

School of Education

(To be completed by Programme Member and attached to front of submitted work)

Name: Mark Makino (119045022)

Programme or Course: Online MA Applied Linguistics and TESOL (ED0013)

Module Title: Module 5 Dissertation (ED7501)

Assignment Title: Explicit or Implicit Teaching Methods as Determined by Native-speaker Status at Japan's Eikaiwa Schools

Module Tutor: Geoff Jordan

Submission deadline: 15 Aug 2014 Submission date: 11 Aug 2014

DECLARATION

(Please tick) I confirm that this assignment is my own work, is not copied from any other person's work, or my own (published or unpublished), and that it has not previously been submitted for assessment on any other programme. I have read and I understand the note on plagiarism in the Programme Regulations.

If you do not understand any aspect of the guidance on plagiarism in the Regulations and Study Guide or Planning units (to be found at the beginning of programme) it is important that you clarify this with School of Education staff before signing this document.

You should ensure that:

1. you have taken a copy of your work
2. your name appears on the work itself

The University of Leicester
MA Applied Linguistics and TESOL

Dissertation

Explicit or Implicit Teaching Methods as Determined by Native-speaker
Status at Japan's Eikaiwa Schools

2014

Mark Makino

Acknowledgements

This thesis could not have come to be without a good deal of help and forbearance from two people and one fairly large group. First, I'd like to thank my tutor Geoff Jordan for his inspirational dedication to ELT and keen critical eye, which inspired me to demand the best from myself and weed lazy thinking from my work. Also, the last 2 1/2 years wouldn't have been nearly as tolerable without my fiancé Anna Goto, who not only put up with endless hours of me staring unresponsively at my computer (even more than usual) but also provided much of the translation work that made the bilingual portions of this thesis possible. Last, for the innumerable teachers working to turn low-prestige, institutionally nutrient-free lemons into life-changing educational lemonade in the *eikaiwa* field, this is for you too.

Abstract

Eikaiwa (private-market English academies) are an unofficial but widespread and influential component of Japan's educational culture. Most research to date on the *eikaiwa* industry has been sociopolitical in nature, and leaves the question of what *eikaiwa* actually do in their roles as schools unposed. This thesis partially fills that gap by studying the classroom practices of *eikaiwa* teachers across Japan.

In doing so, this thesis draws on knowledge from two areas of SLA research: Native-speakerism, which has strong racial and political components in Japan; and linguistic evidence, in the technical sense of material for the building or revising of interlanguage hypotheses. A pattern exists in public and tertiary education in Japan of explicit evidence being presented by Japanese teachers, with implicit evidence left to be provided by native speaker teachers. This thesis attempts to find a similar pattern among *eikaiwa* teachers.

Quantitative and qualitative surveys are conducted on *eikaiwa* teachers working in a variety of contexts and locations across Japan. The results do not support the existence of a strong binary division of native-speaking and non-native-speaking teachers in *eikaiwa* as seen in other contexts in Japan. Rather, *eikaiwa* teachers, whether native-speaking or not, seem to implement a broadly communicative method with a component of explicit instruction, in line with the recommendations of much current SLA writing.

The thesis concludes with discussions on why *eikaiwa* teachers may feel disinclined to follow the patterns established in other milieus in Japanese education, and why those other milieus seem more hesitant than *eikaiwa* to embrace methods supported by SLA research.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements p. 1

Abstract p. 2

Chapter 1: Introduction p. 5

Chapter 2: Literature Review p. 9

2.1. Native-speakerism and the Idea of English in Japan p. 9

2.1.1. Examination English versus Authentic English p. 15

2.1.2. English in Mandatory and Tertiary Education p. 20

2.1.3. Eikaiwa p. 24

2.2. Feedback and Evidence p. 29

2.2.1. Relevant Theories of SLA p. 29

2.2.2. Explicit and Implicit Knowledge and Teaching p. 33

Chapter 3: Survey Methods p. 39

3.1. Quantitative Methods p. 40

3.2. Qualitative Methods p. 43

Chapter 4: Results p. 45

4.1. Quantitative Results p. 46

4.2. Qualitative Results p. 54

4.3. Discussion p. 61

Chapter 5: Implications and Suggestions for Further Research p. 70

Chapter 6: Conclusions p. 73

References p. 74

Appendix A: Survey Consent Form and Questions p. 85

Appendix B: E-mail Request for Participation p. 87

Appendix C: Qualitative Survey Questions p. 88

List of graphs and tables

Table 1: Years of experience teaching English and ages p. 46

Table 2: Responses with t-values for NS and NNS samples p. 47

Table 3: Correlations among items measuring explicit stances using linear regression analysis p. 51

Table 4: Correlations among items measuring implicit stances using linear regression analysis p. 51

Table 5: Mean responses for types of evidence with t-values for NS and NNS participants p. 52

Table 6: Mean responses for types of evidence with t-values for explicit and implicit stances p. 52

Table 7: Qualitative research participants with nationalities and ages p. 55

List of Acronyms

ALT	assistant language teacher
BANA	Britain, Australia, North America
CLT	communicative language teaching
ELT	English language teaching
L1/L2	first/second language
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology
NS	native speaker
NNS	non-native speaker
PPP	present, practice, produce
SLA	second language acquisition
TL	target language
TOEIC	Test of English for International Communication

Chapter 1: Introduction

English conversation schools, or *eikaiwa*, are an integral part of Japan's educational culture. There exists substantial research on Japanese learners of English in other contexts, whether in public education (e.g. Sakui 2004) or higher education (McVeigh 2002; 2006). There is also plentiful research on Japanese education and beliefs on learning in general (Peak 1998; Russel 1998; Cowie 2006), as well as on the socio-political aspects of *eikaiwa* (Kelsky 2001; Bailey 2007). However, there is yet very little pedagogical research on *eikaiwa* in its educational role as a complement to the main sources of education in Japan. This thesis represents an attempt to start filling that gap in the literature.

For those not living in Japan, it can be hard to illustrate just how commonplace *eikaiwa* are. The private foreign language industry as a whole made more than 120 billion yen (approximately 1.3 billion US Dollars) in 2010 (Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry 2012), down from a peak of 375 billion yen just from *eikaiwa* in 2003 (Clarke 2007). Numbers differ (Seargeant 2009; Smart 2010), but all sources indicate that the industry has shrunk over the past decade but remains massive. The city of roughly 130,000 (Fujinomiya City Office n.d.) that I reside in has at least seven *eikaiwa* including the one which I own and teach at; a metropolis like Tokyo or Osaka will have hundreds. A simple but not very flattering comparison for the industry's ubiquitousness is "the McDonalds of English teaching" (Appleby 2013, p. 142). Indeed, trying to describe the state of English teaching in Japan while ignoring *eikaiwa* would be like trying to describe the state of nutrition in the United States without considering fast food. Good or bad, its influence demands attention.

The *eikaiwa* industry is also set in a society with very particular expectations of language teachers. In many teaching contexts in Japan, expectations of the methods to be practised are delineated by the perceived native speaker (NS) or non-native speaker (NNS) status of the teacher, which is conflated with both national identity and race. That is, specific ELT classroom practices, including use of the students' L1, translation, and test preparation are broadly seen as the domain of Japanese teachers, while non-Japanese teachers are expected to teach content captured under the nebulous term *communication* (Geluso 2013). These differing expectations are codified in different job titles and responsibilities at every level of education, from primary school to university (Nagatomo 2012). The main purpose of this thesis is to examine whether this pattern of NS status determining the degree of explicitness in approach carries over to *eikaiwa*, which enjoy autonomy from government educational policies and employ teachers from a greater variety of educational and national backgrounds than regular schools.

To determine the degree to which *eikaiwa* teachers' methods resemble those practised by teachers in public (state-run) and tertiary education, an analysis of how teachers employ linguistic *evidence* will be conducted. *Evidence* may be defined as any material used by learners or presented to learners for the generation or revision of hypotheses about the L2 (Carroll 2001), the current state of the hypotheses composing the learners' *interlanguage* (Selinker 1972). This concept will be further divided into explicit and implicit (conscious or unconscious) as well as positive and negative (hypothesis confirming or refuting) types of evidence. The default method of language teaching practised by Japanese teachers in Japanese public and tertiary education is grammar-translation, under

which teachers work through a given English text and translate it into Japanese word by word, with no production or interaction demanded of students (Hino 1988). This method, which constitutes an extreme reliance on explicit, conscious knowledge and processing, is respected in Japanese society for its appearance of academic seriousness, while methods which favour implicit evidence such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are disdained as too frivolous for real academics (Nagatomo 2012).

To gauge the patterns of deployment of evidence by *eikaiwa* teachers, a two-part survey will be conducted of *eikaiwa* teachers nationwide. The quantitative portion of the survey will measure levels of agreement with various propositions, most having to do with whether respondents practise certain explicit or implicit teaching methods. The qualitative portion of the survey will be conducted with the aim of shedding light on some of the issues affecting the use of particular types of evidence that may not be apparent from the quantitative data. The primary aims of the survey are first, to discover if the NS/NNS status of *eikaiwa* teachers correlates with different approaches to the use of evidence in the classroom; and second, to determine whether these differences if they exist correspond to the observed differences between NS and NNS teachers in other contexts in Japan. If the responses to the evidence-related survey questions are clearly delineated by the NS status of the speaker, then *eikaiwa* teachers can be said to follow a similar categorisation scheme to that found in public and tertiary education. This would speak to a deep ideological reason for this split, as *eikaiwa* are not subject to the curriculum-setting authority of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) as public and tertiary institutions are. If, on the other hand, the same explicit/implicit division correlated

with NS status is not found, then the division seen in other educational contexts in Japan must be seen as particular to those institutions and not necessarily a characteristic of Japanese ELT as a whole.

Dichotomous categorisation of NSs and NNSs as language teachers is a controversial topic (Holliday 2006), and care must be taken to understand the circumstances under which it occurs and how it is justified by those who seek to impose it. In the past, native-speakerism has been analysed primarily as a phenomenon benefitting the NS (e.g. Holliday 2013). Japan's division between Japanese and non-Japanese English teachers represents a twist on this concept, however, as the essential categories remain intact but it is often non-Japanese NSs of English who are disadvantaged by it. Further, little research has been done on how native-speakerism affects the classroom practices of teachers working in contexts with this kind of ideological background. It is hoped that the research accomplished for this paper will shed some light on the practical effects of native-speakerism and similar essentialising ideas.

This thesis is divided into six chapters. Chapter 2 will feature a review of relevant literature, particularly of the NS concept and its impact on English teaching in Japan and also on explicit and implicit knowledge and language teaching. Chapter 3 will introduce the survey conducted for this thesis with both its quantitative and qualitative components. In Chapter 4, the results of this survey will be introduced and discussed. The greater implications of the survey and suggestions for further research will be given in Chapter 5, before concluding with Chapter 6. First, I will review relevant literature on the importance of NS/NNS status in Japan as well as the types of evidence outlined above.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

While abundant literature exists on the subjects of evidence and feedback in ELT, little exists on the roles teachers' identities or prescribed social roles play in deciding how they employ evidence and feedback in their classrooms. A fundamental social role or identity for this thesis is that of the NS, and the role that it plays in delineating teaching roles and responsibilities in Japanese education will be key to understanding how teachers choose to utilise linguistic evidence in lessons. First, the concepts of English and NSs within Japanese society will be explored.

2.1. Native-speakerism and the idea of English in Japan

Three parallel juxtapositions found in Japanese society are crucial to understanding how educational institutions in Japan treat ELT:

Japan versus the world/international society,

Japanese people versus foreigners, and

The Japanese language versus English.

I have elected to call these parallel juxtapositions because in popular discourse, *Japan* is portrayed as a monoethnic, monolingual nation composed of *Japanese people* who speak *Japanese* (Befu 2001; Stanlaw 2004; Lummis et al 2009). Conversely, *the world* is portrayed as full of *foreigners* who speak *English* (Toh 2013; Tsuneyoshi 2013). Official policies on foreign language education have tended to reflect a view of the outside world as English-speaking, perceiving

English alternately as a tool for advancing Japan's interests globally, as a symbol of international status, and as a competitor with Japanese in the nation's educational priorities (Law 1995; Kawai 2009; Tsuneyoshi 2013). English is not merely a subject or a language, but a powerful symbol of both *modernity* and *the outside world*. It is also one which Japan has conspicuously failed to master, being the subject of frequent and ostentatious efforts at educational reform (Nishino and Watanabe 2008), public dissatisfaction (Riley 2009; Seageant 2009) and the site of poor rankings on international tests (Educational Testing Service 2006; 2011), a blot on Japanese education's otherwise strong reputation.

A particular brand of native-speakerism is part of this ideologically complicated picture as well. While similar to Holliday's (2006) description of native-speakerism in that "An underlying theme is the 'othering' of students and colleagues from outside the English-speaking West" (p. 385), the *othered* party in the case of Japan is the NS of English, held to be the categorical opposite of the majority Japanese. The notion of the NS as a fount of cultural wisdom and authentic linguistic practices remains true, but these qualities do not translate into universally preferential treatment for NSs. Rather, NSs and NNSs are made into similarly essentialised and discrete groups and given different responsibilities, jobs, and working conditions, without universal preferential treatment for either. These groups are seen to be composed of *inner circle* (Kachru 1992) white English speakers and ethnically Japanese native Japanese speakers respectively, with intermediates, for instance *expanding circle* (Kachru 1992) English users, either subsumed into one of the two groups or ignored. This version of native-speakerism is influenced by discourse within Japanese society on the meaning of Japan and Japaneseness, as well as the common folk concept of languages being

passed down through blood (Befu 2001). As Seargeant (2013) writes, “the concept of the native speaker while partially shaped by physiological and psycholinguistic facts about human development, is also a product of cultural beliefs about the nature of language” (heading “Introduction”, para. 2). The beliefs on what makes a NS in Japan heavily influence the working environments of English teachers around the nation.

Writing in SLA has tended to take a different view of the NS concept. Recent research has called into question the distinction between NSs and NNSs, not only as teachers but in general (Cook 1999). Rather than seeing them as overarching and non-overlapping categories, authors on SLA have broken down the NS concept into discrete subconcepts which may vary from speaker to speaker (Gass 1998; Doerr 2009; Kramsch 2014). One influential article by Rampton (1990) separates the NS notion into components of *expertise*, *inheritance*, and *affiliation*, distinguishing between the loyalty speakers feel towards a particular language or linguistic culture from their mastery of it as a form of communication. Thus, the scientifically and pedagogically problematic NS concept as deconstructed in applied linguistics writing differs sharply from the NS in the popular imagination.

Although Rampton (1990) meant *affiliation* as being for a language or community, the language community, ethnicity, and national citizenry may be held to be coterminous by some, as in Japan's case. One may be a child of immigrants raised in Japan, or conversely, ethnically Japanese but not raised in Japan (Clavel 2014), and have one's NS status determined by ethnicity rather than language aptitude. A child from an ethnic minority group may, for example, be placed in

remedial Japanese language classes despite having been born and raised in Japan and even being a Japanese citizen (Okubo 2009). Views on what constitutes a NS may be projected from Japanese culture onto other cultures (Doerr 2009). As a society with a fairly narrow definition of a NS in its official language (Sergeant 2013), where Rampton's (1990) *expertise, inheritance, and affiliation* are not only undifferentiated but extrapolated to ethnicity, race, and national origin, Japanese society may project this definition onto speakers of other languages as well, resulting in essentialist definitions or stereotypes of NSs of a variety of languages, including English.

As targets of this stereotyping, NSs of English are recipients of both favourable and unfavourable discrimination in the hiring process for teaching jobs (Kubota 2009). Speaking of the conflation of the terms *native English speaker* and *white Westerner*, Geluso (2013) states:

While this perception may open opportunities for NESTs [native English speaker teachers], the positions made available are often peripheral and serve to marginalize the teacher in relation to the larger learning community or school. (heading "Reception and Role Allocation of NESTs", para. 1)

Within certain contexts, in Kubota's (2009) example competing for a job at a public school in the United States, being a NS of the language to be taught may actually work against a teacher, inasmuch as being a NS of a language other than the majority language constitutes being perceived as an outsider. The same may be said for full-time jobs in Japanese public schools. The NS concept does not always work in NSs' favour, but a valuable point of research on native-speakerism is that in very few contexts are the supposed differences between NSs and NNSs considered irrelevant.

Within Japan, cases between or sharing qualities of both the NS and NNS of English categories are either ignored or subsumed into one of the monolithic categories of foreign or Japanese, with all their cultural and linguistic connotations. As a result, in most contexts, there is no concept of the non-Japanese NNS English teacher. Being a NNS of English as well as non-Japanese therefore constitutes a major disadvantage in the hiring process, in both the private (Bailey 2006) and public sectors (Hayes 2013). Similar problems have been reported for Japanese-American teachers, who share phenotypical characteristics with Japanese but linguistic and cultural background with NSs (Kubota and Fujimoto 2013). I, a descendant of Japanese immigrants to the United States, have been asked to write my Japanese family name in *katakana* rather than the Chinese ideographs that names are normally written in, *katakana* being the syllabary used for loan words and foreign names. Additionally, a Japanese-American coworker of mine at an *eikaiwa* was asked to change his Japanese first name completely to a more stereotypically American-sounding one. The categories of NS/NNS sometimes bend reality to their demands for clear duality.

There exists a school of thought that for the apparent illiberalism and illogic of the NS/NNS dichotomy, it may be a force for good in ELT overall. For one, Hayes (2013) suggests that without categorically different teaching roles for NSs in Japan, i.e. if NSs competed with NNSs for the same jobs, the conservative boards of education and university hiring departments would simply hire Japanese for every job, leaving NSs unemployed. This begs the question of whether this would be a positive development or not for Japanese English education, but surely most NSs would interpret it as an unwelcome possibility. There is clear evidence of discrimination against non-Japanese in other fields with international workforces,

such as professional sports (Yoder 2011), which may be mitigated by the existence of categorical separation of Japanese and non-Japanese workers.

Others suggest that the NS/NNS distinction can have a positive effect on teaching, provided that teaching contexts provide ways in which NSs and NNSs can apply their different strengths (Medgyes 1992). There is a view that NNSs can make up for non-native levels of language proficiency in other ways, such as empathy with students and proficiency in the students' L1, which is an assumption widely made in Japan with regard to people sharing Japanese ethnicity (Befu 2001; Nagatomo 2012; Hayes 2013). The common suggestion that NSs and NNSs should not be mutually exclusive categories of employment (e.g., Holliday 2006; Geluso 2013) would find little sympathy in cultures such as Japan's which mainly demand unadulterated, authentic embodiments of the TL and its culture from the former and grammatical exposition and analysis from the latter.

Japan is not alone in this positioning of English as either a subject for examinations or the pure domain of white Western NSs. Similar phenomena have been reported for Korea (Park 2009), China (Guo and Beckett 2012) and other Asian countries (Sung 2012). The issues that come to light as a result of study of the strict categorisation of NSs and NNSs in teaching in Japan is likely to have applications elsewhere in the world as well.

Authentic and utilitarian uses of English are at the heart of two prominent ways of viewing the English language within Japanese culture. These will be discussed in the following section.

2.1.1. Examination English versus Authentic English

Within Japanese culture, the concept of *English* can have different significances in different contexts. The most common approach to English in Japan is *English as a subject of study*, also called *Japan-appropriated English* or *examination English* (McVeigh 2002, p. 41). This is a dissected and highly rationalised version of the English language, taught by junior high school and high school teachers nationwide for the purposes of the monumentally important college entrance examinations. Unlike the English used worldwide as a means of communication, this *examination English* is pruned of most of its communicative content and is deployed purely as a means of sorting students by examination score. This means that in the interest of classifying students by their ability to absorb decontextualised information, less productive language items are given priority over more productive ones, and grammatical correctness is valued over comprehensibility (Law 1995; McVeigh 2002).

The effect that entrance examinations have on teaching and learning can hardly be overstated. Examinations have been called the entire point of education in Japan, everything else being subordinate to their influence (McVeigh 2002; 2006; Yoneyama 2007). Having students do well on tests in order to gain entrance to high-name-value universities is the openly stated goal of students, parents, and teachers alike (McVeigh 2002; Nagatomo 2012), meaning *washback* from these tests, which is blamed for the persistence of non-communicative grammar-translation methods in schooling (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004), is not only a foregone conclusion but a welcome one in the eyes of many. Still, many students express regret over the lack of practical skills in English gained during their

mandatory educations (Abe 2013). Unfortunately for them, communicative language skills are simply not the point of *examination English*.

The other view of English and English learning falls on the *international* side of the juxtapositions outlined in the previous section, and as such I will call it *authentic English*, although I mean *authentic* as Widdowson (1979) uses the term as a counterpart to *genuine*, authenticity unlike genuineness being simply in the eye of the beholder, potentially more a projection of stereotypes than a reflection of reality. McVeigh (2002, p.168) calls this type of English “fantasy English”, illustrating how wide the gap can be between the *authentic* and *genuine*. Unlike *examination English*, in which English is dismembered and rebuilt to fit pre-existing ideologies of education by examination, *authentic English* represents a pure experience of the *foreign* untainted by association with Japanese institutions, similar to Holliday’s native-speakerism (2006) but applied to a wide range of cultural practices.

Authentic English, unlike *examination English*, is the domain of NSs. The term *native speaker* itself is symbolic of the phenomenon: In Japanese when referring to *inner circle* (Kachru 1992) English speakers it is commonly rendered ネーティブスピーカー *nētibu supīkā* rather than the native Japanese term 母語話者 *bogowasha*. In this way not only the speakers themselves but the terms describing them are kept isolated from one another (Hashimoto 2013). Women and non-white English speakers do not necessarily share in the fantasy-like essentialising of NSs (Russell 1991; Hayes 2013; Kubota and Fujimoto 2013; Toh 2013), as they may be appraised as less native-like than teachers from the groups designated as the ideal (Seargeant 2013), namely white males who are valued for

their presumptive authority in addition to their occidental features (Kelsky 2001).

The *authentic* approach to English and English learning is embodied most obviously in *eikaiwa* due to its heavy marketing of NSs, but makes appearances wherever NSs can be found teaching, from university foreign language departments to extracurricular *communication* classes at public schools (Geluso 2013).

Authenticity is responsible for the fantasy-like appearance that English and other ostentatiously foreign items sometimes take on in Japanese society. The slogan of the widespread *eikaiwa* chain NOVA, “*ekimae ryūgaku*” or “study abroad in front of the station” (NOVA Holdings Co. Ltd. 2014a), demarcates the English study space as not just a place to learn about another country but another country itself, echoing the parallel dichotomies outlined earlier. The phenomenon of foreign country theme parks, in which exaggerated versions of the appearance and atmosphere of other countries are recreated for Japanese tourists within Japan, along with the curious phenomena of token white wedding officiators, “foreign talent” panelists on television talk shows, and the stock Western visitors to Japan who populate Japanese English textbooks (Matsuda 2002; Seargeant 2005; 2009; Toh 2013), can be laid at the feet of the concept of *authenticity* when applied to internationalism. What is foreign (*genuine* or not) in the public arena must be ostentatiously marked to preserve the sanctity of that which is Japanese (Heimlich 2013; Toh 2013). This practice resulting from the premium placed on *authentic* foreigners and foreign culture may border on comical when applied to objects, but it extends to people as well, resulting in anachronisms such as racial caricatures and non-Japanese being viewed as interchangeable, temporary parts of society

(Hashimoto 2013). It also leads to the sidelining of actual opportunities for international exchange within Japan.

English may be valued for its symbolic internationalism even as genuine opportunities for international exchange are ignored. The semi-mystical power attributed to English is made apparent in its described unique ability to let children “soar into the world” (Kubota and McKay 2009, p. 605). This ability is not attributed to the languages of Japan’s closest neighbours, nor the first languages of its largest immigrant groups, which are predominantly from South America or other parts of Asia (Tsuneyoshi 2013). Also, while English from NSs is prized, students have shown antipathy toward Japanese-accented English (Abe 2013; McKenzie 2013), the kind of English Japanese learners are most likely to attain. Books on how to explain Japanese culture to foreigners in English are perennial bestsellers (e.g., Amazon.com Inc. 2014), despite the fact that more tourists to Japan come from other Asian countries than majority English-speaking ones (Japan National Tourism Association 2013). It is apparent that Japan’s own mythical linguistic homogeneity may be projected onto other societies as an assumption of homogeneous English use, even for societies where English is not an official language to start with (Kubota 2011c). *Authentic* interaction with foreigners and the most likely *genuine* interaction seem at odds, a fact which may lead to prejudicial expectations of NS or NNS language teachers from students or superiors.

The demand for linguistically pure foreign environments for Japanese to learn *authentic English* from NSs can be seen to drive the demand for English-only policies in effect in a variety of contexts, from *eikaiwa* to university. As a NS,

having and displaying knowledge of Japanese can in fact be a liability in ELT in Japan, in the senses of both violating the terms of one's employment contract and of disappointing students who expect interaction with an *authentic* foreigner (Breckenridge and Erling 2011; Yphantides 2013). A NS English teacher in Japan may find Thornbury's (2013) advice that "Referencing the learners' L1 validates their linguistic and cultural identity" (chapter 4, para. 5) likely to backfire, taken as a transgression on rather than a validation of the students' Japanese identity. Viewpoints on the pedagogical value of English-only policies vary (Ford 2009) but it is likely the sought-after atmosphere of *authenticity* that accompanies NSs rather than any strictly educational concern that drives their implementation in Japan.

Saliently for this thesis, *examination English* features a very heavy emphasis on explicit, declarative knowledge of English, and as stated previously, is largely taught through translation into Japanese. The ideology of *authenticity* cannot be called an educational policy per se, but it clearly has effects on classroom practices, by demanding that English NSs *do anything but* replicate the practices of their NNS counterparts, in order to maintain the crucial NS/NNS (i.e. foreign/Japanese) distinction. It may be justified therefore to call the effects of the ideology of *authenticity* de facto promotion of implicit approaches to teaching from NSs. Whether NS and NNS teachers in private markets also feel pressure to conform to *examination/authentic English* roles as defined in public education is one question the research conducted for this thesis seeks to address.

Examination English has its most enduring role as a tested subject in junior high and high school, as well as a required subject in university, each of which has

a small role for *authentic English* as well. These milieus will be discussed in the following section.

2.1.2. English in Mandatory and Tertiary Education

As discussed in the previous section, the presence of caucasians denotes *authentic English*, while their absence by default denotes *examination English*. The categorisation of English type by phenotype is duplicated across a wide variety of learning milieus in Japan, and plays a special role in Japan's public education system.

English is a required subject for every student in junior high and high school. As stated earlier, the Japanese English teachers at these levels overwhelmingly prefer grammar-translation methods based on the methods used to interpret classical Chinese texts (Hino 1988; Law 1995; Gorsuch 2001) for the purpose of test preparation, placing the mandatory English education squarely on the *examination English* side of the dichotomy introduced in the last section. There is an element of ritualism in the continued use of this method, in that the focus on manipulating syntactic form and translating discrete vocabulary items is not actually necessitated by the entrance examinations themselves, on which purely form-related or translation questions are unusual (Guest 2000). The disconnect between the exams and the methods used to study them suggest an alternative reason for those methods' continued use, such as the known lack of ELT training for public school teachers (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004) or a need to maintain teacher control of the class, which modern methods such as CLT might be seen to challenge (Nolasco and Arthur 1986; Holliday 1994). The examinations

have also been criticised as poorly designed and useless for both assessment and meaningful sorting (Murphey 2001; Cook 2013), but this has apparently not lessened students' and teachers' singleminded drive to succeed at them.

NSs of English within mandatory education are typically *assistant language teachers* (ALTs), who play a tertiary role both in the classroom and in Japanese education as a whole. Although in this case NSs can often be found working alongside Japanese NNS English teachers, in the case of the ALT position NSs are simply categorised into different and inferior jobs from the NNSs that they work with. ALTs are forbidden to conduct classes on their own, and may visit particular groups of students only a few times per year, severely limiting their effectiveness as educators (Breckenridge and Erling 2011). The constraints of the ALT position sometimes result in claims of racial discrimination (Falout 2013; Kubota and Fujimoto 2013; Masden 2013). Conflicts frequently arise between Japanese English teachers and ALTs due to their perceived and actual differences in duties, with the ALTs most frequently in the disadvantaged position (Hiratsuka 2013). ALTs are often hired as part of the government-run JET Programme, which recruits mostly from BANA countries with no requirement for training in SLA or teaching (Breckenridge and Erling 2011; Geluso 2013; Hashimoto 2013), again emphasising the importance of *authenticity* rather than other qualities when dealing with NSs (Matsuda 2003). ALT positions are often limited to a set number of contract renewals (Geluso 2013), formalising NSs' transient status in Japanese education. Because the ALT system is a part of mandatory education, it can be assumed to have a large effect on the perspective most Japanese citizens have on the allocation of duties between NSs and NNSs.

The same pattern of sidelining of NSs can be observed at universities, where NSs are often given ornamental positions or *communication* classes not taken seriously by the faculty as a whole (McVeigh 2002; Nagatomo 2012; Houghton 2013; Tsuneyoshi 2013). NS university English teachers are also often excluded from consideration for tenured positions (Masden 2013; Rivers 2013b) instead being limited to a few years' contract renewals before automatic dismissal (Heimlich 2013; Rivers 2013a; 2013b), a state of affairs decried as *academic apartheid* (Hall 1998). The use of interchangeable foreign lecturers for international ambience as opposed to serious academic work has been described by McVeigh (2002; 2006) as appearing even at top-tier universities; while at less esteemed institutions hiring practices from the commercial sector have taken root, practices which prioritise personal and marketing-related factors over academic qualifications (Hayes 2013; Hicks 2013; Rivers 2013a). As in junior high and high schools, English NSs and NNSs at universities have their supposed different strengths formalised with different job titles and duties, with NNSs focusing on receptive skills and test preparation done in the students' L1 (Nagatomo 2012). Not only administrators but also students evaluate their NS and NNS instructors differently and using different criteria (Tanabe and Mori 2013), meaning that the pressure on both groups to conform to their respective roles comes from both above and below.

Teachers and learners who try to bridge the NS/NNS categorisations may experience conflict. English grammar and communication, analogous to the different categories of teacher who teach them, are widely presumed to be separate skills (Law 1995; Matsuura et al 2001). The teaching of both of these, in the domains of *examination* and *authentic* English respectively, has been

described by Japanese English teachers as wearing “two pairs of shoes” (Sakui 2004, p. 158). Teachers are said to express interest in communicative teaching methods but are not sure of their ultimate utility in examinations (Gorsuch 2001; Sato and Kleinsasser 2004). Although CLT is officially mandated by MEXT for junior high and high schools, it has not found wide acceptance in high school classrooms (Browne and Wada 1998; Gorsuch 2001), particularly those of students aspiring to take university entrance examinations (Guest 2000). Even in the private market world of *eikaiwa*, while studying for examinations is certainly not banned, several chains do effectively prohibit the grammar-translation method so common in public schools by enacting English-only policies (Yphantides 2013), although at least some appear to do this for both NS and NNS teachers (Aeon Corporation n.d. b). The divide in responsibilities between NSs and NNSs can prove daunting for teachers to attempt to bridge.

Of clear significance also is the aforementioned line that appears to be drawn between *grammar* and *communication*, as if one could not be of use for the other. It seems clear that *grammar* in many teachers' and students' minds is equated with the explicitly storable knowledge of grammatical rules that is so valued within *examination English* (Guest 2000), but whether *communication* can be assumed to be taught implicitly is unknown. What is clear is that *communication*, however it is defined, is often left to NS teachers, with the expectation that it will be taught in some way other than that practised most often by their NNS colleagues.

Because unlike mandatory education the *eikaiwa* industry lies in the private market and is thus more directly affected by consumer demand, *eikaiwa* schools

would seem to be a likely site of many of the practices most influenced by native-speakerism and other ideas surrounding English in Japan. This industry is the topic of the next section.

2.1.3. *Eikaiwa*

The *eikaiwa* industry's position as a private-market, extracurricular provider of English education means that its practices have some characteristics that set it apart from other institutions. Unfortunately, that same position makes its practices hard to summarise, as there is no equivalent to MEXT regulating it and setting a common curriculum or set of standards. Nonetheless, some generalities can be made from looking at what research exists, as well as the materials made publicly available by *eikaiwa* schools.

The first generality is that *eikaiwa* employ large numbers of NSs of English, and not a small number of owners, particularly of non-chain *eikaiwa*, are NSs as well. The hiring of NS teachers is for ostensibly pedagogical but most likely also business reasons (Kubota and McKay 2009; Kubota 2011b). *Eikaiwa* make extensive claims for the benefits of learning from NSs, usually called *gaikokujin kyoushi* (foreigner teachers), in their advertising (Appleby 2013), although this rather parochial denotation is found throughout Japanese education (Houghton 2013). The *eikaiwa* industry does not have exclusive claim on native-speakerism in Japan, but its advertising makes the most consistent use of that particular ideology (Bailey 2007). Some researchers have noted gendered and romantic components to the marketing of NSs in *eikaiwa* as well (Bailey 2006), with female or non-white teachers underrepresented or made invisible in schools' promotional

materials. Whatever the reason, more prominent use of NSs in teaching and marketing is one area in which *eikaiwa* clearly differentiate themselves from state-run and higher educational institutions.

Second, *eikaiwa* are available to all ages. For obvious reasons, English teaching which falls under the purview of MEXT is limited to young people, with mandatory English education covering ages roughly 10 to 18 (Fennelly and Luxton 2011). *Eikaiwa*, by contrast, recruit cradle-to-grave in a nearly literal way: Some major chains offer classes to babies before their first birthdays (Amity Corporation n.d.; Seiha Network Co., Ltd. 2012a). The lack of a community college tradition (McVeigh 2002) also means that adults looking to pursue English for business or personal reasons are confined mostly to private market choices. The significance of this is that *eikaiwa* have a near-monopoly on most demographics of English learners in Japan.

Third, *eikaiwa* typically embrace some form of CLT, although under a variety of different names (Seargeant 2009), and often claim benefits for their methods in pseudo-scientific terms (Seargeant 2005). This differentiates *eikaiwa* from public schools and to an extent universities, where teacher-fronted grammar-translation teaching continues to dominate (Matsuura et al 2001; Nishino and Watanabe 2008; Nagatomo 2012). Free conversation with four to seven familiar classmates is not an unusual format for a full class period at *eikaiwa* (Bailey 2007; Kubota 2011b; Appleby 2013), and promotional materials eschew mention of arduous-sounding “grammar” or “study” (Aeon Corporation n.d. a). If public schools teach *about* English, *eikaiwa* embrace the ideal of learning *by using* English. Indeed, a

literal translation of the term *eikaiwa* is “English conversation”, not “English school”.

The *eikaiwa* industry has meaning in Japanese society beyond simply language learning. Researchers range in their description of it from a type of consumptive hobby (Kubota 2011b) to “edutainment” (Rivers 2013a), “lifestyle fantasy” (Seargeant 2005), or a quasi-dating service (Bailey 2006). Although *eikaiwa* usually refer to themselves as schools, it is apparent that many factors have precedence over education. Image and personality often supersede professional qualifications and experience in hiring (Appleby 2013), and scheduling is sometimes designed to get students in the door rather than provide any consistency in curriculum or the teachers that students see (Kubota 2011b). One of the most salient characteristics of the *eikaiwa* industry however is the commodification of the supposedly English-speaking Western or world culture, usually transmitted through an idealised Western male teacher (Kubota and McKay 2009). Since as has been discussed in the previous section *the West* and *the world* are often conflated with each other as the opposite of *Japan*, commodification of the West in *eikaiwa* can also be viewed as a type of tourist experience, as well as romantic escapism and globalism. Each of these perspectives will be discussed in turn.

The physical positioning of *eikaiwa* speaks to their status as sellers of a type of commodified participatory practice. National *eikaiwa* chain NOVA's slogan “study abroad in front of the station” (NOVA Holdings Co. Ltd. 2014a), referring to Japan's public train stops, associates English study with other types of commuter-friendly convenience shopping. This consumptive facet of *eikaiwa* is described by

Kubota (2011b, p. 475), who divides those attending *eikaiwa* into two categories:

Those seeking cultural capital, in this case the ability to communicate in a new language, and those seeking a form of leisure. She suggests that pursuers of casual (i.e., non-skill-building) leisure comprise a large part of the *eikaiwa* student body. The fact that participation in *eikaiwa* is an act of consumption is almost tautological given its status as a business, but the idea that it may have more in common with renting movies than with attending community college classes seems novel. Many *eikaiwa* students seem to regard it as more a hobby than a serious pursuit, and their lack of consistent attendance and quick abandonment of it (Kubota 2011b) are testimony to this.

Much more has been written about the hint of sexuality that is a part of *eikaiwa*. According to multiple authors, *eikaiwa* target young women's *akogare* (longing) for white Western men and all that they represent (Kelsky 2001; Bailey 2006; 2007; Kubota and McKay 2009; Seargeant 2009; Kubota 2011b; Appleby 2013), and this focus is apparent in *eikaiwa* marketing, hiring, and educational practices. It is overwhelmingly white men and not non-whites or women who appear in *eikaiwa* advertisements, often in the company of an adult female Japanese student as part of a prototypical *eikaiwa* teacher-student dyad (Bailey 2006). Female teachers and non-white NSs are disadvantaged by this positioning of the white male as the ideal NS (Kelsky 2001; Bailey 2006; Seargeant 2009), *eikaiwa* owners having been known to explicitly state their required phenotypical traits for prospective employees (Bailey 2007).

The romantic facets of *eikaiwa* are closely related to the globalist aspirations they often appeal to. Kubota (2011b) asserts that students participate

in *eikaiwa* to become part of an “imagined community” (Anderson 2006) of English speakers. *Eikaiwa* make frequent appeals to vague concepts of *internationalisation* and *globalism*, particularly among women (Sergeant 2009). Clearly, the appeal of *internationalism* is not limited to women, but within the world of *eikaiwa* international society is portrayed as the opposite of Japan's still heavily patriarchal society, a place where women can use their language skills to advance their careers in ways that would not be possible in a typical Japanese working environment (Kelsky 2001; Bailey 2006; Bailey 2007; Kubota 2011a).

A weakness of much of the research on *eikaiwa*, particularly on the advertising of it, is that many *eikaiwa* are in fact too small to advertise, and are in a sense swept up in the ideological trends set by the major chains. If *eikaiwa* chains may be compared to McDonald's (Appleby 2013), smaller *eikaiwa* would be akin to family-run hamburger restaurants, who as a “cottage industry” lack recognition despite a relatively large market share (Nagatomo 2013). Smaller *eikaiwa* may differ from chains in many ways. For example, Kubota (2011b) found that many NS teachers in her study of smaller *eikaiwa* spoke Japanese during classes, a practice proudly prohibited by national chain NOVA (Sergeant 2005; NOVA Holdings Co. Ltd. 2014b). Small *eikaiwa* are numerous, and as many have only one full-time teacher, are hard to find a place for in big-picture descriptions of the industry.

As has been shown, the social roles that *eikaiwa* teachers and students play have been the subject of copious research. While this research may have implications for teaching practices, very little (none, in fact, that this researcher could find) has been accomplished specifically on teaching practices within the

eikaiwa industry. One may assume that an industry which appeals to the aspirational and integrationist sides of language learning would dissuade its teachers from traditional teacher-fronted structural approaches, but this is a mere supposition, not an assertion based on evidence. This thesis will attempt to fill this gap in the literature by analysing *eikaiwa* teachers' practices through the lens of the concept of *evidence*, which is the topic of the following section.

2.2. Feedback and Evidence

The question of how teachers choose to use evidence in the classroom is closely tied to theories and assumptions about how languages are learned. As will be shown, in many contexts in Japan these theories and assumptions reflect economic or sociological traits of the milieus in which English is being taught rather than anyone's idea of best practices in ELT. Still, both the grammar-translation methods found in public and tertiary education and the brand of CLT promoted in *eikaiwa* have historical precedent and ties to current and former prominent theories of SLA. Before addressing evidence directly, these theories which contextualise evidence in the language learning process will be discussed.

2.2.1. Relevant Theories of SLA

The concept of *evidence* is central to the formation of theories of SLA. Evidence is defined as material for analysis of the language system (Carroll 2001). So defined, it may take any number of forms, for instance an example written on the blackboard by the teacher, a request for clarification by another learner during conversation, or a richly diagrammed metalinguistic exposition. A similar concept

is *input* (Krashen 1982), also called *stimulus* (Carroll 2001), which represents instances of TL use available in some form to the learner. *Evidence* unlike *input* may take non-TL forms, such as a confused glance in response to a problematic utterance or an exegesis on a particular TL grammar point written in the learner's L1 rather than the TL (N. C. Ellis 2005). *Feedback* is a subset of evidence which takes place after learner output, such as an explicit correction or request for clarification (Leeman 2007). Both *evidence* and *feedback* may be further classified as positive (hypothesis-confirming) or negative (hypothesis-refuting) (Carroll 2001). Finally, *intake* is *input* which has been processed by or incorporated into the students' interlanguage (Schmidt 1993; Skehan 1998; Carroll 2001; N. C. Ellis 2005). Each of these is used to varying degrees to construct theories of SLA.

Positive evidence is given pride of place in Krashen's (1982) influential *input hypothesis*. Under Krashen's theory positive evidence is raw material for language *acquisition*, an unconscious process, which he differentiates from *learning*, a conscious one. However, Krashen's theory emphasises implicit learning by exposure to repeated *input* in the TL rather than simply *evidence* of the correctness of certain forms; a grammar-translation curriculum full of richly diagrammed example sentences finds little support under his theory (Krashen 1982, p. 128), particularly given that he also proposes that explicit, metalinguistic explanation of grammar does not lead to its acquisition. Krashen's theory was instrumental in promulgating the now widely accepted division between conscious and unconscious learning, and his *input hypothesis* remains an often-cited endorsement of implicit teaching methods (Richards and Rodgers 2001).

Starting in the 1970s, a slew of student-centred methods has become predominant in ELT research and writing. Foremost among these is CLT, which has at its heart the widely acknowledged notion that some kind of meaningful interaction is necessary for SLA (Richards and Rodgers 2001). This approach is viewed positively by students in Japan, naturally for *eikaiwa* but also at the university level to an extent (Sakui and Gaies 1999; Matsuura et al 2001), although its practice is sporadic (Nagatomo 2012). Much like purely structural syllabi have long since fallen out of favour (R. Ellis 1993), a purely communicative methodology, with no explicit component at all, has been increasingly portrayed as outmoded in recent years, with researchers favouring what Dörnyei (2009) calls *principled CLT* and Long (1991) calls *focus on form*, which includes explicit treatment of language items. As Widdowson (1990, p. 98) argues, “A communicative approach, properly conceived, does not involve the rejection of grammar.” Whether teachers practising CLT in *eikaiwa* take this advice and bridge what in Japan are the grammar domain of NNSs to the communication domain of NSs is one issue the survey conducted for this thesis hopes to address.

Feedback and evidence are given a more nuanced role in Long's (1996) *interaction hypothesis*. Specifically, modified input as a benefit of interaction aimed at achieving mutual comprehension is posited as an essential ingredient in SLA (Lightbown and Spada 2006). Long (1996) and other authors have proposed a productive role in acquisition for learners' *output* as well as *input* (Swain 1985), a position which Krashen (1998) rejects. Nonetheless, *interaction* is at the heart of many methods practised within *eikaiwa*, although this may reflect social impetus rather than reflection upon SLA theory. It is also mostly absent from public school English classes (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004; Nishino 2011), which means that

students' first *eikaiwa* class may be the first time they are called upon to actually use English as a method of learning it, as opposed to translating it from and into Japanese.

Indeed, it can be difficult to find a place for grammar-translation in ELT given the prominent roles of input and interaction in modern SLA theories. In fact, the grammar-translation method cannot confidently be described as representative of any theory of SLA at all but rather an artefact of educational and cultural history (Hino 1988), as it was never intended to teach anything but grammatical competence in the written language and has virtually no support among SLA theorists (Richards and Rodgers 2001; Dörnyei 2009). This interpretation of grammar-translation makes sense in light of Japan's examination-oriented educational culture, in which as McVeigh (2002) writes, testability and measurement of pure effort are prioritised over real-world utility of the skills being tested. The availability of *input* in a grammar-translation class is greatly hindered by the emphasis on the translated product rather than the TL material (Krashen 1982; Hino 1988), and the *evidence* available is often limited to L1 lectures about the TL rather than in it (Nagatomo 2012). Both positive and negative evidence may be said to exist in grammar-translation, but of a very indirect nature. Grammar-translation may be best seen as what fills the gap in teaching methodology in the absence of any theory of SLA, as hinted at by grammar-translation teachers' utter confusion when asked how students actually learn English (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004).

Popular concepts of effective language teaching often differ from what holds sway in SLA journals and academic discussions. Likewise, prevalent

methods of language teaching, as discussed earlier, may simply be the most marketable rather than the most effective. As has been shown, the most prevalent teaching methodology in Japan is not based on any SLA research at all, but rather historical and social factors. In the next section, the concepts explicit or implicit knowledge and teaching, which helped to differentiate and define the theories of SLA discussed here, will be explored in greater detail.

2.2.2. Explicit and Implicit Knowledge and Teaching

Unlike the terms NS and NNS, which are heavy with sociocultural meaning but hard to pin down scientifically, the difference between *explicit* and *implicit* knowledge is widely considered in SLA literature to be supported by contemporary neuroscience (R. Ellis 2004; N. C. Ellis 2005). However, defining the terms *implicit* and *explicit* is complicated by a number of competing definitions for the same words as well as similar concepts. First, the terms *explicit* and *implicit* themselves have been described as inconsistently defined (DeKeyser 1994; Schmidt 1994; N. C. Ellis 2005). Parallel or overlapping terms for identical concepts may be used, such as *conscious/unconscious*, *declarative/procedural*, or *didactic/communicative* for *explicit* and *implicit* respectively, with some subtle differences (R. Ellis 1993; Van Patten 1994; R. Ellis and Sheen 2006). Further, *explicit* and *implicit* teaching methods must be considered as separate concepts from *explicit* and *implicit* knowledge; as what is taught explicitly is not necessarily stored as explicit and verbalisable knowledge; and likewise the hypotheses generated from implicit evidence may be formulated explicitly rather than left unformulated (i.e. implicit) within students' minds. Presentation and storage must be considered separately.

In this section, explicit and implicit knowledge will be discussed before explicit and implicit teaching methods.

Explicit knowledge is likely the easier of the two concepts to grasp, since by definition knowledge stored explicitly is available for conscious reflection. SLA researchers have called it knowledge “that” as opposed to knowledge “how” (Anderson 1989, cited in Skehan 1998), or that which is verbalisable or reportable (Schmidt 1994). Explicit knowledge of language often takes the form of statable rules, frequent examples from Japanese English education being metalinguistic terms such as 第1文型 *dai-ichi bunkei* (“sentence form 1”) or 第2文型 *dai-ni bunkei* (“sentence form 2”) used to refer to the subject-verb and subject-verb-complement sentence orders. Because explicit knowledge must be available for conscious reflection, use of metalanguage reflects explicit rather than implicit knowledge (R. Ellis 2004). As grammar-translation classes rely heavily on metalanguage, a bias towards explicit knowledge of English can be clearly seen within Japanese education.

Implicit knowledge, conversely, is that which is not conscious or available for reflection or analysis. Studies on the implicit learnability of abstract patterns have proved that such patterns can be recognised without explicit instruction; however SLA researchers debate the applicability of these studies to their field (DeKeyser 1994). That being said, SLA researchers do not generally doubt the existence or importance of implicit, unconscious and unanalysed learning or knowledge. Children, for instance, are held to have no explicit knowledge of language until after 5 years old, meaning that children before this age use only implicit knowledge to achieve fluent and grammatical speech (N. C. Ellis 2005).

Most theorists agree that the bulk of what we call competence in language is made up of implicit knowledge (N.C. Ellis 2002). Thus, the de-emphasis observed in Japanese public schools on implicit knowledge may be equated with a de-emphasis on most forms of linguistic competence in favour of explicitly formulated, and therefore more easily testable, knowledge.

Theorists disagree on what mechanisms may exist to turn explicit knowledge to implicit. The gradient positions on the availability of explicit knowledge for the creation of implicit knowledge are termed the *non-interface*, *weak interface*, and *strong interface* positions (R. Ellis 2006). Krashen's *non-interface* position, in which explicit knowledge is held to have no role in the formation of implicit knowledge, is refuted by more recent research (e.g. N. C. Ellis 2005; R. Ellis 2006), and criticised as being poorly defined and circular (Skehan 1998). R. Ellis (1993) embraces the *weak interface* position, claiming that explicit teaching may assist in the intake of later input, while other theorists advocate that practice is sufficient to turn explicit knowledge into implicit, which is called the *strong interface* position (Sharwood Smith 1981). Note that all three positions require practice or copious input for the formation of implicit knowledge; none suggest explicit knowledge alone can account for linguistic competence.

As for teaching methods, as with explicit linguistic knowledge, recent research has appeared to redeem explicit language teaching after a long period of disfavour. This has not come at the expense of implicit methods as a whole but rather purely implicit methods, as researchers largely maintain the central role of meaningful interaction in successful SLA (R. Ellis 1993; 2006). Explicit instruction has been said to make grammatical features more noticeable and apt to be

acquired (N. Ellis 1994), increasing the efficiency of implicit methods, a process R.

Ellis (1993) calls *intake facilitation* and Sharwood Smith (1993) calls *input enhancement*. Some researchers maintain that the supposed superiority of implicit methods has always been a myth, for vocabulary (Folse 2004), grammar (Dekeyser 1994) and even for young learners (Harley 1994).

Somewhat ironically, explicit instruction is sometimes held to be even more valuable in classes with an overall communicative or content-oriented thrust, such as CLT or content learning in language (CLIL) (Spada 1997, cited in Spada 2011) to allow for greater *intake facilitation* (R. Ellis 1993) of the copious amounts of input that those methods present. A key point is that explicit instruction has been suggested to be a valuable supplement but not a replacement for input and meaningful practice. Student access to sufficient quantities of input after explicit instruction is not guaranteed. Even when tasked with teaching a long reading passage instructors may essentially convert it into a de facto structural syllabus to be translated rather than read as Nagatomo (2012) observed in a university English class. Explicit instruction may have value in increasing the efficiency of sufficient input or practice, but not as a replacement for them.

The effectiveness of implicit or explicit teaching styles may depend on a number of variables, one of them being the particular point to be taught (DeKeyser 1994; Mackey 2007). Rules that would be hard to infer strictly from positive evidence are said to be candidates for explicit treatment, as are L1 transfer errors and errors stemming from over-application of a rule (Inagaki 2002; N.C. Ellis 2005). A canonical example is the placement of adverbs. Because allowable placements of adverbs in English form a subset of the allowable placements in

French, it can be difficult for French learners of English to notice that one placement (between the verb and object, as in *he drank quickly milk*) is disallowed in English. Researchers have found an advantage for explicit teaching of this rule (White 1991; cited in DeKeyser 1994). The importance of explicit instruction seems tied to the difficulty learners have in *noticing* (Schmidt 1993) points on their own; thus researchers see advantages in explicitly teaching the areas of grammatical competence that would not be salient in natural input.

Infrequency and inconsistency of *input* has been cited as a limiting factor on the efficacy of purely implicit methods, as language classes may meet as little as an hour a week. Infrequent class meetings clearly limit the ability of the teacher to provide redundant presentation of target forms and impart salience to particular language items through repetition (N. C. Ellis and Sagarra 2010). This is a problem for teachers in a variety of milieus, and constitutes another potential weakness to a purely implicit teaching style: That which is introduced explicitly may be more likely to be available for reflection outside the classroom, a phenomenon by which explicit knowledge has been said to provide “hooks” (Lightbown 1985). Purely implicit teaching styles may therefore be especially unsuited for *eikaiwa* because of their leisurely, sporadic class schedules (Kubota 2011b). Teachers who see their students daily, e.g. public school teachers, could feasibly see more positive results from implicit teaching styles than teachers whose class meetings are more limited.

Turning from teaching styles back to evidence itself, there also exist conflicting views on the availability of positive (hypothesis-confirming) and negative (hypothesis-refuting) evidence for improving implicit knowledge of the L2.

While many researchers reject the utility of negative evidence for building fluency in a L1 (e.g. Pinker 1989), processes and contexts for learning a L2 and L1 are known to differ, rendering the applicability of this finding to SLA questionable (Widdowson 1990). Theories that suggest a role for negative evidence in SLA sometimes liken it to skill-building in other fields (Leeman 2007), in that positive and negative reinforcement along with copious practice is seen as leading to automatisisation. Indeed, along with explicit teaching, research has supported the role of negative evidence as improving grammatical accuracy (R. Ellis 2006) and in discouraging negative transfer from the students' L1 (Inagaki 2002).

The literature on linguistic evidence seems to imply that neither implicit nor explicit, positive nor negative evidence should be used exclusively. Most modern theories on SLA see a large role for positive, implicit evidence in the form of *input* for the formation of implicit knowledge, but some see explicit teaching and explicit knowledge as assisting the formation of that knowledge to varying degrees. At the risk of belabouring a point, the focus on explicit knowledge at the expense of all else found in *examination English* squares with no modern theory of SLA. Complete avoidance of the methods practised in *examination English*, however, also seems less than ideal given the acknowledged role that explicit knowledge and explicit teaching have in skill-building theories of language learning. That is, if teachers rely on their *authentic* conversational presence to carry entire classes, as has been observed in *eikaiwa* (Kubota 2011b), their students may benefit less than if those teachers stepped into the role of pedagogue and included some explicit grammatical teaching as well. To what extent *eikaiwa* teachers rely on explicit or implicit instruction in their classes will be measured by the research portion of this thesis, the methods for conducting which will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 3: Survey Methods

The primary questions that this thesis seeks to answer are:

First, does the NS/NNS status of *eikaiwa* teachers correlate with different approaches to the use of evidence in the classroom?

Second, do the differences which arise between NS and NNS *eikaiwa* teachers correspond to the known differences between NS and NNS English teachers in other contexts in Japan?

Naturally, the second depends upon the first; if no differences are observed then the second question becomes moot. Given how rigidly the NS and NNS categories are maintained in other contexts, a finding of no differences would be perhaps the most surprising. Obtaining answers to these questions, however, depends on the participation of *eikaiwa* workers, which in the past has proved difficult to secure.

As privately-owned institutions, *eikaiwa* are spread across Japan, and their owners may have an incentive to maintain secrecy on matters of classroom practices at their schools, which means that finding subjects for research on *eikaiwa* and gaining their cooperation can present a challenge. As such, a degree of flexibility was necessary to ensure that the responses to the survey would constitute a reasonably representative sample of the *eikaiwa* teaching community. The form of the questionnaire and its methods of distribution were implemented in such a way as to overcome the reluctance of *eikaiwa* workers to participate in academic research as has been documented by Kubota (2011b). The implementation of the quantitative portion of the research will be discussed first.

3.1. Quantitative methods

The quantitative portion of the survey comprises 22 five-point Likert-style questions, eight intended to measure teachers' valuations of explicit and implicit knowledge and teaching, and a further eight questions specifically covering positive and negative types of explicit and implicit evidence. The remaining questions are on other aspects of their teaching environments which cannot be clearly called explicit or implicit, such as teachers' perceptions of their students' goals or sociocultural aspects of *eikaiwa*. The Likert scale was chosen for its familiarity in assessing attitudes towards positively-stated propositions (Dörnyei and Taguchi 2010). The full questionnaire can be seen in Appendix A.

As discussed in section 2.1.3, *eikaiwa* employ large numbers of NS teachers. However, NNS teachers within *eikaiwa* constitute at least a sizeable minority. It has been noted that even when surveying English teachers, a purely English monolingual questionnaire may dissuade NNS subjects from responding (Browne and Wada 1998). Because both English NS and NNS *eikaiwa* teachers were to be polled in order to form a comparison with the teaching practices of NS and NNS teachers in other venues, questions were given in Japanese as well as English. These were translated first by the researcher, and then checked by a Japanese native-speaking colleague. The survey was pilot tested on English and Japanese native-speaking acquaintances of the researcher who were either currently working in *eikaiwa* or had done so recently, and feedback was incorporated into the questions in both content and phrasing.

The pilot testing revealed several issues of interest. First, because the *eikaiwa* industry employs teachers of widely varying backgrounds, some questions had to be modified to remove or clarify technical language such as *input* (item 9) and *recast* (item 5), while maintaining a standard of brevity, as Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010) recommend. Some revision was necessary to find sufficiently simple phrasing which would accurately describe the teaching practice in question, particularly for the Japanese translation. A further problem that arose during the translation process was describing the teaching practices in question without appearing to either condemn or endorse them implicitly. Certain verb endings and adverbials in Japanese had negative connotations where the English versions did not; for instance the first draft of item 22 included the verb ending ~しまう *~shimau* which implies negative consequences, making it unlikely that anyone would have responded positively to the action described. As a result of the process of excising unintended connotations, some questions are very differently worded in the Japanese and English versions of the survey.

Questions were uploaded to Survey Monkey, an Internet survey service, and the hyperlink to the survey was sent via e-mail with an attached explanation (see Appendix B) to *eikaiwa* schools across the country, after searching for candidates on the Internet by entering “(city name) eikaiwa” in Japanese as search criteria. As the results show, this method yielded hundreds of survey candidates, but also produced a few potential sources of bias. First, links were not able to be sent to *eikaiwa* whose e-mail addresses were not available, either because they did not have a website or their website allowed contact only through a pre-designed form exclusively for student inquiries. Generally, only non-chain *eikaiwa* listed e-mail addresses, while chains almost exclusively used forms for inquiries.

This presents a potential form of bias because single-location *eikaiwa* are often owned by their head teachers, making them markedly dissimilar to the transient teacher/vacationer who supposedly represents the industry (Currie-Robson 2014). Large, chain *eikaiwa* not only actively recruit new teachers overseas but have the resources to sponsor their visas as well, making the pool of potential employees much larger and more likely to include people inexperienced in both ELT and living in Japan. In short, the methods employed for gathering respondents likely biased the results towards Nagatomo's (2013) "cottage industry" *eikaiwa* rather than chains.

A smaller but intended source of selection bias was that e-mails were not sent to schools within the researcher's area of residence, eastern Shizuoka prefecture. As the researcher is also an *eikaiwa* teacher and that fact was made clear in the request for participation, this was to eliminate the possibility or suspicion of possible use of the survey for competitive advantage. Still, one reply to the introductory e-mail was received asking for further proof of the academic as opposed to commercial nature of the research, and there is no way to be certain how many potential respondents were dissuaded from answering due to a suspicion of industrial espionage.

A final source of bias springs from other resources which were used to recruit survey subjects. These included postings on the several Internet message boards for English teachers in Japan. Teachers proactive enough to be motivated to discuss ELT issues over the Internet may differ in significant ways from those who do not, making this method of recruitment another possible source of bias. Because methods of gaining survey responses included these postings, it can be

hard to determine the exact rate of response to solicitations to participate in the survey. 263 e-mails were sent, and 49 responses were eventually tallied ($n = 49$), comprising 38 from NSs and 11 from Japanese NNS English teachers. I estimate based on the timing of the responses that response rate for the e-mailed survey links may have been as low as 10%. The patterns observed in the collection of data bear out Kubota's (2011b) observed difficulty in conducting research on commercial *eikaiwa*, particularly in the case of large chains.

3.2. Qualitative methods

The qualitative portion of the survey, for which 12 survey participants volunteered their e-mail addresses, was returned by eight, including five NSs of English and three Japanese respondents. The questions were posed in English and in Japanese, and instructions made it clear that responses could be made in either language. Still, only one respondent elected to answer in Japanese, which will be presented as translated by the researcher. The qualitative questions can be seen in Appendix C.

The reasons for choosing e-mail as opposed to another, possibly more informative form of qualitative research such as observation (e.g. Bailey 2007; Kubota 2011b) were primarily to limit the appearance of one *eikaiwa* teacher and owner spying on others. As implied by the low response rate to the initial quantitative questionnaire, *eikaiwa* teachers were not as a rule highly motivated and proactive research participants; adding observation of classes to the methods used for this thesis would have likely reduced the participation rate further. Note also that the previous cases of participant observation of *eikaiwa* were done by a

university professor (Kubota 2011b) and a full-time worker at the *eikaiwa* being studied (Bailey 2007), not a worker at another unrelated *eikaiwa*, as I am. Also of importance is the effect that another NS teacher would have on the classes being observed. In an industry which places such semiotic importance on the visibly foreign, it is unlikely that I would have been able to observe NNS-taught classes as the proverbial fly on the classroom wall. The decision to use an open-ended e-mail questionnaire rather than classroom observation meant that data was gathered less directly but ensured that at least some useful data would in fact be gathered.

Even given the possibility that the results may have been biased by the factors described in this chapter, the research yielded some surprising findings. Results of the survey and subsequent open-ended e-mail questionnaires will be given in the following chapter.

Chapter 4: Results

Survey results show that NS and NNS teachers share many classroom practices and beliefs. Differences arise in a few areas but do not approach the levels of difference expected if NS and NNS *eikaiwa* teachers were replicating the roles given to those groups in mandatory or higher education.

As noted in the previous section, the methods used to gather participants may have biased results towards more reflective or more enthusiastic ELT professionals. Indeed, the average (arithmetic mean) length of the teaching careers of the participants was nearly 10 years, and the sample included eight holders of relevant Master's degrees, six CELTA holders, and ten holders of other ELT certifications. Less than half of the total number of participants held no relevant degree or certificate, including those who declined to state their qualifications. The safest conclusion to draw from this fact is that *eikaiwa* teachers vary widely in their official qualifications, and that being a nominal *eikaiwa* teacher is certainly no guarantee of lack of qualifications or transient work status. Average lengths of English teaching careers and ages are given in Table 1, as well as the sexes of the participants. English teaching in Japan among NNSs has been described as a highly gendered activity (Kubota 2011b; Nagatomo 2012), a finding which this research supports, with NS teachers mostly male and NNS teachers overwhelmingly female. Because precedents exist of Europeans being grouped with NSs despite being from non-English-speaking countries and as detailed in section 2.1 little concept exists of non-Japanese NNS, a lone Swedish respondent was grouped under NS rather than NNS. All other respondents listed their nationalities as one of the BANA countries, New Zealand or Japan.

	All respondents <i>n</i> =49	Only NS (<i>n</i> =38)	Only NNS (<i>n</i> =11)
Mean years of experience	9.97	9.45	11.73
Mean age	37.04	36.24	39.82
Median age	36	36	40
% male	57.14%	71.05%	9.09%

Table 1: Years of experience teaching English and ages

The following section gives results from the quantitative portion of the survey.

4.1. Quantitative results

Arithmetic mean scores for each of the 22 principal questions are given in Table 2, first for all respondents, then for only NS respondents and Japanese respondents, with the t-value computed for the two groups. Responses start from number two because due to limitations in the Survey Monkey format, item number one was occupied by the declaration of informed consent. Throughout this section, repeated reference will be made to grammar-translation teachers in public and tertiary education, compiled from descriptions of grammar-translation in Japanese education by Hino (1988), Sato and Kleinsasser (2004), Nishino (2011) and Nagatomo (2012). This represents not an actual respondent but a point of comparison created by the researcher.

	Question	All (n=49)	Only NS (n=38)	Only NNS (n=11)	t
2	I bring attention to examples of successful English use by students.	4.18	4.13	4.36	0.786
3	Japanese English students expect different teaching styles from native and non-native teachers.	4.06	4.03	4.18	0.555
4	It's best for students to pick grammar up from natural language use.	3.34	3.21	3.82	1.580
5	I often recast or restate problematic student comments for clarification.	3.92	3.95	3.82	0.476
6	When students make errors in speech, I call attention to the mistakes at some point during the class.	3.69	3.67	3.80	0.652
7	I expect my students to be able to describe rules of usage, not just apply them.	2.52	2.36	3.09	2.717**
8	The style of teaching that I practise is one that most Japanese people are accustomed to.	2.32	2.33	2.27	0.180
9	Natural speech, including my own, is important "learning material" for my students.	4.46	4.38	4.73	1.379
10	I try to avoid explicit grammatical explanations.	3.08	2.97	3.50	1.341
11	My lessons have a clear distinction between English learning and English practice.	3.12	2.97	3.64	1.909
12	I negotiate for meaning with students in English when the meaning of what they say is not clear.	4.10	4.21	3.70	2.274*
13	My students come to my classes mainly to improve their English skills.	3.80	3.87	3.50	1.218
14	I use metalinguistic terms (noun, clause, participle, etc.) when I talk about correct usage.	3.55	3.62	3.30	0.927
15	I usually point out the grammatical form of the English in class materials.	3.41	3.26	4.00	2.351*
16	I point out examples of incorrect English for students to avoid.	3.70	3.82	3.27	1.640
17	When I react to unsuccessful English use, I do so within the flow of conversation.	3.88	3.82	4.09	1.105
18	My students expect me to use some Japanese in class.	2.84	2.82	2.91	0.220
19	I often give explicitly grammar-focused explanations.	2.38	2.44	2.18	0.735
20	I rely on natural English use rather than explicit grammar and vocabulary teaching.	3.62	3.46	4.18	1.931
21	Native speakers and non-native speakers should teach using different methods.	2.72	2.56	3.27	1.892
22	Students should produce language without pausing to think for long periods.	3.46	3.51	3.27	0.664
23	Students come to my classes for an intercultural or international experience.	4.00	4.13	3.55	1.892

Table 2: Responses with t-values for NS and NNS samples (**significant at $p < 0.01$, *significant at $p < 0.05$)

As shown in the table, items 8 and 19 garnered the lowest average levels of agreement. The stated unfamiliarity on the part of students with respondents' teaching methods coupled with an avoidance of explicit grammatical explanation seem sufficient to say that practices within *eikaiwa* differ substantially from those within mandatory education. Item 8's low level of agreement indicates that practices within *eikaiwa* are relatively unfamiliar to most incoming students, which one would expect if *eikaiwa* included any components different from the six years of grammar-translation students have already experienced in their schooling. Disagreement with item 19, indicating a rejection of explicit grammar teaching, should not be taken as a clear embrace of implicit teaching methods, however; it is still compatible with other teacher-fronted methods, and evident agreement with other items (6 and 14) is clearly compatible with explicit stances toward teaching. It is clear nonetheless that *eikaiwa* teachers strongly differ from grammar-translation teachers, who would likely have answered clearly in the affirmative to items 19 and 14 and negatively to item 6, simply because there is so little student-teacher interaction in grammar-translation classes with the exception of content-related questions posed and answered in Japanese (Nagatomo 2012).

Japanese respondents were significantly more likely to agree with items 7 and 15, both of which are compatible with explicit stances toward teaching. Note however that item 7, though representing the most statistically significant difference between the responses of the NS and NNS samples, nonetheless has a mean level of agreement just slightly higher than "Neither agree nor disagree" for Japanese respondents. Clearly, this represents a rather large break from the precedents established in mandatory education, where explicit explanation of grammar is the unquestioned default (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004).

Item 23's high level of agreement among NSs would seem to confirm other authors' (e.g. Bailey 2006; Kubota and McCay 2009) views of *eikaiwa* teachers as commodified cultural representatives. However, in the data presented here Japanese *eikaiwa* teachers appear to feel that they are seen the same way by students, meaning again that the NS/NNS dichotomy is not applied as strongly to *eikaiwa* teachers. It is worth noting that public school teachers have been shown to spend some amount of class time lecturing on cultural content as well, albeit in Japanese (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004), meaning that item 23 may have had an affirmative response from grammar-translation teachers as well.

Perhaps the most significant finding from the data is the fact that NS and NNS respond significantly differently on only three items, casting item 3's high level of agreement in a somewhat different light. Even differences which would seem obvious or natural in junior high or high schools, such as the expectation for the students' L1 to be used (item 18) yield no significant differences among NS and NNS *eikaiwa* teachers. *Eikaiwa* teachers seem to believe that students expect them to be more different than they actually are. This is supported by item 21's low average level of agreement. It seems that teachers do not embrace the NS/NNS teacher dichotomy found so frequently in mandatory schooling, although they believe that their students do.

Although NS teachers responded with significantly higher levels of agreement to item 12, compatible with implicit negative feedback, whether the data gathered indicate a tendency towards either explicit or implicit instruction overall for NSs or NNSs is questionable. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, the items

chosen to represent explicit and implicit stances towards teaching have relatively weak (though mostly positive) relationships with each other. It seems that teachers vary in their applications of explicit or implicit approaches to teaching, for instance tending to negotiate for meaning while also using metalanguage at some points, or highlighting positive models of grammar but not correcting errors explicitly. It is certainly feasible that a teacher might give grammar-focused lectures while demanding that students answer questions promptly, although lectures may be seen as clearly favouring explicit knowledge, and time pressure in other contexts is associated with tests of implicit knowledge (R. Ellis 2005). It is clear however that these patterns are not the same ones found in public education, where negotiation for meaning is almost unheard of and metalinguistic explanation is an integral part of grammar teaching (Hino 1988; Nishino and Watanabe 2008).

As shown, use of metalanguage (item 14) is strongly positively correlated with two other measures of explicit approaches to teaching (items 16 and 19), but has almost no relation with two others (items 7 and 11). The lack of relationship between items 7 and 14 is especially surprising given the presumably central role metalanguage would play in students' being able to verbalise rules of usage. Likewise, item 10's strong correlation with item 20 is expected, given that the wording of the questions makes one nearly a condition of the other. However, item 10 has slightly negative correlations with other measures of implicit teaching; indicating that a stated avoidance of grammatical explanation does not automatically result in an approach that includes learning-by-doing (item 4) recasts (item 5) or negotiation for meaning (item 12). The wording of the questions may have played a role in this; respondents may have had an easier time picturing

what was being asked of them for items 10 and 20 because explicit grammar

teaching is such a common practice in language classrooms worldwide (Richards and Rodgers 2001), than for other items which describe less well-known or easily identifiable practices.

	2 +	6 -	7	11	14	15 +	16 -	19
2 +	1.0	.079	.287	-.114	.263	.172	.016	.153
6 -	*	1.0	.05	.068	.109	.262	.322	.145
7	*	*	1.0	.207	.074	.359	-.078	.268
11	*	*	*	1.0	-.068	.162	.232	-.103
14	*	*	*	*	1.0	.209	.395	.417
15 +	*	*	*	*	*	1.0	.203	.378
16 -	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.0	.136
19	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.0

Table 3: Correlations among items measuring explicit stances using linear regression analysis. "+" denotes questions on positive evidence and "-" negative. Values exceeding 0.35 are boldfaced.

	4	5 -	9 +	10	12	17 -	20 +	22
4	1.0	.053	.125	-.053	.153	.297	.181	-.014
5 -	*	1.0	.211	-.163	.06	.201	.015	-.028
9 +	*	*	1.0	.208	.119	.262	.291	-.147
10	*	*	*	1.0	-.101	.167	.479	.256
12	*	*	*	*	1.0	.167	.03	.205
17 -	*	*	*	*	*	1.0	.246	-.033
20 +	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.0	.065
22	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.0

Table 4: Correlations among items measuring implicit stances using linear regression analysis. "+" denotes questions on positive evidence and "-" negative. Values exceeding 0.35 are boldfaced.

Arithmetic mean values for multiple items measuring presentation of explicit positive evidence, explicit negative evidence, and explicit evidence overall; as well

as the corresponding values for implicit evidence can be seen in Table 5. Table 6 shows the same data, with *t* values computed for differences between items measuring explicit and implicit stances rather than for differences between NS and NNS respondents.

	All	NS	NNS	<i>t</i>
Positive explicit (items 2 and 15)	3.80	3.69	4.19	2.105*
Negative explicit (items 6 and 16)	3.70	3.74	3.52	0.984
Other explicit (items 7, 11, 14, and 19)	2.89	2.85	3.05	1.090
All Explicit	3.46	3.35	3.59	1.233
Positive implicit (items 9 and 20)	4.04	3.92	4.45	2.169*
Negative implicit (items 5 and 17)	3.90	3.88	3.95	0.393
Other implicit (items 4, 10, 12, and 22)	3.50	3.47	3.57	0.519
Implicit total	3.81	3.76	3.99	1.672

Table 5: Mean responses for types of evidence with *t*-values for NS and NNS participants (*significant at $p < 0.05$)

	All explicit	All implicit	<i>t</i>
All	3.46	3.81	5.537**
NS	3.35	3.76	4.664**
NNS	3.59	3.99	2.847**

Table 6: Mean responses for types of evidence with *t*-values for explicit and implicit stances (**significant at $p < 0.01$)

Both NS and NNS respondents on average appear to favour implicit teaching approaches significantly more than explicit, although neither group disagrees strongly with any of the items measuring explicitness. The patterns of use of explicit and implicit evidence seen in mandatory education, in which NNS instructors focus almost exclusively on the explicit, seem entirely absent among *eikaiwa* teachers.

The data gathered for this survey seem to support the conclusion that rather than being divided according to their use of explicit or implicit evidence, NS and NNS teachers in *eikaiwa* are rather more reliably delineated by their reliance on positive or negative evidence. Use of positive evidence seems to be higher than use of negative evidence for both NS and NNS teachers, but significantly more so for the latter. For comparison, grammar-translation teachers have been shown to rely almost exclusively on positive evidence (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004; Nagatomo 2012), although it is feasible in principle for grammar-translation teachers to provide examples of incorrect translation, which would constitute negative evidence. The observed differences in the use of positive and negative evidence, while statistically significant, do not approach those that would be observed if *eikaiwa* teachers resembled public school English teachers.

Finally, one strong correlation was observed among the items which did not measure explicit or implicit approaches to teaching, which was between students' expectations on the teacher to use their L1 in class (item 18) and the division between language *learning* and *practice* (item 11). While no item measuring teachers' actual use of the L1 in class was included in the survey, it stands to

reason that students would expect greater L1 use in classes which divide presentation of language from practice or production, as in the widely-known PPP (present, practice, produce) approach. In mandatory education, by contrast, breaks from the teacher-led lecture style of teaching were observed only in the presence of a native-speaking ALT (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004), meaning that the essential division between *learning* and *practice* was kept intact, but *practice* was limited to once per week or less. In the sense of maintaining a distinction between the first P and the second and third Ps in PPP, *eikaiwa* teachers' methods may be said to resemble public school teachers', but as the responses to the other survey items shows the proportion of presentation to practice or performance is much more heavily tilted toward the latter two in *eikaiwa*.

The second, qualitative and open-ended portion of the survey was returned by eight respondents, and yielded various views of *eikaiwa* as a whole as well as individual practices within *eikaiwa*. These will be presented in the following section.

4.2. Qualitative Results

The qualitative portion of the research conducted for this thesis consisted of seven open-ended questions, which were distributed by e-mail to the respondents who chose to enter their e-mail addresses at the end of the initial quantitative survey. The full list of questions can be seen in Appendix C. The respondents (with pseudonyms) were:

	Nationality	Age
Kiki	Japanese	32
Mei	Japanese	47
Chihiro	Japanese	50
Logan	Canadian	37
Keith	British	37
Wallace	British	27
Duncan	British	35
Eli	British	27

Table 7: Qualitative research participants with nationalities and ages

Answers to question 1, on the purposes of *eikaiwa*, yielded quite disparate views on the purpose of *eikaiwa*: Keith sums it up in a single word: “Profit”, while Eli agrees, stating:

I think the primary purpose of *eikaiwa* is to make money and the secondary purpose is to teach English (or other languages).

Two Japanese respondents cite purposes that correspond to Seargeant’s (2005) “lifestyle fantasy”, Kiki “to facilitate communications between people in different countries” and Chihiro “to listen/see the people in [the world] as much as possible”. Two NS correspondents liken *eikaiwa* to other parts of Japan’s private education industry, namely “soroban [abacus], juku [cram schools], piano, etc.” (Wallace) and “Hobby for students who like English...just another juku type school for kids” (Logan). Mei explicitly links the purpose of *eikaiwa* to the oft-cited *akogare* (longing) seen in other research on *eikaiwa* (e.g., Bailey 2007), calling the purpose of *eikaiwa* to fulfil many Japanese’ long-held *akogare* to “come to speak English fluently”. Duncan echoes this sentiment, linking *eikaiwa* to the spoken language and to pragmatic as opposed to grammatical competence.

Respondents felt that many extracurricular factors affected classroom practices, as seen in their answers to question 2. By far the most-cited factor was profit, described by three of the five NS respondents as an important or the single most important consideration when running an *eikaiwa*: “if you can't make money, no point in having an *eikaiwa*” (Logan). The preponderance of this factor may be a result of the high number of teacher-owners among the respondents. An element of salesmanship seems to be part of the classroom experience. As Keith puts it, teachers need to:

manage the student's expectations, and to make the student feel that those expectations are being fulfilled, so that the student will come back for more.

Duncan likewise implies that the profit motive sometimes hinders the smooth running of the class, stating that “I would remove some students from group classes if I had my way.” Eli cites the status of students as customers necessitating:

keeping people happy so they return, which can lead to lower standards of teaching, trying to avoid challenging students too much...

The Japanese respondents, on the other hand, did not cite business or profit in their answers. Kiki and Chihiro both describe the aspirational aspects of *eikaiwa* as being facilitative of the academic aspects, in Kiki's case by motivating them to study to express themselves to a wider demographic of people, which seems to demonstrate *integrative motivation* (Gardner and Lambert 1972) with respect to an *imagined community* (Anderson 2006; Kubota 2011b) of international English speakers. Instrumental goals play a role as well according to Mei, who cites students with specific career-related goals (e.g. TOEIC) as a need brought into *eikaiwa* that successful teachers must address.

Respondents agreed that students have very different and possibly non-overlapping expectations from NS and NNS instructors in answer to question 3. Five out of eight respondents listed either “grammar” or “describing the English language” as an expectation of Japanese instructors, which another also seems to imply by stating that Japanese instructors handle the “boring parts of English” (Duncan), while expectations of NS teachers included “pronunciation” (all three Japanese respondents), and teaching the target culture (Chihiro, Wallace and Eli). Two respondents explicitly mention factors corresponding to “leisure” aspects of *eikaiwa* as outlined by Kubota (2011b), Logan citing the job of the NS teacher as seen by students as holding conversations on topics “that many Japanese don’t discuss on a normal basis”, while Keith gives a concise summary which mirrors Japanese and NS teachers’ roles in other contexts:

They expect a non-native speaker to describe the English language, in Japanese. They expect a native speaker to provide entertaining activities, in English.

Mei also includes the concept, well-known from Japanese nationalist literature (Befu 2001) of the difficulty of “getting used to foreigners”, as a frequent issue that students come to NS teachers specifically to overcome. A common thread in the sometimes cynical view respondents have of the differing expectations on the part of students with respect to NS and NNS teachers is that only NNSs have something resembling a traditional teaching role, a perspective found among ALTs as well (Geluso 2013).

Respondents reacted with either dispassionate acceptance or wholehearted endorsement to the dichotomisation of NS/NNS teachers in Japanese education, as posed in question 4. Two of the NSs and one NNS who answered the question

explicitly linked dividing NS and NNS teachers to meeting demand from students.

Keith sums it up succinctly:

Customers have different expectations of native and non-native speakers. Schools can only exist if they give the customer what they want so, from a business perspective, the difference is entirely justifiable.

Kiki also links the division between NS and NNS teachers to the *raison d'être* of the industry itself, stating that NNS teachers' role is to assist students in the attainment of their ultimate goal of communication with NS teachers. The remaining two Japanese respondents seemed to consider differing job titles and contents for NS and NNS teachers simply a part of rational allocation of tasks according to the skills of the employee. No respondents called into question the validity of the categories themselves, nor did any discuss cases which fall outside of the categories mentioned; e.g. NS teachers capable of fielding questions in Japanese or Japanese teachers with English fluency on par with NSs.

A similar level of acceptance for stereotypical roles of NS and NNS teachers was found in the answers to question 5, which concerned the disadvantages of learning from NSs. The common thread in six of the eight responses was that NS teachers might lack sufficient Japanese ability to explain themselves when communication in English fails. This was either simply assumed to be true of NSs (Kiki, Mei), or of inexperienced NS teachers (Chihiro, Keith, Eli) or was described as not being demanded of them (Wallace, Eli). Two respondents cite the inability to identify transfer errors as a weakness of NSs (Mei, Keith) and two a possible lack of ability to "explain grammar properly" (Logan, Eli). Notably, these summations of NS and NNS characteristics contradict the findings from the initial survey: Recall that NSs reported using metalanguage and focusing on grammatical form (items 14 and 15), and that NNSs reported favouring natural

speech as opposed to grammatical explanation as a means of teaching (item 20).

On the subject of the use of Japanese in class, Eli considers the prohibition of use of the students' L1 problematic:

...sometimes students cannot understand something in English and the teacher is unable, due to not speaking Japanese or not being allowed to, to give a simple explanation in Japanese so that the lesson can progress.

Wallace also cites the expectation that NS teachers will not speak Japanese as a barrier to "building a genuine rapport". Thus teachers do not seem opposed to the use of Japanese in class for pedagogical reasons, but rather for an ostensible lack of ability on the part of NS teachers or simply because the rules forbid it.

Respondents as a whole seem wary of uneducated or untrained NS teachers, echoing frequent criticisms of the *eikaiwa* industry (Currie-Robson 2014).

Attitudes towards explicit teaching were generally positive, with seven of the eight clearly endorsing its role in effective pedagogy in their answers to question 6. Logan, the lone dissenter, downplays the importance of explicit instruction because "especially in Japan, they learn more about grammar than I will ever know, or care to know", notably not refuting the value of explicit grammatical knowledge overall but simply its role in teaching graduates of Japan's education system. Mei cites poverty of input in EFL contexts including Japan as a factor necessitating some degree of form-focused instruction, similarly to N. C. Ellis and Sagarra (2010). Three respondents, Mei, Keith, and Duncan, also go out of their way to point out that a purely form-focused approach, such as that practised in mandatory schooling, is a recipe for failure. Keith does so by way of an analogy from sports:

You don't learn how to swing a baseball bat through instruction.
You pick up the bat and swing it, and you learn from your

mistakes. Your coach gives you models to copy, guides your practice, and points out weaknesses you may not be aware of, but you always learn by doing. Teaching grammar should be just the same.

In this analogy, the coach pointing out weaknesses is the point most resembling explicit instruction in a language class, but the context surrounding that point makes it clear that in Keith's view implicit knowledge and implicit teaching are of prime importance. The coach stepping in to provide correction on a point unnoticed by the player has a resemblance to reactive *focus on form* (Long 1991), in which an instructor provides feedback in response to rather than in anticipation of learner mistakes (Thornbury 2013). Keith also mentioned that he was unfamiliar with the meanings of the terms *implicit* and *explicit* as applied to teaching, but his answer makes it clear that he sees a role for both in the *eikaiwa* classroom.

In their answers to the final question, respondents have overwhelmingly negative impressions of the influence of having passed through mandatory education on Japanese adults' abilities to learn English. Respondents roundly criticise what they see as Japanese education's overemphasis on correctness and rote memorisation of decontextualised rules and vocabulary items. In Keith's view, students' approaches to learning are deleteriously affected by their long experience with grammar-translation, leading to adult students who either ritualistically apply those same methods expecting their increased effort to pay off or "shy away from anything that looks like grammar or vocabulary, and just want 'conversation practice'". Note that these extremes parallel the *examination English/authentic English* division introduced in section 2.1.1. The influence of examinations is highlighted by several respondents, with Wallace pointing out the superfluousness of ALTs brought in to teach speaking when speaking is not a part

of most examinations. Kiki and Logan both mention the possible positive effects of meeting ALTs, although in Kiki's case the effects are noticeable in their absence:

We didn't have many classes with native speaking teachers, so the classes weren't enough for me to be able to communicate smoothly with native speakers.

It seems that while respondents saw some benefits for explicit teaching in their answers to the previous question, they have very little regard for the extreme emphasis on explicit knowledge found in public education. Perhaps it is due to the characteristics of the teachers themselves (as Logan puts it, "Japanese teachers are generally boring") or the specifics of how explicit knowledge is measured (Mei: "You keep getting Xs on your tests for even small mistakes"), but the *eikaiwa* teachers clearly see the eight years of mandatory English education as more hindrance than help.

Issues discovered in both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the research conducted for this thesis will be discussed in greater detail in the following section.

4.3. Discussion

Eikaiwa teachers do not appear to adhere very strongly in their approaches to explicit or implicit knowledge or explicit or implicit teaching to precedents set in other educational contexts in Japan. This is to a degree unexpected and also ironic given what the teachers themselves say about how students see them. Responses to both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the survey indicate that *eikaiwa* teachers feel as if students expect pedantic and demotivating Japanese teachers along with energetic but vacant NS teachers, a caricature of

the often observed roles of the public school NNS English teacher and ALT.

However, responses to questions on classroom practice indicate that *eikaiwa* teachers do not play those roles, and responses to the qualitative survey show that both NS and NNS *eikaiwa* teachers share a disdain for classroom practices reminiscent of *examination English* and *authentic English*. Rather, if students really do expect assignment of roles similar to that of public schools, then NS and NNS *eikaiwa* teachers' practices must prove disappointing, as they do not appear to diverge from each other very much.

A mystery we are left with after the realisation that many teachers in the private market accept and practise modern ELT methods is why most in public schools do not, particularly given that the government has been officially endorsing CLT since the 1980s (Nishino and Watanabe 2008). Teachers in *eikaiwa* indicate that they are faced with preconceived student notions of them and their jobs: NSs as entertainers and providers of *authentic* content, NNSs as explainers and knowledgeable survivors of the examination regime. These would seem similar to expectations of NS and NNS teachers elsewhere in Japan.

Items 3 and 8 from the questionnaire as well as the responses to the qualitative portion of the survey add further contradictions to this riddle. NSs and NNSs in *eikaiwa* both indicated agreement with the idea that students expect them to do different things because of their NS/NNS status (item 3), and neither of the groups agreed that students are accustomed to their way of teaching (item 8). NNSs agreed slightly more than NSs that NS and NNS teachers *should* teach differently (item 21) but this belief does not seem to find much expression in their actual teaching practices. Something about *eikaiwa* seems to allow its teachers to

better ignore these expectations than NS and NNS teachers working in mandatory and tertiary education.

The issue may be the relative status of the teachers' jobs, as well as teachers' status within the classroom. Public school teachers may not have greater levels of training than *eikaiwa* teachers, but they do have professional pride as those officially charged with educating Japan's youth. As Holliday (1994) writes, teachers in cultures with a "collectivist tradition" (p. 88) have been shown to balk at methodologies which threaten their place in the class as the transmitter of hard-won knowledge, a pattern observed very clearly in Japanese higher education (Nagatomo 2012). As teachers in mandatory education are at the centre of educational culture, there may be greater incentive for them to play the role of what their culture defines as a "real teacher". This pressure can come from external sources as well, including society and students. An analogous situation is outlined in Holliday (1994, p. 86) in which the more respected a teacher was (in this case by having a more advanced degree), the more students wanted that teacher to play a traditional didactic role. This difference in status has been seen as explaining a similar difference in practices between Japanese high school teachers in low-status technical high schools and more prestigious preparatory schools (Browne and Wada 1998). It is also possibly relevant that when one speaks of student expectations, public school teachers have the eyes of 40 or so students at once on them (Nishino and Watanabe 2008), whereas for *eikaiwa* teachers the number is usually less than ten (Sergeant 2005). For teachers in tertiary education this gap could be even more pronounced. Student expectations and personal expectations are magnified by the status and classroom realities of

teachers within mandatory and higher education as compared to those within the private market.

A further reason for the lack of strong differences between NS and NNS *eikaiwa* teachers could be that teaching practices converge with greater levels of training, meaning that a data set that whose teachers had fewer credentials and less experience might show more divergence in approaches to ELT. Recall from section 2.1.2 that the typical ALT is hired right out of university (Breckenridge and Erling 2011) while the typical Japanese English teacher in mandatory or higher education also has no formal SLA training, even when charged with training other English teachers (Gorsuch 2001; Sato and Kleinsasser 2004; Nagatomo 2012), and that these public institutions are sites of particularly divergent job descriptions for NSs and NNSs. Public school teachers have been shown to be strongly in favour of CLT in name while applying very little of it in classes (Sato and Kleinsasser 2004; Nishino 2011), implying that training and confidence in communicative methods may be missing more than agreement in the value of CLT. More than half of the teachers in this dataset had at least some formal training in ELT, giving them a possible greater degree of comfort in implementing CLT than their public school counterparts. This comparatively high average level of training also implies that contrary to what the image of the industry might be, the average *eikaiwa* worker may be more qualified for the work of language teaching than the average junior high or high school English teacher in Japan, NS or not.

Indeed, one may wonder at the justice of complaining about the qualifications of private-market language teachers when those in mandatory education, who may be assumed to have greater influence over students' eventual

development, are even less qualified to do their work. A resolution to the conundrum of why the public seems to settle for less subject expertise from public school teachers may be that public school teachers in Japan are seen as not only conveyors of academic information but also moral role models and in situ parental figures (LeTendre 1998). This view of teachers manifests itself in very long working hours, including a slew of counsellor-like responsibilities aimed at developing the students' character and ability to live in adult society (Fukuzawa 1998). Given the wider scope of public school teachers' responsibilities it may be inevitable that mastery of the actual content to be taught and the methods by which to teach it fall behind their private-market contemporaries, including *eikaiwa*, *juku* [cram schools] and other sources of supplementary education which specialise in subject-specific instruction.

Given the depth of the ideologically-driven divide between NSs and NNSs in Japan described in sections 2.1 and 2.1.1, teachers in *eikaiwa* refusing to pigeonhole themselves into archaic and pedagogically unsound entertainer/transmitter roles may seem worthy of applause, but it also presents problems. One such problem is exactly the fact that *eikaiwa* teachers are not matching their students' expectations, however unreasonable or objectionable those expectations are. Several qualitative correspondents mentioned the positive motivational effects of meeting NSs. The mental image one has of the target language community and culture may be incorrect, but its correctness or incorrectness is not necessarily related to its value to the student. As recent writing on integrative motivation (Dörnyei 2001) and "ideal selves" (Dörnyei and Csizér 2002; Dörnyei 2009) reflects, imagining oneself in a kind of foreign situation or community can have real positive effects on learners even if the community in the student's mind

is different from that community in reality. To some extent it may demotivate students when teachers defy stereotype.

Even when it means a degree of distortion of reality, there is an important sense in which *authenticity* may be more important to sustaining learner motivation than *genuineness*. Teachers are not always their *genuine* selves inside the classroom, and there is much artifice in the L2 classroom which is unavoidable, even in less didactic, ostensibly student-centred methods (Swan 1984). While one need not become a caricature in the classroom, there is real pedagogical usefulness to providing a model students will be familiar and comfortable with, whether from the TL culture or the learner's own culture (Dörnyei 2001). The same is true for class materials, which as Lee (1995) writes, can be completely *genuine* while being of no *authentic* use to learners.

Defying student expectation also demonstrably lessens the effectiveness of certain teaching strategies. As described in section 2.2.2, learner variables can influence the effectiveness of different strategies with regard to the use of linguistic evidence. Learning styles that students are accustomed to, whether as part of the educational culture of that nation or simply the way their last teacher taught (Horwitz 1999; Gorsuch 2001), need to be taken into consideration when reflecting on or choosing classroom practices. To give a concrete example, feedback (evidence given in response to output) has been described as sensitive to learner expectations for its effectiveness. Feedback may be misconstrued by learners as being on an issue other than what the teacher intended (Mackey et al 2000; Ammar and Spada 2006). Teachers may intend feedback to address grammatical form, although learners may attend first to meaning, interpreting feedback as

focused on semantic issues rather than grammatical (Skehan 1998). Learners expecting meaning-focused conversation and getting form-focused feedback may be less able or inclined to *notice* form (Schmidt 1993), leading to less opportunity for *intake*. The converse may also occur, with students interpreting negotiation for meaning as strictly grammatical correction. The exchange of utterances combined with feedback has been cited as a potential source of improvement in the interlanguage system (Swain 1985; Long 1996; Mackey et al 2000; Mackey 2007), but the effectiveness of feedback may be reduced by a gap in expectations on the parts of the giver and recipient of it.

Thus, there are downsides to teachers acting in defiance of student expectations, even when those expectations are unreasonable and are based on precedents that have been acknowledged as failures, such as grammar-translation in English education in Japan. Therefore, it seems rather more reasonable that students and teachers should critically examine the rationales behind the roles that they are given, as is frequently recommended with regard to the NS teacher paradigm (Holliday 2006; Holliday 2013). In the pursuit of a greater mutual understanding of classroom roles between teachers and students, *eikaiwa* teachers are actually in an enviable position due to the possibility that they will be able to set policy themselves if they are also the owners of their schools, as is frequently the case (Nagatomo 2013). They have the advantage of having self-selecting students who, having proved some level of motivation and flexibility by seeking out and attending *eikaiwa*, are presumably more open to trying new ways of learning. Learners have been shown to be flexible in their attitudes towards learning when teachers make their expectations known (Riley 2009).

In this aim, *eikaiwa* teachers can analogise and compare teacher/student roles within *eikaiwa* with those roles in other teaching contexts within Japan. For instance, although teaching in Japan for any language often takes the form of teacher-led lectures (Cowie 2006), teachers are known to avoid explicit and deductive methods in the traditional arts (Hare 1998) and sports (LeTendre 1998). In fact, the types of sports practice most Japanese are likely to be familiar with, after-school clubs, often have no instructors at all, with older students guiding less experienced ones (LeTendre 1998). Ideas common in the CLT-like approaches that seem to be prevalent in *eikaiwa* have analogous counterparts in other disciplines in Japan which may prove useful for critical examination of common practices in the language classroom.

There is one point on which *eikaiwa* clearly have a pedagogical disadvantage compared to public schools which is not related to classroom practices or the NS concept per se. *Eikaiwa* classes tend to meet too infrequently for almost any method to be optimally effective for language learning. Time restraints on the effectiveness of implicit teaching methods were mentioned in section 2.2.2, but there is little reason to expect explicit methods to have the desired effect either when classes meet only an hour per week (Lightbown and Spada 2006). This limitation seems to be the point at which the business aspects of *eikaiwa* seem to have the most detrimental effect on their pedagogy, and lends support to Kubota's (2011b)'s assessment of *eikaiwa* as more a pastime than an intellectual pursuit. It can be difficult to reconcile the high qualifications and long experience of some *eikaiwa* teachers with the lack of clear pedagogical thinking with which lesson schedules seem to be made. If the research done for this thesis had found *eikaiwa* teachers to be universally unqualified then this practice would

be of about as much concern as the poor quality of a particular television programme; because *eikaiwa* teachers generally are qualified to teach this instead seems like a large waste of expertise.

With the contradictions between student and teacher expectations in mind, there are a few areas which seem ripe for further research. These will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 5: Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

The data gathered for this thesis do not support the idea that NS/NNS teachers in *eikaiwa* reproduce the roles that are typically assigned to those groups in other educational contexts in Japan. Rather, *eikaiwa* teachers are found to on average favour a CLT-like teaching method slightly weighted towards implicit linguistic evidence and the formation of implicit knowledge, but without a clear rejection of explicit teaching or explicit knowledge, which seems in line with modern recommended approaches to communicative classes (e.g. Dörnyei 2009). Teachers range widely in their experience and qualifications, but because being in the private market *eikaiwa* allows for consumer choice, this arguably presents less of a problem than public school English teachers and ALTs being almost universally untrained in SLA. Still, practices differ widely within *eikaiwa*, meaning there is ample opportunity for further research on this industry.

One area of likely great interest to Japanese consumers is the role of *eikaiwa* in examination culture. *Eikaiwa* teachers appear to align themselves more closely to experiential *authentic* English than *examination English*, yet this does not rule out a role for *eikaiwa* in preparation for examinations. Recall that practice for TOEIC, a test with a strong discrete item and orthodox grammatical focus (Chapman 2003) similar to Japanese college entrance examinations, was cited as one respondent to the qualitative survey as an area of demand from students. To what extent *eikaiwa* teachers see themselves as contributing and to what extent they actually do contribute to their students' academic success within the test-centric Japanese education system remains to be studied.

In hindsight, not having included the size of the *eikaiwa* schools that survey respondents work at in the biographical questions seems a glaring omission. Although to my knowledge this distinction has not been the subject of research itself, it may in fact form one of the most important distinctions, even more than NS/NNS status, between individual schools and teachers in the *eikaiwa* industry. As stated in Chapter 3, chain *eikaiwa* have the resources to recruit teachers directly from overseas, while non-franchised *eikaiwa* seem to be limited to teachers already holding visas to work in Japan, who are likely to have at least some prior experience. Further research should definitely include some reference to the size of the institutions being studied. The same is true for children's *eikaiwa*, another massive industry intentionally left out of this thesis, and the site of its own host of ideological issues, strict NS/NNS division among them (Seiha Network Co., Ltd. 2012b). Researchers looking into the world of *eikaiwa* will have to bear in mind the likely differences between large and small schools, as well as schools that teach children and those that teach adults.

A more technical subject salient to the topic of this thesis is the interplay between learner expectations and the effectiveness of various methodologies. It is entirely possible, for example, that a NNS *eikaiwa* teacher might find greater success teaching grammatical form with recasts than a NS teacher using the same recasting techniques, simply because students may expect NNS teacher's classes to be form-focused while they expect the NS teacher's classes to be meaning-focused. Research has been done which compares students' beliefs on what the teacher was trying to accomplish versus what the teacher believed he/she was trying to accomplish (e.g. Mackey et al 2000) but to my knowledge this has never been done on the subject of native-speakerism and stereotyping of

teachers. It is a delicate subject but given that stereotyping of teachers according to perceived NS/NNS status is reportedly common across multiple ELT milieus (Holliday 2006), and certainly in *eikaiwa* as well (Bailey 2006), much valuable knowledge could be gained from research on it.

The students who choose to attend *eikaiwa* schools would also seem a natural choice for a subject of study; it would be valuable to learn to what extent the teachers' statements in the research conducted for this thesis that students expect NSs and NNSs to teach differently are accurate. Also, because the brief defence of the *eikaiwa* industry in comparison with mandatory education presented in the previous section depends on the idea that consumers can forego *eikaiwa* with transient, inexperienced teachers in favour of schools with more qualified ones (while they cannot do this with their junior high or high schools), it is certainly worth knowing if these are indeed the criteria consumers use when choosing a school. Given the success of chains which prioritise native-speakerism and pseudoscience in advertising, at least some students seem to be choosing schools based on factors not likely to be conducive to effective learning. As with the qualifications of the teachers themselves, this may also be delineated by the size and advertising power of the schools in question.

The findings of the research conducted for this thesis have opened up several new questions ripe for further research on this large and influential industry. Some concluding remarks on the ground covered for this thesis will be given in the following chapter.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

One could be forgiven for having low expectations of the education offered at *eikaiwa* given the way they are frequently presented, both in news media and in SLA literature. Concerned parties seem to have low opinions of the industry as a whole, which materialises in the qualitative data gathered for this thesis as frequent warnings from teachers about other unqualified teachers, as well as academic studies which treat it as more a socio-cultural curiosity than a site of learning. Perhaps the relative status of language teaching in the private market and public schools should be re-evaluated, as there is a widespread perception that *eikaiwa* have low standards that does not square with reality, while public schools enforce policies guaranteeing even lower standards for the teachers in the best position to raise the level of English education in Japan.

Eikaiwa teachers and owners can do their part to claim the esteem that seems lost in their industry by prioritising practices that promote learning over commercial and ideological interests. By setting itself apart from the bad reputation some of its largest chains have created, the industry may be able to gain the respect it deserves commensurate to the dedication of its teachers.

[19,447 words]

References

Abe, E. 2013. Communicative language teaching in Japan: current practices and future prospects. *English Today* 29/2, pp 46-53.

Aeon Corporation. No date a. 日常会話コース *nichijō kaiwa kōsu* (Daily conversation course) [Online]. Available at: <http://www.aeonet.co.jp/daily/> [Accessed 29 April 2014].

Aeon Corporation. No date b. 英語を教える「プロ講師」 *eigo wo oshieru "puro kōshi"* (Pro English Teachers) [Online]. Available at: <http://www.aeonet.co.jp/personal/reason/07.html> [Accessed 11 April 2014].

Amazon.com, Inc. 2014. *Amazon.co.jp*: 日本文化を英語で紹介する事典 : 杉浦洋一、ジョン・Kギレスピー, *John K. Gillespie* : 本 *nihon bunka wo eigo de shōkaisuru jiten: Sugiura Yōichi, Jon K Giresupi, John K. Gillespie: hon* (Encyclopedia to Introduce Japanese Culture in English: Yōichi Sugiura, John K. Gillespie, John K. Gillespie). Available at: http://www.amazon.co.jp/日本文化を英語で紹介する事典-杉浦-洋一/dp/4816337350/ref=sr_1_4?ie=UTF8&qid=1400046434&sr=8-4 [Accessed 14 May 2014].

Amity Corporation. No date. プリスクールコース : 満6ヶ月~1歳 *purisukūru kōsu: man rokkagetsu ~ issai* (Preschool Course: 6 months to 1 year old) [Online]. Available at: http://www.amity.co.jp/age/preschool/age_05_1/ [Accessed 29 April 2014].

Ammar, A. and Spada, N. 2006. One Size Fits All? Recasts, Prompts, and L2 Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28/4, pp. 543-74.

Anderson, B. 2006. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Appleby, R. 2013. Desire in Translation: White Masculinity and TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 47/1, pp. 122-47.

Bailey, K. 2006. Marketing the *eikaiwa* wonderland: ideology, akogare, and gender alterity in English conversation school advertising in Japan. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24/1 pp. 105-30.

Bailey, K. 2007. Akogare, Ideology, and 'Charisma Man' Mythology: Reflections on ethnographic research in English language schools in Japan. *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 14/5, pp. 585-608.

Befu, H. 2001. *Hegemony of Homogeneity: An Anthropological Analysis of Nihonjinron*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Breckenridge, Y. and Erling, E. 2011. The Native Speaker English Teacher and the Politics of Globalization in Japan. In: Seargeant, P. *English in Japan in the Era of Globalization* [Electronic edition]. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 80-100.

Browne, C. M. and Wada, M. 1998. Current Issues in High School English Teaching in Japan: An Exploratory Survey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 11/1, pp. 97-112.

Carroll, S. E. 2001. *Input and Evidence: The Raw Material of Second Language Acquisition*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chapman, M. 2003. TOEIC©: Tried by undertested. *SHIKEN: The JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter* 7/3, pp. 2-7.

Clarke, T. 2007. 'Eikaiwa' firms face Nova fallout [Online]. The Japan Times. Available at: [http:// www.japantimes.co.jp/text/fl20071211zg.html](http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/fl20071211zg.html) [Accessed 24 March 2014].

Clavel, T. 2014. *Kikokushijo: returnees to a country not yet ready for them* [Online]. The Japan Times. Available at: <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/community/2014/05/04/issues/kikokushoji-returnees-country-yet-ready/#.U2crise9tqE> [Accessed 5 May 2014].

Cook, M. 2013. The multipurpose entrance examination: Beliefs of expatriate ELT faculty. *The Language Teacher* 37/1, pp. 9-14.

Cook, V. 1999. Going beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33/2, pp. 185-209.

Cowie, N. 2006. What Do Sports, Learning Japanese, and Teaching English Have in Common? Social-Cultural Learning Theories, That's What. *JALT Journal* 28/1, pp. 23-37.

Currie-Robson, C. 2014. *Teachers tread water in eikaiwa limbo* [Online]. The Japan Times. Available at: <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/community/2014/01/22/voices/teachers-tread-water-in-eikaiwa-limbo/#.U4qHGj-jNqE> [Accessed 1 June 2014].

DeKeyser, R. M. 1994. How Implicit Can Adult Second Language Learning Be? In: Hulstijn, J.H., and Schmidt, R., eds. Consciousness and second language learning: Conceptual, methodological and practical issues in language learning and teaching, *Thematic issue of AILA Review - Revue de l'AILA* 11, pp. 83-96.

Doerr, N. M. 2009. Investigating "native speaker effects": Toward a new model of analyzing "native speaker" ideologies. In: Doerr, N. M. ed. *The Native Speaker Concept. Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 15-46.

Dörnyei, Z. 2001. *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom* [Kindle version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Dörnyei, Z. 2009. *The Psychology of Second Language Acquisition* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com

Mark Makino ED0013 Master's Thesis

Dörnyei, Z., and Csizér, K. 2002. Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics* 23/4, pp. 421–62.

Dörnyei, Z., and Taguchi, T. 2010. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Educational Testing Service. 2006. *The TOEIC® Test: Test of English for International Communication™: Report on Test Takers Worldwide 2005*. Available at: http://www.ea.toeic.eu/fileadmin/free_resources/Europe%20website/3548-TOEIC_TTRep.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2014].

Educational Testing Service. 2011. *Test and score Data summary for TOEFL® Internet-based and Paper-based Tests*. Available at: <http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/TOEFL-SUM-2010.pdf> [Accessed 12 March 2014].

Ellis, N. 1994. Consciousness in second language learning: Psychological perspectives on the role of conscious processes in vocabulary acquisition. In: Hulstijn, J.H., and Schmidt, R., eds. *Consciousness and second language learning: Conceptual, methodological and practical issues in language learning and teaching, Thematic issue of AILA Review - Revue de l'AILA* 11, pp. 37-56.

Ellis, N. C. 2002. Reflections on frequency effects in language processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24/2, pp. 297–339.

Ellis, N. C. 2005. At the Interface: Dynamic Interactions of Explicit And Implicit Language Knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27/2, pp. 305-52.

Ellis, N. C. and Sagarra, N. 2010. The Bounds of Adult Language Acquisition: Blocking and Learned Attention. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32/4, pp. 553-80.

Ellis, R. 1993. The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 27/1, pp. 91-113.

Ellis, R. 2004. The Definition and Measurement of L2 Explicit Knowledge. *Language Learning* 54/2, pp. 227-75.

Ellis, R. 2005. Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27/2, pp. 141-72.

Ellis, R. 2006. Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly* 40/1 pp. 83-107.

Ellis, R. and Sheen, Y. 2006. Reexamining the Role of Recasts in Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28/4, pp. 575-600.

Falout, J. 2013. Forming Pathways of Belonging: Social Inclusion for Teachers Abroad. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Fennelly, M. and Luxton, R. 2011. Are they ready? On the verge of compulsory English, elementary school teachers lack confidence. *The Language Teacher* 35/2, pp. 19-24.

Folse, K. S. 2004. *Vocabulary Myths: Applying Second Language Research to Classroom Teaching*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ford, K. 2009. Principles and Practices of L1/L2 Use in the Japanese University EFL Classroom. *JALT Journal* 31/1, pp. 63-80.

Fujinomiya City Office. No date. 富士山と食のまちふじのみや *Fujisan to Shoku no Machi Fujinomiya (Fujinomiya, Town of Mt. Fuji and Food)*. Available at: <http://www.city.fujinomiya.shizuoka.jp/> [Accessed 14 July 2014].

Fukuzawa, R. 1998. The path to adulthood according to Japanese middle schools. In: Rohlen, T. and LeTendre, G. eds. *Teaching and Learning in Japan*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 295-320.

Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. 1972. *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Gass, S. 1998. Apples and Oranges: Or, Why Apples Are Not Orange and Don't Need to Be: A Response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal* 82/1, pp. 83-90.

Geluso, J. 2013. Negotiating a Professional Identity: Non-Japanese Teachers of English in Pre-Tertiary Education in Japan. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Gorsuch, G. 2001. Japanese EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative, Audiolingual and Yakudoku Activities: The Plan Versus the Reality [Online]. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 9/10. Available at: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/339> [Accessed 15 July 2014].

Guest, M. 2000. "But I *have* to teach grammar!": An analysis of the role "Grammar" plays in Japanese university entrance examinations. *The Language Teacher* 24/11, pp. 23-29.

Guo, Y. and Beckett, G. H. 2012. A critical analysis of English language teaching in today's market economy in China. In: Sung, K. and Pederson R. eds., *Critical ELT practices in Asia: Key issues, practices, and possibilities*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Hall, I. 1998. *Cartels of the mind: Japan's intellectual closed shop*. New York: Norton.

Hare, T. 1998. Try, try again: training in noh drama. In: Rohlen, T. and LeTendre, G. eds. *Teaching and Learning in Japan*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 323-44.

Harley, B. 1994. Appealing to Consciousness in the L2 Classroom. In: Hulstijn, J.H., and Schmidt, R., eds. *Consciousness and second language learning: Conceptual, methodological and practical issues in language learning and teaching*, *Thematic issue of AILA Review - Revue de l'AILA* 11, pp. 57-68.

Hashimoto, K. 2013. The Construction of the 'Native Speaker' in Japan's Educational Policies for TEFL. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Hayes, B. E. 2013. Hiring Criteria for Japanese University English-Teaching Faculty. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Heimlich, E. 2013. The Meaning of Japan's Role of Professional Foreigner. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Hicks, S. K. 2013. On the (Out)Skirts of TESOL Networks of Homophily: Substantive Citizenship in Japan. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Hino, N. 1988. Yakudoku: Japan's Dominant Tradition in Foreign Language Learning. *JALT Journal* 10/1, pp. 45-55.

Hiratsuka, T. 2013. Beyond the rhetoric: Teachers' and students' perceptions of student learning in team-teaching classes. *The Language Teacher* 37/6, pp. 9-15.

Holliday, A. 1994. *Appropriate methodology and social context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holliday, A. 2006. Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal* 60/4, pp. 385-7.

Holliday, A. 2013. 'Native Speaker' Teachers and Cultural Belief. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Horwitz, E. K. 1999. Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a review of BALLI studies. *System* 27/4, pp. 557-76.

Houghton, S. A. 2013. The Overthrow of the Foreign Lecturer Position and its Aftermath. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Inagaki, S. 2002. Japanese learners' acquisition of English manner-of-motion verbs with locational/directional PPs. *Second Language Research* 18/1, pp. 3-27.

Japan National Tourism Association. 2013. *Visitor Arrivals by Country/Area & Purpose of Visit for Dec. 2013 (provisional figures)* [Online]. Available at: http://www.jnto.go.jp/jpn/reference/tourism_data/visitor_trends/pdf/2013_december_zantei.pdf [Accessed 14 May 2014].

Kachru, B. 1992. *The other tongue: English across Cultures. 2nd ed.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kawai, Y. 2009. Japanese Nationalism and the global Spread of English: An Analysis of Japanese Governmental and Public Discourses on English. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 7/1, pp. 37-55.

Kelsky, K. 2001. *Women on the Verge: Japanese Women, Western Dreams* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Kramsch, C. 2014. Teaching Foreign Languages in an Era of Globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal* 98/1, pp. 296-311.

Krashen, S. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. 1998. Comprehensible Output? *System* 26/2, pp. 175-82.

Kubota, R. 2009. Rethinking the superiority of the native speaker: Toward a relational understanding of power. In: Doerr, N. M. ed. *The Native Speaker Concept. Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 233-47.

Kubota, R. 2011a. Questioning linguistic instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education* 22, pp. 248–60.

Kubota, R. 2011b. Learning a foreign language as leisure and consumption: enjoyment, desire, and the business of eikaiwa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14/4, pp. 473-88.

Kubota, R. 2011c. Immigration, Diversity and Language Education in Japan: toward a Glocal Approach to Teaching English. In: Seargeant, P. ed. *English in Japan in the Era of Globalization* [Electronic edition]. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 101-22.

Kubota, R. and Fujimoto, D. 2013. Racialized Native Speakers: Voices of Japanese American English Language Professionals. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Kubota, R. and McKay, S. 2009. Globalization and Language Learning in Rural Japan: The Role of English in the Local Linguistic Ecology. *TESOL Quarterly* 43/4, pp. 593-609.

Law, G. 1995. Ideologies of English Education in Japan. *JALT Journal* 17/2, pp. 213-24.

- Lee, W. Y. C. 1995. Authenticity revisited: text authenticity and learner authenticity. *ELT Journal* 49/4, pp. 323-8.
- Leeman, J. 2007. Feedback in L2 learning: Responding to errors during practice. In: DeKeyser, R. M. ed. *Practice in a Second Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 85-110.
- LeTendre, G. 1998. Shidō: The concept of guidance. In: Rohlen, T. and LeTendre, G. eds. *Teaching and Learning in Japan*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 275-94.
- Lightbown, P. 1985. Can language acquisition be altered by instruction. In: Hyltenstam, K. and Pienemann, M. eds. *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, pp. 101-12.
- Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. 2006. *How Languages Are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. 1991. Focus on form: a design feature in language teaching methodology. In: de Bot, K., Ginsberg, R., Kramsch, C. eds. *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 39–52.
- Long, M. H. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of second language acquisition* 2, pp. 413-68.
- Lummis, C.D., Kang, S., and Kayano, T. 2009. 国家とアイデンティティーを問う *kokka to aidentitī wo tou (An Inquiry into the State and Identity)*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Mackey, A. 2007. Interaction as practice. In: DeKeyser, R. M. ed. *Practice in a Second Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 85-110.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S., and McDonough, K. 2000. How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 22/4, pp. 471-97.
- Masden, K. 2013. Kumamoto General Union vs. the Prefectural University of Kumamoto: Reviewing the Decision Rendered by the Kumamoto District Court. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.
- Matsuda, A. 2002. Representation of Users and Uses of English in Beginning Japanese EFL Textbooks. *JALT Journal* 24/2, pp. 182-200.
- Matsuda, A. 2003. World Englishes in Teaching English as an International Language. *TESOL Quarterly* 37/4, pp. 719-29.
- Matsuura, H., Chiba, R., and Hilderbrandt, P. 2001. Beliefs about Learning and Teaching Communicative English in Japan. *JALT Journal* 23/1, pp. 67-82.

Mark Makino ED0013 Master's Thesis

McKenzie, R. M. 2013. Changing Perceptions? A Variationist Sociolinguistic Perspective on Native Speaker Ideologies and Standard English in Japan. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

McVeigh, B. 2002. *Japanese higher education as myth*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

McVeigh, B. 2006. *The State Bearing Gifts: Deception and Disaffection in Japanese Higher Education*. Lanham, MD: Lexington books.

Medgyes, P. 1992. Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal* 46/4, pp. 340-9.

Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry. 2012. 平成22年特定サービス産業実態調査: 教養・技能教授業 *Heisei 22-nen Tokutei Sābisu Sangyo Jittai Chōsa: Kyōyō/Kinō Kyōjūgyō (2010 Survey of Specific Service Industry: Education/Skills Instruction Industry)* [Online]. Available at: http://www.meti.go.jp/statistics/tyo/tokusabizi/result-2/h22/excel/28_all.xls [Accessed 23 Mar 2014].

Murphey, T. 2001. Nonmeritorious Features of the Entrance Exam System in Japan. *The Language Teacher* 25/10, pp. 37-9.

Nagatomo, D. H. 2012. *Exploring Japanese University English Teachers' Professional Identity* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Nagatomo, D. H. 2013. The advantages and disadvantages faced by housewife English teachers in the cottage industry *Eikaiwa* business. *The Language Teacher* 37/1, pp. 3-7.

Nishino, T. 2011. Japanese High School Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Regarding Communicative Language Teaching. *JALT Journal* 33/2, pp. 131-56.

Nishino, T. and Watanabe, M. 2008. Communication-oriented Policies Versus Classroom Realities in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly* 42/1, pp. 133-8.

Nolasco, R. and Arthur, L. 1986. "You try doing it with a class of forty!". *ELT Journal* 40/2, pp. 100-6.

NOVA Holdings Co. Ltd. 2014a. フリーカンバセーション VOICE *furī kanbasēshon VOICE (Free Conversation VOICE)* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.nova.co.jp/voice/> [Accessed 4 May 2014].

NOVA Holdings Co. Ltd. 2014b. *NOVA Holdings, Co. Ltd. - For foreigner [FAQ]* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.nova.co.jp/hd/foreigner/faq.html> [Accessed 4 May 2014].

Okubo, Y. 2009. The Localization of Multicultural Education and the reproduction of 'Native speaker' concept in Japan. In: Doerr, N. M. ed. *The Native Speaker*

Mark Makino ED0013 Master's Thesis

Concept. Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Park, J. 2009. 'English fever' in South Korea: its history and symptoms. *English Today* 25/1, pp. 50-7.

Peak, L. 1998. The Suzuki Method of music instruction. In: Rohlen, T. and LeTendre, G. eds. *Teaching and Learning in Japan.* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 345-68.

Pinker, S. 1989. *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com

Rampton, M. B. H. 1990. Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal* 44/2, pp. 97-101.

Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching, 2nd edition* [Kindle version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Riley, P. A. 2009. Shifts in Beliefs about Second Language Learning. *RELC Journal* 40/1, pp. 102-24.

Rivers, D. J. 2013a. Institutionalized Native-Speakerism: Voices of Dissent and Acts of Resistance. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Rivers, D. J. 2013b. Labour contract law amendments: Recruitment indicative of change? *The Language Teacher* 37/1, pp. 68-71.

Russell, J. 1991. Race and Reflexivity: The Black Other in Contemporary Japanese Mass Culture. *Cultural Anthropology* 6/1, pp. 3-25.

Russel, N. U. 1998. The Kumon approach to teaching and learning. In: Rohlen, T. and LeTendre, G. eds. *Teaching and Learning in Japan.* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 248-71.

Sakui, K. 2004. Wearing two pairs of shoes: Language teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal* 58/2, pp. 155-63.

Sakui, K. and Gaies, S. J. 1999. Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning. *System* 27/4, pp. 473-92.

Sato, K. and Kleinsasser, R. 2004. Beliefs, practices, and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20/8, pp. 797-816.

Schmidt, R. 1993. Awareness and Second Language Acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13, pp. 206-26.

Schmidt, R. 1994. Deconstructing Consciousness in Search of Useful Definitions for Applied Linguistics. In: Hulstijn, J.H., and Schmidt, R., eds. *Consciousness*

- Mark Makino ED0013 Master's Thesis
and second language learning: Conceptual, methodological and practical issues in language learning and teaching, *Thematic issue of AILA Review - Revue de l'AILA* 11, pp. 11-26.
- Seargeant, P. 2005. "More English than England itself": the simulation of authenticity in foreign language practice in Japan. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15/3, pp. 327-45.
- Seargeant, P. 2009. *The Idea of English in Japan*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Seargeant, P. 2013. Ideologies of Nativism and Linguistic Globalization. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.
- Seiha Network Co., Ltd. 2012a. ハロークラブコース *harō kurabu kōsu* (Hello Club Course) [Online]. Available at: <http://www.seiha.com/school/english/hello.html> [Accessed 29 April 2014].
- Seiha Network Co., Ltd. 2012b. セイハが選ばれる理由 *seiha ga erabareru riyū* (Reasons Seiha Is Chosen) [Online]. Available at: <http://www.seiha.com/select/index.html> [Accessed 26 June 2014].
- Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10/2, pp. 209-31.
- Sharwood Smith, M. 1981. Consciousness-raising and the second-language learner. *Applied Linguistics* 2/2, pp. 159-69.
- Sharwood Smith, M. 1993. Input enhancement in instruction SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15/2, pp. 165-79.
- Skehan, P. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Smart, R. 2010. *Eikaiwa on the ropes after fall of Geos* [Online]. The Japan Times. Available at: <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/community/2010/05/04/issues/eikaiwa-on-the-ropes-after-fall-of-geos/#.U3Troy-9tqE> [Accessed 15 May 2014].
- Spada, N. 2011. Beyond form-focused instruction: Reflections on past, present and future research. *Language Teaching* 44/2, pp. 225-36.
- Stanlaw, J. 2004. *Japanese English: Language and Culture Contact*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Sung, K. 2012. Critical Practices in Asia: A Project of Possibilities in the Era of World Englishes. In: Sung, K. and Pederson R. eds., *Critical ELT practices in Asia: Key issues, practices, and possibilities*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers, pp. 23-54.

Mark Makino ED0013 Master's Thesis

Swain, M. 1985. Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In: Gass, S. and Madden, C. eds. *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Newbury House, pp. 235–56.

Swan, M. 1984. A critical look at the Communicative Approach (2). *ELT Journal* 39/2, pp. 76-87.

Tanabe, Y. and Mori, S. 2013. Effects of Perceived Teacher Personality on Student Class Evaluations: A Comparison between Japanese Instructors and Native English Speaking Instructors. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 3/3 pp. 53-65.

Thornbury, S. 2013. *Big Questions in ELT* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Toh, G. 2013. Scrutinizing the Native Speaker as Referent, Entity, and Project. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Tsuneyoshi, R. 2013. Communicative English in Japan and 'Native Speakers of English'. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Van Patten, B. 1994. Evaluating the role of consciousness in second language acquisition: Terms, linguistic features and research methodology. In: Hulstijn, J.H., and Schmidt, R., eds. Consciousness and second language learning: Conceptual, methodological and practical issues in language learning and teaching, *Thematic issue of AILA Review - Revue de l'AILA* 11, pp. 27-36.

Widdowson, H. 1979. *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. 1990. *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Yoder, R.S. 2011. *Deviance and inequality in Japan: Japanese youth and foreign migrants*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Yoneyama, S. 2007. *Japanese High School: Silence and Resistance*. London: Routledge.

Yphantides, J. 2013. Native-Speakerism through English-Only Policies: Teachers, Students and the Changing Face of Japan. In: Houghton, S.A. and Rivers, D. J. eds. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Appendix A: Survey Consent Form and Questions

[Note: Because of the format required by Survey Monkey, the consent form was included in the questions as question 1]

This survey is being conducted in order to better understand the way private market English teachers working with adult learners see their roles in the classroom. It will not be used for commercial purposes.

All survey answers will be kept confidential. No names of individuals or businesses participating in this survey will be recorded for mention in any publication or presentation which includes this material. If you agree to participate now, you may still withdraw at any point during the course of the survey.

If you agree to participate in this research, please check the box below and continue to the first page of the survey.

I give permission for my answers to the following questions to be recorded, and for them to be used for research purposes. I understand that my answers will be treated as confidential, and I can withdraw my consent at any time.

Thank you very much for your time.

この調査は、英会話事業において社会人の生徒を持つ英語教師が、レッスン内でどのような役割を担っているか理解を深めるためのものです。営利目的のために使用することは一切ありません。

またご回答頂いた内容は秘密に取扱い、この調査自体を含めいかなる出版形式においても、個人や事業所が特定されるような記録や処理・取扱いは一切致しません。
なお調査開始後も、回答を途中でやめることも可能です。

同意していただける場合には、以下のチェック欄にチェックをお入れ下さい。

回答は外部に漏洩する事はなく、また回答を途中で取りやめる事ができることを理解しました。
上記について説明を受け、十分に理解しましたので、この研究への協力を同意致します。

ご協力ありがとうございます。

[Questions 2 through 23 have radio button answers with the following labels:

Strongly disagree 非常に同意できない

Disagree 同意できない

Neither agree nor disagree どちらとも言えない

Agree 同意できる

Strongly agree 非常に同意できる]

2. I bring attention to examples of successful English use by students.
生徒が上手に使った英語表現を例として取り上げる。

3. Japanese English students expect different teaching styles from native and non-native English teachers.

日本人の生徒は英語ネイティブスピーカーの教師とそうでない英語教師にそれぞれ違う教え方を期待する。

4. It's best for students to pick grammar up from natural language use.
言語の自然な使い方から文法のルールを覚えるのが生徒にとっては一番良い。

5. I often recast or restate problematic student comments for clarification.

Mark Makino ED0013 Master's Thesis

生徒の発言中の間違いを明確に分からせるために正しく言い直すことが多い。

6. When students make errors in speech, I call attention to the mistakes at some point during the class.

生徒の発言に間違いがあった場合に、その授業が終わる前にその間違いに着目させる。

7. I expect my students to be able to describe rules of usage, not just apply them.

文法を正しく活かすことだけでなく、文法を説明することができることも生徒に求めている。

8. The style of teaching that I practise is one that most Japanese people are accustomed to.

私の行う教え方は、多くの日本人が慣れ親しんでいる教え方である。

9. Natural speech, including my own, is important "learning material" for my students.

私の英語を含め、自然な会話は生徒にとって大切な「教材」になると思う。

10. I try to avoid explicit grammatical explanations.

細かい文法の説明を避けている。

11. My lessons have a clear distinction between English learning and English practice.

私が行う授業は、英語を「学習」することと「練習」することがはっきり分かれている。

12. I negotiate for meaning with students in English when the meaning of what they say is not clear.

生徒の発言がはっきりしない場合は、英語のやりとりで意味を確認する。

13. My students come to my classes mainly to improve their English skills.

生徒は主に英語力を上達させるために、私の授業に参加している。

14. I use metalinguistic terms (noun, clause, participle, etc.) when I talk about correct usage.

正しい英語の使用について説明するときには、文法用語（「名詞」「節」「分詞」など）を使う。

15. I usually point out the grammatical form of the English in class materials.

レッスンで使用する教材で使われる英文法の形式に触れるようにしている。

16. I point out examples of incorrect English for students to avoid.

間違った英語を生徒が避けるためにもその例を指摘する。

17. When I react to unsuccessful English use, I do so within the flow of conversation.

私は、会話の流れを止めないように図りつつ生徒の間違った英語の発言に、その会話のやりとりを通して対応する。

18. My students expect me to use some Japanese in class.

生徒は私に授業で日本語を使うことを期待している。

19. I often give explicitly grammar-focused explanations.

文法を細かく説明することが多い。

20. I rely on natural English use rather than explicit grammar and vocabulary teaching.

文法や語彙に重点を置いて教えることよりも、自然な英語の使用による授業を行う。

21. Native speakers and non-native speakers should teach using different methods.

英語ネイティブスピーカーの教師とそうでない英語教師、それぞれ違う教授法・メソッドで授業を行った方がよい。

22. Students should produce language without pausing to think for long periods.

生徒は熟考する事なく発言を続けるべきである。

23. Students come to my classes for an intercultural or international experience.

生徒は異文化体験や国際的な経験を得るために私の授業を受けている。

If you have any additional comments, please enter them here:

備考：他にご意見・コメントがございましたら、ご自由にご記入ください。

Sex: 性別 Age: 年齢 Years teaching English: 英語教師歴:

Nationality: 国籍: Relevant qualifications: 資格:

First language:母国語:

If available for further interviews by email, please enter email address:

Eメールによる追加調査にご参加頂ける方は、Eメールアドレスをご記入下さい:

Appendix B: E-mail Request for Participation

Dear Teachers at (name) English School,

My name is Mark Makino, and I am a student in the University of Leicester's MA Programme in Applied Linguistics. For my thesis I am writing about private market English schools, AKA eikaiwa, to understand how teachers see their responsibilities teaching English to adults.

Eikaiwa is a relatively unexplored topic in academic writing on language teaching. Since practices at individual schools are likely to vary widely, it's crucial that the data I use come from many different sources. I'm seeking respondents to a survey on teachers of adult eikaiwa, of any background or nationality, from schools small and large. The survey has 23 multiple choice questions and should take about 5 minutes, and can be completed in either English or Japanese.

Also, although I am an eikaiwa teacher as well, I am specifically avoiding surveying schools in my area (eastern Shizuoka Prefecture) and will absolutely not use the data gathered here for any commercial purpose.

The link to the survey is at the bottom of this email. Thanks very much for your time.

Best,
Mark Makino

英会話スクール講師の皆様へ

私はレスター大学のマスターズプログラムで応用言語学を専攻しておりますマークマキノと申します。プライベートセクターである英語学校（「英会話」）での社会人生徒の英語学習において、英語講師の方々が担う役割について論文を書いております。

言語教育における「英会話」の役割は、学術的にもまだ新しい事象であります。その教育法・レッスン運営の仕方は個々のスクールにより多岐に渡っておりますので、論文執筆においては様々な情報源からデータを得る事が重要だと考えております。スクールの規模、特定の国籍やバックグラウンドに限定されない社会人に教えている英会話講師の方々に関する調査へご回答のご協力を頂きたいお願い申し上げます。質問は全部で23問、英語とその対訳（日本語）で書かれ、回答は5択形式です。時間にして5分程度の短い調査です。

また私自身も英会話スクール講師ですが、私のスクールのあります静岡県東部のスクールへの調査は控えております。またこの調査で得たデータを営利目的で使用する事は一切いたしません。

調査へのリンクはこのメールの最下部にあります。お時間を割いて頂いている事を感謝しております。

[\[link\]](#)

Appendix C: Qualitative Survey Questions

Dear Eikaiwa Survey Respondents,

Thank you very much for taking my initial survey. You have received this e-mail because you entered your e-mail address indicating your willingness to participate in further open-ended questions. The questions are written below. As before, questions may be answered in English or Japanese, and any or all questions may be skipped at your discretion. Please provide no identifying details of students or other parties when answering. Feel free to take as much time as you need in answering if you choose to do so.

Thanks again,
Mark Makino

以前、英会話に関する調査にご協力頂いた皆様へ

先日は英会話に関する調査にご回答下さいましてありがとうございました。
追加調査参加欄にメールアドレスをご記入頂きました方にこのメールをお送りしております。質問は下記にあります。前回のアンケートと同じく、この追加調査も英語・日本語のどちらでもご回答頂けます。生徒個人や団体・グループの特定につながるような内容や情報を回答に含めないようにして下さい。またご回答は全て任意で、回答者の皆様の都合でご回答頂けますのでご協力をお願い致します。

マキノマークより

1. What do you think is the purpose of eikaiwa?

「英会話」の目的／意義は何だと思えますか。

2. Do you feel that the non-educational (e.g. business, aspirational, social, etc.) aspects of eikaiwa affect your classroom practices? If so, how?

英会話の持つ教育とは別の要素（仕事、あこがれ、社交性など）が

レッスン内容に影響すると思えますか。また仮に影響する場合、どのように影響していると思えますか。

3. What differences do you think there are in the expectations Japanese students of English have of native-speaking and non-native-speaking teachers?

英語のネイティブ講師とネイティブでない講師に対して、日本人生徒が期待する事柄についてどんな違いがあると思えますか。

4. Do you think that differences in job titles or job contents between Japanese and non-Japanese English teachers are justifiable? If so, what kinds of differences are justifiable?

日本人講師と外国人講師の役職名や仕事内容の違いには、正当性があると思えますか。

また正当性があるとしたらどのような違いによって正当づけられると思えますか。

5. Are there disadvantages to learning languages from native speakers? If so, what are they?

ネイティブスピーカーから言語を学ぶ事に不利な点があると思えますか。不利な点があるとすれば何だと思えますか。

6. In your view, how important is explicit grammar teaching (e.g., focusing on grammatical form or identifying parts of speech) in effective English pedagogy?

あなたにとって、効果的な英語教授法として文法を明示的に教える事（文法形式に重点を置いたり、文章の構成要素に着目するなど）はどのくらい重要ですか。

7. In your view, how does having attended primary and secondary schools in Japan positively or negatively affect people's ability to learn English effectively in adulthood?

日本で小学校～高校で教育を受けた経験は、大人になってから英語を学ぶ際にどのように（どのようなプラス面で、あるいはどのようなマイナス面で）影響していると思いますか。

If you have any additional comments, please add them below.

備考：他にご意見・コメントがございましたら、ご自由にご記入ください。