity and as reproduction of resources, yet we must place it as part of the reflexive realm of human agency, or to use Archer’s own words, the *internal conversation*. While there is limited space in this module to develop this notion further, Archer’s argument is useful in this module in that it allows us to transcend one of the core dilemmas in critical social research, which pertains to the nature of the links between structure and agency in our understanding and critique of ideological discourse in context.

In EFL contexts, where opportunities to use English are limited, some of the resources may appear relevant because learners need to imagine the importance of English in daily communication. Imagining English – and of oneself as an English user – is indeed crucial for EFL learners because it infuses the target language with symbolic meaning and relevance which, in everyday life, tend to be limited. In this sense, EFL education may require a consensus amongst actors that the L2 is necessary for communicative acts to bear meaning. All of these constitute acts of agency, either individual or collective.

This notion of ‘imagined English’ is useful in understanding the reality of English usage in EFL contexts because it simultaneously highlights the interaction between, and distinct properties of, structure and agency. Throughout this process, some of the available resources may be aligned with *nihonjinron*. In addition, *nihonjinron*-oriented features may appeal to some learners as they use the L2. However, just as the range of resources is broad, there are many kinds of possible performances. While ‘performing English’ can be a form of resistance against English which may or may not be aligned with a said shared sense of Japaneseness, this is only one possible interpretation among many. All these speculations mean that assessing acts of ‘performing English’ in the Japanese EFL context requires wide-ranging deliberations into issues related to the *internal conversation* (Archer, 2012) and intentionality in language use, enriched by extensive ethnographic research in language classrooms.

In the data, however, there is very limited evidence of active – or passive – resistance, except obviously students’ silences during class. But it remains to be seen whether this silence is directly related to a said intrusion of English into Japaneseness, or whether it is related to broader realities found in Japanese education regardless of the subject being taught. While these are only two possibilities, the data collected for this module simply does not include clear evidence of either of them.

So far, I have concentrated on agentive processes and explored themes including exam pressures, CLT, grammar translation, code-switching and the act of ‘performing English’. I now focus more specifically on structural processes.

5.5.4 ‘TRADITIONAL JAPAN’ AND THE DEMAND FOR RECOGNITION

As argued in Module Two, MEXT policy makers promulgate discourses on cultural *immunity* (i.e. protecting Japanese culture) and *permeability* (opening Japanese culture to the outside world) (Willis & Rappleye, 2011). It was also discussed that the ideology of *kokusaika* (internationalization) appears most prominently in these documents, suggesting that English education is conceptualized by policy makers as potentially leading Japanese EFL learners to take a more active role in the global economy and society. Byram (2008) underlines an assumption among MEXT policy makers that “language teaching is a necessary but not sufficient response to change, and needs to be accompanied by ‘internationalization’ of the whole curriculum in compulsory education” (p.11). The author adds that, in the Japanese context, this perspective promotes a relatively utilitarian view on foreign language learning as a process of developing specific skills to be used in a global context. While Module Two showed that there is indeed a focus in policy discourse on broadening learners’ worldviews and not just on developing specific skills, Byram opines that language education is seen by Japanese policy makers mainly from an instrumental perspective, with EFL education acting as vehicle for future economic achievement. Similarly, Kubota (2011) claims that Japanese EFL education is guided by the principle of *linguistic instrumentalism* – i.e. EFL education serving utilitarian goals such as economic development and social mobility. These perspectives provide insight into both the linguistic and the cultural contents of EFL policies, notably with regards to the numerous ‘traditional Japan’ elements found in policy documents and government-approved textbooks. To explain this somewhat utilitarian focus on ‘traditional Japan’ at the structural level, we need to explore the role of traditions in a broader politics of identity.

Taylor (1994) talks about the *demand for recognition* as a core motivator behind nationalist movements in contemporary politics, a demand which often emerges from a sense that one is being *mis*recognized by others. The author argues that what is to be recognized is one’s *authenticity*. At the level of the individual *authenticity* refers to a sense of being true to oneself and to one’s ways of living, and at the cultural level it refers to a cultural community being true to itself and to its own perceived unique features. Here, both the need for, and the act of, recognition are not only characterized within a utilitarian perspective, they are also contained within a universalist framework of culture and nation-state, whereby all cultures and states are seen as possessing ‘uniqueness’, thus making uniqueness a universally shared need. Billig (1995) discusses the *uniqueness* + *universalist* combination in nationalist ideologies thus: “nationalism is not an inward-looking ideology, like the pre-modern ethnocentric outlook. It is an international ideology with its own discourse on hegemony” (p.10). […] “nationalism includes contrary themes, especially the key themes of particularism and universalism” (p.87). The need to have others recognize – and in the context of the MEXT policies, *understand* – one’s uniqueness constitutes the core of identity politics.

From this understanding, it becomes possible to frame the focus on Japanese traditions in recent MEXT policies as a) a manifestation of a type of identity politics in Japan accentuating specific aspects of Japanese culture, and b) an example of a nationalist-oriented educational perspective also observable in other nations. Also related, Wodak et al. (2009) discuss processes linked to the imagination and construction of national identity – or narratives of national culture – and argue that such discourses “primarily emphasize national uniqueness and intra-national uniformity but largely ignore intra-national differences. In imagining national singularity and homogeneity, members of a national community simultaneously construct the distinctions between themselves and other nations” (p.4). These viewpoints help frame traditions as part of a narrative of homogenization of Japanese culture, thus as useful ‘tools’ in this broader call for international recognition – and understanding – of

Japanese culture and nation.

The various depictions of Japanese traditions in EFL textbooks can be seen as tools because, in promulgating ‘traditional Japan’ as a) both fixed (i.e. timeless) and generalizable (i.e. recognized and ‘consumed’ by all Japanese), and b) easily distinguishable from other sets of traditions, they serve to reinforce both Oneness and Otherness. Hall (1996a: 4) explains this process in his argument that traditions “relate to the invention of tradition as much as to tradition itself.” Once ‘traditional Japan’ becomes a ‘flag’ for Japanese homogeneity and unity, it facilitates the process of *alterity* – or Otherization – by providing clear distinctions between Japaneseness and non-Japaneseness. Thus, ‘traditional Japan’ serves as symbol of what needs to be recognized. Like other manifestations of national identity such as those promulgated through the Olympics and other public games, traditions depicted and explained in EFL textbooks for the benefit of Japanese EFL learners can also be considered as an attempt by the Japanese government – which demands and approves such depictions in textbooks – to establish clear and direct connections (or at least to emphasize the connections between) Japanese pupils and a unified Japanese culture and nation.

The utilitarian nature of the ‘traditional Japan’ element becomes noticeable when we consider that policy makers and textbook publishers call for students to learn the linguistic ‘tools’ necessary to promote greater understanding of Japanese traditional culture abroad. The cultural dimension of foreign language education can arguably be characterized not as a means to develop critical cultural awareness and intercultural communicative competence amongst pupils, but instead as a means to promote international recognition and understanding of a very narrow view of Japanese culture and nation. In some measure, these findings contradict my conclusions in Module Two that the evidence found in recent MEXT policies on EFL education lends limited support for the views proposed by critics who argue that the presence of the *nihonjinron* discourse in educational policy is considerable, and that the prominence of discourses contrasting with *nihonjinron* was noticeable.

Review of these findings, especially in light of the evidence found in MEXT-approved textbooks, shows that traces of *nihonjinron* in MEXT policies – even if negligible – are nevertheless of relevance to the current analysis. Because policy is aligned with *kokusaika*, and textbooks contain more prominent traces of *nihonjinron*, we need to conceptualize the links between structural and agentive processes as fractured, complex and sometimes contradictory. To a large extent, this further reinforces the notion that structure and agency are distinct, emergent and complex entities. When a strong notion of social agency (Sealey & Carter, 2004) is considered, it then becomes possible to conceive of structural elements (e.g. MEXT policies) and agentive processes as linked by the *internal conversation*, which allows human agents to reflect on structural constraints and enablements with regards to their concerns and projects (Archer, 2012). Focusing on the links between structure with agency, we notice that teachers and students sometimes reproduce structural and institutional elements (e.g. by concentrating on entrance exams), while at other times their actions seem to evolve in somewhat different directions (e.g. actively negotiating L2 meanings through situated code-switching practices, transforming test contents into communicative contents and activities). Likewise, the above analysis of code-switching practices shows how the links between structural and agentive processes are fractured.

Yet, the facts that the ‘traditional Japan’ aspect was tangential in MEXT-approved textbooks, and that it was not a significant part of classroom discourse practices, underscore the distinct and emergent properties of agency. Indeed, none of the four teachers elaborated on the ‘traditional Japan’ contents during classroom instruction. Only Ms. Tanaka elaborated on the cultural contents found in the textbook in both English and Japanese, although this content mainly referred to American history and traditions (e.g. The Pilgrims, Halloween, Thanksgiving and baseball). While rarely exploring cultural content in depth, Ms. Ishida included cultural content mostly through her own materials and selected videos. Perhaps more importantly, there is no convincing evidence that the ‘traditional Japan’ aspect was interpreted by students in ways which would suggest its relevance to their language learning experience.

To illuminate this further, Yavuz (2012) argues that “teachers in fact do not take their support from the theory [or policy] but from their experiences and perceptions” (p.4343). Breen (2001) indirectly refers to the distinct and emergent properties of structure and agency in the context of language education, and points out that

> learners in classrooms will differentially interpret, accommodate, and adopt strategies largely on the basis of what classroom discourse provides as text, what practices it requires of teachers and learners, and how it constructs both the knowledge to be learned and the unfolding teaching-learning process through social practice. Learners’ cognitions are framed within the prevailing discourse through which they learn and there is good evidence that learners navigate that discourse in different ways. It is inevitable that different learners will differentially achieve in such circumstances (p.316-317).

Also of importance in this discussion is that policies and textbooks are not entities found exclusively at the level of structure. Indeed, the process of classroom language learning constitutes another, more localized, structural layer. While broader cultural and structural realities may influence teachers and learners' choices of language, for example, the day-to-day, moment-to-moment, reality of classroom language education also serves as a structuring force, or at least as a source of information classroom actors can draw from while engaged in the 'EFL project'. What they ultimately choose to do can therefore be explained by a close analysis of classroom discourse and practice, two distinct yet related processes which are not always congruent with larger and more abstract entities such as *nihonjinron.* Breen's account of classroom learning is interesting because, by linking cognition with social factors, and by focusing on how learners process and produce discourse while learning, we can see more clearly which elements of classroom language learning serve the reproduction of existing structures, and which ones do not.

Of course, the mere presence of *nihonjinron*-related perspectives in the data indicates that there are indeed some links between the ideology and EFL pedagogy. In addition, it is always possible for *nihonjinron* to be an important factor in EFL education when it does surface. Consensus in ideology research shows that ideologies are most often hidden and elusive, and that they may have more to do with practice than with language (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992). This possibility must be underlined in the current investigation, since the consumption of ideological discourse at the local level – the core element in the study of ideology – might become more evident through analysis of a more substantial body of ethnographic data. Only more extensive research can reveal the extent of this possibility.

5.5.5 INFLUENCES OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

Of equal importance is the likelihood that views towards English and approaches to language learning adopted by both teachers and students may be influenced by elements outside the classroom. Jackson & Kennett (2013) and Kennett & Jackson (2014) discuss English *edutainment*, or commercial representations of English language learning in various media formats, including television and cellphone applications. They identify *nihonjinron* as the core ideology leading to three related problems: essentialized conflation of language and ethnic identity, reification of the ‘native-speaker’ concept and a defeatist discourse regarding language learning (Jackson & Kennett, 2013). As such, English *edutainment* may exacerbate the three problems stated by the authors, and classroom actors may also consume and reproduce it. Of course, the parallel possibility that such discourse may be deconstructed and resisted must be equally acknowledged.

Seargeant (2009) provides a somewhat divergent perspective on the types of English found in Japanese entertainment. While making similar observations to those of Jackson and Kennett, the author emphasizes the notion of ‘linguistic play’ thus:

> there is, on the one hand, a hegemonic portrayal of English as something which is foreign and exotic to Japanese culture, yet on the other there is a ludic quality which results in such practices becoming a distinct form of cultural production in their own right and an integral part of the local cultural landscape (p.146).

In a globalized and globalizing world, the *appropriation* of English by social actors located in EFL contexts can be achieved in creative – and of course ideological – ways, as target language and culture are treated often collectively as imagined entities. To some extent, this is analogous to what Hall (1996a) defines as *identification*: an ongoing process of identifying oneself with a group based on perceived shared attributes and as “a fantasy of incorporation” (p.3). As we identify with our group partly through imagination, elements related to the Other (i.e. English, foreign food, traditions and communication styles, etc.) are also imagined, and in the process, are incorporated in our collectively-shared understandings of ourselves. Considering that people in EFL contexts are differently invested in regards to English and EFL education, they can also imagine things in different ways. This creative imagination and appropriation of target language and culture is an intricate part of the broader project of cultural production.

When studying ideology in educational contexts, it is crucial to remember that teachers deal with a range of issues *in situ*, which makes it difficult for any single issue – ideological or otherwise – to become a driving force behind actual pedagogical practices. Critical of sociological accounts which view the impact of structure on agency as direct and not requiring agential mediation, Archer (2012) provides some indication as to why single issues cannot be said to dictate actual pedagogical practices: “we are radically heterogeneous as people, rather than having common ends. […] our subjectivity is dynamic rather than static” (134). Emphasizing the role of the *internal conversation* in linking structure and agency, the author adds that “situations do not directly impact upon us; they are reflexively mediated via our own concerns and according to how well we know our circumstances, under our own descriptions” (p.139).

So far, the above analyses have revealed that the links between *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices are fractured, temporary, sporadic, and largely inconsistent with one another, namely because the ideology does not appear to be consumed and instantiated in practice at the level of agency. On the other hand, while *nihonjinron* was not particularly salient to observed EFL practices, culture-related aspects remain poorly conceptualized by policy makers, textbook publishers, and by the four teachers. Without concluding that this specific problem (found at multiple strata of the Japanese EFL system) is symptomatic of a broader ideological structure aiming to protect Japaneseness – or as Pigott (2015: 216) puts it, part of an ideological machinery that frames debates and notions of objectivity, it is fair to suggest that under-conceptualizing cultural content is problematic to the development of linguistic and intercultural communicative competence amongst learners. I revisit this point in the next section.

Now that the five research questions have been answered, I now explore the relevance of these findings and the current study to *nihonjinron* research and ideology critique. Specific concerns include a conceptual re-evaluation of the notion of agency, particularly with regards to the issue of contradictions in people’s stated views, and how analysis of these facts can enrich ideology critique.

6. RELEVANCE OF THE CURRENT STUDY TO *NIHONJINRON* RESEARCH

In the previous two modules, I have explored a) *nihonjinron* and its critiques, b) theoretical and methodological approaches to conducting critical analyses of printed and spoken texts, and c) the presence and importance of *nihonjinron* to policy discourse. Two conclusions emerged as a result of these analyses:

- current *nihonjinron* critiques do not fully explain the problems in the Japanese EFL system due to theoretical and methodological issues;
- while recent MEXT policy discourse on EFL education contains traces of *nihonjinron*, strong evidence of other discourses contradicting *nihonjinron* suggests that the ideology of Japanese uniqueness is not particularly relevant to recent EFL policies.

In this module, I have extended my interrogation of the presence and importance of *nihonjinron* in EFL education by providing an ethnographic look into Japanese EFL classes in JHS. I have explored a) dominant features in the body of ethnographic data, b) the range of perspectives held by participants in regards to the ‘EFL project’, c) explicit references to *nihonjinron* in the data, d) links between *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices, and finally e) the extent to which *nihonjinron* can be said to affect observed EFL practices. It was determined that *nihonjinron* – as observed in the data – is fractured, and does not seem to affect the ways English is taught at the four schools. As such, while traces of *nihonjinron* can be found in the data, the ideology is of no particular importance to observed EFL practices.

I have opted for a stratified approach to studying ideology in educational contexts largely in response to problematic theoretical assumptions grounding current *nihonjinron* critiques, and in order to gain greater understanding of agentive processes within the Japanese EFL system. As such, this module bears significance to *nihonjinron* research principally because it employs a strong notion of social agency, and in doing so, it highlights crucial elements in critical social research: the impact, or importance, of ideology to broader discourse and social practices. This module is significant to *nihonjinron* research also because of its inquiry into the gaps and contradictions within discourse and between discourse and social practice.

In this final chapter, I argue for the importance of agency in ideology research specifically by looking at the contradictions within discourses and between discourse and observed practices, and how this informs our understanding of ideology situated at the level of agency. In doing so, I provide additional comments regarding the critical work on *nihonjinron*, and suggest ways in which further analyses of the Japanese EFL system can be conducted beyond the *nihonjinron* paradigm.

6.1 CONTRADICTIONS IN THE DATA

As demonstrated, teacher-participants did not express fully consistent views, nor were their words and actions congruent. As the content of this section shows, the gaps between what people say and what they do allow us to further problematize agency and bring more clarity to the complexity of agentive processes.

In the data collected for this module, contradictions were most often found in teacher interviews, although these are, of course, thematically related to classroom practice. The clearest examples of contradictions were provided by Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue and their use of the ‘Japan-as-island’ argument to justify Japanese EFL learners’ said lack of involvement, poor language learning aptitudes and limited chances to use the L2, while simultaneously arguing that English is necessary to pupils’ lives. The four teachers also stressed the need for CLT-oriented foreign language teaching, sometimes identifying themselves as CLT-oriented teachers, while often focusing on grammar-translation, grammar teaching and test preparation. Finally, teachers were generally unable to identify and qualify various functions of their own classroom talk or recognize their own code-switching practices. These facts suggest contradictions within discourse and between discourse and observed practices.

From a psychological perspective, gaps and contradictions during interviews may have surfaced because a) interviews are power-laden communicative events, b) interviewees can feel surprised or taken aback by specific questions, and/or c) interviewees may be unable to answer specific questions, leading to potential loss of face, etc. As Taylor (2013: 17) argues, “there are important differences between what we believe we are and what we show to other people about ourselves, just as there are differences between what we show (or think we show) other people about ourselves and what they perceive.” Furthermore, the evaluative nature of interviews may prompt interviewees to provide responses which they feel the interviewer expects. In other words, an unequal distribution of symbolic capital between teacher-participant and researcher can lead to contradictions within discourse and between words and actions.

This possibility poses considerable problems for both descriptive and transformative analysis. Rampton et al. (2006: 16) argue that “empirical work in traditional sociolinguistics has often placed a premium on tacit, unself-conscious language use, arguing that it is in unself-conscious speech that linguists can find the regularity, system and consistency that defines their professional interest.” From a realist perspective, the focus is not placed entirely on what people ‘really think'. Instead, it is more relevant to look at particular phenomena – discursive or otherwise – from a variety of angles, and explore elements such as complementarity, contiguity, and contradictions in the data. While we cannot have direct access to people's thoughts, we can see the gaps between what they say, what they say they do, what they are told to do, what they actually do, the effects of their actions on other social actors, feedback from those actors, and the ramifications of all of these 'layers' on subsequent discourses and actions in the real world.

Part of this inquiry into gaps and contradictions within discourse and between discourse and actions in the real world is the recognition that people’s language use is, to a large extent, self-conscious, especially in contexts where people are, or are perceived as being, evaluated. Evidence of self-conscious language use was noticeable during interviews when, for example, Ms. Ishida struggled to explain the role of culture in the textbook and in her teaching, or when Ms. Inoue periodically made self-depreciating comments. In classroom discourse, this was also noticeable when, for example, Mr. Ono and Ms. Inoue struggled to formulate utterances in English, then resorting to the L1 to complete messages and instructions.

Also from a psychological perspective (although not particularly limited to it), Mercer (2014) argues that “the self-system is responsive to contexts and continuously adapts to and accommodates different features of social environments and interactions, depending on which situational factors are especially salient for a particular individual” (p.161). While the self remains bound to social structures through processes which include adaptation and accommodation, there is an element of agentive volition. In other words, adaptation and accommodation take place when there is an initial recognition by social agents that certain situational factors are important to them. As such, the self is fluid, negotiable and contingent mainly because specific features found in the social world are of interest and because there are specific goals to be met. Archer (2012) emphasizes this point as she develops the notion of the *internal conversation* as element mediating structural and agentive processes.

Clearly, the relationship between people’s ideals and their lived experiences is complex. Not only this, the links between words, beliefs and actions are often fragmented, if not contradictory at times. Nevertheless, people need to negotiate the discrepancies in their lives partly through everyday discourse and also through social practices, given the tools and means available to them. Taylor (2013: 11) echoes this perspective thus:

> living in society, people develop perceptions of what is and what is not desired in a particular context and display self-images accordingly. The subsequent social responses determine whether

> the self-image being tested is discarded or internalized. One direct consequence is that, functioning in several different contexts, individuals may display several different identity images, which are not always convergent.

Hence, contradictions within discourse are to be expected, simply because they result from contingencies both within and outside particular discursive events. For example, as people engage in conversations, they may refer to things that may not pertain to questions or topics immediately preceding their utterances – i.e. they may refer back to things that surfaced previously in the conversation. During interviews, a particular question can be difficult to process, and may even be answered at a later time within the context of a different question. Perhaps more important to the current analysis, people's words may not be exact and comprehensive embodiments of their own thoughts. Rampton et al. (2006: 26) looks at this problem from the angle of pragmatics, and points out that people "engage in more active intimations of perspective, displaying a particular orientation to the situation and the social world though innuendo, irony, prosodic emphasis and so forth, and this can be hard for analysts." Similarly, people may replicate opinions previously heard or read without fully understanding them simply because their reproduction in particular communicative situations (e.g. an interview question) may seem appropriate.

From the perspective of social theory, Larsen-Freeman & Cameron (2008) and Mercer (2014) discuss human agents as complex 'open systems'. Accordingly, each human agent is both an open system and part of other open systems (e.g. the classroom, community, etc.). Their model suggests that the complex interactions binding these systems together cannot easily be contained within explanatory models based on direct causal relationships. Another central element in the open system model, one which is often emphasized by social realist thinkers including Joseph (2002) and Sealey & Carter (2004), is *emergence*. The emergent properties of an open system define this system as essentially distinct from its *a priori* properties. Thus, understanding an open system cannot be successfully achieved simply by looking at its individual components, because open systems are more than the sum total of their constituting parts. In the context of the current study, humans are understood as a) more than the sum total of their identities, beliefs, actions, words, etc., and b) open systems in constant change, thus able to self-organize into new states of being (Mercer, 2014). As this theoretical perspective suggests, human agents are expected to deal with complexity on an ongoing basis, which inevitably entails the production of contradictory views and actions. Similarly, MEXT can also be conceptualized as an open system. In Module Two I have referred to the contradictions in policy discourse as potentially emerging from a tension between the *imagined* and the *real* Japanese EFL system. These contradictions may also be seen as resulting from a constant mediation between a wide range of factors (e.g. standardized education, language learning, economic realities, views promoted by the OECD, etc.) which are deemed by policy makers as relevant to how EFL education should be conducted in secondary schools. The resulting changes and contradictions can thus be seen as signs that MEXT is currently undergoing reorganization and regeneration.

Another possible explanation for contradictions in people's views and actions is Kramsch's (1993) notion that people 'borrow other people's voices'. The notion of *double-voiced discourse*, or as the author puts it, conflicting self-accounts produced by unequal power relationships, draws from Bakhtin's (1986) concept of "various voices that coexist in [people's] utterances and that are […] by nature in conflict with one another" (Kramsch, 1993: 27). According to Kramsch,

> learner utterances naturally conflict since their language is populated by the intentions of others that they cannot easily differentiate from their own meaning. This means that the conflicting values and concepts of learners may originate in the views of others. […] foreign language teachers should thus help learners distinguish their own ideas from those of others […] through intercultural dialogue that acknowledges the dynamic and dialectical relationship between self and other, which also involves power relations (p.27).

Kramsch's argument contains three important aspects: a) educational discourse is a fluid and situated construction of meanings, b) this construction involves processes and entities located both within and between structure and agency, and c) power imbalances may impact how people relate to the Other. The notion of *double-voiced discourse* is useful here because it explains why some teachers unprepared for particular interview questions may choose to borrow views from others. Again, this is not to say that acts of borrowing – and likely contradictions – are inevitable products of power struggles or of ideological constraints. It would also be problematic to assume that any solution would inevitably involve discursive '*de-ideologization*'. Instead, reproducing someone else's views and adopting them as our own should also be understood as acts of agency, mediated by the *internal conversation* (Archer, 2012). Moreover, in particular communicative situations, others' ideas can facilitate communication, even if they lead to contradictions within discourse and between discourse and practice. In short, we should not assume that a) a non-ideological type of discourse is possible (or even desirable), or that b) ideologies are exclusively constraining forces.

Finally, it is also very likely that the teacher-participants formulated inconsistent views not necessarily because of ideological pressures to protect and promote Japaneseness, but because they were engaged in a learning process, articulating views, concepts and thoughts in their minds as they self-organized. From this perspective, gaps and contradictions in the data can also be understood as traces, ‘stages’, or manifestations of human agents – as open systems – gradually emerging as entities distinct from both their *a priori* conditions and social and institutional structures, reflecting on their social situations with regards to their work, concerns, goals and aspirations.

In light of the above, the following six possibilities should be considered in regards to contradictions within discourse and between discourse and observed practice:

1. teachers’ limited knowledge of the issues or facts referred to during interviews;
2. teachers recognizing the facts and issues raised, but not seeing them as pertinent to their everyday teaching practice;
3. teachers’ desire to provide me with ‘something I can work with’;
4. teachers reproducing arguments previously heard or read, felt to be appropriate to particular questions or communicative situations (e.g. “This is what the interviewer must want me to say”);
5. teachers feeling under evaluative pressure, thus projecting positive self-images;

6. teachers constantly formulating and revising ideas as part of a broader process of self-organization and creation of new states of being and knowing.

Equally relevant here is the issue of gaps between idealization – or the *imagined* – and practice, and of course the issue of memory. To report on past events, interviewees must refer to events in their memory, and in doing so, they are also referring to models of what *should* happen. This underscores the inherent biases in peple's recollections of past events.

In this way, if we conceptualize agency as constituted of various facets, we can then identify the first two possibilities listed above as characteristic of *agency as detachment*. Possibilities 3 to 5 can be encapsulated within the the notion of *agency as accommodation*. Possibility 5 is ably explained by Larsen-Freeman & Cameron (2008) and Mercer (2014) as *agency as process of self-organization*. All of these possible manifestations of agency suggest that contradictions within discourse and between discourse and practice are not to be understood exclusively as problems. Like ideologies, contradictions can be conceptualized as points of tension we, as critical social researchers, need to explore in order to gain greater insight into the complex mediating process between structural and agentive forces.

What is clear from the above analysis of the contradictions in teachers' expressed views is that, when studied at the level of agency, *nihonjinron* is fractured, sporadic and rather marginal to observed pedagogical practices. It has also highlighted the need in ideology research to explore and deepen our current understanding of agency.

It reminds us to think of people's words and actions as resulting from agentive processes and not necessarily from structural imposition or control. These choices, on the other hand, also need to be included in their context, which means that acts of agency should be placed in relation to structural realities and their material conditions. Finally, Archer's (2012) notion of the *internal conversation* – as a process of social agents responding to their social conditionings – serves to clarify the interface between structure and agency.

To clarify this notion further, we need to imagine how structural realities may appear to human agents. In other words, when social agents engage with structural realities, what are they dealing with? To begin with, the range of potential perspectives made available by social, cultural and institutional structures is broad, with particular ideologies (e.g. *nihonjinron*) constituting some of many possible options. When social agents reproduce *nihonjinron*, for example, through words and actions, the ideology is less imposed on them as it is available to them. The primary condition for choosing the reproduction of an ideology is recognition that the ideology itself is something of relevance to a particular situation, and of significance to the goals under consideration. In other words, structural – or ideological – reproduction at the level of agency still requires agentive participation. Without concluding that social reality (including the range of ideologies within it) is entirely constituted at the level of agency (i.e. the interactionist perspective), what people deal with in everyday life are options and possibilities. While these may be both limited and limiting, they are also enabling.

At this point, the notion of *critical awareness* – often identified by critical social researchers as the principal remedy to ideology – becomes relevant not only to the current analysis but also to this ongoing theoretical re-evaluation of ideology critique. Critical educational perspectives tend to operate from the assumption that ideological discourses and practices result from a lack of choice, itself a sign that structure dominates agency. Here, structure is viewed as more limiting than enabling. Bloome et al.'s (2005) notion of *power-as-caring-relationship* (see Section 4.1) provides an interesting alternative to this vision. Another problem with the assumption that critical awareness serves to eradicate the effects of ideology is that, while social agents are conceptualized as possessing fluid and emergent identities, they are also seen as locked within social structures which inevitably limit their movements and possibilities. The development of critical awareness thus becomes a process of first recognizing that one has choices to make, and that these choices have to be of a particular sort – i.e. the 'right kind' of choices leading to the mitigation of oppressive power structures. However, problematic discourses and practices also emerge from initial choices: people choose to say or do particular things out of a range of possibilities. To reiterate, it is mistaken to assume that *nihonjinron* is exclusively a debilitating force in (and outside) Japanese society, that it is the outcome of a lack of choices, and that it is exclusively the result of power struggles.

By considering the contradictions and gaps within discourse and between discourse and practice, we should conceive of ideology as part of a broader landscape of possibilities afforded by structure, and instantiated at the level of agency because of choices made *in situ*, themselves the outcomes of the *internal conversation*. These choices, however, are not completely open – hence the limiting features of structure.

De Fina (2015) provides an interesting approach to understanding ideology, identity and agency: “agency cannot be seen as operating only on individual intentions, but always represents a point of intersection between habitus, iterative practices and personal invention and volition” (p.275). Joseph (2002) goes further by adding that intentions and meanings cannot effectively be considered as the primary elements shaping social reality, for they ”are often either not known, or only partially known to agents” (p.151). Within this paradigm, structure, ideology, agency and identity are interrelated in complex ways, as opposed to being locked in binary relationships (i.e. oppressing forces versus the oppressed).

In the next section, I build on this discussion in an attempt at bringing further sophistication to our current understanding of *nihonjinron.*

6.2 REVISITING *NIHONJINRON*

Even if the limited range of *nihonjinron*-related elements in the data makes further sophistication of existing theories and accounts of the ideology more difficult, themes and tendencies did emerge in ways which help us understand the nature of *nihonjinron* as an element of both structure and agency. What differentiates *nihonjinron*-as-structural-process from *nihonjinron*-as-agentive- process is that the former – as described mainly by the *nihonjinron* critics – tends to be fixed, ubiquitous and debilitating, whereas the latter – as observed in the data for this module – is fractured, contradictory, marginal, and as was revealed through analysis of the data, without much impact on other observable discourses and practices.

Earlier, I listed four main explicit references to the ideology in the data. Except for the fourth reference – contradictions to the *nihonjinron* discourse – these explicit references underscore a need to emphasize features of Japanese culture and society perceived to be distinct, further suggesting that traces of *nihonjinron* in the data are about understanding Japan as an entity existing relatively independently from the rest of the world. This can be said to contrast with Billig’s (1995) argument that

> nationalists live in an international world, and their ideology is itself an international ideology. Without constant observation of the world of other nations, nationalists would be unable to claim that their nations meet the universal code of nationhood. Nor would they have ready access to stereotyped judgments about foreigners. Even the most extreme and unbanal of nationalists do not shut out the outside world from consciousness, but often show an obsessive concern with the lives and outlooks of foreigners” (p.80).

Yet, these two perspectives are not mutually exclusive. In fact, nationalism as international ideology may lead to symbolic divisions between nations and cultures as opposed to their integration. The fact remains that national insularism is closely related to active consciousness of things beyond national boundaries.

In that sense, *nihonjinron* is not particularly distinct from other forms of nationalist ideologies found in other parts of the world. Conceptually, nationalist ideologies are characterized by the concept of *alterity*, which Hall (1996a: 4) explains thus: “identities are constructed through, not outside, difference […] it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks.” According to Grad & Martin Rojo (2008: 11-12), “identity therefore relies on the comparison to something outside the self, namely another identity. The motivation for differentiation makes us invest in identity positions and leads people to base the identity building on an ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy.” In short, while its contents seem to be focused on the ‘local’, a nationalist ideology can only emerge because its perpetrators and consumers are aware of, and feel concerned with, the fact that there is an ‘Other’ out there with whom one feels forced or compelled to relate.

However, while these ideas place *nihonjinron* within an international context, what is important to consider for analysis is the role of the social agent. Our understanding of ideology can be expanded considerably by a) including a focus on human agency, and b) understanding alterity as both a structural reality and as an act, or articulation, of identity at the level of agency. Hall (1996a: 6) portrays identities as processes requiring labeling, acceptance of the label, and performance: “an effective suturing of the subject to a subject-position requires, not only that the subject is ‘hailed’, but that the subject invests in the position […] suturing has to be thought of as an *articulation*, rather than a one-sided process.” Likewise, *nihonjinron* – as part of broader identity processes – requires human agents to articulate the ideology and invest in it through words and actions. Wodak et al. (2009) discuss the need for emotional investment in the creation and maintenance of nationalist ideologies:

> if a nation is an imagined community and at the same time a mental construct, an imaginary complex of ideas containing at least the defining elements of collective unity and equality, of boundaries and autonomy, then this image is real to the extent that one is convinced of it, believes in it and identifies with it emotionally (p.22).

This is where this modular PhD project becomes pertinent to existing research on *nihonjinron*. As a nationalist ideology, *nihonjinron* requires active imagination and reiteration to exist. It also requires some form of commitment through actions. Otherwise, and as the data in this module has shown, it remains limited to particular ‘corners’ or ‘layers’ of the educational realm. According to Billig (1995: 38), “national identity in established nations is remembered because it is embedded in routines of life.” In this respect, *nihonjinron* depends on active reproduction of memories in the present:

> Behaviors and thoughts are never totally created anew, but they follow, and thus repeat, familiar patterns, even when they change such patterns. To act and to speak, one must remember. Nevertheless, actors do not typically experience their actions as repetitions, and, ordinarily, speakers are not conscious of the extent to which their own words repeat, and thereby transmit, past grammars and semantics (Billig, 1995: 42).

Of importance here is that people have access to a range of familiar patterns and ideologies. Billig (1995: 133) captures the fluid and transient nature of nationalist ideologies thus: “national identity no longer enjoys its preeminence as the psychological identity that claims the ultimate loyalty of the individual. Instead, it must compete with other identities on a free market of identities.” *Nihonjinron* can thus be understood as an ideologically-driven discourse within a complex network of identity discourses available to Japanese EFL learners and educators. In his critical realist account of hegemony, Joseph (2002) argues that, “although social structures are often reproduced automatically, smoothly (or at least unconsciously), this is not always guaranteed, particularly because different social structures interact with each other in complex ways” (p.10). Because *nihonjinron* is part of – and interacts with – a wide range of other ideologies, its importance is not always predictable.

At this point, two facts about *nihonjinron* in the real world must be underlined: a) through the mediation of structural and agentive processes, human agents are likely to recognize a multiplicity of ideologies, just as they are likely to recognize a multiplicity of social practice (Joseph, 2002:141), and b) while *nihonjinron* can create the conditions for particular forms of identities to emerge, it depends on its reproduction at the level of agency, a process which itself depends on the *internal conversation* as well as a range of factors both within and beyond the realm of *nihonjinron*.

In sum, a stratified account of *nihonjinron* assumes the existence of the ideology at two distinct yet related levels. The first level can be identified as *structural nihonjinron*. At this level, *nihonjinron* possesses certain causal primacy – i.e. it provides certain conditions which can potentially have an impact on agency (thus leading to agentive instantiations of *nihonjinron*). The other level – *agentive nihonjinron* – is constituted of reproductions as well as deconstructions of *structural nihonjinron*. As such, the latter level is crucial to the existence of the former. Agentive instantiations of *nihonjinron* occur mainly through the discourses and/or practices generated by people on the ground, although these instantiations are not entirely contained within the realm of discourse and/or practice: they are also about the material conditions which make these processes possible.

Finally, both *structural* and *agentive nihonjinrons* possess emergent properties. While they share a complex relationship, neither can be reduced to the other. Furthermore, the emergent nature of *structural nihonjinron* and *agentive nihonjinron* – decipherable through the application of a stratified approach – is a central analytical element in understanding the nature of the ideology and its potential impact on social practice. If we observe particular social processes or events (e.g. Japanese EFL practices in JHS) through a stratified perspective, the emergent properties of each stratum become pivotal elements in our understanding of the complex interactions which bind these strata together. Even if *nihonjinron* exists even “by virtue of an absence of counter-hegemonic struggles” (Joseph, 2002: 135), or even if it is not discernable from evidence gathered through ethnographic means, interrogating its presence in – and measuring its importance to – broader discourses and social practices requires clear evidence that human agents are indeed drawing from it, hence the need for an ethnographically-based ideology critique.

In the next section, I build on this new theoretical understanding and re-evaluate the critical work on *nihonjinron* in light of the work in this module.

6.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CRITICAL WORK ON *NIHONJINRON*

This modular PhD project began with a critique of the critical work on *nihonjinron.* While there are similarities between the analyses conducted in all three modules and some of the conclusions reached by the *nihonjinron* critics (e.g. some of the problematic elements found in MEXT-approved EFL textbooks), the main point of disagreement resides less in diverging conceptualizations of the nature of *nihonjinron* and more with regards to the importance of the ideology to broader discourse and social processes. These dissimilarities emerged mainly through the development and application of diverging theoretical and methodological approaches to studying the ideology in context.

I have underlined in the two previous modules a tendency among the *nihonjinron* critics to perceive the ideology as omnipresent in Japanese social life. Seen thus, *nihonjinron* is not just a social ‘fact’ but a structural force debilitating social, cultural and educational change. McVeigh (2003: *x-xi*) stresses the importance of the ideology by claiming that “what is unexpected [about *nihonjinron*] is how powerful such habits of myth-inspired thought are, how they continuously thrive in a sociopolitical environment that encourages their growth, and that people who should know better (notably researchers of all nationalities) reiterate them.” In this account, agency disappears as a result of the overwhelming ideological force of *nihonjinron*. Once the ideology is described as a performing entity, once educational systems are conceived of as ideology-inculcating mechanisms, and once human agents are seen as pawns delivering and consuming only what is made available to them by powerful abstract entities beyond their reach, we are left with a view of *nihonjinron* as a perfect, self-perpetuating ideological system without contradictions or gaps.

Instead, what this study has shown is that we need a broader understanding of ideology in relation to structural and agentive processes. This conceptualization is facilitated by inquiries into both the discursive and the material conditions of ideology. Instead of looking at ideology only as a tool to reinforce social class divisions, we can also conceptualize ideology as part of our general understanding of the world, or “as a basic material prerequisite for the functioning of all societies […] based on an essential need of all societies to express the way that people live their material conditions of existence" (Joseph, 2002: 140). This view of ideology does not necessarily remove the need for critical deconstruction and resistance: it merely sees ideology as part of the complex – and often contradictory – ways in which we experience the world and respond to the structural conditions in which we live. Even if reductive, ideologies can serve as general outlines, or tentative 'gestures' of understanding, of the world we live in. In Section 1.4 of Module Two, I referred to this notion by describing both ideology and hegemony as 'different stages' in the development of common-sense ideas. By implication, we become aware of ideology and of its limitations not just when people are oppressed by it, but also when it fails to account for the material conditions in which we live and the complexity observed in the social world.

What is also necessary in *nihonjinron* critique is an approach, or a combination of approaches, which can account for imperfections and contradictions in the ways we talk about and experience the world. A realist approach to studying *nihonjinron* views the ideology as possessing distinct and emergent properties, which means that it is simultaneously a) discursive, b) *about* itself and other forms of discourses, and c) *about* the material world. Furthermore, while these properties are constitutive of *nihonjinron*, the ideology cannot be reduced to its component parts. A realist approach also considers the possibility (as revealed in the findings gathered in this module) that *nihonjinron* may not organize or enable the sum total of cultural beliefs and practices shared by classroom actors, that it may instead be part of a wide array of cultural representations which may or may not be drawn from by social agents as they engage in the *internal conversation*.

In the next section, I analyze the problems found in the Japanese EFL system by moving beyond *nihonjinron*-related concerns.

6.4 MOVING BEYOND *NIHONJINRON*

While it was determined that the presence of *nihonjinron* in, and its importance to, observed EFL practices are limited, how can we then explain – and remedy – the problems observed in Japanese JHS English classes?

One possible explanation for the problems and contradictions commonly identified as impeding foreign language education in Japan is that the actors in the Japanese EFL system are differently invested in regards to English education. For example, while policy makers promulgate occasionally conflicting policies while emphasizing the *kokusaika* and the *ibunkakan kyouiku* discourses, some Japanese parents, teachers, and even students may not necessarily place much importance on the development of intercultural communicative competence or English language ability. Instead, they may view university entrance exam preparation as the most tangible and realistic goal of EFL education. Some observations made by Mr. Ono during our interviews suggest this tendency. More importantly, the large network of cram schools across the nation underlines the possibility that success on exams is a priority for the actors in the Japanese EFL system. As such, the notion of learning English for intercultural citizenship (Byram, 2008) might actually be incidental when compared to other, perhaps more instrumental goals prioritized by parents, students' and educators. Yet, while a prioritization of entrance exams at the level of agency is convincing evidence of structural reproduction, one should not conclude that language learning is paralyzed as a result. Mr. Ono's argument that exam contents often provide teachers with more reliable points of reference for classroom teaching than those found in policy documents (see Section 5.5.1) shows how structural constraints can sometimes become enabling forces as a result of human agents' capacity to deal with their social situations in light of their concerns and goals (Archer, 2012).

Moreover, the complexity and contradictions found in the data might also be explained by the fact that the Japanese EFL system at large is changing. As observed so far, students and teachers who participated in this study face a very complex reality, with pressures coming from multiple directions. They often attempt to fulfill broad and sometimes confusing pedagogical goals simultaneously, without necessary being equipped with the resources and conditions to successfully reach these goals. While involved in the 'EFL project', these actors may have few immediate points of reference – or the time – to improve current pedagogical practices. As Archer (2012) argues, people in increasingly globalized societies have to learn to "play games" in which the rules are constantly being negotiated. Meanwhile, earlier generations may not be able to offer the kind of models or points of reference from which to deal with new information, needs and goals. In such context, it is natural to see contradictions emerge.

What clearly need further empirical inquiry are the various dislocations between stated objectives and actual practices on the ground. Important questions in this type of inquiry might include:

- Why are educational policy and practice operating so independently from one another?
- How can we make sure that there is more coordination between policy and practice?
- Where can we find points of convergence between various strata of the Japanese EFL system, and how can we build on those?
- Why are language teachers in secondary schools devoting only thirty percent of their time to language teaching-related tasks?

While individual teachers aspire (and at times even claim) to implement pedagogical innovations, a complex network of structural and local contingencies may exacerbate the gap between the *real* and the *imagined* EFL system (Kariya & Rappleye, 2010). Similarly, Cook (2010) highlights the distinction between *curriculum* – i.e. the underlying philosophy of language education – and *syllabus* – the range of pedagogical approaches available. He argues that much of SLA research has remained overly focused on the latter. This also sheds light on the monolingual policy issue discussed in earlier sections. The general lack of agreement among educators and between policy makers and EFL practitioners on this issue shows that the very purpose of English education in Japanese secondary schools remains unclear to many agents active in the system. Bridging this particular gap would inevitably involve greater investment from educators and policy makers in curriculum-related issues in order to develop a more consistent approach to syllabus.

Looking beyond the *nihonjinron* paradigm is also important when unpacking the problematic integration of cultural contents in EFL education in Japanese secondary schools. As suggested in the above analysis, even when culture teaching is not an explicit priority for teachers, it nevertheless happens, even if only through the teaching of the target language. Unfortunately, when it does surface, there is a tendency for teachers to present cultural understanding through cultural dichotomizations.

To remedy this problem, Archer's (1996) stratification of *culture* into the *Cultural System* and the *Socio-Cultural Domain* (see Section 1.2 of Module Two) can serve as an alternative. Indeed, the almost exclusive focus on 'traditional Japan' in EFL textbooks can be understood as problematic because traditions tend to be depicted and understood as symbols of Japanese uniqueness, thus acting as points of references from which to solidify the process of alterity, or '*us* versus *them*' divisions. More importantly, because Japanese traditions refer mainly to the Cultural System, existing depictions of culture – Japanese or otherwise – do not always reflect the rapid cultural and social changes brought by increasing globalization. Consequently, the Japanese Cultural System may, over time, be seen as less relevant to the everyday lives of young Japanese people. By failing to integrate aspects representing the experiences of young Japanese people (i.e. the Socio-Cultural Domain), young Japanese pupils may feel a greater sense of detachment in relation to their own national culture. As Bucholtz & Hall (2006: 381-382) argue,

> cultural beliefs about how people of various social backgrounds

> should, must, or do speak and act (generated through indexicality) are generally reductive and inflexible, while the actual linguistic and social practices in which people engage in specific social contexts (including the display of practice in performance) are highly complex and strategic.

In short, when we claim that teachers and learners of English do not engage significantly – or that they engage in problematic fashion – with cultural content in the EFL classroom, we should also consider what the target knowledge is before analyzing how it is presented to pupils.

Also of concern is the marked emphasis on foreign cultures, especially American culture, as strange and exotic. This raises a range of issues related to *cultural otherization*. Claiming that foreign cultures are more interesting to pupils, and thus more appropriate sources of information about cultural knowledge, is based on the assumption that cultural differences – generally represented by fixed and essentialized cultural 'facts' – are effective 'attention-getters'. As was indicated on numerous occasions in Modules Two and in the current one, foreign cultures are often represented in Japanese EFL textbooks by American, British and Australian cultures, while developing nations tend to be depicted in textbooks as environments populated by children in need of help from Japanese people. These cultural representations focus on the strange or exotic, and in the process, provide problematic perspective on both foreign cultures and culture as a concept. Despite the very clear danger in this type of approach to reinforce colonialist forms of cultural understanding, the issue here is not necessarily on *which* culture is being studied but the *type of focus* placed on cultures, whatever the latter may be. Culture teaching should not be viewed as a process of demarcating the boundaries between national cultures, or studying the cultures where English is said to belong, but instead about clarifying underlying cultural processes found in all cultures of the world, national or otherwise.

This leads us to the important notion of *critical cultural awareness*. This notion is defined by Byram et al. (1994) as a combination between a critical stance towards culture and action-orientation or a desire to change and improve society. Guilherme (2000) identifies it as a core component of intercultural communicative competence, and Houghton & Yamada (2012) underline its pivotal role in foreign language programs. In this module, I suggest that the development of *critical cultural awareness* among language learners is possible if educators present the concept of culture through the distinction between the Cultural System and the Socio-Cultural Domain. This approach can be effective in replacing processes or discourses echoing *cultural otherization* with more culturally-sensitive and productive approaches because culture is thus understood as complex and constantly changing. While I have already underlined some of the the limits of critical thinking, and criticized the idealistic assumption that there is a non-ideological world out there towards which we must strive, problematic approaches to understanding cultures – both native and foreign – can nevertheless be resolved to a large extent through active re-evaluation, re-conceptualization and analysis of cultural information gathered from everyday experience. These processes are at the heart of *critical cultural awareness.*

This is where the ideological nature of this module becomes most visible. Indeed, this entire modular PhD research project has been concerned with the study of the inherent ideological nature of educational systems (Bourdieu & Eagleton, 1992). As such, it has also been concerned with *critical cultural awareness* in both language pedagogy and its related research, particularly with regards to studying cultural representations of both Japanese and foreign cultures, and measuring the potential impact of *nihonjinron* on the development of both English language skills and *critical cultural awareness* among EFL learners. As such, my work is rooted in the belief that both Japanese EFL education and its related research contain ideological elements which can potentially impede both the learning of the target language and our intellectual understanding of this complex process.

A final note on the limitations of the above study – and on possibility for further research – is needed. The work conducted in this module has shown that *nihonjinron* is present in the data but that its importance is marginal. What led to these findings was the application of a stratified approach to the study of ideology in context. Such approach revealed insight into the nature and production of ideology as well as its consumption at the level of agency. Indeed, by focusing on the consumption of ideology in context, a strong version of agency emerged as a central epistemological concern. However, because a considerably large portion of data was collected from teacher interviews and classroom data, this strong version of agency mainly centered on teacher agency and less on student agency. Two reasons explain this choice: 1) it would have been more difficult legally and logistically to collect enough data to provide a rich account of student agency; and 2) JHS students' generally limited experience as both EFL learners and as learners of any subject, and perhaps their somewhat narrow experience with reflexive thinking, may limit the scope of insight into student agency.

As a result, extending the work in this module would necessarily involve looking into both teacher and student agency, namely by gathering data from student interviews, logs and essays. While this endeavour was problematic at the JHS level, further work on *nihonjinron* in the Japanese EFL context might involve gathering data at the high school or university level. Doing so would likely provide a richer perspective into student agency precisely because of students' more extensive experiences as EFL learners, and their ability to provide broader and more substantial reflexive accounts of these experiences.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This module was guided by five research questions (see Section 1), themselves geared towards two core concerns: *Can traces of nihonjinron be found in the body of data?* and *How important are these traces to observed EFL practices?* So far, my goal has been to provide further sophistication of existing theories accounting for the presence and importance of *nihonjinron* in Japanese EFL education at the JHS level. I have proposed an ethnographically-based critical discourse analysis to focus on *nihonjinron* at the level of classroom practice. This type of analysis has foregrounded the need for data triangulation. Application of this strategy has provided a detailed look at the complex and fragmented interaction between *nihonjinron* and observed EFL practices. Analysis of the data in this module has revealed that the presence of *nihonjinron* in, and its importance to, observed EFL practices is marginal. Instead, a range of realities of both discursive and material natures have been shown to shape the various – and at times conflicting – processes observed in the data.

Yet, while *nihonjinron* was determined to be marginal, it is possible for the ideology to be significant in other ways, ways which might play a role in broader enculturating practices in the classroom. While *nihonjinron* may not be clearly visible in the data, there is a possibility for it to be related to other aspects of the data (e.g. teachers' choice of language in the classroom, marked focus on grammar-translation and testing, etc.). It is likely that the observable gaps between teachers' stated beliefs and their actual language use reflect or represent the various challenges faced by educators throughout the process of teaching and using English. It is also possible that these challenges may lead to – or be related to – a shared sense of 'Japaneseness' among learners and educators (provided that this sense does exist) as they engage in the task of learning and teaching English. The various cultural expectations of Japanese teachers and learners towards the target language and related cultures may, at times, bring out certain needs to assert shared beliefs about a Japanese national identity. While clear evidence of this potentially shared sense of Japaneseness may not be readily available in the data collected for this module, and while it is difficult to measure empirically the links between the ideology and actual elements in classroom discourse, being aware of these possibilities is nevertheless crucial. For these reasons, the work in this modular PhD project should not be considered proof that a) *nihonjinron* is entirely irrelevant to Japanese EFL education, or that b) EFL education in Japan is immune to the effects of *nihonjinron*.

At the same time, what is not evident in the body of ethnographic classroom data should not be seen as confirmation that *nihonjinron* is actively being formulated and promulgated by social actors. If we take, for example, the issue of teacher's choice of language in the EFL classroom, many possibilities beyond the limits of *nihonjinron* should also be acknowledged. The way in which teachers switch between Japanese and English could potentially be a function of three separate but interrelated ontological facts: a) issues involving English as a school subject in Japan, b) cultural expectations of teachers & learners in Japan towards education in general (i.e. regardless of the subject being taught), and c) formal education, no matter where it is conducted.

Nevertheless, problems in the Japanese EFL system cannot be overlooked, and solutions are needed. To this end, further work exploring the relationship between a range of ideological discourses and observed EFL practices is required for a fuller understanding of the restrictive and emancipatory properties of education “as a major area for the reproduction of social relations, including representation and identity formation, but also for possibilities of change” (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000: 451). Indeed, ascertaining whether or not a particular ideology is causing observable problems within Japanese EFL education matters less than exploring possible ways to enrich EFL education in the country. Possible avenues might include a) allowing EFL teachers more time to deal with their complex tasks, b) training teachers to deal with new developments in language teaching, and c) helping teachers to combine linguistic and cultural contents in order to facilitate the development of learners’ intercultural communicative competence and sense of intercultural citizenship. These complex pedagogical processes certainly become possible when elements related to *critical cultural awareness* are integrated in foreign language programs. Throughout this pedagogical endeavor, nationalist and/or ethnic ideologies – banal or malign – are certainly elements to consider. However, they are only aspects of a more complex reality. In sum, if the goal of transformative educational research is to improve educational practices on the ground, then ideologies such as *nihonjinron* might not be the best place to begin our investigations. But if we are concerned with what educational experiences mean in the real world – i.e. what education allows people to do in social, economic and cultural terms – then inquiries into ideologies in context are of considerable importance.

REFERENCES

Amano, I. (1990). *Education and Examination in Modern Japan*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Arao, H. (1998). Teaching Exotic Japanese Culture in English Class. *The Language Teacher*, 22-6. Retrieved March 17, 2015, from http://www.jaltpublications.org.

Archer, M. (1996). *Culture and Agency: The place of culture in social theory (rev. ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. (2004). *Being Human: The problem of agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. (2012). *The Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in Practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aspinall, R.W. (2011). Globalization and English Language Education Policy in Japan: External risk and internal inertia. In D.B Willis & J. Rappleye (Ed.), *Reimagining Japanese Education: Border, transfers, circulations, and the comparative*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp.127-146.

Aspinall, R.W. (2013). *International Education Policy in Japan in an Age of Globalisation and Risk*. Boston: Global Oriental.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays (transl. V.W. McGee)*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barkhuizen, G. (2007). A Narrative Approach to Exploring Context in Language

Teaching. *ELT Journal*, 62-3: 231-239.

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

Bernstein, B. (1975). Class and Pedagogies: Visible and invisible. In B. Bernstein, *Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3*. London: Routledge, pp. 116–156.

Bhaskar, R. (1998). *The Possibility of Naturalism: A philosophical critique of the contemporary human sciences.* London: Routledge.

Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A Realist Theory of Science*. London: Routledge.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.

Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29: 447–66.

Bloome, D. & al. (2005). *Discourse Analysis and The Study of Classroom Language and Literacy Events: A microethnographic perspective*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (trans. Nice, R.)*. London: SAGE Publications.

Bourdieu, P. & Eagleton, T (1992). Doxa and Common life. *New Left Review,* 1-191, 111-121

Breen, M. (2001). The Social Context for Language Learning: A neglected situation? In C. Candlin & N. Mercer (Ed.), *English Language Teaching in Its Social Context*. London: Routledge, pp. 122-144.

Browne, C.M. & Wada, M. (1998). Current Issues in High School English Teaching in Japan: An exploratory survey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 11-1: 97-112.

Bucholtz, M. (2000). The Politics of Transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32:

1439-1465.

Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2006). Language and Identity. In A. Duranti, *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., pp. 369-394.

Burns, R.B. (2000). *Introduction to Research Methods (4th Ed.)*. London: SAGE Publications.

Buzzelli, C. & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, Power, and Morality in Classroom Discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17: 873–884.

Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (2008). *From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. et al. (1994). *Teaching-and-Learning Language-and-Culture*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A functional perspective*. London: Continuum.

CJGTC [Prime Minister’s Commission on Japan’s Goals in the Twenty-First Century]. (2000). *The Frontier Within: Individual empowerment and better governance in the new millennium - Chapters 1 & 6, Overview*. Retrieved November 18, 2012, from http://www.kantei.go.jp.

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.

Cook, V. (1991). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

Copland, F. & Neokleous, G. (2011). L1 to Teach L2: Complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal*, 65-3: 270-280.

Creese, A. (2002). The Discursive Construction of Power in Teacher Partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36-4: 597-616.

Creese, A. (2008). Linguistic Ethnography. In K. A. King and N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition*, *Volume 10: Research Methods in Language and Education.* New York: Springer Science+Business Media LLC, pp. 229–241.

Croot, E.J. et al. (2011). Evaluating Standards in Cross-Language Research: A critique of Squires' criteria. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 48: 1002-1011.

Cullen, B. & Sato, K. (2000). Practical Techniques for Teaching Culture in the EFL Classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6-12. Retrieved January 3, 2015 from http://iteslj.org

Dai, L. (2011). Practical Techniques for Cultural-based Language Teaching in the EFL Classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2-5: 1031-1036.

de Fina, A. (2015). Afterword. In Deters, P et al. (Ed.), *Theorizing and Analyzing Agency in Second Language Learning: Interdisciplinary approaches.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp.271-276.

Duff, P.A. & Polio, C.G. (1990). How Much Foreign Language Is There in the Foreign Language Classroom? *Modern Language Journal*, 74: 154-166.

Duff, P.A. & Uchida, Y. (1997). The Negotiation of Teachers' Sociocultural Identities and Practices in Postsecondary EFL Classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31-3: 451-86.

Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative Analysis: Practice and innovation*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1999). Global Capitalism and Critical Awareness of Language. *Language Awareness*, 8-2: 71-83.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language (2nd Ed.)*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Fennelly, M. & Luxton, R. (2011). Are They Ready? On the verge of compulsory English, elementary school teachers lack confidence. *The Language Teacher,* 35-2: 19-24.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. Brighton: Harvester.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, structure and contradictions in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

González, L.P. (2007). Fansubbing Anime: Insights into the butterfly effect of globalization on audiovisual translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 14-4: 260-277.

Gorsuch, G. (1999). *Exploring the relationship between educational policy and instruction in Japanese high school EFL classrooms*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Temple University, Japan.

Grad, H. & Martin Rojo, L. (2008). Identities in Discourse. In R. Dolón & J. Todolí (Ed.), *Analyzing Identities in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, pp.3-28.

Guest, M. (2002). A Critical ‘Checkbook’ for Culture Teaching and Learning. *ELT Journal,* 56-2: 154-161.

Guilherme, M. (2000). Intercultural Competence. In M. Byram, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 298-300.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, S. (1996a). Who Needs Identity? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Ed.), *Questions of Cultural Identity.* London: SAGE, pp.1-17.

Hall, S. (1996b). The Question of Cultural Identity. In S. Hall et al. (eds). *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies*. Cambridge, Mass. and Oxford, pp. 595–634.

Hammersley, M. (2007). Reflections on Linguistic Ethnography’. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11-5: 689-695.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice (3rd ed.)*. London: Routledge.

Hahn, A. (2013). Training Teachers. *The Language Teacher*, 37-3: 19-22.

Heinrich, P. (2012). *The Making of Monolingual Japan: Language ideology and Japanese modernity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hino, N. (1988). Yakudoku: Japan’s dominant tradition in foreign language learning. *JALT Journal,* 10: 45-55.

Hobbs, V. & Kubanyiova, M. (2008). The Challenges of Researching Language Teachers: What research manuals don't tell us. *Language Teaching*

Research. 12-4: 495-513.

Hosoda, Y. (2000) Teacher Code-Switching in the EFL Classroom. *The JALT Journal*, 22-1: 69-93.

Houghton, S.A. (2012). *Intercultural Dialog in Practice: Managing value judgment through foreign language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Houghton, S.A. & Rivers, D.J. (Ed.). (2013). *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Houghton, S.A. & Yamada, E. (2012). *Developing Criticality in Practice through Foreign Language Education.* Oxford: Peter Lang.

Ieţcu-Fairclough, I. (2008). Critical Discourse Analysis and Translation Studies: Translation, recontextualization, ideology. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, X-2: 67-72.

Iwabuchi, K. (1994). Complicit Exoticism: Japan and its other. *Australian Journal of Media & Culture*, 8-2. Retrieved March 7, 2015 from http://www.mcc.murdoch.edu/au/ReadingRoom/8.2/Iwabuchi.html

Jackson, L. & Kennett, M. (2013). Language Edutainment on Japanese Television: Just what are learners learning? *EJCJS*, 13-1.

Jaffe, A. (2006). *Standards of Evidence, Ethnographic Methods and Analysis*. Paper presented at the UKLEF Seminar, 4 March, 2006, The Open University: Methodological issues in Linguistic Ethnography.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3: 10-23.

Joseph, J. (2002). *Hegemony: A realist analysis.* London: Routledge.

Kamada, L. (1996). Comparing Cultures through Critical Thinking: Development and interpretation of meaningful observations. In Cornwell, S., Rule, P., Sugino, T. (Ed.), *On JALT96: Crossing borders,* The Japan Association for Language Teaching, pp. 154-158.

Kaneko, T. (1991). *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Classroom*. Unpublished dissertation, Temple University Japan, Tokyo.

Kang, D.M. (2008). The Classroom Language Use of a Korean Elementary School EFL Teacher: Another look at TETE. *System*, 36: 214-226.

Kanno, Y. (2008). *Language and Education in Japan: Unequal access to bilingualism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Karasawa, M. (2002). Patriotism, Nationalism, and Internationalism among Japanese Citizens: An Etic-Emic Approach. *Political Psychology*, 23-4: 645-666.

Kariya, T. & Rappleye, J. (2010). The Twisted, Unintended Impacts of Globalization on Japanese Education. *Globalization, Changing Demographics, and Educational Challenges in East Asia Research on Sociology of Education*, 17: 17-63.

Kawai, Y. (2007). Japanese Nationalism and the Global Spread of English: An analysis of Japanese governmental and public discourses on English. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 7-1: 37–55.

Kennett, M. & Jackson, L. (2014).‘What If [Your] Boyfriend Was a Foreigner?’ Romance, gender, and second language learning in an edutainment context. *Asian Englishes*, 16-2: 157-172.

Kilickaya, F. (2004). Authentic Materials and Cultural Content in EFL Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10-7. Retrieved January 3, 2015 from http://iteslj.org.

Kingfisher, C. (2013). *A Policy Travelogue: Tracing welfare reform in Aotearoa/New*

Zealand and Alberta, Canada. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Knight, G. (1995). Oral Communication: One year on. *The Language Teacher*, 19-7: 20-25.

Kodotchigova, M. A. (2002). Role Play in Teaching Culture: Six quick steps for classroom implementation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 8-7. Retrieved January 3, 2015 from http://iteslj.org

Koll-Stobbe, A. (1994). English in Code-Switching: Towards an Intergrated Study of Code-Switching. *World Englishes*, 13- 2: 203-214.

Komatsu, S. (2002) Transition in the Japanese curriculum: How is the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools in Japan determined? *International Education Journal,* 3-5: 50-55.

Konidaris, E. (2010). Code-Switching among Trilingual Montrealers: French, English and a Heritage Language. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 3-11: 286-320.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context & Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.

Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, 17-3: 295-306.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese Culture Constructed by Discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly,* 33-1: 9-35.

Kubota, R. (2002). The Impact of Globalization on Language Teaching in Japan. In D., Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and Language Teaching*. London:

Routledge, pp.13-28.

Kubota, R. (2011). Questioning Linguistic Instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education*, 22: 248-260.

Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lather, P. (1986). Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange,* 17-4: 63-84.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2007a). Internationalising Japan: *Nihonjinron* and the intercultural in Japanese language-in-education policy. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2-1: 32-46.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2007b). The Ideology of Interculturality in Japanese Language-in-Education Policy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30-2: 20.1–20.16.

Littlewood, W. & Yu, B. (2011). First Language and Target Language in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44: 64-77.

LoCastro, V. (1996). English Language Education in Japan. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the Language Classroom*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 40-58.

Long, M.H. & Sato, C.J. (1983). Classroom Foreigner Talk Discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H.W. Seliger & M.H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp.268-285.

Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mahdiyan, M. et al. (2013). Applying Critical Discourse Analysis in Translation of Political Speeches and Interviews. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies,* 2-1: 35-47.

Mahootian, S. (2006). Code Switching and Mixing. In Brown, K. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (2nd Ed.).* Oxford: Elsevier.

Matsuura, H., Fujieda, M. & Mahoney, S. (2004). The Officialization of English and ELT in Japan: 2000. *World Englishes*, 23-3: 471-487.

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *A Realist Approach for Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE.

Maybin, J. & K. Tusting (2011). Linguistic Ethnography. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge, pp.515-528.

McVeigh, B.J. (2002). *Japanese Higher Education as Myth*. London: M.E. Sharpe.

McVeigh, B.J. (2003). *Nationalisms of Japan: Managing and mystifying identity*. Boulder, Colorado: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The Guided Construction of Knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mercer, N. (2010). The Analysis of Classroom Talk: Methods and methodologies. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80: 1-14.

Mercer, S. (2014). The Self from a Complexity Perspective. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Ed.), *Multiple Perspectives on the Self in SLA.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp.160-176.

MEXT. (2010). *Section 9, Foreign Languages*. Retrieved October 10, 2012 from http://www.mext.go.jp.

MEXT. (2011a). *Five Proposals and Specific Measures for Developing Proficiency in English for International Communication*. Retrieved January 19, 2013 from http://www.mext.go.jp.

MEXT (2011b). *Monbukagaku Tokeiyoura* [Statistical Abstract for Education, Sports, Science and Technology]. Tokyo: MEXT.

MEXT. (2012). *Survey Results of Public Junior High Schools and Combined Junior High and High Schools*. Retrieved July 22, 2012 from http://www.mext.go.jp

MEXT. (2014a). *English Education Reform Plan Corresponding to Globalization*. Retrieved May 17, 2014 from http://www.mext.go.jp.

MEXT. (2014b). *Eigo Kyoiku Kaizen no Tame no Eigo Ruoku Chosa Jigyo Hokoku* [Report on English Proficiency Survey for the English education reform]. Retrieved September 2, 2015, from http://www.mext.go.jp.

Mishler, E.G. (1986). *Research Interviewing: Context and narrative.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Miyazato, K. (2009). Power-Sharing between NS and NNS Teachers: Linguistically powerful AETs vs. culturally powerful JTEs. *JALT Journal*, 31-1: 35-62.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Constructing the Frame in Intrasentential Codeswitching. *Multilingua,* 11-1: 101-127.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social Motivations for Code-Switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Claredon.

Nealon, J. (1998) *Alterity Politics: Ethics and performative subjectivity*. Duke University Press.

Ng, P. (2014). Local Contextual Factors in the Japanese EFL Classroom. In P. Ng & Boucher, E.Y. (Ed.) *Local Contextual Influences on Teaching: Narrative insights from ESL and EFL professionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp.1-16.

Ogane, E. (1997). Code-Switching in EFL Learner Discourse. *JALT Journal*, 19-1, 106-123.

Oliver, D.G. et al. (2005). Constraints and Opportunities with Interview Transcription: Toward reflection in qualitative research. *Social Forces*, 84-2: 1273-1289.

Omaggio-Hadley, A. (1993). *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston. MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Parker, I. (1998). *Social Constructionism, Discourse and Realism: Inquiries in social construction*. London: SAGE Publications.

Pigott, J. (2015). English-as-Panacea: Untangling ideology from experience in compulsory English education in Japan. In D.J. Rivers (Ed.), *Resistance to the Known: Counter-conduct in language education.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.216-234.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *Linguistics*, 18-7/8: 581-618.

Rabbidge, M. & Chapelle, P. (2014). Exploring Non-native English Speaker Teachers' Classroom Language Use in South Korean Elementary Schools. *TESL-EJ*, 17-4: 1-18.

Rampton, B. (2003). *Coming to Ethnography from a Background in Teaching*. Paper presented at the UKLEF Colloquium at BAAL Annual Meeting, 4-6

September 2003, University of Leeds: Linguistic Ethnography at the Interface with Education.

Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-Hymesian Linguistic Ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11-5: 584-607.

Rampton, B. et al. (2006). *The Meanings of Ethnicity in Discursive Interaction: Some data and interpretations from linguistic ethnography*. Paper presented at a workshop on ethnicities organised by the ESRC Identities & Social Action Programme, June 2006.

Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation (trans. D. Savage)*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1991). Narrative Identity. *Philosophy Today*, 35: 73-81.

Romaine, S. (1990). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sadeghi, S. et al. (2012). Application of Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis (CCDA) in Analyzing Classroom Interaction. *English Language Teaching*, 5-1: 166-173.

Sato, M. (2011). Imagining Neo-Liberalism and the Hidden Realities of the Politics of Reform: Teachers and students in a globalized Japan. In D.B Willis & J. Rappleye (Ed.), *Reimagining Japanese Education: Border, transfers, circulations, and the comparative*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 225-246.

Sato, N.E. (2004). *Inside Japanese Classrooms: The heart of education*. London: Routledge.

Sealey, A. (2007). Linguistic Ethnography in Realist Perspective. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11-5: 641-660.

Sealey, A. & Carter, B. (2004). *Applied Linguistics as Social Science*. London:

Continuum.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The Idea of English in Japan*. NY: Multilingual Matters.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Second Language Classroom: A Conversational Analysis Perspective.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Shimahara, N.K. (2002). *Teaching in Japan: A cultural perspective*. London: Routledge.

Simms, K. (2003). *Paul Ricoeur*. London: Routledge.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slimani, A. (2001). Evaluation of Classroom Interaction. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Ed.), *English Language Teaching in Its Social Context: A reader*. London: Routledge, pp.287-305.

SØndergaard, B. (1991). Switching Between Seven Codes within One Family: A linguistic resource. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12-1/2: 85-93.

Squires, A. (2009). Methodological Challenges in Cross-Language Qualitative Research: A research review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies,* 46-2: 277-287.

Stapleton, P. (2000). Culture’s Role in TEFL: An Attitude Survey in Japan. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 13-3: 291-305.

Tarone, E., Cohen, A. & Dumas, G. (1983). A Closer Look at Some Interlanguage Terminology: A framework for communication strategies. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (Ed.) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman, pp. 4-14.

Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, pp. 25-73.

Taylor, F. (2013). *Self and Identity in Adolescent Foreign Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Temple, B. & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative Research and Translation Dilemmas. *Qualitative Research,* 4-2: 161-178.

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative Research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York: Falmer.

Tsukamoto, M. & Tsujioka, N. (2013). Teaching English through English to Senior High School Students in Japan. *The Bulletin of Shitennoji University*, 55: 308-324.

van Dijk, T. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and Peace.* Aldershot, UK: Dartmouth, pp. 17-33.

van Leeuwen, T.A. (1996). *Text and Practice*. London: Routledge.

van Lier, L. (2001). Constraints and Resources in Classroom Talk: Issues of equality and symmetry. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Ed.), *English Language Teaching in Its Social Context: A reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 90-107.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Wei, L. (2006). Bilingualism. In Brown, K. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (2nd Ed.)*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Wenger, E. (2000). *Communities of Practice*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. (2007). A Step Too Far: Discursive psychology, linguistic ethnography and questions of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11-5: 661-681.

Willis, D.B. & Rappleye, J. (Ed.) (2011). *Reimagining Japanese Education: Border,* *transfers, circulations, and the comparative*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Wodak, R. et al. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity (2nd Ed.)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Woolard, K.A. (2006). Codeswitching. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp.73-94.

Yavuz, F. (2012). The Attitudes of English Teachers about the Use of L1 in the Teaching of L2. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46: 4339-4344.

Yoneyama, S. (1999). *The Japanese High School: Silence and resistance*. London: Routledge.

Yoshino, K. (1992). *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan: A sociological enquiry*. London: Routledge.

APPENDIX 1: DATA GATHERING DOCUMENTS

1. Project Summary

Name of Researcher: Jeremie Bouchard
Institution: The University of Birmingham, Birmingham, U.K.
Research Title: Interrogating the Process of Identity Formation and Negotiation in Japanese Junior High School EFL Classrooms
Start & Finish Dates: January 9, 2012 – January 9, 2016

（自己紹介）

私はカナダの大学にて第２ヶ国語英語教員免許を取得して来日。公立の中学校（道外）で１年、私立の中学高等学校（市内）で 9 年間英語講師をさせて頂きました。
来日中、オーストラリアの大学院にて英語教育の修士を取得し、現在は北海学園大学で講師を務めながら、イギリスの大学で博士号取得の為、更なる勉学と研究をしております。

（研究内容等・日本語）

私の研究は、外国語を取得する中でアイデンティティを確立していく過程に注目しています。
研究項目は、a)文部科学省の中学校英語教育方針、b)中学校 3 年生の英語教材、c）中学校 3 年生の英語授業の談話（言語使用）状況、の 3 点です。
英語を教え学ぶ授業の中で、どのように EFL の先生（日本人の先生）と生徒がアイデンティティを扱うのかを調べます。これらを確認するために、札幌市内の公立私立中学校へ出向き、できれば、EFL の先生にお会いし、通常の英語授業を１０回程度観察し、さらに録音させて頂きます。私の存在は授業の邪魔にならないよう配慮したいと思います。
もし、先生がご希望であれば、授業の補助など、ボランティアで協力することも可能です。
参加者の名前や個人情報は、学校の名前や場所同様に決して明らかにはしません。生徒がこの研究に参加したくない、または研究の対象になることを希望しないこともできます。
（その学生の談話は取り扱いいたしません）
私の研究では、授業に参加する全ての生徒の参加や談話を必要とはしていません。
必要であれば、もっと詳しいプライバシーや匿名性に関する規則についての情報をお伝えいたします。
この現場調査を含む私の研究が、今後、日本の EFL システムや外国語習得におけるアイデンティティの確立に関係する大切な課題として話題にされていくことを願います。

（研究内容等・英語）

My research focus is the process of identity formation with regard to foreign language learning. My objects of study are a) MEXT policies pertaining to junior high school EFL education, b) EFL textbooks used in junior high school third year EFL classes, and c) discourse practices in junior high school third year EFL classrooms. In short, it is an ethnographic look into the Japanese EFL system. More specifically, I interrogate how EFL teachers and students negotiate identities while engaging in classroom language learning and teaching. To address these issues, I plan to go to different schools in the Sapporo region and meet with EFL teachers at each school. I plan to observe and audio record 10 hours of regular classroom periods. My presence in the classrooms will be non-intrusive. I also volunteer my services to the school and to the teachers involved if needed. The names and personal references of the participants, as well as the school's name and precise location, will not be revealed throughout the study under any circumstance. It is perfectly acceptable for a student not to participate or to withdraw from the study at all time. The nature and structure of my research is not dependent on the full participation of all students in a classroom. If required, I can provide further information regarding participants' anonymity and privacy. Hopefully, this research will address important issues pertaining to the Japanese EFL system and to the process of identity formation with regard to foreign language learning.

Jeremie Bouchard
July 22, 2013

2. Information sheet

Interrogating the Relationship between Discourse and EFL Practices at the Junior High School Level
INFORMATION SHEET
中学校における英語の授業と英語教育実践の関係性の研究　情報記載書

Dear parents, teachers and students.
保護者・教員・生徒各位

I very much appreciate your time and attention. In this document, my goal is to summarize my research project as simply and as clearly as I can. But if you have any question, I encourage you to either ask me in person or contact me (see contact information below).

本件にお時間とご配慮をいただき、感謝申し上げます。この文書は、研究課題をできる限り簡潔かつ明確にまとめて報告することを目的としております。もし、質問があれば、私に個人的に質問、またはご連絡いただけますようお願いいたします（下記の連絡先をご覧ください）。

In my research, I study discourse practices in junior high school EFL classrooms, junior high school EFL textbooks and Government policies guiding junior high school EFL education. During my stay at Hiraoka Chuo Junior High School, I plan to a) observe and audio-record 10 regular classroom periods (of 50 minutes each), b) transcribe and analyze the recorded data, c) conduct a survey among teachers and students, and d) interview teachers. Throughout the data collection stage, it will not be necessary for the participants to use English.

私は中学校の英語学習学級内の英語の授業実践、中学校英語教科書、そして中学校の英語教育の指針となる政府政策についての研究を行っています。私が平岡中央中学校に滞在する間、私はa)通常の10回分の授業（各45分）の観察、録音、b）録音されたデータの書き起こし、分析、c）先生方と生徒を対象とした質問紙調査、d）先生とのインタビュー調査を予定しています。参加者はデータを収集する過程で、英語を使う必要はありません。

Here are some of the possible questions you may have concerning the study. Throughout the classroom data collection stage:

下記は、データ収集段階での本調査に関して予想されるいくつかの質問例です。

1) Will the researcher’s presence be intrusive?

   研究者の存在がじゃまにでは？

   No. My intention is to observe how classrooms are actually conducted, and so I do not intend to change or influence the normal course of events.

いいえ。私の目的はクラスの授業が実際どのように行われているか観察することであり、普段授業に変化や影響を与えることを目的としていません。

2) Will students be required to submit written work to me?

生徒の皆さんは研究者にプリントなどの提出を求められますか？

No work will be collected for the purpose of this study. However, students will be asked to complete an attitude survey near the end of the classroom data collection stage.

本調査の目的のために書いた作品が集められることはありません。しかしながら、生徒の皆さん達には授業データ収集の最終段階でアンケートを書いてもらいます。

3) Who will have access to the data collected?

誰が収集されたデータを利用できますか？

No one other than me (Jérémie Bouchard) will be able to listen to the audio recordings. I will transcribe these recordings, making sure that the details of the participants and the schools remain confidential. To do that, I will use a special coding system to identify participants.

私（ジェレミー ブシャー）以外の誰も録音された音声を聞くことはありません。私は録音された音声を書き起こし、調査参加者、そして学校の詳細は極秘にされる保証します。そのため，参加者の識別には特別の符号化を用います。

4) How will the data be recorded?

どのようにデータは録音されるのでしょうか？

I will only use an audio recorder to collect classroom data and data from teachers’ interviews. No video recordings will be made throughout the entire study.

授業データと先生とのインタビューデータ収集に用いられるのは音声レコーダーのみです。この研究を通して、ビデオでの録画は一切行いません。

5) What should I do if I do not want to participate in the study, or if I want to withdraw from the study?

もし、この研究に参加を望まない場合又はこの研究の参加を辞退希望する場合はどうしたら良いですか？

If a student does not wish to participate, or wishes to withdraw from the study at any time, it is perfectly acceptable to communicate his/her intention to me directly or to his/her homeroom teacher. In this case, I will simply eliminate any data produced by that student.

もし、生徒の皆さんが本調査への参加を望まない場合、または辞退を希望する場合は、いつでもその意思を直接私に、または担当の先生にお伝えください。その場合、対象となる生徒のデータを消去いたします。

6) How will the data be used?

どのようにデータは使われるのですか？

The findings from this study will form the bulk of my doctoral research project, and will be shared mainly in articles to be published in academic journals and in academic presentations.

この研究からの結果は私の博士論文研究の一部分になります。そして、それらは主に学術誌の研究論文として、または学術発表という形で共有されます。

7) What should I do if I have more questions?

さらに質問がある場合はどうしたらよいでしょうか？

If required, I can provide further information regarding the study and/or participants’ anonymity and privacy.

必要であれば、この研究、および参加者の匿名性、個人情報についての更に詳しい情報を提供いたします。

If you agree to participate in this study, please sign the consent form attached to the present document. Please give one copy to the homeroom teacher (which I will keep) and keep one copy for your own records. Hopefully, this research project will address important issues pertaining to junior high school EFL education. I greatly appreciate your help and support. Thank you very much.

この研究へ参加していただけるのであれば、この文書に付された同意書に署名をお願いいたします。そして、担任の先生へお渡しください。この研究が平岡中央中学校の英語教育に寄与すると共に、今後の英語教育の重要な問題に取り組めることを願っています。皆様のご協力に心より感謝いたします。ありがとうございます。

Jérémie Bouchard
EFL Lecturer, PhD candidate
Faculty of Humanities

Dr. Alison Sealey
PhD supervisor
Senior Lecturer in Modern English Language
School of English, Drama and American & Canadian Studies
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2TT
United Kingdom

3. Consent form for teachers

Interrogating the Relationship between Discourse and EFL Practices at the Junior High School Level

CONSENT FORM (Teacher)

中学校における英語の授業と英語教育実践の関係性の研究　参加同意書（指導者用）

Please check the box on the right to indicate your consent

右側にある四角をチェックし、あなたが同意したことを示してください。

1) I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet attached to this form dated August 20, 2013, and have had the opportunity to ask questions. 私はこの文書に付された 2013 年 8 月 20 日の情報記載書を読み、理解し、そして質問する機会を得たことを承認します。	□
2) I understand that my participation is voluntary. 私は普段の授業と同じである。	□
3) I understand that my identity will not be revealed under any circumstance. 私プライバシーが保証されることを理解しています。	□
4) I allow the researcher to share the results of this study in his PhD dissertation, academic journals and academic presentations. 私は本研究者が本調査の結果を彼の博士論文、学術誌または学術発表で共有することを許可します。	□
5) I understand that there is no compensation, financial or otherwise, for participating in this study. 私は本調査の参加に対しての一切の報酬、金銭的支払いがないことを理解しています。	□
6) I agree to take part in this study. 私は本調査に参加することに同意します。	□

Name of Participant: ____________________
参加者名
Signature: ____________________
署名
Date: ____________________
日付

Principal Investigator: ____________________
研究責任者
Signature: ____________________
署名
Date: ____________________
日付

4. Consent form for students

Interrogating the Relationship between Discourse and EFL Practices at the Junior High School Level
CONSENT FORM (Students)
中学校における英語の授業と英語教育実践の関係性の研究　参加同意書（生徒用）

Please check the box on the right to indicate your consent.

右側にある四角をチェックし、あなたが同意したことを示してください。

7) I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet attached to this form dated August 20, 2013, and have had the opportunity to ask questions. 私はこの文書に付された 2013 年 8 月 20 日の情報記載書を読み、理解し、そして質問する機会を得たことを承認します。	☐
8) I understand that my participation is voluntary. 私は普段の授業と同じである。	☐
9) I understand that my identity will not be revealed under any circumstance. 私プライバシーが保証されることを理解しています。	☐
10) I allow the researcher to share the results of this study in his PhD dissertation, academic journals and academic presentations. 私は本研究者が本調査の結果を彼の博士論文､学術誌または学術発表で共有することを許可します。	☐
11) I understand that there is no compensation, financial or otherwise, for participating in this study. 私は本調査の参加に対しての一切の報酬､金銭的支払いがないことを理解しています。	☐
12) I agree to take part in this study. 私は本調査に参加することに同意します。	☐

Name of Participant: ______________________
参加者名
Signature: ______________________
署名
Date: ______________________
日付

Principal Investigator: ______________________
研究責任者
Signature: ______________________
署名
Date: ______________________
日付

5. Consent form for parents

Interrogating the Relationship between Discourse and EFL Practices at the Junior High School Level
CONSENT FORM (Parents)
中学校における英語の授業と英語教育実践の関係性の研究　参加同意書（保護者用）

Please check the box on the right to indicate your consent.

右側にある四角をチェックし、あなたが同意したことを示してください。

13) I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet attached to this form dated August 20, 2013, and have had the opportunity to ask questions. 私はこの文書に付された2013年8月20日の情報記載書を読み、理解し、そして質問する機会を得たことを承認します。	□
14) I understand that my child's participation is voluntary. 私の子供は普段の授業と同じである。	□
15) I understand that my child's identity will not be revealed under any circumstance. 私プライバシーが保証されることを理解しています。	□
16) I allow the researcher to share the results of this study in his PhD dissertation, academic journals and academic presentations. 私は本研究者が本調査の結果を彼の博士論文、学術誌または学術発表で共有することを許可します。	□
17) I understand that there is no compensation, financial or otherwise, for participating in this study. 私は本調査の参加に対しての一切の報酬、金銭的支払いがないことを理解しています。	□
18) I give permission for my child to take part in this study. 私は私の子どもが本調査に参加することを許可します。	□

Name of Participant: ______________________
参加者名
Signature: ______________________
署名
Date: ______________________
日付

Principal Investigator: ______________________
研究責任者
Signature: ______________________
署名
Date: ______________________
日付

APPENDIX 2: SAMPLE OF CLASSROOM TRANSCRIPT

Sakura JHS – Classroom 9 (June 26 – 8:55 – 9:45)

italics =	words in Japanese
[square brackets] =	back channels and other short utterances by one interlocutor while the other is speaking
(parentheses) =	general notes on events or non-verbal behaviors significant to what is happening during the dialog
underlined =	further specifying where codes relate to specific sections of the interview

1) From 0:51 to 1:03 (recording time) – asking students to tell me five things they did during their recent school trip.

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
	1	Takahashi-kun:	*eh dare kurun desu ka*?
	2	One boy:	*ie ie mo ikko mai choudai.*
	3	Mr. Ono:	*ano ne kankoku kara no kyaku san* (inaudible)
	4	Takahashi-kun:	*sore wa ichi nen* (inaudible)
C-*Ni*-foim	5	Another boy:	(inaudible) *kita chousen*.
	6	Mr. Ono:	*kita chousen janakute.*
C-*Ni*-cont	7	Another boy:	*nante iu no anata*?

2) From 1:34 to 1:54 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
	1	Mr. Ono:	*ano kami desu ga ato de-*
	2	One boy:	*saigo ni narimashita.*
	3	Mr. Ono:	*ano-*
	4	Another boy:	*yabureterun ja.*
C-*UE*-code	5	Mr. Ono:	*ato kara mata renraku wo shimasu. kyou daseru hito wa ya kyou daseru hito kudasai.*
	6	First boy:	*hai.*
	7	Mr. Ono:	*hai ja uh* first first this sheet, do you have this sheet? Have this sheet?
	8	Same boy:	*ore uh-*
	9	Some students:	No no no.
	10	Mr. Ono:	No? *dewa* tomorrow tomorrow.
	11	One boy:	*hai hai hai.*

3) From 3:28 to 4:11 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uewt	1	Mr. Ono:	OK, good morning.
	2	Chorus:	Good morning.
	3	Mr. Ono:	Today is uh Bouchard *sensei* ninth time?
	4	Bouchard:	That's right. Ninth time.
	5	Mr. Ono:	Yeah ah OK so-
	6	One boy:	Oh.
	7	Mr. Ono:	Today's ninth time and-
	8	Another boy:	*kyu nichi.*
	9	Mr. Ono:	Only one time Bouchard *sensei* will come. Only one time. Bouchard *sensei* comes to Sakura JHS ten
	10		times. So today's nine.
	11	One boy:	*honto ni kaeshitakunai.*
	12	Mr. Ono:	Next time is mmh-
	13	One boy:	Goodbye.
	14	Some boys:	(laughing)
	15	Bouchard:	Next time is last time.
	16	Mr. Ono:	Next time is the last time
	17	Some students:	Ah *so desu ka*? Eh.
	18	Mr. Ono:	Let's start.

4) From 9:17 to 10:26 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uewt	1	Mr. Ono:	Ok so today- so close your textbook. Close your textbook.
	2	Takahashi-kun:	Why? Why?
	3	One boy:	No, thank you.
C-*UE*-code	4	Mr. Ono:	Yes, thank you. (writing on the board) Look here. *kore sa mazu mina san sa* Program 4- sorry, open your
+	5		books to page 42 again. 40 O-open you books to page 42 please. What do you think? What do you
C-*UE*-uest	6		think? *nani ga ki ga tsuita koto arimasu ka* what do you think?
	7	Takahashi-kun:	*hai.*
	8	Mr. Ono:	*dozo*.
	9	Takahashi-kun:	(inaudible)
	10	Mr. Ono:	*so desu ne migi gaki ni page ni natteiru koto ga*… (pointing out some structural and content differences
	11		between pages 42 and 43 and other pages in the book)

5) From 12:14 to 12:48 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uest	1	Mr. Ono:	*dewa* at first at first *mou ichido* one more check the new words. Check the new words. Last time uh last
	2		week, we checked new words, OK? We checked the new words-
	3	Takahashi-kun:	No no no no no.
	4	Mr. Ono:	*ie ie ikkai yattemasu yo ne. ano purinto kubatte*.
	5	Some boys:	Ah.
C-*UE*-code	6	Mr. Ono:	*yon no ichi yon no ni yon no san no zenbun* new words *wo sa* check *wo shita no oboetemasu yo.*

	7	Takahashi-kun:	Ah.
C-*UE*-uest	8	Mr. Ono:	*daketo daibu mo* long time ago. *nano de-*
	9	One boy:	Ago.
	10	Mr. Ono:	*mou ichido yattekitai to omou.*
	11	Same boy:	Oh oh.
C-*UE*-uewt	12	Mr. Ono:	*dewa* look at the sheet or textbook. (setting up the CD player)

6) From 14:07 to 14:30 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uest	1	Mr. Ono:	(writing the word ‘hear’ on board) What does it mean? Means, it mean-
	2	A few boys:	*kiku.*
	3	Mr. Ono:	Thank you. (inaudible) Hear *dozo*.
	4	Chorus:	Hear.
	5	Mr. Ono:	Heard.
	6	Chorus:	Heard.
	7	Mr. Ono:	*demo mina san kore kiita toki ni-* (writing on board)
	8	Takahashi-kun:	*so omoimashita*.
	9	Mr. Ono:	so good boy. Good boy.

7) From 15:26 to 15:38 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uest +	1	Mr. Ono:	*mochiron kore wa ne* I run very hard *watashi wa isshoukenmei hashiru toka so iu kanji*. *hai dewa* next
C-*UE*-code	2		page page 43 please.

8) From 19:04 to 19:30 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-code	1	Takahashi-kun:	*nan nin kurun desu ka*?
	2	Mr. Ono:	Four s- four four teachers.
	3	Takahashi-kun:	*nani jin desu ka*?
	4	Mr. Ono:	Korean.
	5	Takahashi-kun:	Korean *de dake desu ka*?
	6	Mr. Ono:	And Japanese.
	7	Some boys:	Eh.
	8	Mr. Ono:	Interpreter. Interpreter is the correct pronunciation?
	9	Bouchard:	Interpreter, that’s right.
	10	Mr. Ono:	Interpreter *tte dou iu imi desu ka*?
	11	One boy:	(inaudible)
C-*Ni*-foim +	12	Mr. Ono:	Korea Korean Korean can’t Ja- can’t understand Japanese. So in- we need interpreters.
C-*UE*-uest	13	One boy:	*tsuyaku*.
	14	Mr. Ono:	Very good. Very good. Very good.

9) From 22:15 to 23:56 (recording time) – (as the Korean visitor arrived)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
	1	One boy:	Ah *kimashita*.
	2	Mr. Ono:	*hai*.
	3	Some students:	*konnichiwa*.
C-*Ni*-cont	4	Takahashi-kun:	anyuu haseo.
	5	Korean visitor:	anyuu haseo.
	6	Some students:	Oh. anyuu haseo.
	7	Korean visitor:	anyuu haseo.
C-*UE*-uewt	8	Mr. Ono:	So, look at this sheet. Look at this sheet. So, front side please. Front side please. What do you think
	9		about this sheet? What do you think about it? And please look back side. Please look at the back side.
	10		What do you think? And please look at your textbook. What do you think? Long story. But- I made this
	11		sheet. This three sections, here. And back side. A little long. And the textbook, page 42, 43, 44. Long
	12		and long and long. What do you think?
	13	Some boys:	(inaudible)
C-*UE*-uest	14	Mr. Ono:	Do you understand? *nani iitai ka iu to mazu kono eibun yomu mae ni minasan sa nagai to omottara*
	15		*nagai desu yo*.

10) From 24:37 to 24:47 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uest	1	Mr. Ono:	*demo so iu toki do yatte yomi susumeru ka tte iu to suisoku suru*.
	2	One boy:	Guess.
	3	Mr. Ono:	Uh *atteru* guess very good very good. Guess.
C-*UE*-uewt	4	Same boy:	Guess what?
	5	Mr. Ono:	Guess what? Guess what?
	6	Some students:	(laughing)

11) From 25:01 to 26:47 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-code	1	Mr. Ono:	At first, *ne* please look here. Look here. Please look here. *mazu kore wo tsukatte, mazu kore wo*
	2		*tsukatte. de* last time, we listen the CD listen to CD. And the keyword is *futatsu arimashita ne*. (writing on
C-*UE*-uest	3		board) So please remember last week. What is the keyword of this story? Anyone?
	4	Takahashi-kun:	Pillow.
	5	One boy:	*makura*.
	6	Mr. Ono:	Pillow. Thank you good. Pillow.
	7	Same boy:	*makura*.

C-*UE*-uewt	8	Mr. Ono:	*makura* good. And is this a funny story, or sad story?
	9	Some students:	Funny story.
	10	Mr. Ono:	Funny story. Very good. Funny story. So at first sorry please don't look. Don't look. Only listening only
	11		listening. Please look.
	12	One boy:	Oh.
	13	Mr. Ono:	At first first time only listening. Don't look textbook and sheet. (setting CD recording) Today, little busy.

12) From 29:51 to 32:23 (recording time)

Code	**Line#**	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
C-*UE*-uewt	1	Mr. Ono:	So last week you listen to CD. You can learn the pillow, the key word is the pillow. And funny story. What
	2		else can you think today? What else can you remember? No?
	3	One student:	(inaudible)
	4	Mr. Ono:	(inaudible) What else?
	5	Another student:	(inaudible)
C-*UE*-uest	6	Mr. Ono:	Yeah good. *nihongo* OK. Japanese OK.
	7	Same student:	(barely audible – seems to be explaining the content of the story on pages 42, 43 and 44)
	8	Mr. Ono:	Very good. *hakase ga hatsumei shita ima no happyou desu ga hakase hatsumei shita makura wo*
	9		*tameshite mita. soshitara ne sono musume san ga ma mei koto de sono iutteita tte iu kokoro made*
C-*UE*-code	10		*kimashita ne.* Anyone? *nandemo ii desu* keyword *tatoeba-. ja* OK. How many characters can you h-
+	11		listen?
C-*UE*-uewt	12	Some students:	Three.
	13	Mr. Ono:	Three three three three three. So open your books to pages 42 and 43. One, two, three.
	14	One boy:	Four four four.
	15	Mr. Ono:	Four?
	16	Some students:	(laughing)
	17	Same boy:	(inaudible) *neko.*
	18	Mr. Ono:	And four-
	19	Same boy:	Four four four.
	20	Mr. Ono:	Yeah. Three people and one cat. OK?
	21	Some students:	OK.
C-*UE*-code	22	Mr. Ono:	No? su- cat *wa chigau* not cat. *dewa* how many people? So three, the answer is three. And *hoka* any
C-*UE*-uest	23		other keywords? *nan ka ki ga tsuita koto.*
	24	One boy:	*ni ka getsu go*.
C-*UE*-code	25	Mr. Ono:	*ni ka getsu go. ni ka getsu kan tameshita tte iu* (inaudible) *kakaretemashita yo ne.* Anyone? *dewa* so we
	26		take two minutes. Please talk your partner or *tate* or *yoko* or *naname.* Please talk with your classmates
	27		in uh in two minutes about this story. Keyword *wo* keyword *tte muzukashii to omou no de donna hanashi*
	28		*datta ka ima (name of students) tte iutte kuremashita.*

13) From 35:12 to 36:53 (recording time)

Code	**Line#**	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
	1	Mr. Ono:	OK so do you need more time? Yes, I do *de* do you need more time? No no no no no. So so Bouchard
	2		*sensei*.
	3	Bouchard:	Yes?
	4	Mr. Ono:	Is it e-easy story or difficult story?
	5	Bouchard:	I think it's an easy story.
	6	Mr. Ono:	Easy story.
	7	Bouchard:	Easy?
	8	Some students:	Yes.
	9	Bouchard:	A little easy?
	10	Some students:	Yes.
C-*UE*-code	11	Mr. Ono:	A little easy *da to watashi omou*. Easy *da chotto nai kana to omoimasu.* Easy *kantan tte iu imi desu*. In
+	12		your country-
C-*UE*-uest	13	Bouchard:	Mmh.
	14	Mr. Ono:	What age is the suitable?
	15	Bouchard:	This?
	16	Mr. Ono:	This story, yes.
	17	Bouchard:	Mmh, in Canada, English part of Canada, English part of Canada, this is maybe elementary school third
	18		fourth year?
	19	Mr. Ono:	Third or four year, so-
	20	Bouchard:	English part.
C-*UE*-code	21	Mr. Ono:	Third or four *nano de* so eight or nine years old?
	22	Bouchard:	Eight or nine years old. But in the French part of Canada, where I am from, this is mmh about your age.
	23		About your age. Twelve or thirteen years old-
	24	Mr. Ono:	*wakarimashita*?
	25	One boy:	*hai.*
	26	Takahashi-kun:	*san* uh *hassai*?
C-*UE*-code	27	Mr. Ono:	*daitai* En- *eigo eigo tsukatteru kuni no hito* eh *gomen nasai* Canada *no eigo wo ne tsukatteru tte iu*
	28		*kodomotachi ni totte wa san yon nensei* third or third or fourth grade.
	29	Another boy:	Eh.
C-*UE*-code	30	Mr. Ono:	But in French- French *wa*? What is French in Japanese?
+	31	Some students:	*furansugo*.
C-*UE*-uest	32	Mr. Ono:	*furansugo* good. Good very good. *furansugo tsukatteru tte* like like you. Like you *tte iutte mo* like you
C-*UE*-uest	33		*anata ga suki ja nai desu yo ne. kono-*
	34	Some students:	(laughing)
	35	Mr. Ono:	So so so, good. (writing on board)

14) From 43:10 to 44:16 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-code	1	Mr. Ono:	So look here. Look at the TV. So, how many characters? One first is *dare*?
	2	One student:	(whispering) Dr. F.
	3	Mr. Ono:	Dr. F. Thank you. *koko desu yo ne* Dr. F. Dr. F. And next?
	4	Some students:	Neighbor.
	5	Mr. Ono:	Neighbor. And last?
	6	Takahashi-kun:	Neighbor's-
	7	One boy:	Daughter.
	8	Takahashi-kun:	Daughter.
C-*UE*-uewt	9	Mr. Ono:	Neighbor's daughter. So, any comments or, no? Other comment? No?
	10	Takahashi-kun:	No.
	11	Mr. Ono:	No. *dewa* now next *nan no koto wa dare desu ka tte iu koto de kore wa-* (turns around and writes on
	12		board)

15) From 45:13 to 45:30 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uewt	1	Mr. Ono:	Nervous? Very nervous today? We have five guests and Bouchard *sensei*. So you are very nervous. *dou*
	2		*desu ka*? *manabi to makura no kankei dou deshita*?
	3	Some students:	(inaudible)
	4	Mr. Ono:	*ma* eh *dekinakatta.*
	5	One boy:	*amari kankei nai desu*.
	6	Mr. Ono:	Uh. (turns around and writes on board)

16) From 51:32 to 52:10 (recording time) – (after chorus rehearsal of text on pages 42, 43 and 44)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
C-*UE*-uewt	1	Mr. Ono:	Very good voice. Loudly, very good. So homework. Homework. Please practice reading 5 times. OK?
	2	Some students:	OK.
	3	Mr. Ono:	At home, OK?
	4	Two students:	OK.
	5	Mr. Ono:	OK, thank you. And please bring- I think tomorrow is no English class. Yes. Friday. Two days a- later two
	6		days after after tomorrow. Please bring this sheet, today's sheet OK?
	7	Takahashi-kun:	*hai*.
	8	Mr. Ono:	OK. OK. That's all for today. Goodbye.
	9	Chorus:	Goodbye.

APPENDIX 3: FIELD NOTE TEMPLATE

School: ___________________ Date: ____________________ Time: ____________________

Teacher: _________________ Class #: __________________

Physical characteristics of each classroom

Other relevant data

Class objectives and contents

Explicit references to the *nihonjinron* discourse (indicate time of occurrence)

Explicit references to other forms of discourse (indicate time of occurrence)

Advice and comments to teacher

Others

APPENDIX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (WITH INTERVIEW DATES)

(all dates below are in 2013, except when indicated)

Questions	Sakura JHS Mr. Ono	St-Maria J&SHS Ms. Tanaka*	Asahi JHS Ms. Inoue	Heiwa JHS Ms. Ishida**
1. How important is it for Japanese students to learn English?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
2. Do you think English education has an impact on Japanese culture & society?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
3. What are some of the positive aspects of the way in which English is taught in Japanese schools?			10/5	2014.01.28
4. What are some of the negative aspects of the way in which English is taught in Japanese schools?			10/5	2014.01.28
5. What do you think about the recent MEXT policies on EFL education?	5/30		10/5	2014.01.28
6. Are the recent MEXT policies on EFL education important to the way in which you conduct your classes?	5/30		10/5	2014.01.28
7. Do you understand the recent MEXT policies on EFL education?	5/30		10/5	2014.01.28
8. Do you feel you are serving the needs of your Japanese EFL learners?			10/5	2014.01.28
9. What do you think about the textbook you are using (positive/negative aspects)?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
10. Is this textbook teaching cultural content effectively?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
11. What image of the English speaking world is this textbook projecting?			10/5	
12. What have students said about this textbook?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
13. How much of your classroom do you devote to	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28

the textbook, and how much do you devote to other learning materials?				
14. Do you teach the cultural aspects of (learning) English?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
15. How do students respond to cultural content?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
16. How would you define a successful class?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
17. How would you define an unsuccessful class?	6/21		10/5	
18. Do you feel your teacher training was sufficient? Did it prepare you for the job?	6/21		10/5	2014.01.28
19. Do you have time and opportunities to engage in further professional training?	6/21		10/5	
20. Out of the total amount of working hours, how much do you devote to classroom lesson planning, teaching and assessment?	6/21		10/5	
21. How much time do you devote to other responsibilities outside the classroom?	6/21		10/5	
22. How would you improve your teaching practice?			10/5	
23. How should the current EFL system in Japanese JHS be improved?			10/19	
24. What makes language learners successful at learning a language?			10/19	
25. Which is more important for you as a teacher: preparing students for tests or preparing students for communicating in English?	6/21		10/19	
26. Which of these 2 sets of teaching approaches (language testing or CLT) do you devote more time and energy to?	6/21			
27. Do you think your students can eventually become	6/21			

multi-lingual / multicultural individuals?				
28. What is/are the role(s) of native-English speakers in the Japanese EFL system? Are NS of English essential to EFL education in Japan?	6/21		10/19	
29. What are the advantages and disadvantages of having NS of English teach English to Japanese JHS students?	6/21		10/19	
30. In what context(s), and for what purpose(s), are Japanese EFL students most likely to use English in their everyday life?	6/21		10/19	
31. Can the current EFL system prepare Japanese learners to fulfill this/these purpose(s)?				
32. How important is rehearsing English phrases and sentences (alone, with partners, with the whole class) to your class & students' learning in general?	6/21		10/19	
33. When do you require English output from your students, and when do you allow them to use Japanese?			10/19	
34. Have you ever been evaluated by a government official during your class or outside your class?	5/30		10/19	
35. Is there any strategy in place for ensuring that the government policies on EFL education are implemented in the EFL classroom?	5/30			
36. When your students use English in the classroom, do you feel they are genuinely communicating in English or not? Can you describe your impression of your students'				

classroom English use?				
37. Do you think the classes I have observed and recorded were different from the classes I didn't observe?			10/19	
38. Please talk about your language learning experience & how you have learned to teach.			10/5	2014.01.28
39. Do teachers critique each other after they observe each other's classes?		8/2		

* On 2013.08.02, I interviewed Ms. Tanaka for almost an hour and a half continuously. This was the only interview she was able to do. We discussed many of the questions listed above. Her answer to Question #38 can be found in a different interview I had with her at a different time.

** On 2013.11.27, my interview with Ms. Ishida felt more like a conversation, and was essentially about her class. Some questions in the list above were rephrased to suit the context of our conversation.

APPENDIX 5: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT SAMPLE

Asahi JHS – Interview 4 (October 5 – 14:00 – 15:15)

italics =	words in Japanese
[square brackets] =	back channels and other short utterances by one interlocutor while the other is speaking
(parentheses) =	general notes on events or non-verbal behaviors significant to what is happening during the dialog; translations of relevant segments in Japanese
underlined =	further specifying where codes relate to specific sections of the interview

1) From 2:20 to 6:12 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
	1	Bouchard:	Can you begin by explaining for example [uh] why did you decide to become an English teacher [mmh] and
	2		how you became an English teacher?
	3	Ms. Inoue:	OK uh when I was a junior high school tea- uh student [mmh] uh I uh in the first grade [uh] I I don't like English
	4		because I don't know uh what to study [uh] or the much vocab- uh much words. [uh] So I don't know what to do.
	5		[uh] But I uh met a good teacher [uh] (name of teacher) *sensei.* Uh he is uh his class is very uh interesting and
	6		very good [uh] for me, for example using the fo- foreign mmh foreign thing song [uh] English songs [uh] and so I
	7		like I like the subject [uh] English. [uh] So after the last year the third uh I'm sorry the third third grade [uh] I I uh
	8		met my homeroom teacher. He is uh (name of teacher) *sensei* [uh] but he's not English teacher uh social study
	9		teacher. [Ah OK] Uh but he uh my school uh in my school uh not not good uh not good because uh some
	10		students uh running running around and uh fight [uh] with uh teacher. [uh] So it's uh it's Japanese *aruteiru*
	11		(unknown meaning) *aruteiru* (unknown meaning) *ammari* (not so)-
	12	Bouchard:	*aruteiri* So it's undisciplined sort of school.
	13	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes.
	14	Bouchard:	Ah OK.
	15	Ms. Inoue:	But uh but teacher rebuilt [uh] the class the mana- management the class. [uh] Uh so I I want to be such a
	16		(name of teacher) *sensei* and (name of teacher) *sensei*. So I choose teacher's-
	17	Bouchard:	You chose to become a teacher.
	18	Ms. Inoue:	Yes. Teacher.
	19	Bouchard:	OK, very good. And so uh you went to university and the master's too? Did you do a master's?
	20	Ms. Inoue:	Ah no. I didn't master's.
	21	Bouchard:	Ah OK, just uh first four years-
	22	Ms. Inoue:	First four years, yeah.
	23	Bouchard:	OK. And your teacher was *ano* Mr. (name of professor we both knew).
	24	Ms. Inoue:	Ah (name of professor we both knew) *sensei*.
	25	Bouchard:	OK, very good. And you've been working here for two years.
	26	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes, two years. Uh before uh I worked at uh private private high school.
	27	Bouchard:	Ah OK.
	28	Ms. Inoue:	Uh (name of local private high school).
	29	Bouchard:	Ah OK. For how long did you work there?
	30	Ms. Inoue:	Uh about half year. [Ah OK] Uh the this uh before [uh] I worked at the cram school (name of local cram school).
	31	Bouchard:	For two years, right?
	32	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh I went one and a half [Ah OK.] uh because uh I uh in mmh I have something wrong with my body.
	33	Bouchard:	Ah OK.
	34	Ms. Inoue:	I I can't hear too much because of hard working. So wor- I had to quit the uh job.
	35	Bouchard:	OK.
	36	Ms. Inoue:	And so uh the after that work private school. [OK.] But during the working the private school, I mmh passed the
	37		uh junior high school teacher's license. [uh] So uh now I I can work there.

2) From 8:33 to 9:23 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
	1	Bouchard:	How important do you think it is for Japanese students to learn English?
	2	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh uh I think uh it's important for the students [uh] to uh lis- listening something the news. Listening and
I–*Ed*–prio	3		speaking English. [uh] *kana* now students uh can understand how to uh make sentences [uh] and read
I–*Ed*–mac	4		something. [uh] But mmh they didn't know the didn't do the something to uh read and conversation. [uh] So-
	5	Bouchard:	It's more important for them [uh] to learn reading and conversation.
	6	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah.
	7	Bouchard:	OK, very good.

3) From 9:36 to 56:49 (recording time)

Code	Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
	1	Bouchard:	How how important is it to their lives? [mmh] To their lives. Now they're twelve, thirteen, fourteen years old,
	2		right? They have to learn English, right? *Monkasho* says you must learn English. [Yeah] My question to you is
	3		how important is English to these students' lives?
I–*Ni*–enlf	4	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh. It's uh difficult question. Uh but I think uh for adult [uh] uh they need uh le-learn *ka* or for ca- career [uh] is
	5		in in English is uh very important for them.
	6	Bouchard:	Uh so it's important for their careers?
	7	Ms. Inoue:	Uh career or how to think about uh *nan da* *nihon nan ka jibun no kimochi wo tsutaeru toki ni* (Japan uh when
	8		they need to express their feelings) [uh] *eigo ga hitsuyo da to omoun desu*. (English is necessary I think).
	9	Bouchard:	Ah OK.
	10	Ms. Inoue:	*tada nihon nihon-* (Japan Japan)
	11	Bouchard:	They need they need English to communicate their own feelings.
I–*Ni*–cdif	12	Ms. Inoue:	Uh.
	13	Bouchard:	With who? [mmh] Or to who they communicate these feelings?
I–*Ni*–juni	14	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh maybe the OK the other country's people [OK] *mo so iu dashi yappari* (we can say that, but after all) the
	15		same Japanese. But *nihonjin* (Japanese people) uh Japanese people uh I hear hide uh our feelings [uh] *tada*
	16		*nihongo dake de tsutaerarenai koto mo takusan aru to omoun desu* (I think there are many things we can't

		express in Japanese)
	Bouchard:	Ah interesting.
	Ms. Inoue:	*so dakara* uh *eigo toka eigo ja moshi nakatta mo shite mo* (So whether or not it's English) other languages *demo* uh *nan daro jibun no honne to ka mieru no gengo to shite dai nigengo hitsuyo nai ja nai to omou* (to express one's true feelings, I think it's necessary to have another language).
	Bouchard:	So there are some parts of their personality [uh] or their lives [uh] that they can't communicate in Japanese.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yes.
	Bouchard:	English allows them to do this. [uh] And they can communicate this to [uh] uh other Japanese.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yes.
	Bouchard:	Not just foreigners but also Japanese. Interesting. Oh.
I–*Ni*–cdif I–*Ni*–juni	Ms. Inoue:	*nan ka nihongo da to iutteiru koto to warui koto* (in Japanese when you want to say something negative) uh is it OK to say [uh] but it's not OK to say. [Ah] But uh *eigo ha yappa shaberu to nattara ano tsukawanakute ha ano hon chanto shitai koto wo iwanai to tsutawarimasen* (in English, whether or not you are able to speak English, you still have to say exactly what you want to do). Uh *nan da* (how can I say)-
	Bouchard:	So it's important to be clear-
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah *so*. Clear. Unclear is not uh.
	Bouchard:	Mmh you have to be clear in English.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah.
I–*Ni*–cdif	Bouchard:	Do you for you, does is English does English give more freedom-
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh yes *so*.
	Bouchard:	Ah OK. Ah.
	Ms. Inoue:	So I say for students the same *dakara*.
	Bouchard:	You say that to the students?
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmmh.
	Bouchard:	Can you tell me how you say this to the students? For example, if you had the students in front of you, how would you say that? It's a very complex idea, right? [Ah] How do you say that to the students?
I–*Ed*–ente I–*Ni*–cdif I–*Ni*–juni	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh. *nan daro*, uh *nan de eigo manabu to omou tte tatoeba* (for example, why do you think you are learning English?). *tada seito ha ya juken dakara* (students usually say for entrance exams) [uh] uh *kentei dakara* (for proficiency tests). [uh] *tte yappari saishou ni watashi ga* career *no koto omoun desu kedo* (and as I said earlier about careers) [uh], uh *so iu mo so dakedo nihongo dake de tsutaerarenai no koto tte aru yo ne tte yappa* (there are these reasons, but I also point out that there are things we can't express in Japanese).
	Bouchard:	What's their reaction when you say this?
I–*Ni*–cdif I–*Ni*–juni	Ms. Inoue:	*so iu saishou de odoroku desu yo ne* (they are first surprised when I say this) ehh! [Ah] Surprised. *do iu koto tte tte* (they ask me what I mean by that). *ja* (well) please think about it *chotto kangaete toka de minna kangaete mitara* (please think about it for a while, and when everybody does) [uh] *de nihonjin ha honne iwanai nihonjin ha moto moto* (they conclude that Japanese people can't express their true feelings, Japanese are at the heart)-
	Bouchard:	*nihonjin ga honne ga ano nihongo de tsutaenai* (Japanese people can't express their true feelings in Japanese).
	Ms. Inoue:	*so tsutaerarenai* (right, they can't express them).
	Bouchard:	*nihongo de ha kedo eigo de ha* (that's in Japanese, but in English) [*eigo dattara* (if it's in English)] *kanousei ga aru* (it's possible).
I–*Ni*–cdif I–*Ni*–juni	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh *kanosei ga kekko aru* (there are a lot of possibilities). *tashika ni nan ka tatoeba mitame demo irashite futotta to ka* eh (for example, you can tell someone they got fat) (laughing) *nan ka* straight *de ienai koto mo ietai to ka* (you can say things that are difficult to say straightforwardly) [mmh] *nan daro ato chotto kashikoii koe* students *ha* (there are some sly students) [mmh] *nan daro taoeba nan ka ano sensei no jugyou ha tsumannai to ka nemui to ka* (for example who say that this teacher's class is boring, that it makes me feel sleepy) [uh] *so iu koto wo chokusetsu iutte kizutsuke yori ha, jitsu ha suugaku no jugyou no toki nemui* (they can say that directly without having to worry, during the math class I felt sleepy)-
I–*Ni*–cdif I–*Ni*–juni	Bouchard:	So when you say that English allows [uh] students or Japanese people to express [Yes.] thoughts or ideas or feelings [mmh] that are difficult to say in Japanese, do you think this actually happens? Do you think that *kore jitsu ha* (in reality) [mmh] in reality *ha* [mmh] do you think that Japanese people use English to communicate feelings uh that they can't communicate in Japanese?
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh.
	Bouchard:	*jissai ha aru tte kanji* (this happens in reality).
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh *jissai mo* (it actually happens).
	Bouchard:	Mmh, for example, do you express ideas in English [uh] sometimes-
I–*Ed*–actl I–*Ni*–cdif I–*Ni*–juni	Ms. Inoue:	Sometimes mmh for example the for debate [OK.] for debate, uh in second grade uh the students can do the debate uh using the materials. [uh] uh *sore made* for example it's uh homeroom time [uh] *nan daro jikan nan daro gakkatsu no toki* (when it's time to talk about school activities) [uh] *toka* uh please talk about *chotto hanashi aimashio tte iutte mo tabun koko de motette mo ienai ko mo itte, tada eigo nara to shabereru ko kekkou iru to omou* (if I say let's share our ideas some children will still be unable to say something, but if it was in English there may be quite a lot of students who could speak out).
	Bouchard:	In your class, here at this school [uh] do you have discussions like this or debates like this?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh, yes debate.
	Bouchard:	You do?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh, yeah.
	Bouchard:	What for example, tell me an example of a debate that you have in your class.
	Ms. Inoue:	In English?
	Bouchard:	Yeah.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah, uh for example uh last year I choose topic uh for uh (inaudible) *nan no koto yatta kana* (what did I do?) *eto*-
	Bouchard:	This is *chuugakkou san nensei* (junior high school third year)? Uh *chuugakkou*-
I–*Ed*–actl	Ms. Inoue:	Ah uh *chuu ni ni nensei* (junior high school second year).
I–*Ed*–clt	Bouchard:	*chuu ni nensei de* (in junior high school second year) [uh *so*] debate in English.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yes, agree. Uh student lea- learn about agree and disagree [uh, OK.] and why, because *to ka tsukatte* [mmh] *de yattan desu kedo, nani yatta* (I did, but what did I do?) First uh Japanese restaurant and uh fo- foreign restaurant. [uh] *nihon shoku to, nihon shoku no* restaurant *to* (Japanese food, Japanese restaurant and) [uh] *gaikoku* restaurant *dochira ka suki* (foreign restaurant which do you like?) which uh [uh] one do you like? Why? Because, *dochira hou ga ninki ga aru* (which one is popular?).
	Bouchard:	So, [uh] talking about preferences we say likes and dislikes uh what do you like and what you dislike, so that's opinion and then [eh] uh support this [uh] with reason and something like this.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yes.

Bouchard: OK. [uh] Uh do students enjoy these class?

Ms. Inoue: Yes [mmh] uh they enjoy. Uh they uh separate the half uh *nihon shoku to* (Japanese food versus)-

Bouchard: Ah (laughing).

Ms. Inoue: *so* (laughing) *de yatte* (we do) uh for example, students say uh the Japanese restaurant is very good but the other students but you go you you went to the McDonald, how do you *to ka* (laughing).

Bouchard: Ah.

Ms. Inoue: Mac *iku jan mai nichi* (But you go to McDonald's every day) (inaudible).

I–*Ed*–engu Bouchard: So in these debates, when these debates are happening [uh] how much English is used and how much Japanese is used? What's how many percentage of English and how many percentage of-

I–*Ed*–grtr Ms. Inoue: Uh first years uh Japanese write down Japanese. [uh] After that, uh uh translate *ja nai desu kedo tsugi ni eigo kaite mite* (without translating it fully, they rewrite it in English). *mazu omotta koto wo* (first what you think) [uh] uh what do you think? [uh] Uh in the write down the Japanese or English. [uh] So after that uh please translate for English [uh] or something.

I–*Ed*–engu Bouchard: And when they talk to their partners, or when you know you have half the class uh uh *wa shoku* (Japanese food) and half the class *yo shoku* (western food) [uh] and they they they talk [Ah yes.] right? So how much is English and how much is Japanese between the students?

Ms. Inoue: Uh it's uh case by case. But uh this *dono gurai kana* (about how much) maybe I think it's uh sev- *shichi hachi wari nana ka nanaju* (seventy or eighty, seven or seventy) seventy or *hachiju* (eighty) percent uh eighty percent uh in English-

Bouchard: Wow!

Ms. Inoue: *kata koto de* (approximately).

Bouchard: That's good that's good.

I–*Ed*–actl I–*Ed*–clt Ms. Inoue: Uh and then something uh don't know I uh they don't know uh said say in English. [uh] So the support the clever students [uh] *tte* support *suru you ni* (in order to emphasize support) [uh] *chotto* group *mo kangaete* [uh] *tsukutta no* (I made groups).

Bouchard: Ah OK. How often do you do these activities in one year?

Ms. Inoue: Ah one year is uh about uh uh about only three or four-

Bouchard: Only three or four-

Ms. Inoue: Time.

Bouchard: Times a year [Yeah] OK. And uh it's one class one period or two periods or three periods?

Ms. Inoue: Uh about the third period. Three period.

Bouchard: Three periods [Yeah] in a row, right? OK. [uh] Very good. And these kinds of activities [uh] uh in the *kyoukasho* (textbooks) uh there's no debate- [mmh] is is there a debate [uh] kind of language uh (holding textbook) this is for *san nensei* (third year) but in the *ni sensei* (second year) is there a debate activity in the *ni nensei* (second year)?

Ms. Inoue: Ah a little debate uh not debate [uh] but uh says my op- uh do you opinions. [Ah OK.] *ano* agree uh using agree or disagree or [Ah OK] I'm for or I'm against [OK].

Bouchard: So when you do these activities [uh] with the students [uh] is that one hundred percent your idea or is this an idea from the textbook?

I–*Ed*–actl I–*Ed*–clt Ms. Inoue: Ah idea fir- first question Ja- Japanese or the foreign restaurant [uh huh] *toki ha* (when it was about), using textbook. [Ah OK.] But the other uh *ku-* uh title [uh] *nan dattake na* uh *watashi* mmh, ah *chotto mu- muzukashii mondai atta desu yo ne* (there was one which was a little difficult). Is a difficult question. [uh] Uh using uh through the social studies uh *ijime* (bullying) bu-bullying.

I–*Ed*–mora Bouchard: Bullying. Very difficult yeah.

Ms. Inoue: Bullying *ni tsuite na no* (it was about). *ijimeru* uh this year uh the law decided uh *ijimeru* bullying people uh *nan daro kakuri shitari nan ka* (uh hiding) [uh] *houritsu kimattan desu yo ne* (it was decided by law). [mmh] *sore ga kimaru ni tsuite* (since this was decided) [uh] *sansei ka hantai ka* (do you agree or disagree?).

Bouchard: Ah OK. OK. It's a very big problem yeah yeah. OK, very good. Uh you're describing something very interesting about *chuugakkou ni nensei* (junior high school second year) [uh] I uh very happy wow, this is very surprising. But *san nensei* (third year) it's different, right?

I–*Ed*–grtr Ms. Inoue: Oh yes uh so different. Uh *san nensei* (third year) is uh I think uh students have to brush up or [uh] the skill or the grammar [uh] or something. *nan daro gensai kanryou to ka kankei dai meishi* (present perfect or relative pronouns) [uh] *to ka*. So uh con- concentrate on the mmh learning for the grammar, [uh] so the change. And uh a the change as a teacher [uh] part-time teacher *ga* change *kawatta no de chotto soko mo ishiki shite* (the part-time teacher change, so I have to be more conscious of that). [uh] Uh this part, uh now my partner is uh concentrate on the grammar. [OK.] So uh I uh *awase tte iu kanji* (we have to coordinate our efforts).

I–*Ed*–ente Bouchard: You work together [Yeah] Oh, OK, that's good. So your focus in the *san nensei* (third year) is really about preparing the students for the *nyuugaku shiken* (entrance tests) for uh [mmh] high school and everything like that.

Ms. Inoue: Yeah.

Bouchard: Ah OK, very good. [mmh] Alright uh thank you. Very good answer. [uh] Uh let me be a little bit more global. [Ah yeah] Uh global questions so- [Yeah] Do you think English education [uh] uh you know English education in Japan [Yeah] is becoming bigger and more and more important [uh yeah] right? Do you think English education in Japan has an impact on Japanese society and Japanese culture? Do you see [mmh] Japanese society and culture changing because of English education? [mmh] Or not changing?

I–*Ni*–juni Ms. Inoue: I think it's a little uh change [uh] because uh mmh to be a to uh for job hunting [uh] or career up or job [uh] and uh pass the school [uh] I change. But mmh I uh something uh something I don't change uh the Japanese mood [uh] because uh-

Bouchard: The Japanese mood doesn't change.

Ms. Inoue: Mmh. I I think uh English is important [uh] for Japanese uh I really think so. [uh] But uh English te- test or the exam uh very difficult. [uh] Uh a little, little by little. So the uh the the people like people who like uh study English [uh] are very mmh rise up the skill. [mmh] But don't like or [uh] the can't can't uh accept the thing uh I don't know. [mmh] A little little by little uh separate the this mood. [uh] *nan ka kakusa wo bunderu kimoku* (there are disparities between people).

I–*Ed*–ente Bouchard: Some people continue very far, some people stay there [mmh mmh] they don't make progress [*so so*] in English and everything.

Ms. Inoue: *nan tte iun daro, gakuiki shakai* (how can I say, a society based on accreditation).

Bouchard: *gakuiki shakai* (a society based on accreditation).

Ms. Inoue: *wo jocho shiteru you ni mo kanji* (it's conducive to that sort of thing). *hai*.

Bouchard: Ah OK. [Yeah.] OK.

Ms. Inoue: *ma watashi ha* I like English *dakara* (so) *nan daro* [uh] *ganbatte benkyou ano eigo suki ni natta morau shimasu kedo* (I studied hard and came to like English, but) [mmh] mmh *hyottou ni shitara* (just like that)-

Bouchard: Not everybody thinks like that.

I–*Ni*–esop	Ms. Inoue:	Uh *so* (that's right), *nan ka kodomo ni yotte ha moto kara motteru chikara de gengo noryoku tarinai koto ka ha* (it depends on each child, there are some who are already motivated and others who do not have enough linguistic abilities) [uh] *mo oite kareru shakai ni nachau kana* (we might gradually become a withering society). [uh] *dakara chotto sabishii no kana* (so it's a bit sad). (laughing).
	Bouchard:	I understand. Do you think you know Japanese you know traditional culture Japanese culture [mmh] I'm not going to describe it. I'm just gonna think about your image [Ah yeah] of Japanese culture and so forth. Do you think that Japanese people learning English [uh] changes their idea of Japanese culture?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah I think it's uh change the idea [uh] because uh uh the it's uh in- increasing the studying English people. So the uh people look at the uh other world news. For example Lehman shock *to ka*, [uh] *nan daro* it's uh *naisei* (domestic affairs), world-
	Bouchard:	Uh Syria and-
I–*Ni*–juni I–*Ni*–esop	Ms. Inoue:	Something so uh in past [uh] uh stu- Japanese people uh *nihon ha* [uh] uh Japan is island, so uh I don't in uh I uh they aren't interested in *kanshin ga* (interest) indifferent for the other country. [Country.] So but now-
	Bouchard:	When when you are talking about like you say before like when was before?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh-
	Bouchard:	Until when?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh these uh ten years.
I–*Ni*–cont	Bouchard:	So ten years ago, the mood in Japan changed-
I–*Ni*–nain	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh I think so.
	Bouchard:	Towards island thinking [mmh] towards more international kind of [uh yes] thinking. Ah OK.
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh compared to uh my junior high school or high school [Ah OK.] *to ka kurabetara kekko sekai hanashi to ka* (comparatively, we have become more internationally-minded) [mmh] Mmh.
	Bouchard:	Can you give me hint or examples of this change?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes uh-
	Bouchard:	For example here at school or something like this.
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh for example uh the subject uh connect to the subject [mmh] *nan daro shakai tatoe-* (for example, social studies) for example stu- uh social studies and uh English [uh] uh is using the same uh activity [mmh] or the idea. [mmh] *nan daro tatoeba uh shakai shakai ka ha kekkou sekai to ka mawarimasu yo ne.* (for example, social studies surveys the world, right?) [mmh] *tte sore ni tai shite eigo mo sore ni awasete [mmh] jugyou henkou sasetari* (and English takes from this and lessons are changed) uh-
	Bouchard:	OK. Mmh OK, very good. So let's move on to maybe- uh actually before we talk about *monkasho* (MEXT), I told you before [uh yeah] I wanted you to tell me about *monkasho* (MEXT). Just before [mmh] uh we begin *monkasho* (MEXT) discussion, uh what are some positive points [uh] and what are some negative points [uh] about English education in general here in in the way you see English education in Japan? [mmh] Can you tell me some good points and some bad points maybe?
I–*Ni*–juni	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh I think the good point is uh mmh it's uh the best uh uh what to say it's the *kankyou* (environment) *nan daro* it's the-
	Bouchard:	Environment?
	Ms. Inoue:	Environment to study [mmh] uh for students or something. [uh] So it's a very good point. [OK.] But uh bad point is uh I said uh-
	Bouchard:	Before?
I–*Ni*–esop	Ms. Inoue:	Before. [mmh] Uh can uh peo- uh some students can't uh understand the English or [uh] *nan daro umare umarete kara mo motteru mono ga* (it's something they've had since birth) [mmh] *nan daro eigo ga wakaranai* (how can I say they don't understand English).
	Bouchard:	Ah from the start, they they did not understand [*so*- (that's right)] English-
	Ms. Inoue:	*nan ka gengo noryoku ga* (linguistic ability) the language uh skill is not good for uh [Ah] *ni totte ha nan daro kuttsu ha fueta* (for them, it's more painful) pain- painful.
	Bouchard:	It's painful to study English (laughing).
	Ms. Inoue:	*so* (that's right) (laughing). I think so uh. *tada so watashi ha yo ji kan ano* (I uh four hours) uh in a week uh students uh [uh] have to study four four time. [Yeah.] It's uh very good. But *uh nan daro hontou ni wakaranakute tsurai* (if you really don't understand it's hard). [uh] Uh *umare motta sai no no jiten de* (if you are carrying this from birth) [mmh] *gengo ni kakeru ni ko ni totte kono yo ji kan ha uh nan ka kekkou hontou ni kutsu ni kanji* (it's very painful for these kids to try and figure out the language four times a week) I think.
	Bouchard:	For some students four times a week it's very hard.
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh very hard yeah. Can't sleep *ne* [Yeah.] *nete mo ma chuui sareru shi* (even if they sleep they can't notice) (laughing) [(laughing) Really?] *kakunin shite mo kakenai* (Even if you double check with them, they can't write).
	Bouchard:	Ah they can't write, uh. [uh] So your class in all your classes uh these students who have uh what we call uh may say English allergy maybe? (laughing) [uh] How many uh what's the percentage of students?
I–*Ni*–juni	Ms. Inoue:	Ah OK uh maybe had allergy only one.
I–*Ed*–chal	Bouchard:	One percent?
	Ms. Inoue:	One per-
	Bouchard:	Or one one student?
	Ms. Inoue:	One one student for fourty in fourty.
	Bouchard:	Ah OK. Very few people basically. [Yeah] Ah OK.
	Ms. Inoue:	But *ano-*
	Bouchard:	But the majority of your students *ha*? What's the-
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah uh maybe uh I I taught uh about one hundred sixty. [Yeah.] *sono naka de* maybe twenty twenty. [mmh] *kekko ooi* (quite a lot).
	Bouchard:	You teach 16 classes.
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh four four class.
	Bouchard:	So four classes, four groups so that means 16 classes in one week.
I–*Ed*–chal	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yeah.
	Bouchard:	Ah OK. It's quite busy yeah [mmh (laughing)] (laughing). Plus homeroom plus everything else.
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes.
	Bouchard:	Yeah good good good [About (laughing)] good. OK, so these are positives and negatives. Do you think do you think uh that Japanese students should receive more English classes, more English education? Or it's OK now?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah uh I think it's uh OK [uh] to say that. So uh if uh if the *monkasho* the do that uh so please uh same time uh [uh] *ja* increase uh Japanese class. [Ah] *nihongo no* class *mo fuyasu* (increase the number of Japanese classes too).
	Bouchard:	Ah OK.
	Ms. Inoue:	Because uh *gen*- uh lac- uh the skill of the language [uh] uh very important for uh [That's right] students.
	Bouchard:	Ah OK. So so to develop language skills [uh] in general language skills [uh] it's not good to have only English

		classes [uh huh] increase. Also the Japanese. [Yes maybe] For students, which do you think is more important
		to develop language skills? [uh] Is Japanese more important than English?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah uh maybe students uh no mmh maybe case by case. But students uh some some students say that
		Japanese is very important [uh] uh *nan daro moshi nihongo ha dekinai to* (how can I say, if they can't use
I–*Ed*–prio		Japanese) [uh] *jibun no bogokugo mo dekinai no ni* (if they can't use their own language), [uh] *eigo wo benkyou*
		shite nan ka hen na ki ga suru tte iu ko ga imasu (there are some students who said it would be strange for
		them to study English).
	Bouchard:	Ah OK. [mmh] So they need to [uh they need-] they need Japanese first [uh first] need to understand first and
		then next English. [mmh] Ah OK, very good. Alright. Uh let's go to the *monkasho*. [Eh] Uh first of all, have you
		read the *monkasho* policies?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes.
	Bouchard:	Yeah. How often do you read them?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh how often uh once a month. *tsuki ni ikkai gurai* (About once a month).
	Bouchard:	Once a month you look at the paper. [uh yeah] It's the yellow book, right?
I–*Ed*–mext	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes. Yellow book. Yeah.
	Bouchard:	I have it yeah. OK [uh] do you understand the monkasho policies?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh maybe a little. But uh it's not clearly.
	Bouchard:	OK. Can you explain how unclear they are?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh clearly *na tokoro ha* (the clear parts) uh *zenbun ha* (everything) I I cannot input the this uh [Content?]
I–*Ed*–chal		*monkasho*'s content. [uh] So uh *nan tte iu na* (how can I say?) uh not clearly *no tokoro ha* (the unclear parts) uh
		eigo de iu to gengo katsudo juushi dewa attemasu kedo (there are sections on the types of English activities
I–*Ed*–actl		but), [uh] *gutai teki ni do iu koto ha gengo katsudo attari to ka* (there are clear indications as to the kinds of
		language activities) [uh] four skills *yon gino no* (four skills) *go gi-* uh five skills [uh] *go gino ga kou yatte oshieru*
		beki tte iu tokoro kuwashiku yori to (there are parts where they explain how to teach these five skills) I I don't
		know (laughing) I can't uh-
	Bouchard:	Ah so some parts of the *monkasho* policies [uh] you don't uh you're unclear about [Ah yeah] What to do they
		need? What do they mean by grammar? [uh] What do they uh and so forth. [uh] OK. So what do you do?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh what do you do?
	Bouchard:	What do you do if you don't really understand everything? [Ah yes] What's uh do you do? [Ah uh] Do you just-
I–*Ed*–chal	Ms. Inoue:	Uh I I rely on the the *senpai* (senior) the [uh] uh uh teacher. [Ah OK] And uh re- read the *monkasho* [uh OK.] So
		uh (laughing) I once a month *tsuki ni ikkai wakaranakunatte yonde* (I read it when I don't understand, about
		once a month). (laughing)
	Bouchard:	Ah OK. So you rely on uh like your uh [mmh] your *senpai.* (senior) basically [Yes] OK. The textbook. [uh] Do
		you think the textbook is very uh or the textbooks [uh] are very good at [uh I think-] teaching the *monkasho*
		policy? Do you think the *monkasho* policy and the textbooks are uh good connection or do you think they're
		different?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah maybe I think it's uh very materials uh compared to the past. [Yeah?] Uh and uh-
	Bouchard:	It's good?
	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah uh junior high school students. [Ah] Uh so for example it's uh uh (flipping through textbook) we we learn
		about the history [uh] for the Mother Mother Teresa *to ka* other uh culture *to ka* my culture.
I–*Ed*–cult	Bouchard:	Japanese culture.
	Ms. Inoue:	Japanese culture.
I–*Ed*–text	Bouchard:	OK. So this textbook, what kind of uh are are you saying that this textbook teaches a lot of cultural content?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes, Japanese culture.
	Bouchard:	Cultural content yeah. So uh what kind of cultural content? Uh Mother Teresa so foreign culture [uh] some-
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh my my my uh country's-
	Bouchard:	Japanese culture?
	Ms. Inoue:	Japanese culture mmh.
I–*Ni*–juni	Bouchard:	OK. Which is most important, foreign culture or Japanese culture in these textbooks?
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh anything this textbook uh I think is uh the most uh important is uh mmh fo- uh first my Japanese.
	Bouchard:	Uh Japanese is more important yeah?
	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah. First [OK] first uh we have uh Japanese people [uh] uh have to uh the explain our [uh] culture [uh huh] in
		other language. *demo nihongo demo yappa tsutae nakute ha nai, sonna koto kara kyuu uh hoka no hito ni hoka*
		no bunka kiite kyuushu suru to otagae ni totte ii no kana (Even in Japanese it's important to communicate our
		culture, and from this we hear about other people other cultures and learn from each other like sponges).
	Bouchard:	So it's important for Japanese young Japanese students to be able to discuss and explain [mmh] their
		Japanese culture [mmh] before learning other cultures. [mmh] Or can you learn at both at the same time?
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmmh both.
	Bouchard:	Do you understand?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah I'm sorry.
	Bouchard:	OK. One more time. [uh] What you said I think is *ano* it's important for Japanese students to learn about their
		culture first [uh huh] to explain their culture [uh] first. And then they learn about foreign cultures. [mmh] So
		number one number two [mmh] right? Or can they learn number one number two together at the same time?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah I think together is very good for me.
	Bouchard:	It's very good? [mmh] Ah OK.
	Ms. Inoue:	*nan da dochi to tsukatte iu to uh hyotto shitara ano mo nihon no bunka* Japanese uh culture *ha* [uh] *mo ano*
I–*Ni*–cont		*nihongo no jiten demo manande oitte* [uh] *de heiko shite* the together. [uh] *de gaikoku no bunka mo nihon no*
		bunka no kankei suru (maybe focusing on either one uh Japanese culture uh well we can learn through a
		dictionary, then make parallels between foreign and Japanese cultures).
	Bouchard:	What kind of images of foreign cultures [Ah] do you think are shown in this book?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah foreign culture. [mmh] For example *eto* uh *nan daro na* it looks like social studies. [Ah] *nan da* for the world.
I–*Ni*–fost		Uh *sekai shi tokai sekai no chiri* (it shows the history and geography of the world) [mmh] It's a mood or
I–*Ni*–foim		something [uh] *to ka nan daro ryokou ni ittari to ka sou iu no* image *na* (it promotes the image/notion of
		traveling).
	Bouchard:	About culture content, [uh] do you teach only what's in the textbook, or do you teach other cultural content that
		is not in the textbook? In your class.
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah uh *ne* for the every wo- uh every May June I design the other materials, for example-
	Bouchard:	May or June?
I–*Ni*–fost	Ms. Inoue:	Eh. So show the my picture [uh] for uh my friend for uh Facebook *nan daro gaikoku no tomodachi no sashin to*
I–*Ni*–foim		*ka kyoka moratte* (pictures of my foreign friends which I was permitted to show) (inaudible) (laughing)
	Bouchard:	(laughing) Ah that's good. Uh do you show videos YouTube videos or something [Ah yes] like this? A little bit
		you show something like this. Last time, you played uh Billy Joel and The Beatles right [Ah yes yes] so foreign
		cultures yeah. OK good. So for you, culture teaching [uh] cultural content [uh] how important is it to your

English class? Culture content?

I–*Ni*–cont Ms. Inoue: Ah OK. It’s uh very uh important for uh student uh people to uh understand other culture [uh] and uh the uh Engli- *nan daro fue-* uh *nan daro takaku teki ni mono goto miru koto ga dekiru nan nan daro-* (how can I say, to see things from many perspectives, how can I say-)

Bouchard: So they can they can discover more things?

Ms. Inoue: Ah yes discover uh the not uh *nan daro tan itsu janakute ironna kou-* (not a single but many-)

Bouchard: Ah it widens their perspectives.

Ms. Inoue: Ah so so so so. [uh] *ikko dewanakute* (not only one) [uh] *nihonjin dake* (only Japanese) [uh] *to ka janakute.*

Bouchard: It’s not just yeah it’s not just what monocultural-

Ms. Inoue: Ah mono- ah yeah-

I–*Ed*–mext Bouchard: Called pluri-cultural [Ah pluri-] Ah OK. Good. Uh let me go back to the *monkasho*. Uh [Yeah] so you understand the *monkasho* [uh] some some you don’t understand. What do you think about the *monkasho*, when you read this, do you think ah this makes sense? Or do you think uh it’s very strange? [Ah] Or do you think it’s too difficult? [uh] What’s your feeling of the-

Ms. Inoue: Uh maybe I think it’s uh *nan daro* it’s *risou* (idealistic) uh I think it’s the *monkasho-*

Bouchard: It’s uh idealistic.

I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: Idea- uh [(laughing)] very good uh *suteki na hontou ni risou* (it’s elegant and idealistic). [Ah] *dakara* (So) so it’s uh hard for stu- uh teachers to the come true [uh] uh the-

Bouchard: To become real [Uh real so] to make it come true yeah.

Ms. Inoue: dakara so the for *teachers sen- sensei douryoku shinakereba* (teachers have to make efforts) have to the make effort [uh] *da shi* uh *soshite ma dekireba monkasho no hito mo* (also if the people at MEXT) [uh] *so suru tame* uh support *ga attara* (if they gave support) [mmh] *motto ano furui sensei* (also the older teachers) [uh] elderly do *ka-*

Bouchard: Older teachers.

I–*Ed*–mext Ms. Inoue: Older teachers *mo monkasho no koto wo minai yo to iwanai shi wakaru-* (there are some older teachers who don’t look at them-)

Bouchard: Oh are there teachers in in school [uh] older teachers who don’t care about the *monkasho-*

Ms. Inoue: Ah, other school teachers [Ah] uh not my my school uh *hotondo wakai bakkari no hito* (mainly young people).

Bouchard: Here?

Ms. Inoue: Ah yes thirty thirty *gurai* (about).

Bouchard: Thirty years old.

Ms. Inoue: Thirty or-

Bouchard: So most teachers at Asahi JHS are young [Ah yes] Ah OK. Uh you’re talking about other teachers in other schools. Some older [uh] teachers they don’t OK.

Ms. Inoue: Over fifty.

I–*Ed*–mext Bouchard: They don’t care [uh] about the *monkasho*. OK. So you say that the *monkasho* policies are idealistic [Ah yeah] *risou desu ne* (idealistic right?). [uh] So how important are the *monkasho* policies to your class? Are they important or not so important?

Ms. Inoue: Ah it’s important uh the uh *gengo katsudo* (language activities) uh language activity [uh] uh *no jujitsu* (real use) uh u- using in English [uh] uh co- communicate with others using English [uh] and say [uh] the their feelings. [uh] So it’s uh very good for me.

Bouchard: It’s very good. So there are some good things and bad. [uh] Ah OK, very good.

I–*Ed*–edis I–*Ed*–clt I–*Ni*–esop Ms. Inoue: Uh *hi- hito* uh I think *hitori dewa* [uh] *ma benkyou to ka* [uh] *maru tsuke* [uh] *dekiru kerodomo* (anyone can learn to provide accurate answers to questions) [mmh] *sore tsukatte hanashi nasai tte iu no ha* (but to use it in real life) [uh] *yappari dare ka inai ha dekinai shi* (it’s difficult to do when there’s no one around) [uh] *ironna hito no hatsuon to ka kiite* (to listen to a variety of different pronunciation styles and accents) ah *kono hatsuon nan ka ma atteru attenai demo ii shi omoshiroi to ka umai to ka* (it’s fun to notice different pronunciation styles and accents, whether or not we get it right) [uh] *wakaru ki ga suru* (I’d like them to get used to it). [mmh] *sore ha hontou ni monkasho no hito ga sugoi to omou ne* (that’s where the people from MEXT are really good).

Bouchard: Ah OK. So they they do have good good perspectives. [uh] You want may- maybe support [mmh] from the *monkasho* people-

Ms. Inoue: (laughing) *so so so so* (That’s right)

Bouchard: Ah OK, very good. Uh I’m not sure if you answered. The textbook that you’re uh using uh [mmh] what do you think about it? Do you think it’s good? [uh] Do you think it’s you say it’s better than before, right?

I–*Ed*–text I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: Ah it’s a really difficult. First uh first uh I saw the first time [uh] uh it’s very difficult uh to use because uh it’s uh real conversation basic dialog. [Yeah] *dakara hontou ni kudageta kaiwa mo aru shi* (some of the conversations are very unnatural/broken) [uh] *tatoeba nan daro* uh I want to use the this dialog for the change the word *to ka nan daro ano-*

Bouchard: Word substitution yeah.

Ms. Inoue: So *nan da* pattern practice *to ka* [Ah OK] *shitai toki mo attan desu kedo* (there are times when I want to do pattern practice) [uh] *mo oyo hyougen mo kekkou haittete* (there are some advanced vocabulary words and expressions) mmh advanced [Ah OK] uh place *to ka mai kai sore wo setsume wo kekkou jikan kakaru no de-* (to explain this every time takes a lot of time-)

Bouchard: So you don’t have a lot of time to-

Ms. Inoue: Uh *chotto* (laughing)

Bouchard: To practice basic [*so* (that’s right)] dialogs and do activities [uh] with basic dialogs. [uh] Yeah.

Ms. Inoue: Uh for example uh *doko kana* (where is it?) (flipping through textbook) mmh *kou iu toki* for example ‘do you want to learn?’ *tte iuwarete* (if you are told ‘do you want to learn?’) [mmh] ‘yes I do’ *tte futsu no bun ja nain desu ka* (isn’t ‘yes I do’ a normal response?).

Bouchard: That’s right.

Ms. Inoue: *ma ano kodomotachi ga* [uh] *ichi nensei de narratteru* (our kids learn this in the first year of JHS).

Bouchard: They understand.

I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: *de dekinai no ko ga* ‘sure’ *detekuru to* [mmh] uh *so katamatta* (when ‘sure’ comes up, it’s difficult for those who can’t understand English well). *koko ga naratteru tokoro ga* eh ‘yes I do’ *no kotae kata ga arun desu ka* (isn’t want we learned ‘yes I do’?). *nande desu ka* (Why?). *machigai ja nain desu ka* (Isn’t this a mistake?). [mmh] *tte iu kara* (that’s what they say). (laughing). [Ah] *setsumei ano kudaketa hyougen* (to explain casual expressions) *ma zenzen warui dewa nai kedo kodomotachi ni totte ha* (it’s not bad at all, but for the kids) [mmh] *konran no kikkake ni* (it’s possible for them to get confused). [Ah OK.] *saishou* (first time) uh last year I do uh confused that.

Bouchard: Uh confused yeah. [uh] So sometimes students uh they they’re used to uh fixed patterns of language. [Ah yes] Do you like English? Yes I do.

Ms. Inoue: That’s right.

Bouchard: ‘Yes I do’ is the only answer for them.

	Ms. Inoue:	Uh only answer.
	Bouchard:	But 'sure' you know 'maybe', other types of answers they have difficulty with yeah.
	Ms. Inoue:	Before text uh-
	Bouchard:	It's confusing yeah.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah. Uh but uh now a little uh *nan ka chotto naretekita kana* [mmh] *ima ha* (they are getting used to it a little now).
	Bouchard:	Your students, by the way, your students when they come to (name of local district) *ichi nensei* (first year JHS) and so forth, [Yeah] uh do they already know some English from elementary school from *juku* (cram school) or [Ah] Are there some kids who are good in English already?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah uh now now the third grade uh didn't uh do that for the elementary school. [That's right] Uh *ima no shita gakunen kara shougakkou de narrateru* (the year before them, they have learned it in elementary school). [mmh] *kiteru* (some of them come).
	Bouchard:	So now your students are going to become better.
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yeah (laughing).
	Bouchard:	(laughing) Because elementary schools have started [Yeah.] yeah. OK, very good. Uh let me ask you a general question [OK] uh about you as a teacher. Uh do you understand [uh] do you have an idea of the needs of your students?
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes.
	Bouchard:	Do you have uh uh about idea? Or do you have a clear idea of what your students' needs are?
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh yes.
	Bouchard:	You do?
	Ms. Inoue:	Yes. [Good.] Uh for for example in my class uh say something uh say everything *nan demo ii mo tsumannai to ka* (they say everything, including 'it's boring') [uh] *nemui motto* ('I'm sleepy', do more) [uh] uh *uta ga kikitai* ('I want to listen to songs') I want to listen to music. [Songs] Listen to song or something. [uh] *motto kufu shite toka terebi mitai to ka* ('try to adjust' or 'I want to watch TV').
	Bouchard:	But these are uh maybe these are not needs. Uh you know these are like desires. They want to. [Ah yes yes] My question is the needs. For example, these students need this. [mmh] I know they need to uh study more grammar or they need more chances for conversation. [uh] Or they need to debate more. The needs [Ah yeah] for them to become uh yeah. Do you have ideas of your students' needs?
I–*Ed*–ente	Ms. Inoue:	Yes maybe is uh con- consider uh grammar [uh] for the *juken no tame ni* (for the entrance exams). *tabun* (maybe) needs ni ha-
	Bouchard:	You understand yeah?
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh.
	Bouchard:	Do you think that as a teacher [mmh] you are fulfilling these needs? Do you know fulfilling?
	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh I uh-
	Bouchard:	Needs *aru shi* (there are needs) are you helping them fill these needs?
I–*Ed*–chal	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh. Uh it's uh difficult I think (laughing) [(laughing)] uh *ano* forty uh one class four- forty people [Yeah] forty students, so I can't uh [Ah] see all.
	Bouchard:	That's right yeah.
	Ms. Inoue:	*ma chotto hyotto shitara ano katayo tte* (probably I'm not so balanced)
	Bouchard:	So so- some students you can't help but not everybody [*so*] basically.
	Ms. Inoue:	Uh *dekireba* (if possible) if I have uh many people uh many help [uh] *areba* (if there were) uh [(laughing)] *atama ii ko dekiru ko ha dondon* new worksheets [uh] *wo agetai shi* (I'd like to give new worksheets to the talented students) [uh] *dekinai ko tsuki ni ikkai ni aitai kedo* (I'd like to meet students who have difficulty once a month but) [mmh] mmh so I want to uh *shou ninzu* class *shitai desu* (I want smaller classes). [Ah] *dakara-* (So-) [Ah OK] *motto chiisai* (Smaller).
I–*Ed*–chal	Bouchard:	You you would like smaller classes.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah smaller class. Small for students.
	Bouchard:	It's understandable. Good. I think every tea- every teacher [Yeah.] yeah. OK, good. Uh ah yeah, very important. About this textbook [Eh] what are students' opinions of this textbook? What have students said about this textbook?
I–*Ed*–text	Ms. Inoue:	Ah textbook mmh uh for- mmh I don't say about the textbook for students. But uh students say that how to the uh make uh *nan daro shukudai ni tsuite no monku ga iimasu* (they complain about homework). *nan daro* uh *yoshuu no* (about self-study).
	Bouchard:	Ah they complain about the homework yeah.
I–*Ed*–actl I–*Ed*–clt	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh in my uh school [uh] ano tradi- tradition *dentou de ha* (according to tradition) *nan daro ma futsu no eigo no jugyou so nan desu kedo kore ga utsusu desu yo ne* (it's the same for regular English classes, but this is about copying). *ano kanarazu kaki utsusu*, memo- (they have to copy, in notes).
	Bouchard:	Ah you mean like taking notes.
	Ms. Inoue:	Taking note [Ah OK] *kanarazu* (it's required).
	Bouchard:	They need to take notes.
	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah [OK] so *dakara seitou ni yotte ha mo eigo nareta shi* [uh] *kaku imi ga nai tte iu ko ga iru* (it depends on the students, but some of them already know English enough, so there is no point in copying notes).
	Bouchard:	Ah OK some students don't need to take note [*so*] because they already understand [*so*] what you are teaching them. Ah (laughing).
I–*Ed*–text	Ms. Inoue:	Uh I think so too a little. So *jitsu ha watashi mo so omou mo atte* (in fact I think so too), *ma kore ichi nensei ichi nensei no uchi ha* (but for first year students) uh it's uh *nan daro eigo ni naru no tame ni kaku no ii kana* [mmh] *to moun desu kedo* (I think it's good for them to copy to learn English), *ni san nen ni nattara ma utsushite kore wo kitte mo hatte mo ii no kana to omou* (when they get in the second and third year, I think it's fine to just photocopy this, cut it and paste it) [mmh] (laughing) *kono hen de* [uh] *jibun no nayamu tokoro ga aru ne, kono hen na* [OK] *hai* (this is an issue I kind of wonder about). Ah but students don't say about the content. Text *no tsuite monku ha iemasen* (they don't complain about the textbook).
	Bouchard:	They don't say anything. [uh] Oh I like this textbook uh don't [uh *so so*] say anything.
	Ms. Inoue:	Ah uh *yoku wo ieba ookisa ga hen tte iimasu* (what they say the most is that the size is strange).
	Bouchard:	The size [*katachi* (its shape)] is too big?
	Ms. Inoue:	Size *ga yoku wakaranai tte* A *demo* B *demo nai no de* A *yon demo* B *yon demo nai. kore nan da* (they don't understand what ize it is, it's not A or B, what is it?) [Ah] *tte iu* (laughing) What's this *tte* (They ask 'what's this?') (laughing).
	Bouchard:	Ah OK. So they they don't [*katachi* (its shape)] Ah just about the shape. [(laughing)] (laughing) Interesting. OK. So they don't really care about the [Yeah] OK. In your class, well I have observed your class many times, ten times, [Ah yeah] on average in percentage about percentage [Percentage] uh how much of your class of one classroom do you use the textbook? And how much of the class do you use other [mmh] learning material?
I–*Ed*–text	Ms. Inoue:	Ah maybe uh it's uh eighty percent.

Bouchard: Eighty percent tetxbook.

I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: Uh twen- uh twenty percent uh English song uh the uh I I use making the worksheet my worksheet [Worksheets and] or some TV show [mmh] *hontou ni* sometimes *tokidoki* (very few times). (laughing). [(laughing)] I have time *jikan aru toki shika* (only when I have time).

Bouchard: If we could only make time.

Ms. Inoue: Yeah, much time.

Bouchard: (laughing) OK. So that's good. Are you OK with the questions?

Ms. Inoue: Ah yes.

Bouchard: Alright. Uh I think you answered to me, right. How do students react to culture teaching? When you [Ah] teach culture, what's their reaction?

I–*Ed*–cult Ms. Inoue: Ah it's uh case-by-case. Uh students uh uh surprised [uh] or ah I know I know *to ka* [mmh] I understand, or uh have a question *to ka* [mmh] *kekkou ano san shu san san in samazama* (there are all kinds of responses) [mmh OK] Mmh. *bunka no toki ga suki seitou* (when it's about culture, they like it).

Bouchard: So when you teach culture content, they react [*sore ga suki* (they like it)] a little bit more yeah.

Ms. Inoue: Mmh *bun-* uh *honbun no koko ha-* (looking at the grammar of basic sentences-)

Bouchard: Grammar?

Ms. Inoue: Grammar. *tatoeba koko* how to *desu to ka* [mmh] it uh *sore* what is that? *nani sashiteru no* (what are you pointing at?) [mmh] *to dattara nan ka juku itteru ko ha ah kore kore tte iutteru no ha hoka no ko ha utsusu dake* (students who go to cram school respond 'oh it's that it's that' and others only register it).

I–*Ed*–gram Bouchard: Interesting. When they go to *juku* (cram school) [uh] what do they do they usually learn? Grammar or do they learn about culture?

Ms. Inoue: Uh only grammar.

Bouchard: It's only about grammar.

Ms. Inoue: Grammar. [Ah OK.] *juku ha* grammar (cram schools are about grammar). *de eikaiwa ha kaiwa dake* (language schools are all about conversation).

Bouchard: Of course yeah. Conversation and culture and so forth [Yeah] OK. Uh, for you [mmh] as a teacher what's a good class? What's a how do you see [uh] how do you define a successful class?

Ms. Inoue: Ah successful class uh-

Bouchard: Ah today was a good class, I enjoyed it uh what what class is this?

Ms. Inoue: Uh it's uh *nan dake* reaction [(laughing)] reaction.

Bouchard: Loud reaction from students.

I–*Ed*–clt I–*Ed*–actl Ms. Inoue: Reaction and uh the the practice pattern practice *to ka kaiwa wo suru* (when students converse) in English. [uh] Mmh and uh mmh can uh talk about each other *nan ka soudan shiaeru* group *de-* (they can collaborate well in group-)

Bouchard: They can do-

Ms. Inoue: De- debate a little debate small debate-

Bouchard: Debate or discussion.

Ms. Inoue: Ah yeah discuss-

Bouchard: Group discussion.

Ms. Inoue: Group discussion yeah *dekiru no ga risou* (it's ideal if they can do it).

Bouchard: Ah. And but this more in *chuugakkou ni nensei* (JHS second year) basically yeah?

Ms. Inoue: Ah yes.

Bouchard: *chuugakkou san nensei* (JHS third year) is difficult to do that.

Ms. Inoue: Uh *so desu ne* (that's right).

Bouchard: OK.

Ms. Inoue: *ammari ano hen na koto tte iu ka* debate *to ka yari sugiru to oya ni monku iwaremasu* (if we do out of the ordinary things, if we do debates too much, parents will complain).

I–*Ed*–ente Bouchard: Of course yeah.

I–*Ed*–gram Ms. Inoue: Ah *juken no kankei arun desu ka tte iwareru kara yougaku mo chotto* uh *kiyoumi hakaratte* yatte (they will say 'shouldn't you focus on entrance exam preparation?', so instead of focusing on western studies, concentrate on that).

Bouchard: OK. [mmh] Uh what's uh the opposite question. What's an unsuccessful class?

Ms. Inoue: Ah (laughing) unsuccessful class. Uh no reaction (laughing).

Bouchard: No reaction.

I–*Ed*–actl Ms. Inoue: No reaction, sleepy (laughing)

Bouchard: OK.

Ms. Inoue: Uh can't ah *yappari* reaction *nai* (after all, when they don't react). *nan ka iutte kaitte konai* (When I say something and I get no response). [uh] Uh mmh *min- desu ne*.

Bouchard: OK. So it's really about the students' reaction.

Ms. Inoue: Uh *nan da donna nan no han no hoshii desu ne* (any reaction is OK) [uh] *wakannai* I don't know *demo ii kana* [uh] *iutte* hoshii (it's OK if they say 'I don't know', I want them to). *nan ka aru no ni mo akiramerareru kanashii* (When there is something, it's sad when they give up).

Bouchard: Mmh I have observed *san nen yon kumi* (third year fourth class) [uh] how how about *san nen san kumi ni kumi ichi kumi* (third year third class, second class, first class) how how different are they [mmh] in terms of reaction?

Ms. Inoue: Ah for the six [uh] six is very uh fu- funny and uh funny? *ichi ban yari yasui* (easy to do).

Bouchard: Easy to teach.

Ms. Inoue: Easy to teach. And *han no mo ii shi* (good reaction) [uh] uh *nan daro-*

Bouchard: Uh response.

Ms. Inoue: Response *mo aru shi* (They respond) [uh] *ano so* small discussion *mo dekiru joutai* (we can have small discussions). *itsumo-* (All the time-)

Bouchard: All the time yeah.

I–*Ed*–team I–*Ed*–clt Ms. Inoue: All the time. [Ah] *eigo nigate na ko mo tokui na ko oshierareru kankyou* (It's an environment where the strong students teach the weaker students). [Ah] *ichiban watashi ichiban suki na class* (it's my favorite class). (laughing). [Ah] *jibun no* class [(laughing)] *yasashii* (they are kinder than my students). Ah *eigo to shite ha ichi ban suki* (In terms of English, it's my favorite class).

Bouchard: Ah OK.

Ms. Inoue: Uh *yon kumi ga jibun no* class *nano de-* (Class four is my class-)

Bouchard: That's your class.

I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: *chotto ironna* pressure *ga aru kara* (there are many kinds of pressure) [(laughing)] *chotto jibun de kibishi shite* (I'm kind of severe on myself). (laughing)

Bouchard: That's right, that's right.

Ms. Inoue: Uh *san nen go kumi ha* (as for the third year fifth class) uh acti- uh they like to uh do activity. [uh] Activity *ga daisuki* game *to ka* (They love activities and games). [mmh] Mmh *tada shi benkyou ga* study not good. [mmh]

	598 599		Mmh *sugoi genki* [*genki* (lively) kids ah] *chotto urusai gurai* (they are really energetic, almost too noisy). *de* two class *ni kumi ha* (As for the second class) very uh *totemo shizuka* (they are very quiet).
	600	Bouchard:	Very quiet [mmh] *ni kumi* (second class).
	601 602	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh *ga chotto no mori agarase chotto muzukashii toki ga aru* (there are times when it's hard to get them excited about something).
	603	Bouchard:	How about *yon kumi* (fourth class)? What's your image of *yon kumi* (fourth class)?
	604	Ms. Inoue:	*yon kumi* (fourth class) *ha hi ni yorimasu ne* (it depends on the day).
	605	Bouchard:	*hi ni yorimasu* (it depends on the day) what does that mean?
	606 607	Ms. Inoue:	Uh case-by-case for the day. [Ah OK.] *nan daro* for example after the uh after *su-* uh math *suugaku no ato da to* sleepy *nemui* (sleepy) *to ka.*
	608 609 610	Bouchard:	Ah it's really case-by-case. [Yes] It varies uh variation uh. OK, very good. Uh your teacher training [Yeah.] at uh your university, [Yeah.] (name of her university seminar professor) and so forth, right. Training to become a teacher yeah. [mmh] Do you think that your teacher training was sufficient? Do you know sufficient?
	611	Ms. Inoue:	Ah sorry, I forgot.
	612	Bouchard:	Uh sufficient or do you think it was uh appropriate *tekisetsu na* (appropriate) [*tekisetsu na* (appropriate)]
I–*Ed*–teat	613	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes appropriate.
	614 615	Bouchard:	Uh good for [Good for yeah.] your job. So after your teacher training, [mmh] were you ready to be a teacher? Or what the was there a gap big gap between you know teacher training and real teaching?
	616	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes uh gap. I have a gap.
	617	Bouchard:	A big gap?
	618	Ms. Inoue:	Big gap.
	619	Bouchard:	What kind of gap was this?
	620 621 622 623	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh for example in the college uh my [Yeah.] my university college *de mo* uh maybe the uh we the people uh they who want to be a teacher [Yeah.] for English (inaudible) *hito ha yappa* first learn about the *kongen moto* (the roots) the why the start the English *to ka eigo no eigo gaku to ka* (the study of English) [mmh] *gengo gaku ka hajimaru-* (linguistics-)
	624	Bouchard:	OK linguistics [Eh linguistics] uh grammar and so forth yeah.
	625 626 627 628	Ms. Inoue:	I think it's uh very de- uh important. [mmh] But uh *jibun no daigaku dewa yappari sono moto daiji ni shiteirun desu kedo* (after all, my university emphasized the study of English and its linguistic roots) [mmh] *iza jugyou to naru to* (when I began teaching) [mmh] *chotto mo chotto jugyou wo* for the class [uh] class *no tame no jugyou no gaa tte ii kana* (we should have received more training in classroom planning and management).
I–*Ed*–teat	629 630	Bouchard:	Di- uh for example uh during teacher training [uh] did uh teacher teach uh show you how to teach textbook for example?
	631	Ms. Inoue:	Uh *kore wo yarannai ammari-* (we didn't actually do this-)
	632	Bouchard:	*ammari yatenakatta*? (You didn't really do this?)
	633	Ms. Inoue:	*yatenakatta kedo* (didn't do this).
	634 635	Bouchard:	OK. Did you learn for example, did you read the [mmh] *monkasho* policies for example? In university did you study the *monkasho* policies?
	636	Ms. Inoue:	Mmmh did-
I–*Ed*–mext I–*Ed*–teat	637 638	Bouchard:	*monkasho no* policies uh [uh] the the at the university during teacher training [uh] did you read with the teacher? [mmh] *yomimashita ka* (Did you read?)
	639	Ms. Inoue:	Ah *yomimashita* (I read).
	640	Bouchard:	*de kenkyuu to ka kenkyuu* (research) study?
	641	Ms. Inoue:	Uh.
	642	Bouchard:	Ah OK, very good. Uh did you did you have kind of classroom management training?
	643	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes uh-
I–*Ed*–teat	644	Bouchard:	*atta* (Did you really have?)
	645	Ms. Inoue:	*nai sore ga nain desu yo ne* (We didn't have that).
	646	Bouchard:	*nakatta* (Didn't have).
	647 648 649 650 651 652	Ms. Inoue:	*nai* (No). [mmh] *sore ga ichi ban taihen* (This is the most difficult part). [mmh] *tabun daigaku de naratteru no ha* (Maybe what we learn at university) [mmh] *mo hanashi wo kikuzentei* (we do pre-reflection) [mmh] *hanashi wo kikimasu* (then we listen to a lecture) [mmh] *ano katsudo dekimasu* (then we can do the activity). *tabun* (maybe) for normal *nan da eigo naraitai ko juku mitai na kanji* (for students who want to study English it's like a cram school) [Ah OK] *hontou benkyou shitai ko ga itte sono renshu wo shiterun desu kedo-* (For those who really want to study there is that kind of practice but-)
I–*Ed*–teat	653 654	Bouchard:	So the type of training you had was about ideal learners [mmh] ideal learners [mmh] *risou no seitou tte iu kanji so iu tame ni ga-* (it was for ideal learners-)
	655 656	Ms. Inoue:	*risou no seitou ga mawattete renshuu mo risou no seitou ma naritai no ko ga iru kara-* (it was for ideal learners, but there are also learners who want to become like that-)
I–*Ed*–chal	657	Bouchard:	*ja mondai nai no ko tte iu kanji mondai nai no* class (it's like for unproblematic students, unproblematic classes)
	658 659	Ms. Inoue:	*so so so dakara mondai no ko takusan aru toki ni so jugyou ga-* (that's right, so when I started having tough kids, my classes-)
	660	Bouchard:	So what did you do uh how did you your first class what it shock? Your first class as a teacher [Ah] (laughing).
	661	Ms. Inoue:	Uh a little shock.

4) From 58:31 to 1:07:41 (recording time)

Code	**Line#**	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
	1 2	Bouchard:	Now that you are a teacher [mmh] uh I know you are very busy [uh] uh do you have chances or opportunities to do teacher training or teacher uh professional training basically?
	3	Ms. Inoue:	Uh professional training-
	4 5	Bouchard:	Like uh you know Saturday go to uh lecture or *chu- chuugakkou* (junior high school) [uh] uh something like this [Ah yes] and listen to a lecture and debate with [Ah] teachers *to ka*.
	6	Ms. Inoue:	Ah only once a month.
	7	Bouchard:	Once a month?
	8	Ms. Inoue:	Ah I think [Ah] uh-
I–*Ed*–mext	9	Bouchard:	That's quite a lot actually. Once a month. [uh] mmh.
	10 11 12	Ms. Inoue:	*ikka getsu ikkai shika* (Only once a month). For the *nan da eiga- eigo kenkyuu eiten* (name of local English research group) [uh] *eiten ut-* uh I take part in that. [Oh OK] *dakara soko de ha dekiru* (so I can do professional training there).
	13	Bouchard:	So every month you go there and you-
	14	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes, every month.
	15	Bouchard:	What happens during these uh events?

Ms. Inoue: Uh event uh something uh bring the my material [uh] and research [uh] uh other teachers uh.
Bouchard: Uh talk to other teachers.
Ms. Inoue: Uh talk to uh using the mo- movie. [Ah OK] Mmh.
Bouchard: Once a month, it’s quite a lot actually.
Ms. Inoue: Ah yeah once a month.
Bouchard: Yeah. It’s quite a lot yeah.
Ms. Inoue: *ikka getsu ikkai dake* (Only once a month).
Bouchard: *sugoi sugoi* (It’s amazing). [(laughing)] More than me (laughing).
Ms. Inoue: Ah no no (laughing).
Bouchard: OK, that’s good. Uh at your school [uh] uh do amongst teachers [uh] you say that most teachers here are young teachers. [Ah yes] Do you often talk with other teachers and share ideas and-
Ms. Inoue: Ah share ideas *ha* once a week.
I–*Ed*–teat Bouchard: Once a week yeah.
I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: Yeah. Uh if I uh talk tough uh *nan da komatta toki ni* [mmh] *zen in senpai nano de kiki ni kuru* (when I have some trouble, my seniors listen to me).
Bouchard: Do you think that you have good support from your co-workers?
Ms. Inoue: Ah yes.
Bouchard: Ah that’s good.
Ms. Inoue: Very good support yeah.
Bouchard: And uh mmh do you observe each other’s classes?
I–*Ed*–teva Ms. Inoue: Ah the it’s uh no time [OK.] So I can’t do now. But last year I I did [Observed] a lot yeah.
Bouchard: Did anybody observe your class?
Ms. Inoue: Ah yes yes.
Bouchard: Ah OK. Other teachers here?
Ms. Inoue: Others teachers.
Bouchard: OK. Only English teachers observe your class or math teachers-
Ms. Inoue: Ah other teachers all [Ah OK.] yes yes.
Bouchard: Depending yeah. Uh is this uh teachers observing each other’s classes, is this uh the *kyoutou sensei* (vice-principal) or *koucho sensei* (principal) who says plan organize this? Or is this volunteer?
Ms. Inoue: Ah volunteer.
Bouchard: It’s volunteer.
Ms. Inoue: Ah *dakara* (so) uh this year uh no. [Mmh OK.] Uh last year the have [You had] I have yeah have.
Bouchard: Ah OK, very good. OK. OK. Let’s look at your job overall, not just as a teacher yeah? [uh] Uh so how many hours do you work here?
Ms. Inoue: Here at school?
Bouchard: Every week.
Ms. Inoue: Uh over twelve.
Bouchard: Uh every day?
Ms. Inoue: Yeah [Twelve hours?] every day.
Bouchard: So seven a.m to seven p.m. *gurai* (about)?
Ms. Inoue: Ah six six or five thirty work, go there and uh-
Bouchard: Eh five thirty you’re at school?
Ms. Inoue: Ah fif- uh five thirty yeah five thirty.
Bouchard: *go ji han asa de* (five thirty in the morning).
I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: Yes yes.
Bouchard: *sugoi* (that’s amazing).
Ms. Inoue: *so, demo ni ban me* (That’s right, but I’m second) [Ah *so ka* (is that so?)] second.
Bouchard: What when do you wake up? (laughing).
Ms. Inoue: Uh I get up at four thirty four thirty. [mmh] Uh it’s very near uh for my-
Bouchard: Do you do you live in (name of district where the school is) or-
Ms. Inoue: Ah no no no uh in (name of district next to the district where the school is).
Bouchard: Ah you you told me before (name of district next to the district where the school is) yeah.
Ms. Inoue: (name of district next to the district where the school is) near uh (name of broader area north of Sapporo).
Bouchard: Ah OK. So how long does it take you [uh] by car to come here?
Ms. Inoue: It about ten ten or twelve minutes.
Bouchard: Ah OK. By car.
Ms. Inoue: By car yeah.
Bouchard: Ah OK. So you come here at five thirty-
Ms. Inoue: Yeah five thirty uh prepare uh the uh English class [uh] and uh do something [OK.] But at seven [uh] uh *shichi ji ni naru to* (at seven a.m.) uh some uh teachers [uh] can’t go there to ka because of di- disease or [Something] cold *to ka*. So uh I uh my uh *nan daro watashi no kakari de jikan wari kaetari suru yaku-* (my responsibility is to adjust the schedule-)
Bouchard: Ah your responsibility is uh-
Ms. Inoue: *ato* chime *to ka-*
Bouchard: Is to check the chime and uh schedule [Schedule yeah] and emergency situation
Ms. Inoue: *shichi ji kara mo jibun no jikan ja nai no de* (from seven o’clock it’s not my time).
Bouchard: Ah so from five thirty to seven, that’s your time. After seven it’s no time for you.
Ms. Inoue: Ah uh no time uh *bukatsu owari made* (until the club activities are over). Uh and the-
Bouchard: Oh they have club activity in the morning?
Ms. Inoue: And uh in the morning uh to seven fifteen *kara* eight *made* (from seven fifteen to eight).
Bouchard: *sugoi* (that’s amazing).
Ms. Inoue: *so chotto dake asa de aru no ni* (that’s right, short club activities in the morning) [uh] *de* uh after school [uh] *houkago ha* (after school) uh four thirty *made* uh committee uh *nan tte iun daro iinkai* [Yeah] meeting *iinkai* (they have committee meetings until four thirty). *de* after the meeting *iinkai no ato ha* (after the meeting) uh seven by seven. [uh] *shichi ji made* club activity (they have club activities until seven p.m.). *de* after seven [uh] *ato shichi ji ikou ni natte ano* (after seven p.m.) not my work uh my work uh but I think not my work. *ironna sensei no tetsudai* (I have to help other teachers do all sorts of things) help [Ah OK.] *gakkou no shigoto* (work related to the school) the school work [uh] *nan daro* homepage upload [uh] uh making uh [uh huh] something.
Bouchard: *de ie kaeru jikan ha* (so what time do you go back home?)
Ms. Inoue: mmh nine eight thirty or nine. *hidoi toki ha* eleven ah eleven or twelve (when it’s bad, I get home at eleven or twelve).
Bouchard: *de* eleven or twelve de ano come back at five thirty.
Ms. Inoue: Five thirty.

Bouchard: So you barely sleep *desu ne* (right?) [Uh yeah.] *ammari netenai* (you don't really sleep).

Ms. Inoue: *zenzen netenai* (I don't sleep at all). [uh] *san ji kan* (three hours) three hours [*tte ie de* (And at home)] I I only sleep three hours.

Bouchard: *tte ie de ha ammari-* (And at home you don't really-)

Ms. Inoue: *so ie de ha ammari* [(laughing)] dekinai *chotto ofuro* (That's right, I can't really do much except take a bath) uh take a bath uh-

Bouchard: Go to bed.

Ms. Inoue: Go to bed mmh

Bouchard: Ah *sugoi* (that's amazing) that's a very hard schedule [Yeah.] So you do you do about uh on average about thirteen fourteen hours a day. So five days a week *desu ne* (right?). [Eh] So Saturday how often do you work on Saturday?

Ms. Inoue: On Saturday uh I have uh club activity [uh] badminton *aru no de* uh from the uh eight [uh] eight or seven thirty *kara* (from eight or seven thirty a.m.) [uh] uh *to nagakute mo* four (until four p.m. at the most) [uh] uh four.

Bouchard: Sunday nothing.

Ms. Inoue: Uh Sunday I have.

Bouchard: What do you have?

Ms. Inoue: Sunday *mo gogo dake* (only in the afternoon) uh only afternoon or only morning *to ka-*

Bouchard: Club?

Ms. Inoue: Yes club. So I have no time (laughing).

Bouchard: Uh all the time is gone.

Ms. Inoue: But now now uh some stu- uh sensei *no kage de* [uh] *ima yasumete* (because of some teachers, I'm now able to have a break)

Bouchard: (laughing)

Ms. Inoue: *yashi no jikan* (free time) free time. I'm very happy. (laughing)

Bouchard: Very happy for that.

Ms. Inoue: Yeah.

I–*Ed*–chal Bouchard: Uh OK. [Yeah.] So you work a huge amount of so many hours [Yes.] in one week. How much in percent again percentage [Uh percentage] uh how much of this time is only for classroom lesson plas- uh planning [uh huh] classroom planning? Classroom teaching? [uh] And classroom I guess assessment or testing? *tte kanji* correcting students' paper [Ah OK.] *kono mitsu dake* (only these three) only these three. Just the teach English teaching [uh] *no hou ga* (in relation to) not the clubs not the schedule nothing *tte kanji*. Just the English teacher's job. [Ah] *daitai* (approximately).

Ms. Inoue: Ah maybe two two hours.

Bouchard: *nan* percent (in percentage). In your overall week-

Ms. Inoue: Ah *shigoto no naka de* (as part of the job?).

Bouchard: Uh. *shigoto no naka de ha* (as part of the job).

Ms. Inoue: Uh oh it ten uh ten or twelve twelve percent *gurai* (approximately).

Bouchard: Twelve percent *ha eigo no sensei mitai desu ne* (Twelve percent of the time you are an English teacher, right?).

Ms. Inoue: Uh. *de to hotondou dochi ga tte iu to* (it's roughly that) yeah.

Bouchard: *de hachi ju* percent *de sensei tte kanji* (eighty percent of the time you are a general teacher)

Ms. Inoue: Ah yes *so iu koto* (it's like that).

Bouchard: *tanin to ka-* (Homeroom teacher-)

Ms. Inoue: *motto eigo no sensei shitakatta desu* (I wanted to be more of an English teacher). (laughing)

Bouchard: *desu yo ne* your original image is very different *desu ne*.

Ms. Inoue: Yeah.

Bouchard: Do you think this will change as your career evolves? Now you're a new teacher. But in fifteen years from now, twenty years from now, [uh] when you're older [uh] do you think this will change? Or or it will always stay the same?

Ms. Inoue: Uh I I think I want change. *nan* uh ah excuse me, change?

Bouchard: *ko- kono ryou ha ano* (this proportion) this you know [Ah] twelve percent

Ms. Inoue: *kono ryou ga kaetai* (I want to change this proportion).

Bouchard: *motto eigo no sensei ni naritai* (Do you want to become more of an English teacher?)

Ms. Inoue: *naritai* uh- (I want to become)

Bouchard: *naritai kedo naru so* (You want to become but will it be possible?)

Ms. Inoue: Uh it's uh case-by-case for school. *gakkou no joutai no-* (It depends on the school-)

Bouchard: That's right.

I–*Ed*–chal Ms. Inoue: Uh here is very uh *ochitsuiteiru gakkou desu kedo* (this school is pretty settled but) [uh] *mondai ga ooi* uh *nan daro* uh physical uh uh problem *ga ooi* (there are many students who develop physical problems) for students. [Ah] *dakara chotto jikan ga kakaru* (so it takes quite a bit of time). Uh *toilet ikenai ko* (students who can't go to the toilet). [uh] *toilet hitori de ikenai ko* (Students who can't go to the toilet by themselves). [uh] *ie ni kaeranai ko to ka* (Students who can't go back home). [uh huh] *ato jibun de jibun wo kizu tsukeru koto ga takusan iru no* (Also, there are a lot of students who hurt themselves). *chotto soko ga shinpai* (This is a bit worrisome).

* All real names in the transcript (except Bouchard) have been either changed to pseudonyms or simply avoided.

APPENDIX 6: STUDENT ATTITUDE SURVEY

Dear students.

Thank you so much for welcoming me in your class. These ten classes went by very fast. I have enjoyed my time with you very much. I sincerely hope that your efforts in studying English will help you become successful English speakers in the near future.

I invite you to complete this survey. I am very much interested in your feelings about the following statements. Please read each sentence carefully and decide how you feel about it. Circle:

1	2	3	4	5	6
strongly disagree	disagree	mildly disagree	mildly agree	agree	strongly agree

This survey has 26 sentences, so it will probably take about 10 minutes to complete. Please complete this survey by yourself. Thank you very much.

1. I enjoy my English class.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
2. I can understand English well.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
3. It is easy for any Japanese person to learn English.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
4. I am learning English because I want to communicate in it.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
5. The Japanese language is unique in the world.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
6. There are many similarities between foreign cultures and Japanese culture.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
7. I can learn about Japanese culture from my English teacher.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
8. There are many differences between the English language and the Japanese language.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
9. It’s important for me to learn about foreign cultures.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
10. I can learn about foreign cultures from my English teacher.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
11. The Japanese are a unique group of people in the world.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
12. I think I can become a bilingual Japanese-English speaker.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
13. The Japanese land and climate are unique in the world.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
14. I can learn about Japanese culture from my English textbook.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
15. Only Japanese people can understand Japanese culture well.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
16. I can use English well.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
17. I am learning English because I want to have a good score on a high school entrance exam.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
18. Japanese culture is unique in the world.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
19. It is important for me to learn how to speak and write in English well.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
20. Japanese people who can speak English well are special.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
21. Only Japanese people can understand the Japanese language well.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
22. There are many similarities between the English language and the Japanese language.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
23. It’s important for me to learn about Japanese culture.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
24. The Japanese people have a unique way of thinking.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
25. I can learn about foreign cultures from my English textbook.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6
26. There are many differences between foreign cultures and Japanese culture.	1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6

Thank you very much for your responses. I have tried to make this survey as clear as possible. If you wish to write comments about the statements above or about this survey, please use the lines below.

APPENDIX 7: SURVEY ON TEACHERS' USE OF LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM

Dear (teacher's name).

How are your classes going? Thank you so much for allowing me to observe and record your classes this past year. I simply would not have been able to conduct my PhD research without your valuable contribution. I am sure that you are very busy right now, and I apologize if this letter comes to you at a very busy time.

Recently, my research has begun to focus on the very interesting topic of in-class language use by EFL teachers. I am therefore very much interested in gathering your views on the way you use English and Japanese in your own English language classroom. As such, I invite you to complete the following survey. This survey should take you approximately 10 minutes to complete (please make sure to complete both sides). After you have completed the survey, could you please put it in the envelope provided, and send it my regular mail before June 13 (Friday)? I have already put a stamp on it, and have written the return address. Again, I apologize for asking you this favour at a busy time of the year, and thank you very much for your contribution to my research.

Part 1: Please put a check (√) in the box which best describes your language use in the classroom.

	Statements	**Always**	**Usually**	**Sometimes**	**Hardly ever**	**Never**
1.	I translate words and sentences in English or in Japanese.					
2.	I ask my students to translate words and sentences in English or in Japanese.					
3.	I switch between English and Japanese within sentence.					
4.	I explain words and grammar structures in English.					
5.	I explain words and grammar structures in Japanese.					
6.	I use Japanese when I feel my students won't understand something.					
7.	I use Japanese when I want my students to remain focused and interested.					
8.	I use English when I want my students to remain focused and interested.					
9.	I discuss cultural topics in English.					
10.	I discuss cultural topics in Japanese.					

Part 2: Please circle your level of agreement (or disagreement) with the following statements. 4 is strong agreement and 1 is strong disagreement.

Statements	**Strongly agree**	. . . .		**Strongly disagree**
1. It's important to translate words and sentences in English or in Japanese.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
2. I use Japanese because I don't have confidence in my English ability.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
3. My students should use English at all time in the classroom.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
4. I should use English at all time in the classroom.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
5. An English-only policy is a good idea for English education in junior high schools.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
6. My students will learn English more effectively if I use English 100% of the time.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
7. My students will learn English more effectively if I use English 80% of the time.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
8. My students will learn English more effectively if I regularly use Japanese to explain difficult things.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
9. Using Japanese is important to show empathy and solidarity towards my students.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
10. My students don't like it when I use Japanese.	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

Part 3: Please write an approximate percentage (number out of 100) in the boxes on the right.

Statements	English	Japanese
1. Generally speaking, in my classroom, I use …		
2. When I give instructions, I use …		
3. To provide feedback, I use …		
4. To explain vocabulary words, I use …		
5. To explain grammar points, I use …		
6. To explain testing procedures and strategies, I use …		
7. To discuss cultural topics, I use …		
8. To do chorus practice, I use …		
9. To manage the classroom (discipline, etc.), I use …		
10. To praise the students, I use …		
11. To reprimand the students, I use …		
12. To talk with the students about things unrelated to the English class, I use …		

APPENDIX 8: LISTS OF CODES

Note: Each code is separated by a hyphen.

Sets of codes	**Codes***	**Explanations**
Left	C	data found in classroom audio-recordings
	I	data found in teacher interviews
	M	data found in classroom materials
	T	data found in classroom textbook
Middle	*Ed*	elements related to EFL education
	Ni	*nihonjinron*-related elements
	UE	elements related to use of English by the teacher in the classroom
Right – *Ed*	actl	references to active learning
	alt	references to ALTs
	chal	references to challenges faced by English teachers
	clt	references to communicative language teaching
	cult	references to the teaching of culture
	edis	references to teaching English at the discourse level
	engu	references to use of English in the EFL classroom
	ente	references to entrance exams
	gram	references to grammar teaching
	grtr	references to grammar-translation
	inno	references to teacher’s own teaching innovations
	kata	references to *katakana* pronunciation
	mac	references to educational macro-objectives
	mext	references to EFL policies published by MEXT
	mora	references to moral education
	prio	references to teaching priorities
	prof	references to proficiency tests
	team	reference to team spirit building
	teat	references to teacher training
	teva	references to teacher evaluation
	text	references to textbook
Right – *Ni*	cdif	references to cultural differences
	cont	references to discourse(s) contradicting the *nihonjinron* discourse
	enlf	references to English as *lingua franca*
	esop	references to English speaking opportunities for Japanese people
	foim	references to foreign countries as imagined entities
	fost	references to foreign cultures as ‘interesting’ or strange
	fodj	references to foreigners discovering Japan
	jeng	references to Japanese people’s difficulties in speaking English (Japanese people as monolingual individuals)
	juni	references to Japan as unique nation (‘traditional Japan’)
	nain	references to links between Japan as a nation and Japanese people as individuals
	nasp	references to native-speakerist discourse
Right – *UE*	code	use of code-switching
	uest	use of English with simultaneous Japanese translations
	uewt	use of English without Japanese translation (‘only English’)

* Codes are listed alphabetically.

APPENDIX 9: ANALYZED EXCERPTS

5.1.2 Code-switching

Excerpt 5.1.2.1 – Asahi JHS (August 28)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Inoue:	OK. Thank you. So first uh practice	
2		speaking three times *san kai*. Only you	Three times
3		*hitori de*. *hai ja* let’s start.	Alone / Yes, well

Excerpt 5.1.2.2 – Asahi JHS (August 28)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Inoue:	The first check your preparation.	
2		Ah *ja yoshuu check kara ikimasu*.	Well, let’s check your preparations

Excerpt 5.1.2.3 – Heiwa JHS (December 18)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Ishida:	*dewa ima mazu saishou ni minna san de*	Well, first what I want you to
2		*yatte itadakitai no ha tadashii to omou hou*	do is to circle the ones you
3		*ni maru shite kudasai.* Which one is bigger?	think are right.
4		Look at the picture. Oh, the dog is bigger	
5		than the cat. OK? So, make a circle. Write	
6		down a circle, make a circle. OK? Next,	
7		number two. OK? Let’s go. Circle circle.	
8		One minute. Hurry up.	

Excerpt 5.1.2.4 – St-Maria J&SHS (May 23)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	In pairs, give your partner three hint	
2		words. Man wear the jacket, woman	
3		cleans the glasses. *muzukashii wa kyou.*	Today it’s really hard. It’s
4		*metcha muzukashii.*	really really hard.
5	Another student:	*yada.*	I don’t like this.
6	Ms. Tanaka:	*ii?* Difficult, yes. Fold the paper like this.	Good?
7		Everyone, then in practice, practice in	
8		pairs. Today’s speaking training is very	
9		difficult. *hai*. Now, start practice in pairs.	Yes.

Excerpt 5.1.2.5 – Sakura JHS (May 29)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Mr. Ono:	*hai* good very good. *dewa tsugi. aruku koto*	Yes / Alright, next. How do
2		*ga nan desu ka*?	you say ‘walk’?
3	Chorus:	Walk.	
4	Mr. Ono:	*de* the *wo tsukete* the walk *dozo*.	And you put the for the walk. Go ahead.
5	Chorus:	The walk.	

Excerpt 5.1.2.6 – Asahi JHS (August 28)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Inoue:	*hai ja* ah next pair work uh please *janken*.	Yes, well / Rock-paper-scissors
2		Please play *janken* uh you win orange part,	Rock-paper-scissors
3		you lose uh green part. *hai* three times let's	Yes
4		start.	

Excerpt 5.1.2.7 – St-Maria J&SHS (May 21)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	We Go. The name of that shop *ne*? And	Right?
2		(student's name) had a break time with Bennyapa	
3		on that on Saturday. Let's focus on Bennyapa.	
4		This is (student's name)'s story *deshio*? Let's	isn't it? / Yes.
5		focus on Byu *hai*. Byu's story. Byu is a Thailand	
6		student. She wanted to go to Japan. And finally,	
7		she came to Japan on Mar- in May. This May. And	
8		she was accepted by (student's name)'s family.	
9		And she- we call her Bennyapa Byu *hai*. Let's	Yes.
10		change to passive voice.	

Excerpt 5.1.2.8 – St-Maria J&SHS (June 18)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	OK, girls. *hai*. Thank you very much. OK,	Yes.
2		look at the front. (student's name) *san*.	(honorific suffix) / Yes.
3		OK, thank you. Stop doing that. *hai* OK.	
4	Another student:	Now, Q&A time. Q&A time.	
5	Ms. Tanaka:	Q&A time. So, tell me. What do you know	
6		about Thanksgiving Day? Anything.	
7		Anything is OK. What do you know about	
8		Thanksgiving Day? (student's name) *san*.	(honorific suffix)
9	That student:	On Thanksgiving Day fourth Thursday in	
10		November.	
11	Ms. Tanaka:	Thanksgiving Day is the fourth Thursday	
12		in November. So, the date will be changed	
13		year by year, probably. *ne* not fixed date.	Right

Excerpt 5.1.2.9 – Sakura JHS (May 1)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Mr. Ono:	*tokoro de kondo ne*- next page 12. Look at	By the way, right, next page
2		page 12. *miru to zenzen kono kanke nai*	12. Look at page 12.
3		*desu yo ne…*	Looking at this, we see it's totally unrelated, right…

Excerpt 5.1.2.10 – St-Maria J&SHS (June 25)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Do you know her name?	
2	One student:	Lucy.	
3	Another student:	Rose.	
4	Ms. Tanaka:	No.	

5	Another student:	Ms. White.	
6	Ms. Tanaka:	*zenzen chigau*.	Totally different.
7	Another student:	Laura.	
8	Ms. Tanaka:	*shiranai ne*.	Don't know her name, do you?
9	That student:	Laura.	
10	Ms. Tanaka:	Laura *ja nai yo*. her name- she is-	It's not Laura.
11	Another student:	Laura.	
12	Ms. Tanaka:	Tammy.	

Excerpt 5.1.2.11 – St-Maria J&SHS (May 23)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Don't forget to write Japanese meaning, from	
2		number 6.	
3	One student:	Uh?	
4	Ms. Tanaka:	Number 6.	
5	Same student:	(inaudible, in Japanese)	
6	Ms. Tanaka:	Please, write. (laughing) *gyaku da*. Number 7…	The opposite.

5.1.3 Use of English with simultaneous translation

Excerpt 5.1.3.1 – Heiwa JHS (October 17)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Chorus:	What do you want to be in the future?	
2	Ms. Ishida:	*to kiite kudasai*. *moshi mo watashi ga*	This is what you hear. If I
3		singer *ni naritai, aite wa* I want to be a	want to be a singer, and I
4		singer *tte iuttara nante iu kotae aru no ka?*	answer I want to be a singer, what kind of responses are there?
5	S1:	Wow!	
6	Ms. Ishida:	*mou hitotsu*?	Another one?
7	S2:	Great.	

Excerpt 5.1.3.2 – Asahi JHS (September 18)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Inoue:	OK, sit down please. *suwatte*. *hai* look up	Sit down. / Yes
2		your face. *hai, kao agete*. *hai*	Yes, look up. Yes

Excerpt 5.1.3.3 – Asahi JHS (May 8)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Inoue:	OK, *ja* first, please come back your	Well
2		worksheet homework. *hai. ja mazu shukudai wo dashite kudasai.*	Yes, so first hand in your homework.

Excerpt 5.1.3.4 – Sakura JHS (September 18)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	On May 5th, I went to my uncle's house.	
2		When I arrived there, when *te iu koto ga*	When doesn't mean when,
3		*itsu janakute nani nani no toki da*. Arrive *ga*	but during or as. Arrive

4 5 6 7		*touchaku shita*. *watashi ga tsuita toki* the phone was ringing. (makes a ringing sound; some students laugh) I ate sushi. I ate sushi there.	means reach. When I got there…

Excerpt 5.1.3.5 – Sakura JHS (September 18)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1 2	Mr. Ono:	Bouchard *sensei* is this the small letter OK? Sakura Park.	Teacher
3	Bouchard:	No. It has to be a big letter.	
4	Mr. Ono:	Big letter.	
5	Bouchard:	Big letter.	
6 7	Mr. Ono:	(to students) Big letter *janakya dame nan desu*.	Only big letters.
8	Bouchard:	That's right. It's a name.	
9 10	Mr. Ono:	We say only park I go to the park is small letter.	
11 12	Bouchard:	That's right. The park means any park. But Sakura Park is only one park.	
13 14 15 16 17	Mr. Ono:	Ahh. *naze ka tte iu to tatoeba watashitachi tada koen itta te iu toki wa ikutsu mo kangaeraremasu yo ne. tatoeba chikaku ni mitsu gurai aru dore ka ittan da na te iu kangaerareru desu kedo-*	The reason is that when we say the word park, we mean all kinds of parks. For example, if there are three different parks around, we don't know which one.
18	S1:	Oh.	
19 20 21	Mr. Ono:	*sakura koen te iu no ga kore ga* (inaudible) *ga itta koen ga hitotsu te iu koto nano de oomoji ni suru yo*.	When we say Sakura Park, we mean we went to only that park, so we use capital letters.
22	S1:	Oh.	
23	S2:	*hai hai*.	Yes yes.

Excerpt 5.1.3.6 – Asahi JHS (September 11)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1 2 3	Ms. Inoue:	*hai* what's the meaning? (taps on the blackboard with chalk) *ko iu imi nan dake*? *ue shita dochi*?	Yes What's the meaning? Top or down? Which?
4	S1:	*ue shita shita*.	Top down down.
5	Ms. Inoue:	*shita. hai shita*.	Down. Yes, down.

Excerpt 5.1.3.7 – Heiwa JHS (October 24)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1 2 3	Ms. Ishida:	*… riyuu wo gakkou he ikitai, koukou he ikitai, san nensei no tokoro kara* (inaudible) *san hai.*	…the reason why you want to go to school, go to high school, because you are in the third year (inaudible) three, go.
4	Chorus:	I want to go to high school.	
5 6	Ms. Ishida:	So why? *ima made dattara sugu* because *de kotaemashita.* I want *san hai.*	Right after this, we put 'because' to answer / three, go.

7 8	Chorus:	I want to go to high school because I want to study more.	
9 10 11 12	Ms. Ishida:	*kore wo* because *de tsukawanai de ikimashio. ii?* (inaudible) because *de tsukaimasen. moto* simple *ni iimasu. san hai.*	Let’s try without using ‘because’. OK? Without using ‘because’. Saying it more simply. Three, go.
13	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to study more.	
14 15 16 17	Ms. Ishida:	Very good. *riyuu ga iro iro kawatte kimasu ne. motto benkyou shitai kara. kore ha tomodachi wo tsukuru tame ni koukou ikitain da. san hai.*	We can change the reason, right? Because I want to study more. Also, I want to go to high school because I want to make friends. Three, go.
18	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to make friends.	
19 20	Ms. Ishida:	(inaudible) *koushien ni ikitain da.* Ready, go.	I want to take part in the national baseball tournament.
21	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to play baseball.	
22	Ms. Ishida:	*daigaku ikitain da.* Ready, go.	I want to go to university.
23	Chorus:	I want to go to high school to go to college.	
24	Ms. Ishida:	To go to university.	

5.1.4 Use of English without translation

Excerpt 5.1.4.1 – Sakura JHS (May 1)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1 2	Mr. Ono:	Today, last week uh two weeks ago, I tell you I tell you about college teacher.	
3	Students:	Yeh (clapping hands)	
4 5	Mr. Ono:	You write this agre- you like a- agreement *doisho*.	Consent form
6	Students:	(clapping hands again)	
7	Mr. Ono:	Now today-	
8	S1:	Do you like (inaudible)	
9 10	Mr. Ono:	Today we have a self-introduction *jikoushoukai*.	Self-introduction
11	S2:	Woahh.	
12	Students:	(clapping hands again)	

Excerpt 5.1.4.2 – St-Maria J&SHS (May 9)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Good morning girls.	
2	Chorus:	Good morning Ms. Tanaka.	
3	S1:	(calling another student’s name)	
4	Ms. Tanaka:	How are you today?	
5	Chorus:	I’m fine, thank you. And you?	
6	Ms. Tanaka:	Fine. How is the weather today?	
7	Chorus:	It’s sunny.	
8	Ms. Tanaka:	Sunny. Then what is the date today?	
9	Chorus:	It’s May 9, 2013.	
10	Ms. Tanaka:	OK. Please have a seat.	
11	Students:	(talking out loud)	
12	Ms. Tanaka:	Shhh. OK, please. Let’s do our vocabulary	

13		test. OK?	
14	S2:	Ah *kyou yattenai tango*.	Ah, I didn't do the vocabulary task.
15	S3:	(inaudible question, in Japanese)	
16 17 18	Ms. Tanaka:	Why? After the test. (student's name), hurry up and get ready. (another student's name, repeated twice), Here you are.	
19	S4:	*sensei, matte kudasai*.	Teacher, please wait.
20	S5:	*sensei*?	Teacher?
21	Ms. Tanaka:	*hai*.	Yes.
22 23	S5:	All's well that ends well *tte nan desu ka*? End *tte* (inaudible)?	What does 'All's well that ends well' mean? What's 'end'?

Excerpt 5.1.4.3 – St-Maria J&SHS (May 9)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1 2 3 4	Ms. Tanaka:	(showing flashcards) A cheap t-shirt is easy to find. A cheap t-shirt is not easy to find. OK? I want to hear your opinion *hai*. A cheap something-	Yes
5	S1:	A cheap t-shirt is eager-	
6	Ms. Tanaka:	Eager?	
7 8	S1:	No no no no (some girls laughing) easy to find. Eh eh *kaimasu yo ne*.	It changes, doesn't it?
9	Ms. Tanaka:	Uh.	
10	S1:	A cheap a cheap t-shirt is easy to find.	
11	Ms. Tanaka:	OK, thank you *hai*. How about jeans?	Yes.
12	S2:	A cheap jeans are-	
13	Ms. Tanaka:	Are-	
14	S2:	Easy to find.	
15	Ms. Tanaka:	Easy to find. Yes. At UniQlo, at Seiyu *ne. hai*.	Right? Yes.
16	Some students:	Seiyu?	
17	S3:	*soko yasui yo*.	It's really cheap there.
18	Ms. Tanaka:	*yasui hai*.	Cheap, right.
19	S4:	A cheap electric guitar is easy to find.	
20	Ms. Tanaka:	Easy to find, are you sure? *hai* shoes.	Yes.
21	S5:	A a shoes is	
22	Ms. Tanaka:	A shoes (inaudible, in Japanese)	
23	S6:	A pair of-	
24 25	Ms. Tanaka:	A pair of (laughing) shoes, yes. A cheap pair of shoes-	
26	S5:	A-	
27 28	Ms. Tanaka:	A a just cheap shoes *demo ii. ne* cheap shoes.	Is OK. Right?
29	S5:	Cheap shoes is-	
30	Ms. Tanaka:	Is?	
31	S5:	Are are are	
32	Ms. Tanaka:	Are-	
33	S5:	Easy to find.	
34	Ms. Tanaka:	Easy to find. *hai* (student name)	Yes
35 36	S7:	Ah *eto* bag bag bag *eto* cheap bag is uh *eto nan dake*. Easy to *nan dake*.	Uhm. Uhm, uhm what is it again?
37	S8:	To find.	what is it again?

38	Ms. Tanaka:	To-	
39	S7:	Find.	
40	Ms. Tanaka:	Find. *ne. hai* (student name)	Right? Yes.

Excerpt 5.1.4.4 – St-Maria J&SHS (May 9)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Tanaka:	OK, so does anybody know about Ichiro,	
2		what do you know about Ichiro Suzuki?	
3	S1:	Baseball player.	
4	Ms. Tanaka:	Baseball player. Yes. He's not a soccer	
5		player.	
6	S2:	Professional.	
7	Ms. Tanaka:	Professional baseball player. He was not	
8		the first major league player. He was not	
9		the first major league player. But he was	
10		the first Japanese outfielder in the major	
11		league. Outfielder *nani*?	What?
12	S1:	*gaiya senshu*.	Outfielder.
13	Ms. Tanaka:	*gaiya senshu*. *sono mae ni mo* before	Outfielder. Also before him
14		him, many Japanese players went to America and became a major league	
15		player. But he was the first outfielder,	
16		Japanese outfielder. And where is he	
17		now? Where does he play now?	
18	S3:	America.	
19	Ms. Tanaka:	*ya* America *nan dayo*. America	Of course America.
20		(inaudible) *desu*. More specific. Which	
21		area? Which city?	
22	S4:	Seattle.	
23	S5:	Mariners.	
24	Ms. Tanaka:	A la la la la la Seattle. He used to play in	
25		Seattle. But not any *ne* anymore.	Right?
26	S6:	(inaudible)	
27	Ms. Tanaka:	*hai* New York. *doko*?	Yes. / where?
28	S7:	New York.	
29	Ms. Tanaka:	New York?	
30	S4:	Manhattan.	
31	S6:	Yankees.	
32	Ms. Tanaka:	Yankees. *so*. For the Yankees. Who	That's right.
33		used to play in New York Yankees?	
34	S1:	Matsui.	
35	Ms. Tanaka:	Matsui. Yes. Matsui.	

5.1.5 Culture teaching

Excerpt 5.1.5.1 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Mr. Ono:	the aim is to let students surprise. [mmh] So [(laughing)] funny or
2		strange culture. [Ah OK] Yeah.
3	Bouchard:	So you want students to be kind of impressed [Yes] or shocked.
4	Mr. Ono:	Yes.

Excerpt 5.1.5.2 – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	they are quite interested in the origin of Halloween or how to celebrate
2		[uh] Christmas or Halloween in America. [uh huh] And how different
3		from Ja- Japan in Japan, or so.

Excerpt 5.1.5.3 – St-Maria J&SHS (June 18)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Now, Q&A time. Q&A time.	
2	S1:	Q&A time.	
3	Ms. Tanaka:	So, tell me. What do you know about	
4		Thanksgiving Day? Anything. Anything	
5		is OK. What do you know about	
6		Thanksgiving Day? (student's name)	
7		*san*.	(honorific suffix)
8	S1:	On Thanksgiving Day fourth Thursday in	
9		November.	
10	Ms. Tanaka:	Thanksgiving Day is the fourth Thursday	
11		in November. So, the date will be	
12		changed year by year, probably. *ne* not	Right
13		fixed date.	
14	S2:	Fixed date?	
15	Ms. Tanaka:	Date date. *hi tsuke wo kawaru yo ne*.	The date changes, right?
16	Some students:	Uh.	
17	Ms. Tanaka:	OK. And what else? Thank you	
18		(student's name). *tatoeba* what do they	For example
19		eat? How do they celebrate? *to ka*. What	etc.
20		is the origin? Anything is OK. *hai*	Yes
21		(student's name)	
22	S2:	Thanksgiving Day has been celebrated	
23		in America every year ah since the first	
24		(inaudible)-	
25	Ms. Tanaka:	(laughing) Since the first Thanksgiving	
26		Day. How many years?	
27	S2:	400 years.	
28	Ms. Tanaka:	400 years. OK. Can you say that without	
29		the textbook?	
30	S2:	Uh?	
31	Ms. Tanaka:	Without looking at the textbook? Can	
32		you say that? *ganbare hai*.	Do your best, yes.
33	S2:	Thanksgiving Day has been ah-	
34	Ms. Tanaka:	Has been-	
35	S2:	Has been celebrated in America-	
36	Ms. Tanaka:	In America-	
37	S2:	Every year-	
38	Ms. Tanaka:	Every year-	
39	S2:	Since the first Thanksgiving Day almost	
40		400 years ago.	
41	Ms. Tanaka:	Almost 400 years ago. *so da so datta ne*	That's right, that's right
42		since almost 400 years ago *ka mata wa*	Or then again
43		for almost 400 years. *dochi ka ne*. *yon*	Whichever, right? For 400
44		*hyaku nen kan ne*. For 400 years has	years right?
45		been celebrated. Wow! Long history.	

46		Thank you (student’s name). Good job.	
47		What else?	

Excerpt 5.1.5.4 – St-Maria J&SHS (July 4)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	OK, girls. Look at the blackboard. July	
2		4th.	
3	S1:	*kyou*?	Today?
4	Ms. Tanaka:	Uh. July 4th. What day is today? *kyou*	What day is today?
5		*ha nan no hi*?	
6	S2/S3:	*natsu no hi/ umi no hi*.	It’s Summer Day/Sea Day.
7	Ms. Tanaka:	*umi no hi*? A la la la la la la la la. *hai*.	Sea Day? / Yes.
8	S4:	*kyou ha* (inaudible) *no hi*	It’s (inaudible) Day
9	S5:	*kyou ha dokuritsu kinenbi*.	Today’s Independence Day.
10	Ms. Tanaka:	Oh! Great.	Is that so?
11	S6:	*so na no*?	
12	S7:	National-	Like Nation-building Day or,
13	Ms. Tanaka:	Ah, wait. (student’s name), *kenkoku*	Independence Day- yes.
14		*kinen toka, dokuritsu ni- hai.* In English	
15		please.	
16	S1:	In- in-	
17	Ms. Tanaka:	In-	
18	S1:	In- in- in-	
19	Some students:	(laughing)	
20	S3:	Indentopod-	
21	S4:	Independence.	That’s right. (X4)
22	S6:	Ah *so so so so*.	
23	Ms. Tanaka:	(writing on the board) Independence	
24		Day. OK. Do you know- do you	
25		remember, this year is very important in	
26		America.	
27	S1:	(inaudible, in Japanese)	Right.
28	Ms. Tanaka:	*ne*. Why is this year important in	
29		America?	
30	S2:	America become a inde-	
31	Ms. Tanaka:	Pardon?	
32	S2:	America become independent.	
33	Ms. Tanaka:	Good. (writing on the board) America	
34		became independent.	

Excerpt 5.1.5.5 – St-Maria J&SHS (July 4)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	So, American people celebrate this	
2		day with picnic or barbecue or-	
3	Another student:	*ii na*.	That’s great.
4	Ms. Tanaka:	Family gathering	
5	Another student:	Eh, *kyou yatterun desu ka*?	Is that what’s happening today?
6	Ms. Tanaka:	*hai*?	Yes?
7	Same student:	*kyou yatterun desu ka*?	Is that what’s happening today?
8	Ms. Tanaka:	Uh, in America *toka. hai.*	Like / Yes.

Excerpt 5.1.5.6 – Heiwa JHS (November 26)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1 2 3	CD recording:	I always say people in one country can’t live a day without the help of people in other countries.	
4	Ms. Ishida:	*hai*.	Yes.
5 6 7	Chorus:	I always say people in one country can’t live a day without the help of people in other countries.	
8 9	Ms. Ishida:	*aru kuni no hito bito, ta no kuni no hito bito*.	People in one country, people in other countries
10 11 12	CD recording:	People in Japan, for example, must think of people in China when they wear clothes.	
13	Ms. Ishida:	*hai*.	Yes.
14 15 16	Chorus:	People in Japan, for example, must think of people in China when they wear clothes.	
17 18 19 20 21 22	Ms. Ishida:	*tatoeba nihonjin ha tte iutte mo nihonjin tte iu hajimechatta no de for example tte iu kotoba ha tatoe tte iuttemasu yo. de iro fuku wo kiru toki ni sore wo tsukutta chuugoku no hito bito no koto kangaenakereba dame deshio*.	“People in Japan” begins the sentence, followed by the expression “for example”. Also, when we wear all kinds of clothes we must think of the Chinese people who made them.
23 24 25	CD recording:	They must also think of people in Africa and south America when they eat chocolate and feel happy.	
26	Ms. Ishida:	*hai*.	Yes.
27 28 29	Chorus:	They must also think of people in Africa and south America when they eat chocolate and feel happy.	
30 31 32 33	Ms. Ishida:	Chocolate *wo taberu toki ni ha* Africa *no hito bito* eh *minna ni* America *hito bito no koto kangaenakereba dame datta*. OK?	When we eat chocolate, we must think of African people and uh Americans.

Excerpt 5.1.5.7 – Heiwa JHS (January 28)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1 2 3	Ms. Ishida:	Eh *ashita* Deck *sensei to* team teaching *nattemasu ga, sono toki kite mimashio.*	Tomorrow, we’ll have team teaching with Mr. Deck, so let’s ask him.
4	S1:	Ah Deck *sensei.*	Teacher
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ms. Ishida:	Eh Englishman to American *no chigai desu ne, hontou ni konna sonna omoide iru no kana to iu.* Eh *watashitachi kara shite miru to dochira no eigo wo hanasu hitotachi nan desu ga, dou nan deshio.* Englishman *no* pride *nan deshio ka, sou iu uta nan deshio ka. chotto kakoii desu yo.*	Not sure if there are differences between Englishmen and Americans. I am not sure if we can differentiate between these two types of English. Is this a song about English pride? It’s actually a cool song.

Excerpt 5.1.5.8 – Heiwa JHS (February 3)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1 2	Ms. Ishida:	What day is it? *kyou ha nan no hi? setsubun.*	What day is it? End-of-Winter Day.
3	S1:	*setsubun.*	End-of-Winter Day.
4 5	Ms. Ishida:	*setsubun ka. setsubun tte nani?* What's the meaning of *setsubun?*	End-of-Winter Day, is it? What's the meaning of *setsubun*?
6	S2:	*mame maku.*	Throwing beans to ward off evil spirits.
7	Ms. Ishida:	*mame maku.*	Throwing beans to ward off evil spirits.

Excerpt 5.1.5.9 – Asahi JHS (August 29)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Ms. Inoue:	*hai ja* number 1. (inaudible).	Yes, well
2	S1:	*nihon shoku*.	Japanese food.
3 4	Ms. Inoue:	*hai, nihon shoku. mou ikko de ii kata dare ka*? *ote agete*.	Yes, Japanese food. What's another way of saying this? Raise your hand.
5	S2:	*wa shoku*.	Japanese food.
6 7 8	Ms. Inoue:	*so, wa shoku. wa shoku. dochi demo ii. wa demo, nihon demo ii. achira mini* uh *chuuka dattara*?	That's right. Japanese food. Japanese food. Whichever is OK. What if it's Chinese food?
9	Some students:	Chinese food.	
10	One boy:	*chuuka ryouri*.	Chinese food.
11 12	Ms. Inoue:	(laughing) *chuuka ryouri*. Chinese food. *hai ja tsugi ni*.	Chinese food. Yes, well, next one.

Excerpt 5.1.5.10 – Sakura JHS (May 14)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1 2 3	Mr. Ono:	*ja koko de watashi ga kyoumi no shitsumon ga arun desu keredomo* (writing on the board)	OK, I have a question I want to ask.
4	S1:	Japan?	
5 6	Mr. Ono:	Mmh, *datte nihon ni sunderu no wakaru shou?*	Well, you know he is living in Japan.
7	S2:	*sunderu no?*	He lives in Japan?
8 9 10	Mr. Ono:	*datte itsumo mai shuu gakkou ni kiteru shi Hokkai Gakuen no sensei da tte iu no wa wakaru kara*	Well, he always comes to school every week, and he is a teacher at Hokkai Gakuen University, so you know.

Excerpt 5.1.5.11 – Heiwa JHS (January 30)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Honda:	Uh, I never meet a samurai–
2	Audience of journalists:	(laughter)
3 4 5 6	Honda:	So I don't know that is true. But I think Japanese uh is uh never give up and strong mentality and we have good discipline. So I think I have, too. So just I want to show that spirit on the pitch.

5.1.6 Challenges faced by English teachers

Excerpt 5.1.6.1 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	Do you think it was you had enough training? When you began your job
2		as an English teacher, do you think you were ready?
3	Mr. Ono:	Mmh. I’m sorry for college teachers. (laughing)
4	Bouchard:	Why?
5	Mr. Ono:	You are college teacher (laughing) yeah oh very bad. (laughing)
6	Bouchard:	Why?
78	Mr. Ono:	Very bad (laughing) [(laughing)] because mmh of course university is
9		theory theory *riron* (theory) theory and school is *jissen* (practice) practice
10		yes. Uh but much uh different [mmh] much much much much different.
11	Bouchard:	So did you have a shock?
12	Mr. Ono:	Yes very shocked.

Excerpt 5.1.6.2 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	So after your teacher training, [mmh] were you ready to be a teacher? Or
2		what the was there a gap big gap between you know teacher training and
3		real teaching?
4	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes uh gap. I have a gap.
5	Bouchard:	A big gap?
6	Ms. Inoue:	Big gap.
7	Bouchard:	What kind of gap was this?
8	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh for example in the college uh my [Yeah.] my university college *de mo*
9		uh maybe the uh we the people uh they who want to be a teacher [Yeah.]
10		for English (inaudible) *hito ha yappa* first learn about the *kongen moto* (the
11		roots) the why the start the English *to ka eigo no eigo gaku to ka* (the
12		study of English) [mmh] *gengo gaku ka hajimaru*- (linguistics-)
13		OK linguistics [Eh linguistics] uh grammar and so forth yeah.
14	Bouchard:	I think it’s uh very de- uh important. [mmh] But uh *jibun no daigaku dewa*
15	Ms. Inoue:	*yappari sono moto daiji ni shiteirun desu kedo* (after all, my university
16		emphasized the study of English and its linguistic roots) [mmh] *iza jugyou*
17		*to naru to* (when I began teaching) [mmh] *chotto mo chotto jugyou wo* for
18		the class [uh] class *no tame no jugyou no gaa tte ii kana* (we should have
19		received more training in classroom planning and management).

Excerpt 5.1.6.3 – Heiwa JHS (February 10)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	when you began teaching English, do you feel that your teacher
2		training [mmh] prepared you? Or did you have a big learning curve?
3	Ms. Ishida:	Not big curve. [Ah OK.] Mmh and uh of course we had uh some
4		training in the Board of Ed- City Board of Education. [mmh] But uh
5		most of us [mmh] maybe our self-study. [mmh] And uh during the class
6		during the class, I try to use it. [mmh] I wanted to use it. So I have to I
7		had to speak English [mmh] and using it.

Excerpt 5.1.6.4 – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Tanaka:	probably each English teacher [uh] try harder uh is has to try harder
2		[uh] because they stay in English they have to explain grammatical
3		things grammatical things in English. If they haven’t done yet, [uh] they
4		have to try harder and they have to train themselves.

Excerpt 5.1.6.5 – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Tanaka:	compared other countries, Japanese training system is not sufficient
2		[uh] I think. In Tokyo [uh] there are many workshops [uh] and uh and I
3		know some workshops I I especially interested in. [uh huh] Uh are
4		being held in Tokyo. But seems impossible to join that kind of program.

Excerpt 5.1.6.6 – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Tanaka:	I have been to some other countries [uh huh] and I experienced
2		something in each country. [uh] That experience is very helpful for me
3		now [uh] right now. [uh] So for as an English teacher we should go
4		outside and go to uh experience different cultures. [uh huh] So and so
		we can share [uh] with students those experiences. [uh] Mmh.

Excerpt 5.1.6.7 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	For you how important is it for Japanese students to learn English?
2	Mr. Ono:	Mmh. I think it’s uh mmh the most is to pass entrance examinations.
3	Bouchard:	That’s the most important?
4	Mr. Ono:	Yeah.

Excerpt 5.1.6.8 – Asahi JHS (September 4)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Inoue:	uh first problem is uh have no time (laughing) uh *jikan ga nai* (no time
2		available) [uh] *nakunatte,* uh test *no hai ga mijikakute* (little time for test
3		preparation).
4	Bouchard:	Ah so preparation for test is shorter.
5	Ms. Inoue:	Uh, shorter.
6	Bouchard:	In the *ni nensei* (second year) [uh yes] basically. *san nensei* (third year)
7		is quite a lot of preparation [Ah yes] for the test.
8	Ms. Inoue:	Normal.

Excerpt 5.1.6.9 – Asahi JHS (September 4)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Inoue:	*ma mazu* (well, first) first uh translate translate *shite rikai shita ue de* (once
2		they understand the content and can translate it) [uh] *de naiyou* content
3		(then we can focus on content).
4	Bouchard:	Mmh mmh. So it’s difficult to go to the content area.
5	Ms. Inoue:	Uh yes. Content area.
6	Bouchard:	So you teach the grammar. And when they understand the grammar [*so*]
7		then you want them to produce. [mmh] But there is little time to produce.

Ms. Inoue:	Yes.

Excerpt 5.1.6.10 – Asahi JHS (September 4)

Interlocutor	**Utterance**
Ms. Inoue:	(laughing) *so nakanaka ima* (somewhat) uh I have uh it's it's my fault. I have no time to uh prepare the the good activity. [uh] *mo* uh *dakara chotto*- (it's somewhat-)
Bouchard:	Ah OK.
Ms. Inoue:	*nan ka dekinakatta* (I can't quite do it yet). [OK.] Or the *ato ha* test *no kangaeru koto ga*- (and there are the tests to think about.)

Excerpt 5.1.6.11 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Interlocutor	**Utterance**
Ms. Inoue:	I cannot input the this uh [Content?] *monkasho*'s content. [uh] So uh *nan tte iu na* (how can I say?) uh not clearly *no tokoro ha* (the unclear parts) uh *eigo de iu to gengo katsudo juushi dewa attemasu kedo* (there are sections on the types of English activities but), [uh] *gutai teki ni do iu koto ha gengo katsudo attari to ka* (there are clear indications as to the kinds of language activities) [uh] four skills *yon gino no* (four skills) *go gi*- uh five skills [uh] *go gino ga kou yatte oshieru beki tte iu tokoro kuwashiku yori to* (there are parts where they explain how to teach these five skills) I I don't know (laughing) I can't uh-

5.2.2 Teachers' views on culture teaching

Excerpt 5.2.2.1 – Sakura JHS (May 8)

Interlocutor	**Utterance**
Ms. Ono:	I hope the company will wrote more good Japanese points. For example [mmh] uh *sakura* (cherry blossom) is only Japanese. [mmh] Eh of course America or and so on. [mmh, have this] take take cherry trees [mmh] but uh I think Japanese is very very good, *hanami* (flower viewing) is uh good. [mmh] So uhm I want them to write more Japanese good point. [mmh] Because oh always newspaper and TV said now's children is self-confident is low. Self-confidence [ahh] is low. But Japan is good country. [mmh] But oh we said we heard we often heard Japanese bad news. [mmh] For example uh children is reduced or children. [There are less children] Less yeah or uh when we graduate college [mmh] we have no job. [mmh] Or and so on. But Japan is very very good good. For example this is uh I think this is a long history [mmh] and *hanami* (flower viewing) is uh very very good point. For example talking or uhm for example unknown people's friendly. [mmh] Or and so on. So uh of course uh I think *hanami* (flower viewing) or Japanese many good points. [mmh] So at first the thema the theme for example this is a Kyoto [mmh] and *hanami* (flower viewing) uh it's OK but more good points in Japan.

Excerpt 5.2.2.2 – Heiwa JHS (February 10)

Interlocutor	**Utterance**
Ms. Ishida:	I use media. [mmh] Mmh TV and uh newspaper [uh] mmh as a like a sort uh we live in uh we live in the America [mmh] and uh Canada [mmh] and uh foreign country. As we can use English. [mmh Ah] (pointing to the

4		textbook) This this is a very simple box a kind of box [mmh] So-
5	Bouchard:	Limiting yeah this textbook.
6	Ms. Ishida:	Yes limiting [mmh] Mmh we are in a box. [mmh] I feel.
7	Bouchard:	What's the box?
8	Ms. Ishida:	Now?
9	Bouchard:	Mmh is is the box the school? Is the box Japan? [Ah] Is the box-
10	Ms. Ishida:	Maybe sometimes like uh hospital. [Ah] (laughing) So bad image. But uh I
11		think it's uh clean. [Ah] This is clean. No smoke. [mmh] No alcohol. [mmh]
12		Very clean. But uh very limited. Mmh.

Excerpt 5.2.2.3 – Heiwa JHS (January 28)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Ishida:	communication between culture [uh] is at first to know to know our culture.
2		[mmh] So oh I don't know so much about Japan. [mmh] I thought it. So
3		now the junior high school students can know about all of all many many
4		kinds of things [uh] in the textbook.

Excerpt 5.2.2.4 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	Which is most important, foreign culture or Japanese culture in these
2		textbooks?
3	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh anything this textbook uh I think is uh the most uh important is uh
4		mmh fo- uh first my Japanese.
5	Bouchard:	Uh Japanese is more important yeah?
6	Ms. Inoue:	Yeah. First [OK] first uh we have uh Japanese people [uh] uh have to uh
7		the explain our [uh] culture [uh huh] in other language. *demo nihongo*
8		*demo yappa tsutae nakute ha nai, sonna koto kara kyuu uh hoka no hito*
9		*ni hoka no bunka kiite kyuushu suru to otagae ni totte ii no kana* (Even in
10		Japanese it's important to communicate our culture, and from this we hear
11		about other people other cultures and learn from each other like sponges).
12		So it's important for Japanese young Japanese students to be able to
13	Bouchard:	discuss and explain [mmh] their Japanese culture [mmh] before learning
14		other cultures. [mmh] Or can you learn at both at the same time?
15		Mmmh both.
16	Ms. Inoue:	

Excerpt 5.2.2.5 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Ms. Inoue:	*nihonjin ha honne iwanai nihonjin ha moto moto* (Japanese people can't
2		express their true feelings, Japanese are at the heart)-
3	Bouchard:	*nihonjin ga honne ga ano nihongo de tsutaenai* (Japanese people can't
4		express their true feelings in Japanese).
5	Ms. Inoue:	*so tsutaerarenai* (right, they can't express them).
6	Bouchard:	*nihongo de ha kedo eigo de ha* (that's in Japanese, but in English)
7	Ms. Inoue:	*eigo dattara* (if it's in English)-
8	Bouchard:	*kanousei ga aru* (it's possible).
9	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh *kanosei ga kekko aru* (there are a lot of possibilities). *tashika ni nan*
10		*ka tatoeba mitame demo irashite futotta to ka* eh (for example, you can tell
11		someone they got fat) (laughing) *nan ka* straight *de ienai koto mo ietai to*
12		*ka* (you can say things that are difficult to say straightforwardly) [mmh]
13		*nan daro ato chotto kashikoii koe* students *ha* (there are some sly
14		students) [mmh] *nan daro taoeba nan ka ano sensei no jugyou ha*

15		*tsumannai to ka nemui to ka* (for example who say that this teacher's
16		class is boring, that it makes me feel sleepy) [uh] *so iu koto wo*
17		*chokusetsu iutte kizutsuke yori ha*, *jitsu ha suugaku no jugyou no toki*
18		*nemui* (they can say that directly without having to worry, during the math
19		class I felt sleepy)-
20	Bouchard:	So when you say that English allows [uh] students or Japanese people to
21		express [Yes.] thoughts or ideas or feelings [mmh] that are difficult to say
22		in Japanese, do you think this actually happens? Do you think that *kore*
23		*jitsu ha* (in reality) [mmh] in reality *ha* [mmh] do you think that Japanese
24		people use English to communicate feelings uh that they can't
25		communicate in Japanese?
26	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh.
27	Bouchard:	*jissai ha aru tte kanji* (this happens in reality).
28	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh *jissai mo* (it actually happens).

Excerpt 5.2.2.6 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Inoue:	Japanese people uh *nihon ha* [uh] uh Japan is island, so uh I don't in uh I
2		uh they aren't interested in *kanshin ga* (interest) indifferent for the other
3		country.

Excerpt 5.2.2.7 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Are you saying that it's it's uh difficult to expect Japanese students to
2		become proficient [Yes] in English [Yes] Ah OK. OK. Because Japan is an
3		island country.
4	Mr. Ono:	Yeah it is only one point for example [mmh] oh for ex- other other reason
5		is for example oh Japanese uh oh you know uh ten or twenty years ago
6		[mmh] many Japanese students wanted to go abroad [mmh] and
7		exchange programs and so on. [mmh] But nowadays [mmh] uh younger
8		students don't try.
9	Bouchard:	Why do you think?
10	Mr. Ono:	Mmh we are rich [mmh] rich. And mmh it is unnecessary to go abroad.

Excerpt 5.2.2.8 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Has English education changed the way Japanese people communicate?
2	Mr. Ono:	Mmh but only yeah but only English classes only English classes.

Excerpt 5.2.2.9 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Do you see [mmh] Japanese society and culture changing because of
2		English education? [mmh] Or not changing?
3	Ms. Inoue:	I think it's a little uh change [uh] because uh mmh to be a to uh for job
4		hunting [uh] or career up or job [uh] and uh pass the school [uh] I change.
5		But mmh I uh something uh something I don't change uh the Japanese
6		mood [uh] because uh-
7	Bouchard:	The Japanese mood doesn't change.
8	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh.

Excerpt 5.2.2.10 – Heiwa JHS (January 28)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Do you think English education in Japan has an impact, an effect, an an
2		influence on Japanese culture?
3	Ms. Ishida:	Mmh we can see and the listen [uh] and uh everywhere [uh] any time [uh]
4		and uh using using English [uh] uh even uh Japanese [OK.] even
5		Japanese (inaudible).

Excerpt 5.2.2.11 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Mr. Ono:	*katakana eigo* so [Ah OK] yes uh many *katakana* is uh put into Japanese
2		life. [mmh] So students-
3	Bouchard:	Uh what do you think about this? Do you think it's good or bad?
4	Mr. Ono:	It's it's good thing [Ah] yes. [OK] Many *katakana*s come into [mmh] yeah.

Excerpt 5.2.2.12 – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	do you often like uh have you ever had like for example a student saying *ni*
2		*nihonjin da mo doushite eigo hanasanai to*? (I'm a Japanese. Why do I
3		have to speak English?) [Ah] This type of reaction. Have you ever had
4		this?
5	Ms. Tanaka:	*ano* very rare.
6	Bouchard:	Very rare.
7	Ms. Tanaka:	It's very rare. It's that's because this is St-Maria. [Yeah] Because well the
8		students who enter in this school enter this school [uh] are highly
9		motivated [Yeah] about in English.

Excerpt 5.2.2.13 – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	do you think that the more Japanese people will learn English the more
2		Japanese culture will change?
3	Ms. Tanaka:	Japanese culture.
4	Bouchard:	Mmh.
5	Ms. Tanaka:	Japa- uh that's not the English problem. IT (laughing) IT probably change
6		Japanese culture. [(laughing)] *sumaho* (smartphone) or *sumaho*
7		(smartphone) or Internet [uh] those are common language English [uh] in
8		that in that meaning [uh] in that sense, English can have the big impact *tte*
9		*iu ka* IT *ne*.

Excerpt 5.2.2.14 – Heiwa JHS (January 28)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Which is more important for you: teaching about Japanese culture or
2		teaching about foreign cultures in your classroom?
3	Ms. Ishida:	Both.
4	Bouchard:	Both are equally important yeah? [mmh] Ah OK. Very good.
5	Ms. Ishida:	Because we are Japanese. [uh] And when I teach to students [uh] the
6		grammar [uh] but I have to I have to explain both 'as tall as' *onajii gurai se*
7		*ga takai* (about as tall as). [mmh] But uh now we are now two girls, we are
8		too short. [uh] But uh in English *onajii gurai se ga takai* (about as tall as)
9		'as tall as' (laughing). [mmh] So very interesting uh language culture.

5.2.3 Teachers' views on monolingual EFL education

Excerpt 5.2.3.1 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	What's your impression of your students when they use English?
2	Mr. Ono:	Uh at first I became a teacher at first [mmh] I only have activities. For
3		example mmh when we study do you like. So apple, orange [mmh] and so
4		on. [mmh] So hello. [Hello.] Do you like apple? Yes. [Yes I do.] Do you like
5		orange? [So yes] uh yes. But it's not necessity necessity.

Excerpt 5.2.3.2 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Mr. Ono:	elaborate is it takes time [mmh] to elaborate. [mmh] Or like this [mmh]
2		mmh activity. So uh today we have no time so please have a uh please
3		have a partner [mmh] and uh each student you can hear [mmh] uh uh the
4		partner's answer is yes I do, so sit down is OK. [mmh] So please have a
5		question. Do you like soccer? Yes I do. OK. Do you like basketball? Yes I
6		do. Do you like (inaudible)? Yes I do. OK sit down.

5.3.1 Japan-as-unique; 'traditional Japan'

Excerpt 5.3.1.1 – Progress in English 2, page 98 (textbook used at St-Maria J&SHS)

Line	Content
1	Himeji Castle was built by Ikeda Terumasa in 1609.

Excerpt 5.3.1.2 – Progress in English 2, page 76 (textbook used at St-Maria J&SHS)

Line	Content
1	Ichiro was the first Japanese outfielder in the major leagues. After him, many other
2	Japanese players have gone to the major leagues. Japanese scientists have won the
3	Nobel Prize and many Japanese athletes have played professional soccer or golf both in
4	Japan and around the world.

Excerpt 5.3.1.3 – Sunshine 3, page 61 (textbook used at Asahi JHS)

Line	Content
1	Look at these pictures of animals playing together.
2	They are called *Choju-giga*, or "Cartoons of Birds and Animals."
3	When I first saw them a few days ago, I was very interested in them.
4	I especially like this scene of the frogs and rabbits enjoying wrestling.
5	I read about *Choju-giga* yesterday on the Internet.
6	I learned that the pictures were drawn about 700 years ago.
7	Some people say they're the oldest *manga* in Japan.
8	If it's true, the history of *manga* in Japan is very long.

Excerpt 5.3.1.4 – Japan News article titled "Renewed face of Asakusa" (used at Heiwa JHS)

Line	Content
1	The large paper lantern hanging from the Kaminarimon gate of Sensoji temple in
2	Asakusa, Tokyo, was replaced on Monday for the first time in ten years.
3	The new lantern, made of layers of Japanese *washi* paper over a bamboo frame, is 3.9

4	meters tall, 3.3 meters in diameter and weighs 700 kilograms.
5	Many tourists took photos as it was lifted into place at about 7 a.m.

Excerpt 5.3.1.5 – Sunshine 2, page 50-51 (textbook used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Line	Content
1	If you come to Yokosuka in the fall, you must go to Kannozaki. You can see a tall man in
2	a Gulliver's costume at the festival.
3	If you come to Sapporo in the winter, you should go and see the Snow Festival. You'll
4	enjoy beautiful scenes.
5	If you come to Saga, go to Yoshinogari Park. When you are at the park, you'll learn
6	about Japanese history.

Excerpt 5.3.1.6 – Sunshine 2, page 62 (textbook used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Line	Content
1	Dear Mr. and Mrs. Greenwood,
2	Hello. My name is Sato Hiroko.
3	I'm a junior high school student in Fukuoka, Japan.
4	Today I heard you will be my host family.
5	I'm very happy and excited now.
6	This will be my first trip to a foreign country.
7	I want to study English and make a lot of friends in the U.S.
8	Do you want to know anything about Japan?
9	Are you interested in Japan?
10	I'm looking forward to your email.
11	Take care.
12	By for now,
13	Hiroko

Excerpt 5.3.1.7 – Sunshine 2, page 76 (textbook used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Line	Content
1	I want to have my own Japanese restaurant in New York. I'm good at cooking Japanese
2	dishes. People in America love Japanese food because it's healthy. I hope they will like
3	my tofu dishes in summer and hot pot dishes in winter. I'll be happy if people like my
4	food. So I'm practicing cooking every day to be a good chef.

Excerpt 5.3.1.8 – Sunshine 3, page 77 (textbook used at Asahi JHS)

Line	Content
1	Look at the next picture. It was drawn by Jatariuc, 15, in Romania. This picture shows
2	the flag of her country. She says, "The most important thing to me is *my* country."

Excerpt 5.3.1.9 – Sunshine 3, page 62 (used at Asahi JHS)

Line	Content	
1	A:	Look at that.
2	B:	Oh, it's beautiful.
3	A:	That is *the temple* built by Ashikaga Yoshimitsu in 1397.
4	B:	You call it Kinkakuji, right?

Excerpt 5.3.1.10 – Worksheet produced by Ms. Inoue

Line	**Content**	
1	Tom:	What sports do you enjoy watching on TV, Yuji?
2	Yuji:	①I like to watch baseball and soccer, but my ☐ is sumo.
3	Tom:	Sumo?
4	Yuji:	Have you ever heard about sumo?
5	Tom:	Yes, often. [have / TV / I / it / on / seen].
6	Yuji:	Is that right? What did you think about it?
7	Tom:	I enjoyed it. And it’s an interesting sport.
8	Yuji:	Sumo is Japan’s national sport.
9	Tom:	I didn’t know ②that. How old is it?
10	Yuji:	I don’t know exactly, but I think it’s over a thousand years old.
11	Tom:	What do you like about sumo?
12	Yuji:	It’s very exciting. Many of the wrestlers look heavy, but they are very strong. Did
13		you know the strongest one is from Mongolia?
14	Tom:	No, I didn’t.
15	Yuji:	His name is Asa-sho-ryu. And there are many wrestlers from Mongolia now.
16	Tom:	Really. I hope sumo will be popular in my country some day.

Excerpt 5.3.1.11 – Sunshine 3, page 55 (used at Asahi JHS)

Line	**Content**	
1	Mr. Oka:	*Kaiten-zushi* has an interesting history. The first *kaiten-zushi* bar was
2		opened by Mr. Shiraishi Yoshiaki, a *sushi* chef, in Osaka in 1958. It made
3		*sushi* more popular in Japan.
4	Pat:	Really? How did he get the idea?
5	Mr. Oka:	He got the idea when he saw bottles at a beer factory. They were traveling
6		on a conveyor belt.
7	Pat:	Is that true?
8	Mr. Oka:	Yes. The *kaiten-zushi* belt moves at eight centimeters a second. That’s the
9		perfect speed for customers to pick up plates.
10	Pat:	That’s great. Mr. Shiraishi was a man of ideas. His idea helped to make
11		*sushi* more popular in the world.

Excerpt 5.3.1.12 – Spring Mid-Term test sheet (used at Sakura JHS)

Line	**Content**	
1	Yuki:	Did you enjoy your vacation?
2	Ms. Wood:	Yes. I ア (go) to Kyoto last week.
3	Yuki:	Really?
4	Ms. Wood:	I saw a *karesansui* garden. イ (　　) (　　) (　　) (　　).
5	Yuki:	A *karesansui* garden?
6	Ms. Wood:	It’s a Japanese-style rock garden and it’s very traditional. I have a lot of
7		pictures. Here they are.
8	Yuki:	Wow, beautiful! Are these traditional Kyoto dishes?
9	Ms. Wood:	Yes, ウ (　　) (　　). I enjoyed *yudofu* and *dengaku* in Arashi-yama. I
10		love Kyoto dishes.

Excerpt 5.3.1.13 – Worksheet produced by Ms. Inoue

Line	**Content**	
1	Lisa:	Tom, I am going to play tennis with my friends tomorrow. Why don’t you join us?
2	Tom:	Sorry, but I can’t. My friend’s father teaches me Japanese every Saturday. I
3		started learning Japanese last month.

4	Lisa:	Oh, that’s nice. Do you like studying Japanese?
5	Tom:	Yes. It’s difficult but it’s interesting. I can learn about many famous places in
6		Japan. I am going to visit Kyoto with my friend’s family next month.
7	Lisa:	That’s great. Well, why do you learn Japanese?
8	Tom:	I love Japan. It’s a beautiful country. I want to work in Japan.
9	Lisa:	Oh, really?

Excerpt 5.3.1.14 – Sunshine 2, page 32 (used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Line	**Content**	
1	A:	What do you think of *ukiyoe*?
2	B:	I think (that) it’s beautiful.

Excerpt 5.3.1.15 – Progress in English 2, page 124 (used at St-Maria J&SHS)

Line	**Content**	
1	Mrs. Green:	Oh, what a beautiful plate! Thank you so much, Jiro.
2	Jiro:	My mom sent it. It’s traditional Japanese pottery.
3	Mrs. Green:	It’s lovely! What’s it used for?
4	Jiro:	Sweets are served on it.
5	Mrs. Green:	It’s too beautiful to use. I think I’ll hang it on the wall.
6	Jiro:	I guess it can be used as a decoration, too.

Excerpt 5.3.1.16 – Sakura JHS (May 8)

Line#	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	Do you think that their [students’] self-confidence can be raised by
2		studying Japanese culture more? [Yes] Ah OK [Yes]” […] [students]
3		should study about [Yes] Japanese culture [Yes] more [Yes] OK.

Excerpt 5.3.1.17 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Mr. Ono:	Japanese English ability is low [mmh] because you you know Japan is
2		communicate with the Ja- around Japan sea. [mmh] (drawing a picture of
3		Japan on a paper) So we can’t go [mmh] other places.

5.3.2 Cultural polarization

Excerpt 5.3.2.1 – Sakura JHS (May 1)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	*hai ja ikimasu.* Look at the blackboard please.	Yes, well let’s go.
2		Rea- reading practice. Reading practice let’s go.	
3		*de eto ni danraku kono mae ga iimashita yaku de*	about this paragraph, I translated that before, and it was about the differences between America and Japan
4		(inaudible) *ni danraku natte nihon to* America *no*	
5		(inaudible) *tai sareteru yo*.	
6		This is a contrast Japan and America. OK so let’s	
7		go. I went to Sakura Park *dozo*.	Go ahead
8	Chorus:	I went to Sakura Park.	

Excerpt 5.3.2.2 – Sunshine 2, page 97 (used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Line	Content	
1	Mike:	I once had a similar experience in Japan.
2	Momoko:	Oh, did you? Tell me about it.
3	Mike:	My host mother always made Western food for me.
4	Momoko:	Always? But I hear you like Japanese food better than Western food.
5	Mike:	Yes, I like rice the best for dinner, but she always gave me bread.
6	Momoko:	She probably thought you liked bread the best. She was treating you as a
7		guest.
8	Mike:	I understand that now. She was just trying to be polite to me.
9	Momoko:	Each country has its own customs. We have to understand the differences.

5.3.3 Japanese students as monolingual

Excerpt 5.3.3.1 – Sakura JHS (June 26)

Line	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Mr. Ono:	Korea Korean Korean can't Ja- can't understand	
2		Japanese. So in- we need interpreters.	
3	S1:	*tsuyaku*.	Translation.
4	Mr. Ono:	Very good. Very good. Very good.	

Excerpt 5.3.3.2 – Sakura JHS (May 8)

Line	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation
1	Mr. Ono:	Bouchard sensei is this the small letter OK?	
2		Sakura Park.	
3	Bouchard:	No. It has to be a big letter.	
4	Mr. Ono:	Big letter.	
5	Bouchard:	Big letter.	
6	Mr. Ono:	(to students) Big letter *janakya dame nan*	It has to be a big letter.
7		*desu*.	
8	Bouchard:	That's right. It's a name.	
9	Mr. Ono:	We say only park I go to the park is small	
10		letter.	
11	Bouchard:	That's right. The park means any park. But	
12		Sakura Park is only one park.	
13	Mr. Ono:	Ahh. *naze ka te iu to tatoeba watashitachi*	The reason is that when we
14		*tada koen itta tte iu toki wa ikutsu mo*	go to a park we can go to
15		*kangaeraremasu yo ne. tatoeba chikaku ni*	many different parks. For
16		*mitsu gurai aru dore ka ittan da na te iu*	example, there can be
17		*kangaerareru desu kedo-*	three parks nearby, so we need to specify which.
18	S1:	Oh.	
19	Mr. Ono:	*sakura koen tte iu no ga kore ga* (inaudible)	If we say Sakura Park,
20		*ga itta koen ga hitotsu te iu koto nano de*	there is only one park
21		*oomoji ni suru yo*.	named like that, so we use capital letters.
22	S1:	Oh.	
23	S2:	*hai hai*.	Yes yes.

Excerpt 5.3.3.3 – Sakura JHS (June 19)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Bouchard:	Final one.	
2	S1:	*nani yattandarou*?	What did you do?
3	S2:	We enjoyed bus break.	
4	Bouchard:	We enjoyed what?	
5	S2:	Bus break.	
6	Bouchard:	Ba- ba- ba- basket?	
7	Some student	(laughing)	
8	s:	Bus *no* (inaudible)	(possessive marker)
9	S3:	Ah in the bus?	
10	Bouchard:	Recreation on the bus.	
11	Mr. Ono:	Ah we enjoyed recreation on the bus. *hai*.	Yes
12	Bouchard:	We enjoyed recreation on the bus.	
13	Chorus:	What does that mean recreation?	
14	Bouchard:	Recreation?	
15		Recreation rec- means fun things.	
16	Mr. Ono:	Fun things. Recreation. Thank you.	
17	Bouchard:	(clapping their hands)	
18	Most students: Mr. Ono:	*ja kaeshimasu.*	OK, I'm giving those back
19		*sensei, eigo to wa?* (some students	Teacher, how about
20	S1:	laughing)	English?
21		*eigo wa muzukashii.*	English is difficult
22	Mr. Ono:	*eigo wa eigo wa muzukashii.*	English is difficult
23	S1:	*hai,* (calling another student's name, giving	Yes
24	Mr. Ono:	test back to students).	

Excerpt 5.3.3.4 – Sunshine 2, pp. 42, 43 & 44 (used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Line	**Content**
1	"I did it at last!" said Dr. F in his small room. "This is a great invention."
2	His neighbor heard his voice and came over.
3	"What did you make? It looks like a pillow to me."
4	The thing on the doctor's desk looked just like a pillow.
5	"Yes, it *is* a pillow," the doctor said. "But it's not *just* a pillow."
6	The neighbor looked inside the invention.
7	"Great. You can have wonderful dreams."
8	"No," the doctor said. "You can study in your sleep."
9	"Study? What can you learn?"
10	"You can learn English. Many people will want this pillow."
11	"Does it work?"
12	"I hope so. But I didn't test it yet. I already speak English, so I can't test it on myself," the
13	doctor said.
14	"Why don't you try it on me?"
15	"All right. I'll give it to you."
16	"How long will it take?"
17	"About a month."
18	"Thanks. I'll try it."
19	The neighbor took the pillow home. Two months later he brought the pillow back to Dr. F.
20	"I used it, but I didn't learn a word of English."
21	"That's funny," said the doctor. He looked inside the pillow. "Everything is OK. Did I make
22	a mistake?" he said.
23	Some time later the doctor saw his neighbor's daughter on the street.

24	“How’s your father?” he asked.
25	“All right, thank you. But he is a bit strange these days. He talks in his sleep in English. He
26	never did it before. What happened?”
27	He learned something in his sleep. But he can only use it in his sleep.

Excerpt 5.3.3.5 – Sakura JHS (May 8)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Mr. Ono:	some students said. For example, Yuki is Japanese girl, [uh] but the CD
2		is very very co- uh like foreigner.
3	Bouchard:	Mmh, her voice?
4	Mr. Ono:	Like English speaking yes.

Excerpt 5.3.3.6 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Bouchard:	After uh which point would you say English is no longer necessary is no
2		longer needed? Which point would you say uh [mmh] that’s enough?
3	Mr. Ono:	22 years old.
4	Bouchard:	So after university?
5	Mr. Ono:	Yeah because because I don’t know how many people. For example after
6		22 many people work. [mmh] But how many people need English? [mmh]
7		Always [mmh] I don’t know.
8	Bouchard:	It’s quite small, isn’t it?
9	Mr. Ono:	Yes I think.

Excerpt 5.3.3.7 – Sakura JHS (June 21)

Line#	Interlocutor	Utterance
1	Mr. Ono:	for example in Japan oh some companies [mmh] are used in English
2		[mmh] uh oh sorry English is used in some companies [mmh] major
3		companies. [mmh] So when they have a meeting they only use English.

5.3.4 Contradicting the *nihonjinron* discourse

Excerpt 5.3.4.1 – Worksheet (used at Asahi JHS)

Line	Content
1	Ken passed the test again when he was eighteen years old.
2	He went to Australia and became friends with some students.
3	Ken and his friends talked about sports, music and dreams.
4	He learned that students in Australia and Japan felt and thought in the same ways.
5	He really enjoyed his life in Australia.
6	After coming back to Japan, he talked about his life in Australia to his friends, teachers
7	and family.
8	He said to them, “People can become good friends if they learn to ☐ each other.”

Excerpt 5.3.4.2 – Sunshine 2, p.67 (used at Sakura JHS and Heiwa JHS)

Line	Content
1	The Earth Summit was a big event and it changed my life.
2	I became famous.
3	I had a lot of chances to meet and talk with people around the world.
4	I always say, “People in one country can’t live a day without the help of people in other

5 countries." People in Japan, for example, must think of people in China when they wear
6 clothes. They must also think of people in Africa and South America when they eat
7 chocolate and feel happy.

Excerpt 5.3.4.3 – Sakura JHS (May 15)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Mr. Ono:	*kouyougo tte nani ga tte oyake oyake*	What's an official language?
2		*tte sou iu ne ano sono kuni de*	The notion of official in a
3		*koushiki ni tte iu ka nihon de*	country, the official language in
4		*tsukawareteiru no koushiki tte*	Japan is Japanese. You all
5		*nihongo desu.* [name of student] *ga*	watch the news, so you know
6		*minasan de* news *miteiru kara*	that, unlike regular companies,
7		*wakaru to ori tatoeba* UniQlo *to ka*	companies like UniQlo and
8		Rakuten *to ka sou iu kaisha de kaigi*	Rakuten conduct their
9		*ga zenbun nihon ni aru kaisha nano*	meetings in English. Like that,
10		*ni kaigi ga eigo de yaru. iuttemasu.*	English is considered an
11		*sou iu no mo aru de no touri eto*	official language in some
12		*kouyougo ga kouiuhun ni shite eigo*	places where people use it on
13		*de natte mo eigo ga machi no naka*	the streets and so on.
14		*de tsukawareteru yo tte iu ohanashi.*	
15	Some students:	Mmh.	
16	Mr. Ono:	*chotto sono atari rikai shinikui*	Maybe that's a little hard for
17		*kamoshiremasen.*	you to understand.

Excerpt 5.3.4.4 – Heiwa JHS (January 30)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**	**Translation**
1	Ms. Ishida:	*tokoro de desu ne, watashi ha kore wo tori*	By the way, from this clip you
2		*ageru no ha kare no eigo ga iro iro*	can notice that he makes a
3		*machigae ga arimasu. satte ano gokai shite*	lot of mistakes. But I don't
4		*hoshikunai no ha kare no machigae wo*	want you to misunderstand
5		*shite ki suru tame ni yatterun janakute,* eh	that I am showing you this
6		*kare no eigo kiku no toki kimitachi kiki toru*	clip to point out his mistakes.
7		*da to omoimasu.* oh *naru hodo naru hodo.*	I think you can all
8		*ma chuugakkou eigo zenbun jinsei zen*	understand his English. Oh I
9		*sekai ni tsutaeru koto ga dekirun da tte iu*	get it I get it. I want you to
10		*koto ga shite hoshii tte iu hitotsu.*	remember that even with
			imperfect English we can
			communicate our thoughts to
			people all over the world.

Excerpt 5.3.4.5 – Asahi JHS (October 19)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Inoue:	*ato yappari eigo no sensei de aru to nan daro eigo ha kore kara mo*
2		*hitsuyou dashi tte iu* (when you are an English teacher, you need to explain
3		why learning English is necessary) [uh] *hanashi ni ya kana ja imasu ne*
4		(there are some students who say they don't like English) [mmh] *eigo no*
5		*sensei da to eigo yada nan de shinakya ikenai no tte iwaretara* (when
6		teacher are asked by students why do we need to study English?) [mmh]
7		Mmh *demo so janakute eigo ga ma shuudan de attari oisagetetara*
8		*ottoshitara de au kamoshirenai omoshiroi kikai shinatteiru ja nai ka*
9		(however, not only that, groups of students can quickly develop strong
10		opinions, and this can be an interesting opportunity too) [mmh] *mo chotto*

11		*kaji tte mite kan no hou ga iin ja nai tte itsumo iimasu* (I'm always telling
12		them wouldn't it be better if you tried a little harder at it).

Excerpt 5.3.4.6 – Asahi JHS (October 19)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Inoue:	*sore wo ningen no hanashi to okikaeru tte iu ka* [uh] *hito to onaji tte iimasu*
2		(I tell them that humans are all the same everywhere). [mmh] *moshi nigate*
3		*dattara* (if English is their weak point). [uh] *mada sono men shika mietenai*
4		*janai no kai to ka* (I ask them whether they are now only looking at the
5		surface of it or not). [mmh] *iutteru* (That's what I tell them). Mmh *sugoi sa-*
6		*rei ga chotto hen desu kedo* (Maybe it's strange to say so but) [mmh] *de*
7		*hito ha yada na to omou hito ga iru kamoshirenai kedo* (there are some
8		people who don't like other people but), [mmh] *sono men shika mietenai*
9		*kara ya ni mieru dake de* (they feel so because they only focus on the
10		surface) [mmh] *sono hito mo subete shite wake ja nai yo tte iutte ageru*
11		*surun desu* (I tell them that this is not all there is about them). [mmh] *eigo*
12		*mo sore onaji kana to omotteite* (I think it's the same with English) [mmh]
13		*ma nigate na koto subete ni oite* mmh- (this applies to all our weak points-)

Excerpt 5.3.4.7 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Inoue:	It's uh very uh important for uh student uh people to uh understand other
2		culture [uh] and uh the uh Engli- *nan daro fue*- uh *nan daro takaku teki ni*
3		*mono goto miru koto ga dekiru nan nan daro*- (how can I say, to see things
4		from many perspectives, how can I say-)
5	Bouchard:	So they can they can discover more things?
6	Ms. Inoue:	Ah yes discover uh the not uh *nan daro tan itsu janakute ironna kou*- (not a
7		single but many-)
8	Bouchard:	Ah it widens their perspectives.
9	Ms. Inoue:	Ah *so so so so* (yes yes yes yes) [uh] *ikko dewanakute* (not only one) [uh]
10		*nihonjin dake* [uh] *to ka janakute* (not only Japanese).

Excerpt 5.3.4.8 – Asahi JHS (October 5)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Bouchard:	So ten years ago, the mood in Japan changed-
2	Ms. Inoue:	Mmh I think so.
3	Bouchard:	Towards island thinking [mmh] towards more international kind of [uh yes]
4		thinking. Ah OK.
5	Ms. Inoue:	Uh compared to uh my junior high school or high school [Ah OK.] *to ka*
6		*kurabetara kekko sekai hanashi to ka* (comparatively, we have become
7		more internationally-minded).

Excerpt 5.3.4.9 – St-Maria J&SHS (August 2)

Line	**Interlocutor**	**Utterance**
1	Ms. Tanaka:	as an English teacher we should go outside and go to uh experience
2		different cultures. [uh huh] So and so we can share [uh] with students those
3		experiences.

5.5 Relevance of the findings to observed EFL practices

Excerpt 5.5.1 – Asahi JHS (September 2)

Turn#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation of Japanese segments
1	Bouchard:	Who, who is Paul Wilson, by the way?	
2	Ms. Inoue:	Uh, I don't, I don't know Paul Wilson. Do	
3		you know?	
4	Bouchard:	I think he is an old American singer.	
5	Ms. Inoue:	Old American singer?	
6	Bouchard:	Yeah. Like-	
7	Ms. Inoue:	For example?	
8	Bouchard:	Folk singer. Folk singer. You know,	
9		guitar, something like that.	
10	Ms. Inoue:	Ah.	
11	Bouchard:	I don't know.	
12	Ms. Inoue:	Paul Wilson *shiteru hito*?	Anybody knows Paul Wilson?
13	S1:	*dare*? *dare*?	Who? Who?
14	Ms. Inoue:	Paul Wilson.	
15	S2:	*dare*?	Who?
16	S3:	*kashuu*?	A singer?
17	Ms. Inoue:	*kashuu rashii. kashuu rashii*.	Looks like he's a singer. (X2)
18	S1:	*shiranai*.	I don't know.
19	Bouchard:	OK.	
20	Ms. Inoue:	*maa, you na, maa ato de, hai*.	Well, like that, later anyway, yes.

Excerpt 5.5.2 – Heiwa JHS (December 18)

Turn#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation of Japanese segments
1	Ms. Ishida:	Now, you stand up and ask nine students,	
2		nine friends, OK? For example, this one.	
3		Which one is bigger, the dog or the cat?	
4	S1:	Answer.	
5	Ms. Ishida:	Dog. The dog is bigger than than-	
6		Than the cat. *kitto kanojou ga kotaete*	Surely, she answered the
7		*moraimashita* please write down her	question.
8		signature. *de koko ni nan ka* (inaudible)	And right here, uh
9		*kotaete moratta hito no namae kaite*. OK,	Write the name of the
10		thank you very much (inaudible) another. Do	person who answered
11		you understand? And one, two, three, nine	
12		friends. OK? You get nine friend's signatures.	
13		Stand up, please.	

Excerpt 5.5.3 – St-Maria J&SHS (July 4)

Turn#	Interlocutor	Utterance	Translation of Japanese segments
1	Ms. Tanaka:	Uh, in America *toka*. *hai*. One more	Like / Yes.
2		question. One more question. Why in	
3		*ichi nana nana roku*, in 1776, why did	One seven seven six
4		they go to America, from England? Why	
5		did they go to America? (inaudible)?	

One student:	They are religion belief.	
Ms. Tanaka:	Ah, they are religion freely (writing on board) They are religion freely. *chotto chigau*. *kou iu toki nani ga tsukau kai*? They went to America mmmh they are religion freely, no. *oboeteru*? Somebody.	A little different. / What do we use here? Do you remember?
Another student:	In order to-	
Ms. Tanaka:	They wanted to practice-	
That student:	*hai*, they wanted to-	Yes.
Ms. Tanaka:	Practice-	
That student:	Practice-	
Ms. Tanaka:	Their religion freely Oh, *yoku wakaru*. (writing on board) Practice their religion freely. OK? They wanted to practice their religion freely. *onajii koto wo*, in order to practice their religion freely. *ne*? Both are OK.	You understand well. Same thing, Right?