# Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Japan: To Divide or Not to Divide

## SHIMO Etsuko[*1]

## Abstract

The author previously compared the perceptions of two groups of university-level English teachers regarding their students: English first language (L1) teachers (ETs) and Japanese L1 teachers (JTs) (Shimo, 2014, 2016, 2018). Semi-structured interviews were conducted as a follow-up investigation in order to further explore the background factors of the differences between the two groups and to explore more effective ways of coordinating English language programs. The interview data of two ETs and two JTs were analyzed based on (a) class content and students' expectations from ETs and JTs, (b) students' preference in class format, and (c) ETs and JTs' teaching roles. One topic that was repeatedly mentioned in the interviews was the possibility that names and labels promote stereotypes of certain groups of people. Other themes that emerged included cultural resources that the teachers can provide and the effect of the teachers' roles and experiences on their perceptions of students. The paper concludes with three suggestions. First, English language programs should not promote stereotypical images of certain groups of people. Second, the cultural resources that English users including ETs, JTs, and teachers from other counties bring in to classrooms should be utilized in English language learning/teaching. Third, English teachers should provide their students with learning activities that require not only discrete knowledge but also more comprehensive,

---

＊近畿大学総合社会学部教授  〔キーワード〕English L1 teachers, Japanese L1 teachers, native-speakerism, teacher and learner perceptions, stereotypes

integrated skills. By doing so, teachers will be able to adopt a dynamic teaching approach and more effectively uncover their students' capabilities.

## 1 ．Background

In Japanese universities, English teachers are often divided into two groups: English first language (L1) teachers and Japanese L1 teachers. The Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET) Investigation Committee (*Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai Jittai Chosa Iinkai*) (2002, p. 60) reported that　as many as 48.1%　(173 out of the 360 cases[2] surveyed) had less than 10%　native-speaker　teachers, implying the need to have more 　native-speaker　teachers. More recent reports would probably show different statistical figures, but the dichotomous idea of hiring either　native-speaker　or　Japanese　teachers is still common in the foreign language learning programs in Japan. On the JACET homepage (JACET, no date), a note regarding job opening announcements states:　Please prepare the announcement in English for job openings for native speakers.　This message implies that the job openings are either for the Japanese readers of the homepage or for 　native speakers,　in this case, English L1 speakers.

Oda (August 2015) reported on a case of a university-level English language program in which most of the English teachers are from the Outer Circle or the Expanding Circle.[3] This case does not seem to be part of JACET's assumption unless its message in Japanese is addressed not only to Japanese L1 teachers of English but also to English teachers from the Outer Circle or the Expanding Circle. It seems unlikely that the JACET took non-Japanese, non-native English speaker teachers into consideration in its job opening announcements. It probably just considered only two groups of teachers: Japanese L1 speakers (JTs) and English L1 speakers (ETs).

---

2　The 360 cases included universities and junior colleges (JACET Investigation Committee, 2002: p. 9).

3　B. Kachru described English speaking populations or rather, countries, as belonging to three circles:　Inner Circle,　Outer Circle,　and　Expanding Circle.　The Inner Circle represents countries in which English is the L1 of most of the nation, the Outer Circle refers to countries in which English is used as an official or second language, and the Expanding Circle includes countries in which people learn and use English as a foreign language (Kachru, 1992, p. 356–357). See Kachru (2006, p. 69) for the concept of World Englishes rather than World English.

In the previous papers (Shimo, 2014, 2016, 2018), I reported similarities and differences in the perceptions of ETs and JTs regarding their students' personalities and attitudes toward English learning, students' English abilities, reasons why the students learned English, and the ways in which the students should learn English or other foreign languages. These studies were based on questionnaire surveys conducted as part of a three-year research project from April 2013 to March 2016.

Shimo (2014) discussed the findings from a pilot study in which a questionnaire survey was given to a small group of teachers (six ETs and 11 JTs). The study revealed that JTs were stricter in judging students' pronunciation and grammar knowledge. The findings also included the differences about students' preferred class format. Most JTs perceived that students preferred a class format in which they get frequent opportunities to initiate activities, and most ETs perceived that students preferred a class format in which the teacher mostly explains the material.

Shimo (2016) and Shimo (2018) reported findings from the main survey, which expanded on findings from the small-scale pilot survey. Responses from 154 ETs and 170 JTs were analyzed. Shimo (2016) reported that both groups of teachers tended to have similar perceptions of the students as willing to obey teacher instructions and to accept teacher suggestions while being passive, shy, and mild-mannered. On the other hand, proportionally more ETs perceived students as cheerful, willing to communicate in English, interested in how to improve their English, while proportionally more JTs perceived students as eager to learn. The main survey also revealed the same tendency regarding the teachers' perceptions of students' preferred class format, agreeing with the pilot survey findings. Proportionally more JTs perceived students as liking a student-centered class format, and proportionally more ETs perceived students as liking a teacher-centered class format.

Shimo (2018) offered several important findings. First, the tendency to agree that students' oral communication skills were good was stronger among ETs than JTs. Second, teachers targeting productive skills such as speaking and writing tended to agree that students were good at those skills. The correlation between writing skills being targeted

in the class and teachers' perceptions of students' writing skills as good was medium ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.007$). Teachers targeting discrete language features such as pronunciation and grammar tended to think that students were not good at using English. Negative correlations, though not statistically significant, were observed between these discrete language features targeted in class and the teachers' perceptions of students' abilities.

In addition, differences were found between the two groups of teachers regarding their perceptions of students' motivation types. The proportion of the ETs who agreed that students were intrinsically motivated was higher than that of the JTs. The proportion of the teachers who thought that students were also extrinsically or instrumentally motivated was large for both the groups, but it was larger for the JTs.

As a follow-up investigation of these studies (Shimo, 2014, 2016, 2018), a series of interviews were conducted in February and March 2016 to further explore the background factors that led to these differences, and to explore more effective ways of coordinating English language programs. In this paper, the findings of this interview study will be reported.

## ２．Interview: Method and Participants

The interviews were semi-structured (Richards, 2009); all questions were prepared beforehand, but some additional questions were asked when the interviewer (the author) found them appropriate or necessary to ask. The interviewer provided the interviewees with printed material that reported the findings from the questionnaire surveys, explained the findings orally as well, and asked the prepared questions. The first few questions were designed to collect basic information about the interviewee's teaching situations, and the rest were based on the research findings. The following questions were prepared for the interviews:[4]

　⑴　What kinds of classes do you teach？(class names, objectives, targeted skills,

---

4　Some expressions in the questions have been modified for this paper from the original text, which were provided as a printed handout for the interviewees. The meaning of the questions has remained the same.

students' majors, etc.)

⑵ What levels of English proficiency do your students have?

⑶ Are your students generally motivated to learn English? Can you describe their English learning motivations?

⑷ How would you describe your students in terms of their personalities and attitudes toward learning English?

⑸ Regarding the results of the teachers' perceptions of their students' personalities and attitudes toward learning English, what do you think have caused the differences between ETs and JTs?

⑹ Regarding the teacher's perceptions of their students' preferences in teaching styles or class format, what do you think have caused the differences between ETs and JTs?

⑺ How do you define the following class formats?

⒜ A class format in which students have frequent opportunities to initiate activities: that is, student-centered classes.

⒝ A class format in which the teacher mostly explains the material: that is, teacher-centered classes.

⑻ Regarding the teachers' perceptions of their students' English abilities, there seemed to be a correlation between teachers who teach productive skills and their positive evaluations of their students' English abilities. Does this sound logical to you? In the case where the teachers are teaching students with limited proficiency, would they have different impressions of their students' English abilities if they were teaching integrated skills instead of focusing on discrete language features?

⑼ Regarding the teachers' perceptions of their students' reasons or motivations for learning English, why do you think the differences occurred between ETs and JTs?

⑽ Regarding the use of translations in English classes, how often do you utilize translations? How do you do so? Do you have your students translate English to

Japanese or vice versa ? In what respect do you think translation practice would be useful ? In what respect would it be harmful ?

⑪ Do you agree that ETs may be happier than JTs about their teaching situations (in terms of teaching their students, perhaps not about their hiring situations) ? Why do you think so ?

⑫ In your English program, are ETs and JTs assigned different teaching and administration roles ? If so, how are they different ? Why are they assigned different roles ? What are the benefits and drawbacks of doing so ?

⑬ In an earlier draft for Shimo (2018), the interviewer concluded:  The key may, in fact, lie in the view of teaching English as an International Language and World Englishes (e.g., Marlina & Giri, 2014). According to such view, English is owned not only by L1 speakers but by anybody who uses it. Rather than separating teachers by their L1 and giving them different roles simply because of their L1s, a different approach may be more effective in the end: Individual teachers' abilities and experiences should matter in deciding on their roles in an effective English language program.  What do you think the collaboration between ETs and JTs should be like ?

⑭ How are the concepts of English as an International Language, World Englishes, or English as a Lingua Franca, implemented in the language program at your institution ?

⑮ Is there any collaboration between English language programs (English teachers/ professors) and Faculty programs (teachers/professors in the field of students' majors) at your institution ?

I interviewed two ETs (ET1 and ET2) and two JTs (JT1 and JT2), who had all participated in the major, large-scale questionnaire survey. ET1 and JT1 were working at private universities in East Japan, and ET2 and JT2 at national universities in West Japan. The first language of the interviewee was used in each interview: English for the ETs and Japanese for the JTs. Table 1 summarizes the background information provided by each interviewee.

Table 1.　Interview Participants

|  | ET1 | ET2 | JT1 | JT2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Job position | Private university, specially appointed lecturer | National university, specially appointed associate professor | Private university, full professor | National university, full professor |
| L1 | English and French | English | Japanese | Japanese |
| Nationality | Canada | Ireland | Japan | Japan |
| Area of expertise | Linguistics / TESOL | Linguistics / Applied Linguistics | Applied Linguistics | Linguistics |
| Years of teaching | 6 to 10 years | 11 to 15 years | 21–25 years | 26 to 30 years |

The interviews were recorded and partially transcribed. These interviews were not designed to collect linguistic or pragmatic data, or qualitative data from which certain sociological and/or psychological theories were to be derived by using qualitative-data-analysis software such as MAXQDA. Therefore, complete transcription was not considered as essential. Instead, notes taken by the author during the interviews as well as while listening to the recorded interviews, were used in the data examinations.

## 3．Interview Findings

The interview findings were analyzed based on three points: ⒜ class content and students' expectations from ETs and JTs, ⒝ students' preferences in class format, and ⒞ ETs and JTs' teaching roles. These points were designed to help investigate the background factors that led to differences in teachers' perceptions and explore more effective ways of coordinating English language programs.

Direct quotations from Japanese interviews in this paper were translated by the author. Careful attention was paid so that the original meaning would be conveyed without causing any misunderstanding, and the original Japanese was also added to the text.

### 3．1　Class content and students' expectations from ETs and JTs

First, the possibility that teachers are discriminated against because of *"names"* or *"labels"* was pointed out repeatedly throughout the interviews. The following comments of

ET1 reflect this point:

- *At our university in my experiences, Japanese faculty don't teach communication courses. In my general experience, it's usually native English speakers. It's very sad this university has the rule that Japanese cannot teach.*

- *I know many many qualified Japanese who could teach communication maybe better than me.*

- *Because I'm a white guy with blue eyes and so I teach.*

ET1 recounted a case in which he believed that a Japanese teacher was discriminated against because of her Japanese name: *Every year in December January February, people are quitting jobs and we have to look for emergency replacements. I put forward a Japanese [teacher] for the communication class, and they say we can't do that. She was actually born overseas and . . . she considered herself an English speaker first. Now she is a full-time [teacher] at a national science university. She uses only English with her students.*" ET1 explained that she was rejected for the position of teaching "*communication*" because she was Japanese: She had a Japanese name and Japanese nationality.

Second, ET1 and ET2 mentioned that ETs get more fun or more interesting parts of the content to teach. ET1 pointed out that ETs and JTs perform different roles, and ETs are expected to do the fun part while JTs handle the serious part.

- *Communication is seen as fun and exciting and we talk. Students tell jokes.*

- *Whereas JTs, they teach more serious, majime[5] classes. They teach a class called reading to first- and second-year students. Only Japanese [teacher] can teach those. Native speaker teachers teach communication, and writing, and discussion skills.*

Since ETs and JTs are assigned different roles, students expect different teaching attitudes and different types of activities from each group of teachers.

---

5　*Majime* is a Japanese word meaning serious or earnest.

Moreover, ET2 commented that ETs tend to have more interesting cultural experiences that they can share with their students than JTs who already share a similar culture with the Japanese students.

> *I think . . . [because of the] nature of the ETs' classes, [they] will be sharing their concern of something . . . at least something to do with their culture. . . . So, maybe because of that . . . they may be teaching something that [is] maybe new or interesting in the cultural life of the students, and they have cultural knowledge that they can share with their students [through] which they can see their students getting interested in their culture as a result of their transition and whereas . . . Japanese teachers maybe more purely. . . they share a culture, Japanese culture, so maybe, they do not focus more on cultural topics but maybe more [on] actual language teaching. . .*

Showing interest in other cultures is a positive element that should be promoted in language learning. JT2 made remarks on a similar point. He claimed "*[Students] do have different reactions when the same story is told [by a JT and by an ET]* (同じ話をしても やっぱり〔学生は〕食いつきが違う) and explained that students get more interested in stories told by people who grew up in the cultures represented in the stories. He said:

> *Japanese students share the same perspectives as us JTs, and so they think what we are talking about is simply what we saw during overseas travel. I think that the level of the students' interest is completely different when they listen to stories told by people who grew up in the culture [English-speaking countries] ever since they were born.* （日本人学生さんは僕らと感覚を共有しているから、どうせ海外旅行行って 見てきたのを喋ってるんだっていう話しにどうしてもなってしまうんですよね。生まれ てこの方その文化圏〔英語圏〕で育った人〔の話〕に耳を傾けるというのはやっぱり興 味の持ち方の度合いが全然違うと思いますよね。）

In his explanation about students having different reactions to a similar story by an ET and by a JT, JT2 said "*[the students'] feeling that white people are cooler than Japanese and that sort of things, unfortunately, have something to do [with their reaction]*"（日本人より白人がかっこいいんだとかいうそういうレベルのことが残念ながら〔この反応に〕少し作用している）. He additionally explained that a survey that they normally conduct among first-year students indicate that many students "*entered university in the expectation that they can have English conversation in English [classes]. . . . They feel admiration*[6] *for native speakers as the target people they can interact with*（大学に…英語〔の授業で〕は英会話できると期待して入ってきた…ネイティブとやりとりできることへの憧れってのはある）.

JT1 shared an interesting story that indicated students' admiration for native-ness. About ten years ago, three English teachers, an inexperienced ET with blond hair, an experienced teacher from Korea, Oxford graduate who had studied Applied Linguistics, and a JT (himself) were teaching in his program. In the beginning, the blond teacher's class was the most popular among the students. However, the students' evaluation of the Korean teacher's class turned out to be the highest in the end.

Whether or not the interest shown by students in the cultures of English-speaking countries is related to their simple admiration for the West or whiteness, students often find hands-on cultural experiences shared by the people who speak their target language as L1, fascinating. People gain culture-specific experiences throughout their childhood and adolescence. There certainly are some culture-specific experiences that only those who have gone through that culture over an extensive time period could gain and integrate as part of their identity. ETs can share the cultures of English-speaking countries based on their actual experiences which would be useful in attracting the students' attention and raising their interests, especially if the students are already interested in learning the

---

6　A Japanese word, *akogare*, was used by the interviewee. This word is often translated as desire or longing (Kubota, 2011, p. 473; Takahashi, 2013, p. 1). In this paper, it is translated as admiration. According to a Japanese-Japanese dictionary, 広辞苑（第七版）[*Kojien (7th edition)*], 憧れ［*agogare*］is defined as 憧れること、憧憬. The following is a list of definitions of 憧れる [*akogareru*]. ①さまよい出る。②物事に心が奪われる。③気をもむ。④思い焦がれる。理想として思いを寄せる。In this paper, the fourth definition, to adore or idolize someone or something is used.

language. ETs with rich sources of the target language culture are essentially different from JTs in that respect. This difference is certainly a factor that makes students expect different learning contents from ETs and JTs.

In summary, names and labels that promote stereotypes and cultural resources that ETs bring in are major factors that lead to different expectations of students from each group of teachers. The latter point should be utilized in language learning. The former, however, poses a question that language program developers and coordinators have to take into account: Should a language program reinforce and promote stereotypes related to certain groups of people ?

### 3.2　Students' preferences in a class format

This point of analysis is related to the questionnaire result that the tendency to perceive that their students liked a student-centered class format was stronger among JTs than among ETs. ET1 pointed out that Japanese students do not know how to initiate activities and that they are not used to a student-centered class format, as the following comments showed:

- *Many students don't know what they know and what they don't. Many students need guidance.*

- *Many students don't know how to learn English. They don't know how to improve. This is also based on their experience. At high school they were used to listening to the teacher. [Now they] have a class with a foreigner. This is already a big change.*

Both JT1 and JT2 suggested that the impressions ETs form about their students would vary depending on their experience. JT1 said that inexperienced non-Japanese teachers tend to think that *Japanese students are so quiet*"[7] just because they say nothing. JT1 pointed out that such teachers would simply show a movie and instruct the students to talk about it without giving any framework or guidance to facilitate

---

7　JT1 said this sentence in English, so no Japanese has been added here.

discussion and support the students' learning. In other words, inexperienced non-Japanese teachers are likely to assume that students do not like a student-centered class format that requires them to talk.

JT2 also mentioned that this tendency would be related to how much experience the ETs have had.

> *We can probably understand [this result] a bit better if we consider how much experience the teacher has in Japan. Teachers who've been in Japan for 30 years would have different perceptions. That's just my guess, but I kind of feel that'd be just the way it is.* （日本での経験がどのくらいあるかっていうことを絡めると少しなんか見えてくるんじゃないかなぁという気がするんですけど。日本に来て30年とかっていう先生方は違う見方をするんじゃないかなと guess ですけど、そういう気もします。）

As ET1 pointed out, Japanese students are generally not used to a class format in which they have to speak up and share their opinions with others. *Shutaiteki de taiwateki na fukai manabi* (active, interactive, and profound learning)[8] was adopted as an important teaching approach in the most recently revised versions of *Course of Study* (Elementary and Junior High School version in 2017, and Senior High School version in 2018: Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), 2017a, 2017b, 2018). This term replaced the *katakana*[9] term, *akutibu raaningu* that came from an English term, active learning. The use of the *katakana* term had been criticized for not conveying its meaning clearly (Asahi Shimbun, February 15, 2017). The necessity of implementing *akutibu raaning* (active learning) elements was pointed out in policymaking-related committees in the past few years (e.g., MEXT, 2014). The adoption of this concept in the most recent *Course of Study* indicates that Japanese schools lacked this kind of activity until now. When students remain inactive not knowing what to do, it is not surprising if the teachers have the impression that students do not like to participate, and that they do

---

8　This English phrase is a translation by the author.
9　*Katakana* is one of the Japanese writing scripts and is used for many loan words.

not like the  student-centered  class format.

In addition, JT2 commented that the survey result may also show JTs' inferiority complex. He explained:

> *More and more applied linguistics researchers are teaching [English at universities in Japan], and the number of teachers getting professional trainings in teaching itself is rapidly increasing. Practical English skills are emphasized by the university [administration side] these days, and very few are trying to adhere to a traditional, rigid teaching style. I believe that's what's going on, but if we actually observe their classes, we might wonder "oh, are they only at this level ?"*（周りで応用言語学畑の研究者もどんどん増えていますし、いわゆる授業を行う訓練というのを専門的に積んだような先生も非常に増えていますし、大学自体も実用的な英語をと言っていますので、本当に旧来型のがちがちの授業をしている人はほとんどいないと思います。思いますが、実際に多分見てみたら、あぁこんなものか、ということではあるかと思います。）

JT2's point was that JTs are aware that they should be adopting a student-centered teaching style because students will learn more effectively, as the recent academic trend shows, but they are failing to do so. JT2's comment can be supported by the recent MEXT policy that emphasizes the importance of active learning. Teachers are aware that they should encourage students to initiate activities and have dialogues and discussions in profound learning. However, they may face a dilemma because they cannot do what they think they are supposed to do because of the lack of teaching skills or other factors related to class frequency, class size, material availability, and student motivations.

### 3.3　ETs and JTs' teaching roles

JT1's English program had a hiring policy to deliberately eliminate native-speakerism. His program did not adhere to the dichotomy of ETs and JTs. He explained that the administration knew how he detested the use of the phrase,  native speakers,  and the board of directors supported his idea of not distinguishing English teachers by whether

they are native English speakers. In his program, two out of 10 English teachers were Japanese. Teachers from various countries, such as China, Korea, Turkey, and the Philippines, were teaching English in his program. Previously he had tried to make his foreign language program more diverse by promoting non-English language choices. However, it was not successful because most of the students ended up choosing English. Thus, he decided to promote diversity in the English program itself by hiring teachers of various backgrounds.

According to JT1, the program faced issues regarding non-Japanese teachers' Japanese language proficiency. At that time, only the two Japanese teachers had the Japanese proficiency level necessary for writing official documents, including the ones required by the MEXT. In response to this problem, they had non-Japanese and Japanese teachers work in pairs for committee work. JT1 also mentioned that the staff members' English proficiency was another issue, while pointing out that the staff members' efforts to use English and the teachers' efforts to use Japanese would help build a smooth relationship between them.

ET1 was working in an English language department. He explained that in the first two years of the program, ETs focused more on the productive skills, while JTs taught receptive skills. In the third and fourth years, both ETs' and JTs' classes became more content-based. ETs did not have any control over academic and administrative decisions: All the administrative committee work was taken care of by Japanese teachers. He also explained that Japanese and non-Japanese teachers were usually in different employment systems. Japanese teachers could become tenured while non-Japanese teachers were usually in limited-term contract positions. He said that in different departments of his university, two non-Japanese teachers who were proficient in Japanese had been given tenured positions. However, he did not think that that would happen in his department even if ETs were proficient in Japanese because "*[JTs] probably think it's their kingdom, so they don't want someone like me to come and . . . [start] controlling their kingdom, basically.*"

While ET2 found his work situation fairly complicated and rather frustrating, when

asked for his opinion about the collaboration between ETs and JTs, he responded "*the solution is not to make a distinction but just help [students learn].*" He also emphasized what matters is whether the teacher is a good teacher or not, rather than whether the teacher is an ET or a JT.

ET1 much more plainly shared his frustration about the assumed teaching roles among ETs and JTs. He thought that there were "*definitely drawbacks*" in such role divisions. He said, "*[There are] very qualified Japanese teachers who cannot teach communication skills. [But. . . some] ETs [are] not so qualified but teach at university. Not at this university but I've seen that.*" When asked if there are any benefits in assigning certain roles to certain group of teachers, he sighed and commented, "*If you want to reinforce the stereotype then . . . but it's a drawback.*" He complained about the false assumption that "*communication is so difficult and Japanese cannot do it*" and commented "*It would be ideal to have a Japanese teacher. [In the current situation, students think] Why am I learning communication from a teacher who doesn't speak my language?'*," pointing out that a Japanese teacher would be able to present a better role model for students.

ET1 claimed that Japanese society has a bias towards ETs as Japanese people think that "*foreigners are better at X,*" and criticized the *eikaiwa*[10] culture referring to the Japanese people's simple admiration for English conversation. Over 40 years ago, Lummis (1975, p. 115) pointed out that *eikaiwa* business is a form of racial discrimination that shows worship toward white people. Tsuda (1994), through his analysis of English conversation schools' advertisements, explained that *eikaiwa* business conveys such ideologies as native-speakerism and English imperialism. In recent years, several researchers (e.g., Kubota, 2011, pp. 481–486; Takahashi, 2013, pp. 20–28) have claimed that English conversation schools are still targeting female consumers by utilizing the image of white men and are commoditizing whiteness and native English speakers. Yasuo, an owner of a small-scale English conversation school, commented that *eikaiwa* business is

---

10　*Eikaiwa* is a Japanese word meaning English conversation.

one third *mizushōbai* [nighttime entertainment business] or a host club  (Kubota, 2011, p. 484) that benefits from Japanese people's simple admiration for white people or inferiority complex towards them. He, therefore, would rather hire white teachers because students prefer white teachers over non-white ones, as was clear when he once hired a biracial Japanese British female teacher.

Just like *eikaiwa* business, university-level English language programs can reinforce stereotypes and promote native-speakerism and English imperialism by dividing roles among ETs and JTs according to their L1. Should English programs at universities be part of commercialism and contribute to the promotion of such ideologies ?

Finally, a positive correlation between teaching of productive skills and teachers' perceptions of their students' English abilities should be discussed. JTs are often assigned to teach receptive skills and discrete grammar points, while ETs teach communication skills including speaking and writing. Opinions of interviewees were asked regarding the two findings of the major survey: ⒜ ETs tended to agree more than JTs that their students' oral communication skills were good, and ⒝ teachers targeting productive skills such as speaking and writing tended to agree that their students were good at those skills, while teachers targeting discrete language features such as pronunciation and grammar tended to think that their students were not good at using English.

JT2 was skeptical about the first result pointing out that inexperienced ETs would make a quick judgment that Japanese students are unskilled in English as they do not speak a lot of it. Regarding the positive correlation, JT2 commented, "*This [finding] would mean that if students are given an opportunity to speak or write, they can do better than the teachers' expectations. . . . I understand this point regarding grammar. I can see some [teachers] would think this student is not good [based on his grammar], criticizing this and that without hesitation.* （〔この結果は〕やらせてみると割と喋れるじゃん、書けるじゃんっていうことなんでしょうね。...文法は分かりますよね。あーだこーだとついつい言ってしまうところがあって。だめだな、この学生は、と思う人がいることは理解できます）.

JT1 immediately approved the correlation. Mentioning that the use of standardized tests such as TOEIC Bridge is not effective because the students who perform poorly in

these tests can perform very well in other fluency-focused English activities. He said, "*[this teacher] mentions one student to be a poor, poor performer, but I think this student is actually very good in my class'... this teacher's comment ... the teacher is actually talking about grammar and pronunciation* (...〔ある先生が〕「あの学生はできない、できない」って言ってるんですけど、「私のクラスではあれはすごくセンスある」って思うんですよね。……その時のコメントがやっぱりグラマープロナンシーションの話をされる).

Moreover, both ET1 and ET2 agreed that the finding about the correlation made sense. ET1 said I totally understand and explained what he does in his general communication courses. "*It is true students would tell me, 'Please correct my mistakes.' I can't do that. My students write four or five pages. I can't correct all the mistakes. Correcting everyone's mistakes [is] impossible.*" He pointed out that students can make themselves understood without having impeccable grammar skills.

ET2 also commented that "*for someone who is teaching pronunciation, grammar, by definition, they are focusing on deficiencies of students. . . . I don't teach [grammar]... whereas if you are [teaching]... writing or speaking or writing class, you are trying to encourage them to produce more [content in that] language.*" A teacher teaching writing and speaking encourage his or her students to continue to speak and write, and therefore it makes sense to him that such teachers would conclude that their students can speak or write.

The final point implies that teachers will benefit from teaching various kinds of skills. They will be able to learn more about their students' weaknesses and strengths regarding their English abilities. The idea of assigning communication classes to ETs and non-communication classes to JTs is irrelevant. First, communication involves all four skills, basic grammar knowledge, and vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, there should be no language classes that are non-communication in nature.

Then, how about assigning speaking classes only to ETs? It conveys a message to the students that only native speaker teachers can teach speaking, and non-native speakers will never be able to acquire speaking fluency. This would promote native-speakerism. In order to prepare students for real-life communication and actual use of the

target language, a language program should not promote native-speakerism. Students will benefit from a program that accepts diverse ways of using English by teachers of various backgrounds, rather than a program designed by the dichotomy of ETs and JTs. Honna (2005, p. 77) suggested that communicating with other Asian people in English would help Japanese learners feel relaxed about speaking as they both would be using their second language. Similarly, students may find it more comfortable and feel less anxious if their teachers are from the Expanding Circle.

Additionally, students will benefit more if speaking is taught along with other skills. Language skills are usually used in an integrated manner, and are not independent of each other. Focusing on one skill in one class could be effective in training students in that particular skill. However, by integrating two or more skills, more dynamic and thus more interactive and fun class activities can be designed. One class can target writing and presentation skills while another class focuses on reading and discussion skills. Teaching integrated skills by focusing on two or more kinds of skills would help teachers notice what their students can do more effectively and allow them to adopt a more energetic approach in teaching.

## 4　Conclusion

The analysis of the interviews with two ETs and two JTs has provided important perspectives that language program developers should take into account.

First, English language programs should not reinforce stereotypes or promote racially discriminatory images. In order to avoid such reinforcement, teachers' roles should not be decided by their L1s but by their individual qualifications, skills, abilities, and experience in teaching. English language programs that utilize binary opposition, such as native/non-native (i.e., ETs and JTs), tend to promote stereotypical features of each group.

Derivry-Plard (2013) pointed out that in Japan, native English speaker teachers are regarded as native speakers but not as true teachers, and non-native English teachers as true teachers but not as near-native English speaker teachers. Both groups of teachers are

disadvantaged with this social assumption. Derivry-Plard (2013) also emphasized that language teachers as professionals have to get rid of such essentialist, reductive images of identities, in order to think of their professional language teaching field as a truly intercultural communicative space where binary oppositions like native/non-native, exclusion/inclusion should be overcome (p. 255).

Second, the cultural resources that ETs bring in to classrooms should be effectively utilized. At the same time, this utilization should not be restricted only to ETs' resources. Non-native English speaker teachers who are from non-Japanese cultures may bring in interesting contribution that are different from JTs'. Most English users in the world are non-native speakers including JTs. Communication among non-native speakers is increasing (Honna and Takeshita, 2013), and it is important to consider ways of utilizing all these resources that English users bring in to their classes.

Both students and teachers should benefit from multilingual and multicultural English language programs rather than programs that are characterized by dichotomous features because the usage of the English language is now so diverse that various varieties are accepted in real-world international communication. Making English language programs multilingual may sound contradictory because there is only one target language in the program. However, as Oda (August 2015) reported, hiring teachers who are capable of using more than one language would help to make programs more multilingual and multicultural. This does not mean that bilingual or multilingual teachers automatically make good teachers; sufficient teaching skills and pedagogical knowledge are the basic requirements for teachers. Moreover, the concepts of World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca contribute to the diversity in English education (Honna & Takeshita, 2013). Implementing these concepts in English language programs should help minimize native-speakerism in English education.

Lastly, if teachers make judgments of their students based on the wrong assumptions, such judgments will eventually influence the students' learning achievement in a negative manner (e.g., Pygmalion Effect and Golem Effect). It is important for teachers to observe their students' performance in various activities that require not only

discrete knowledge but also more comprehensive skills. Teaching more than one kind of skills in a class in an integrated manner instead of focusing on one particular kind of skill or on one discrete aspect of language use will allow teachers to adopt a more dynamic teaching approach and more effectively uncover their students' capability.

## References

Asahi Shimbun (2017, February 15, p. 24).「生きる力」３つの柱で 学習指導要領改定案 ［ Zest for Life　Three main pillars: Revision draft for the Courses of Study].

Derivry-Plard, M. (2013). The native speaker language teacher: Through time and space. In S. A. Houghton, & D. J. Rivers (Eds.) *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*  (pp. 243–255). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Honna, N. (2005). English as a multicultural language in Asia and intercultural literacy. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 14*(2), 73–89. Retrieved from https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/06-Nobuyuki-Honna.pdf

Honna, N., & Takeshita, Y. (2013). English as an international language and three challenging issues in English language teaching in Japan. In R. Marlina, & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students*  (pp. 65–77). Cham: Springer.

JACET (Japan Association of College English Teachers: *Daigaku Eigo Kyouiku Gakkai* ) (no date).  Job Openings: How to Apply  Retrieved from https://www.jacet.org/job-openings/how-to-apply/

JACET Investigation Committee（大学英語教育学会実態調査委員会）(2002) わが国の外国語・英語教育に関する実態の総合的研究—大学の学部・学科編— [Comprehensive Research on Foreign Language, English, Education in Japan: University Undergraduate Programs, Faculties and Departments]

Kachru, B. (1992). Teaching World Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.) *The other tongue: English across cultures*  (2nd ed.) (pp. 355–365). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. (2006). Word Englishes: Agony and ecstasy. In K. Bolton, & B. Kachru (Eds.) *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics*  (pp. 69–88). London: Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2011). Learning a foreign language as leisure and consumption: Enjoyment, desire, and the business of eikaiwa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14,* 473–488.

Lummis, D. (1975). イデオロギーとしての英会話 [English conversation as an ideology] (translated by Y. Saito). *展望 [Prospect], 194,* 112–125.

Marlina, R. & Giri, R. A. (Eds.) (2014). The Pedagogy of English as an International Language: Perspectives from Scholars, Teachers, and Students. Cham: Springer.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2014). 初等中等教育における教育課程の基準等の在り方について（諮問）[Primary and secondary-level educational curriculum standards and other]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo0/toushin/1353440.htm

MEXT. (2017a). 小学校学習指導要領 [Elementary School Course of Study]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/content/1413522_001.pdf

MEXT. (2017b). 中学校学習指導要領 [Junior High School Course of Study]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/content/1413522_002.pdf

MEXT. (2018). 高等学校学習指導要領 [Senior High School Course of Study]. Retrieved from https://www.mext.go.jp/content/1384661_6_1_3.pdf

Oda, M. (2015, August). Native speakers and the learning of English at Japanese universities (Intercultural communicative competence and English language education in a globalized world). Presentation held at the 54th Japan Association for College English Teachers Conference.

Richards, K. (2009). Interviews. In J. Heigham & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction* (pp. 182–199). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shimo, E. (2014). Teachers' beliefs about English learners at universities in Japan: A review of previous research and findings from a pilot study. *Kinki University Applied Sociology Review, 3*(2), 31–48.

Shimo, E. (2016). English teachers' perceptions of students' personalities and attitudes: Comparing English L1 and Japanese L1 teachers. *Kindai University Applied Sociology*

*Review, 4*(2), 35–55.

Shimo, E. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of their students' English abilities and attitudes towards learning English: A comparison of English L1 and Japanese L1 teachers. *Kindai University Applied Sociology Review, 7*(1), 15–30.

Takahashi, K. (2013). *Language learning, gender and desire: Japanese women on the move.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tsuda, Y. (1994). 英会話学校の広告の神話とイデオロギー：記号論的解読の試み [Myths and ideologies of English conversation schools' advertisements: An experiment analysis by semiotic coding]. 国際開発研究フォーラム *[International Development Research Forum], 1,* 175–193.

### Acknowledgement