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Abstract

In 2009, The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, and Science and Technology in Japan (MEXT) revised the Course of Study (COS) curriculum guidelines for senior high schools, and it was implemented in 2013. Under the new policy, Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) are expected to increase the use of English in classrooms, which will require JTEs to make changes in their instruction. This paper attempts to examine how JTEs perceive the implementation of the new policy. Through a questionnaire to elicit general views with a sample of 30 JTEs and focused interviews with three participants, the results show that JTEs are concerned about the pressures of conducting classes in English and focusing more on developing students’ communication skills in English. They are concerned about how to teach English through English because of their lack of training to provide effective communicative language activities. Data also showed that they are conflicted over their beliefs about how much of the target language (L2) should be used. They have strong beliefs that grammar needs to be taught in Japanese (L1). A positive outcome of this study is that the JTEs state a willingness to enter teacher development with colleagues to find ways to meet the curriculum demands. This result will hopefully inform constructive teacher development programs that understand the value of collaboration in teacher learning. Thus, this paper has implications for teacher education.
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1. Introduction

Japanese teachers of English (JTEs), especially in secondary schools, have been facing growing demands to make changes in their instruction to meet the needs of globalization. Since 2000, The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, and Science and Technology (MEXT) has taken a strong interest in
the effects of globalization, and this has influenced MEXT’s perspective on Japanese education (Tahira, 2012). In 2009, MEXT revised the English curriculum guidelines (to have been implemented four years later in 2013) in the Course of Study (COS) to emphasize the importance of encouraging students’ use of English, which further requires English teachers to teach English through English (TETE). In addition to the TETE policy in April 2011, another revised guideline focused on developing students’ communicative abilities in English was released, which states that the goal is “[t]o develop students’ communication abilities such as accurately understanding and appropriately conveying information, ideas, etc., … and fostering a positive attitude toward communication through foreign languages [English]” (MEXT, 2011, p. 1).

The policy initiatives indicate that both language knowledge and communication ability are required for students in order to adapt to a global society and improve intercultural understanding as a means to foster growth. However, what is remarkably different in the new COS guidelines for English is the above mentioned added policy initiative that places more of a priority on increasing the use of English in the classroom. It states, “[c]lasses are to be conducted in English, in principle” (AJET, 2011, p. 1). The policy further states its intention,

…not only to increase opportunities for students to come into contact with English and communicate in it, but also to enhance instruction which allows students to become accustomed to expressing themselves and understanding English in English (p. 1).

This suggests the crucial role of JTEs is to increase their subject matter knowledge of the English language and pedagogical knowledge of how to teach English communicatively as well. Furthermore, in 2014, corresponding to the rapid interest in globalization, MEXT announced the New English Education Reform Plan in December 2014 in order to enhance English education substantially throughout elementary to lower/secondary schools. This reform plan places more emphasis on developing the communicative competence of students and ensuring they nurture English communication skills by establishing coherent learning achievement targets as Table 1 shows.
The implication of these major reforms of MEXT placing a stronger emphasis on developing communication skills for an increasingly interconnected world and conducting classes in English, must surely have an impact on JTEs ways of teaching English in their classes. For example, Igawa (2013) writes in regard to the policy changes,

This was shocking to many practicing high school teachers of English because the teaching method most popularly employed in Japan now is grammar-translation, where the medium of instruction is predominantly Japanese. In addition, virtually no professional development programs for this particular way of teaching have been offered (p. 191).

Given these actual situations, it is still unclear how the current reforms and conditions are to be conceptualized by JTEs, and how much these new policies are to be implemented in actual teaching. In other words, in order to find solutions to problems concerned with JTEs making changes in their instructional approaches, we need to explore the realities they face. Knowing their concerns about implementing the reforms, we can move on to make suggestions for their teacher development, which is the aim of this study.

Three research questions are examined in this paper:

1. How are the new national curriculum reforms generally perceived by JTEs?
2. To what degree are JTEs ‘filtering’ the new policies?
3. What are some possible approaches to take in the teacher development of JTEs in relation to the above questions?

Question one is aimed at ascertaining the general perception of JTEs through a questionnaire as a primary data source, and question two is to delve into their perceptions through in-depth interviews with three JTEs. Question three attempts to form some implications for teacher development based on outcomes from the preceding questions.

2. The Study

This study has been mainly carried out at a private secondary school in Hokkaido. It may not be too much to say that the English teachers in this secondary school are held accountable to improve students’ communicative language skills since the school policy, as stated in its brochure, emphasizes the importance of having students develop global perspectives and communicative skills. It makes references to “[s]tanding on a world stage at the age of 18” and invites one to “[t]hink global.” In this context, JTEs are feeling pressure to strongly focus on implementing more communicative activities in the classroom, and it follows that JTEs need to make an effort to adapt to the change. However, changing a teacher's mindset takes much effort, and Fullan (1991) writes that teacher change happens with new approaches, new or revised materials and a change in beliefs, and that they all have to occur simultaneously for successful implementation. Unlike researchers or university level experts, JTEs are presented with time-consuming obstacles that can get in the way of change. For example, at secondary schools, JTEs have to face the burden of extra work such as homeroom duties, club activities, parents’ issues and other school duties (Laskowski, 2014, Sakui, 2004, Takaki & Laskowski, 2002).

Since the purpose of my study is to try to reveal the perceptions of JTEs’ and possible conflicts they face in order to find ways to access their professional development needs, a qualitative study is adopted taking an exploratory/interpretive approach as an appropriate means to explore, describe and explain how and why a person thinks, feels and acts. Brown (2006) explains, “Exploratory research tends to tackle new problems on which little or no previous research has been done” (p.43). Besides, Brown summarizes the aim of exploratory research as exploratory because it does not aim to provide the final and conclusive answers to the research questions, but explores the research topic with varying levels of depth.
(Brown, 2006). Singh (2007) likewise adds, “exploratory research is the initial research, which forms the basis of more conclusive research” (p.64). Thus, an exploratory research method is adopted as the purpose of this study trying to unpack JTEs’ problems and concerns from their perspective. In doing so, the study attempts to give ‘voices’ to teachers by exploring and describing the participants’ perceptions about the reforms to better understand their actions, which then could lead to finding effective ways to help JTEs in their teacher development.

2.1 Method

Data collection and analysis occurred in two stages. The first step was to conduct a survey to gain a general consensus about the TETE policy shift of the COS. The questionnaire results of 30 JTEs’ responses were analyzed as a sample questionnaire in the first stage (see Appendix 1). Data was collected in August in 2014 after a teacher-training seminar at Kumamoto University, where English teachers at both public and private schools took courses to renew their teaching licenses, and where the author is enrolled in a doctoral program.

In the second stage, an introspective account of JTEs’ perceptions of the TETE policy (see Appendix 2) were sought through conducting individual in-depth interviews with three JTEs: Teacher A (TA), Teacher B (TB) and Teacher C (TC). Interviews took place from May to September in 2014 at different times with respect to the busy schedules of the three teachers as well as the author herself. Japanese was used in the interviews for deeper discussion and purposes of clarity in a relaxed atmosphere with privacy. The interviews were recorded on an audio tape recorder and later transcribed and translated into English.

2.2 Participants

As for the sample survey, 30 junior and senior high school JTEs, who participated in a teaching license seminar varied in ages from those in their 30s to those in their 50s. The participants also had a wide range of experience as well.

The three JTE participants are English teachers at a junior high school and high school located in Sapporo, where the author is employed as a
teacher. Participants’ background information is presented in Table 2.

### Table 2. Backgrounds of JTEs’ teaching and learning experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA (Female)</th>
<th>TB (Female)</th>
<th>TC (Female)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Teaching:</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status:</td>
<td>Temporary teacher</td>
<td>Temporary teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification:</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree in English Literature</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree in English Language Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience:</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(As of 2015) Experience of learning English abroad:</td>
<td>ESL intensive English program for 2 months in America</td>
<td>Pre-ESL program for 1 year and ESL program for 1 year in America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.3 Data Analysis

Data from the questionnaires were statistically broken down according to possible relevance. As for the interviews, a comparative analysis was carried out using a technique associated with grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Data gathered from the three JTEs were compared to look for common patterns or themes that would emerge and represent their perceptions. These had to be substantiated by the data and then could be selected as thematic categories to represent their perceptions.

#### 2.4 Sample Survey Findings

The results from the sample survey show (see Figure 1) that 83.3\%(n=25) of the JTEs have positive attitudes toward the policy as 56.7\%(n=17) answered that they “Strongly agree” and 26.7\%(n=8) answered “Mostly agree” with the new policy of TETE and none of them disagreed. As for the rate of English used in their classes, teachers who answered that they use English more than 50\% of the class time were 25, while 5 teachers answered they use English 30\% or less in their class as Table 3 shows.
These data show that most JTEs agree with the TETE policy in general. Moreover, around 10 teachers responded that they conduct their classes with more than 70% use of English and a majority of JTEs use English from 50% to 70% of the time in their classroom as Table 3 shows. Additional data clarifying when JTEs use English in the classroom show that most responses related to material instruction and classroom management (N=22) (see Table 4).

Table 3. Use of English in the class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of Using English</th>
<th>N=30</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 90%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%-80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-70%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%-60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%-50%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%-30%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%-15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data show that most JTEs agree with the TETE policy in general. Moreover, around 10 teachers responded that they conduct their classes with more than 70% use of English and a majority of JTEs use English from 50% to 70% of the time in their classroom as Table 3 shows. Additional data clarifying when JTEs use English in the classroom show that most responses related to material instruction and classroom management (N=22) (see Table 4).

Table 4. When do you use English?  (Multiple answers allowed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only textbook material instruction (Reading English in textbooks and sample sentences)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text material instruction &amp; classroom management English</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text material instruction &amp; having students involved in communicative activities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the class time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data above is similar to the results in a questionnaire on English use given to 95 JTEs by Tsukamoto and Tsujioka (2013). Topping their list was English used for instructional purposes at a little over 70%. English for instructional purposes implies directions for classroom management and other functional phrases such as greetings and warming-up activities. Tsukamoto and Tsujioka theorized that the reason for particular use and limited use of English in their survey is that MEXT (2009) states that English classes should be conducted in ‘English in Principle,’ which does not mean they need to use English all the time and they can switch between English and Japanese depending on the classroom situations and activities. However, their analysis also suggests that curriculum policy initiatives made at the institutional level, which are far from the classroom, are problematic because of their ambiguities.

Where general views about TETE are concerned, most of the teachers are supportive and they claim that they conduct their classes basically in English, on the other hand, the English they use is mostly for classroom management or textbook related instruction. The result is an indication that very little conversational communicative interactions occurred between JTEs and students as most uses of English were for instructional purposes. Igawa points out that this latter use of English is more like the language used in English for explanations “whereas teaching English through [italics are in original] English” signifies not only the language, but also the process of the teaching (2013, p.193). Willis (1982) sheds light on the view of using English throughout the daily teaching process in the following:

> Teaching English through English means speaking and using English in the classroom as often as you possibly can, for example when organizing teaching activities or chatting to your students socially. In other words, it means establishing English as the main language of communication between your students and yourself; your students must know that it does not matter if they make mistakes, or if they fail to understand every word that you say. They must recognize that if they want to use their English at the end of their course, they must practice using it during their course (p. xiii).

The implications of this observation is that in order to meet the TETE policy, JTEs need to use English in communicative activities where they themselves are part of activities communicating with their students in English, and even chatting or conversing with students as Willis suggests would be beneficial.
Additional results, which are not mentioned above in the survey, are shown in Figure 2 and they refer to the possible advantages of TETE. What can be said here is that most of the teachers recognize the advantages of TETE because it provides students with a foreign language environment. The JTEs appreciate students’ exposure to English since they think TETE has the potential of increasing students motivation for learning English including listening and speaking. JTEs also consider that communicative language teaching (CLT) methods offer an effective teaching approach for teaching English since more than 80% of the JTEs answered that they ‘Strongly agree or Mostly agree’ in total to the question of ‘Language skills must be improved through communication.’

![Possible advantages of TETE](image1.png)

**Figure 2. The possible advantages of TETE (N=30)**

Meanwhile, JTEs also feel the disadvantages of TETE as Figure 3 below shows:

JTEs are apprehensive that students might be confused and fail to understand the English instruction, consequently they posit that Japanese is required to explain language and to teach grammar. The results of the advantages and disadvantages of TETE show that teachers are conflicted over TETE. That is to say, on the one hand English teachers recognize the importance of using English in the classroom to develop students’ communicative skills and to motivate them to use more English. On the
other hand, a majority think it is difficult to implement TETE in their classes as they believe Japanese is required for accuracy of language structure explanations, and there are difficulties adjusting JTEs’ language level to suit students’ level.

Table 5 shows the results of JTEs’ intentions for TETE. Most of them have positive perceptions for improving their teaching skills and English proficiency and cooperative action with other teachers.

### Table 5. JTEs intentions for TETE (N=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Yes</th>
<th>Mostly Yes</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Not So Much</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the activities using English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in in-service training</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study teaching methods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with colleagues and share the ideas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving English of teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3. The possible disadvantages of TETE (N=30)**
The results show that JTEs are willing to introduce more English activities, and that they are willing to improve on their instruction to meet policy aims as well as being more involved in teacher training to achieve it. These are positive outcomes that are noteworthy for both improving and involving JTEs in teacher development programs.

Next, to learn more detail of how the JTEs feel about the policy shift and what their needs are for teacher development, we turn to the data from the interviews.

### 2.5 Interview Outcomes

Based on the findings from the sample survey, a gap between policymakers and practicing teachers exists in implementing the language education policy successfully. Next, “information-rich cases” (Patton 2002, p.230) from the interviews of three JTEs who work in a local teaching context where the study takes place, will be presented to further show their perceptions of the TETE policy. Examining the interviews, five salient themes emerged: (1) the lack of the experience of teaching English through English (TETE); (2) teaching in English is too limited; (3) JTEs conflicting beliefs about TETE over the role of L1 to teach grammar; (4) positive perception of TETE for communicative competence; and (5) JTEs are willing to collaborate to develop their skills. Research findings will be described and documented in the narrative lines recorded from the participants.

1. **The lack of the experience of teaching English through English (TETE)**

   Teachers often teach based on their personal theories of teaching which are largely influenced by experiences when they were learners. Lortie (1975) refers to this as “apprenticeship of observation,” in which he argues that prior learning experiences in schooling play a crucial role in determining teaching beliefs and practices, and that teaching beliefs are formed on the basis of prior learning experience as students rather than as teachers.

   Personal theories of teaching are also influenced by professional theories or knowledge of teaching (Kumaradivelu, 2001). In the case of teachers, they are introduced to theories of teaching during university study or in research literature on teaching. However in the comments below, it seems that as a teacher and as a learner, there was a lack of pedagogical knowledge in using English in the classroom. TA mentions that the lack of pedagogical knowledge when studying to be a teacher has led to insecure feelings about how to implement the reform even though she is aware of
the policy initiatives,

TA: I’m afraid that it might be hard for all English teachers to conduct all of their lessons in English, putting myself in the position of an English teacher, because we have never had the training for using English in teaching English and I graduated college only two years ago. In college we did not have any training for teaching English in English even though we already knew about the shift in the new course of study, which emphasizes teachers’ using English in class. In fact, I have no idea about what kinds of English should be used and how we should use it, as we have never taken any training for achieving that purpose.

TB’s comments below also indicate that she did not receive adequate training to TETE when she was a student,

TB: Most English teachers used Japanese in my school days, however, only a few English teachers taught English in English, and we admired then as language teachers. If we English teachers are forced to use more English in classrooms followed by some standard prescription, we would at least try or intend to use more English... Grammar translation was the main approach in my school days and I received no training on how to teach English while at university.

The comments above prove that the interviewees’ teaching approaches were formed when they were learners. Remarkably, their teacher training was not on using English for communicative purposes although the COS has emphasized it for more than 20 years. It would also seem to be, as TB directly states, centered on a grammar-translation approach and this, in turn, has impacted on what they do in their classrooms. Gorsuch (1998) found through her survey of Japanese high school teachers of English that 70 to 80% of them used the grammar-translation method. TB also clearly points out that she lacks knowledge of teaching English communicatively. This result shows that pre-service training has an impact on why teachers do what they do in the classroom because of those early teacher-learning experiences. Nagamine (2012) also found that the participants of his study were still affected by perceptions of teaching formed by their pre-service training in regards to what they “thought about possible approaches to conducting English classes in English” (p.131).

2. Teaching in English is limited
As the general sample survey above (Table 4) demonstrated, the JTEs used English for more than half the class time, and it was used mostly for instructional purposes. English for instructional purposes implies directions for classroom management and other functional phrases such as in greetings, as well as others shown in Table 4. These uses are referred to as classroom English (CRE) among JTEs and are seemingly representative of the English used by JTEs (Laskowski, 2014, also see a list of CRE phrases categorized by functions in Aichi, Education Center School Handbook-Revised Edition, 2004). Below are examples of CRE given by TA and TB. First, TA offers her description of CRE phrases that she uses in the classroom,

**TA:** Well, most of them are for greetings such as, “How is the weather?” “Hello,” “Good Morning,” or for giving students instruction, such as, “stand up,” “sit down,” “repeat after me,” or an encouragement phrase like “Good job.” Others are for repetition and reading aloud.

TB’s uses of CRE are very much in line with TA’s,

**TB:** We need to be careful of overusing English as it might confuse students. I mainly use directive phrases such as, “Listen to me,” “Look at ~,” “Turn over your ~,” “Open your ~,” and some formulaic expressions in our ‘English Expression’ coursebook.

Besides articulating CRE phrases, TB makes an important observation reflecting L2 use. She is aware that she is providing limited uses of English as to not confuse her students. However, as Igawa (2013) and Willis (1982) argued previously, teaching English through English needs to go beyond the limited explanations and uses of CRE. This touches on Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) in that if students are sufficiently challenged by someone at a higher level (a teacher as a mentor) to go beyond what they can learn on their own, their learning potential is increased. Below is an example of TC’s comments that could be addressed by the concept of learning within ZPD,

**TC:** Students have come to understand my English in a few months. As a profession, we teachers should provide adequate English according to the proficiency level of students. If teachers just continue to speak English without thinking about students’ level or talking about whatever they want to say, then this may not be a good influence on students. Our
On the one hand, TC has indicated that if she talks with her students in English more, then they will “have come to understand her.” This would indicate that she has mentored her students successfully in order to advance their understanding her in English. However, she seems conflicted over her use of English in this way, as she does not want to go too far above their level. This would naturally be an issue with ZPD in order to determine at which level of proficiency the students could be challenged. Nonetheless, teaching or using English below or equal to the students level, if we apply the concept of ZPD, would put limitations on student learning. It can be argued that MEXT’s TETE policy is following along the lines of the ZPD approach by nudging JTEs to use more English and challenging their students to eventually “come to understand” their English. This has implications for teacher development and will be addressed later.

Interestingly, in regard to limiting uses of English, in Tsujioka and Tsukumoto’s study cited above, the area where the lowest amount of English was used was for grammar explanations (3.2%) and grammar exercises (8.4%). This means that an overwhelmingly amount of L1 was used in instruction concerning grammar, which seemingly would occupy a lot of time in classes taking grammar-translation approach. As TB states,

TB: *I think that I should ideally use English to explain the content of the textbook and the situation, then have students listen to what the teacher says or learn from today’s point. However, when it comes to grammar explanation, I naturally shift into Japanese, as teaching grammar in Japanese seems much easier for students to understand.*

TB expresses the limitations of her English use, especially when she teaches grammar. Generally, teaching the grammar of a target language reflects a strongly held belief among JTEs that it should be carried out in L1. However, this is not a scientific fact. There are various studies suggesting that grammar can be taught communicatively in L2 (Brandl, 2008, Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrel, 1998, Glasgow & Paller, 2014, Larsen-Freeman, 2001). The issue reported above about teaching grammar
in L2 as a means to decrease L1 use will be addressed next.

3. **JTEs have conflicting beliefs about TETE over the role of L1 to teach grammar**

   In exploratory studies setting out to gain participants’ perceptions, the issue of teacher beliefs can emerge. Since the 1980s it has been well documented in the literature on general education that beliefs formed from experiences, school practices and individuality (Borg, 2003) play a major role in how teachers conceptualize, plan and carry out their instruction (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Shavelson, & Stern, 1981). For example, over twenty years ago, in a seminal article depicting the various roles and types of teacher beliefs, Pajares (1992) wrote that the emergence of studies on teacher thinking,

   \[...[s]uggest that another perspective is required from which to better understand teacher behaviors, a perspective focusing on the things and ways teachers believe \[and that\]... beliefs are the best indicators of decisions we make throughout our lives and in the case of teachers have a stronger influence on teaching practices (p.308).

   Recognition of the important role that teachers’ beliefs play in the language classroom finally emerged in the 1990s (e.g. Burns, 1992, Woods, 1996) and it continues to appear as a major construct in teacher thinking. Studies on the role of beliefs also appear in the Asian context (Ng & Farrell, 2003, Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001, Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, 2004). Research on beliefs show that it is a messy construct (Borg, 2003, Laskowski, 2007). That is, beliefs do not necessarily work in a cause and effect, linear manner, and teachers often have conflicted beliefs. Conflicts in teachers’ beliefs within the Asian region have been observed regarding the issue of working in a curriculum, which explicitly emphasizes a communicative approach and L2 use, and at the same time implicitly is driven by grammar instruction and L1 use. In their study located in the Asian Pacific region, Richards et al. (2001) found that teacher beliefs can be resistant to change, which causes conflict within teachers. They write that even though they were working in a curriculum that emphasized a communicative focus, “[m]any of the respondents still hold firmly to the belief that grammar is central to language learning and direct grammar teaching is needed by their EFL/ESL students” (p. 54).

   JTEs’ conflict of being aware of the explicitly stated communicative objective in the COS and the implicitly held belief that grammar needed to be emphasized (and with L1 instruction) as a priority, is directly related to
the present theme under discussion. (It is also addressed in the subsequent theme as well.) Although all JTEs in this study recognize the importance of TETE, the teachers believed they needed to monitor their English use. They felt this way because of their strongly held belief that L1 is needed when it comes to the teaching of grammar as shown in the following,

**TA:** *In order for students to improve their communicative skills, teachers are of course required to address those skills in the classroom. However, I feel that we have to choose classroom English carefully, for I think that just to push through using English, such as explaining grammar without considering students’ proficiency, may cause confusion and may not be effective.*

TA’s comment implies that she believes that grammar has to be explained in L1 and she does not think it is effective to use English in teaching grammar. TC is clear in articulating L1 use in grammar explanations and accuracy input,

**TC:** *Of course I would like to teach English in English but I have little choice but to use Japanese to explain grammar because students cannot understand an explanation of grammar in English… . I believe that input is very important for language-learning as students cannot produce any language without input, that is to say, to have students remember important grammar structures with Japanese translation or explanation is essential.*

TA and TC have strong beliefs that teaching grammar in L1 explicitly is the most effective approach, or there is no alternative approach because they believe that grammar explanation and grammar forms are indispensable for grammar teaching. On the other hand, TB’s comment focuses more on the approach of teaching grammar,

**TB:** *I think it is not question of whether we teach grammar in English or in Japanese but how we teach grammar. Whenever I start teaching grammar students easily get bored, teaching grammar itself usually makes students bored; I don’t know what to do about this. But when I use English, students seem to pay more attention to what I say more so than in Japanese.*

This comment indicates that TB is consciously aware of the inadequacy of
the grammar teaching approach she is taking. She is also conflicted over using L1 or L2 to teach grammar. At first, she said that it doesn’t matter what language to use in order to teach grammar, and a later comment shows that she is aware that when she uses English, students become more engaged. These observations of the classroom atmosphere, which ironically is often created by teachers, may have implications for teacher development. In TC’s case, since “[t]he classroom environment provides a wealth of situational and functional contexts that can be exploited to introduce grammatical structures” (Brandl, 2008, p.108), there can be ways to provide her (and JTEs in general) learners opportunities with less use of L1. This is especially relevant when considering MEXT’s view that grammar translation and teaching grammar rules or terminology in English classes “be minimized” (MEXT, 2009, p.43).

In the comments of the JTEs, we see a strong belief in the role of L1 to teach grammar and a conflict over the relationship between teaching grammar and developing students’ communicative abilities. Moreover, this conflict is intensified when we consider that JTEs are officially told “[g]rammar should be taught in a way to support communication, and in a way that it is integrated into language activities” (MEXT, 2009, p.42), and “[g]rammar instruction should be given as a means to support communication” (MEXT, 2009, p.7). In this regard, Brandl (2008) points out the complexity of grammar teaching by saying that “[i]n many cases, rules are too complex or language structures are not transparent enough for students to figure out underlying rules, as is the case with many syntactical aspects of the language or with expectations to the rules” (p.112). Larsen-Freeman writes, that it will be important for language teachers to notice that “[g]rammar is about much more than form, and its teaching is ill served if students are simply given rules” (2001, p.251). What is emphasized here is that grammatical rules are learned when teachers design learning tasks that allow the students to apply them (rules) in practice, which will make a difference in learning grammar communicatively. Following this, next are the JTEs’ conflicting beliefs about communicative language teaching.

4. **Conflicting beliefs of TETE for communication**

As shown in the previous thematic category, studies, such as Borg (2003, p.91) have reported that “[w]hen it comes to teachers’ perceptions or beliefs and their actions in the classroom that ‘language teachers’ classroom practices are shaped by a wide range of interacting and often conflicting factors.” Although the JTEs firmly believed (as in the case of TA and TC) that classes should focus on accuracy first by placing an
emphasis on grammar by using a grammar-translation approach, they also were clearly aware that they needed to alter their instruction to find ways to integrate communicative approaches into their classes. According to Nishino’s study (2011), 60% of the high school teachers in her research approved of the need for in-service training on communicative language teaching (CLT). However, as the data has indicated, teachers have conflicting beliefs implementing CLT in their classrooms as TA states,

TA: Using English to promote students’ communication skill is effective, yes. It may be effective and a stimulus for students to watch Japanese teachers use English communicatively because students may increase their learning motivation for communication…. They may try to use English more if teachers use English more and they may intend to use English more…. In order to have students improve their communicative skills, teachers are of course required to address those skills in the classroom.

TA’s comment shows that she understands that the purpose of foreign language education is to foster communicative ability (MEXT, 2008b) and that teaching English through English is important in order to enhance students’ communicative competence. Meanwhile TC, with more teaching experience, casts deeper insights into communicative skills,

TC: To create an English environment as much as possible is better than doing nothing. However, I wonder which part of ‘communicative ability’ is supposed to be improved? Whether they put all communicative ability into just ‘communication’ or whether they intend to have students improve some specific communicative ability because ‘communication’ itself is the issue. This all sounds so ambiguous for me and may vary from speaking to writing. From my point of view, ‘communication’ includes all the skills of English. Many people might tend to think only speaking is ‘communication’, though, getting information through Internet is also one of communication [meaning reading articles or information in English]. Given this, reading and writing skills are also required.

TC seems confused over what is expected of her in developing the stated communicative goals in the COS. As MEXT (2008b) stresses the importance of a balance in the teaching of the four language skills, which can be seen from the overall objective “[t]o develop students’ basic communication abilities such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing”
(p.1). MEXT also emphasizes increasing time for classroom activities focusing on practicing communication, and less time on grammar teaching (2008b). However, “[i]n spite of a stated policy shift towards a focus on communication, the teaching principles advocated by MEXT are not fully practiced and understood by teachers, and the Ministry needs to provide further support for them” (Tahira, 2012, p. 3). Since MEXT does not clearly define the type of classroom activities and ways of teaching which it expects teachers to adopt in their classroom, TB comments,

\[\text{TB: When we aim at the more communicative approach to increase students’ communicative skills, still I realize that how much we have limited skills for teaching English communicatively.... English expressions used in the course books are beginning to include more communicative expressions, though, I don’t know how to let students use them communicatively other than just letting them repeat and have them read these phrases in pairs. Drills or grammar or reading long articles are mainly focused, though, I would like to implement many activities in my class questioning students in English and engaging students more in activities by using more English. But I cannot spare enough time for planning and implementing these activities.}\]

Although The New English Reform Plan in 2014 mentions classroom activities (see Table 1), MEXT’s expectations, combined with the ambiguity of CLT, and the insufficiency of explanations officially given by MEXT) remain obscure for JTEs. Thus, problems in incorporating CLT in the classrooms still remain (Igawa, 2013, Tahira, 2012). As Fennely and Luxton (2011) point out that, “Neither the curriculum nor the guidebook seemed to be well understood” (p.21). The lack of clear and practical definition of classroom activities may result in JTEs staying away from implementing the revisions stated in curriculum policy.

In order to support JTEs who are conflicted between curriculum policy and realities of introducing actual communicative activities in the classroom, Nishino (2011) stresses the importance of opportunities for teacher development among peers. He suggests that teachers can continuously learn from their colleagues and switch to new ways of teaching, allowing time and opportunities for them to accumulate experiences in using communicative approaches.

5. **JTEs are willing to collaborate with colleagues to develop their skills**

A positive sign for getting JTEs to implement the new TETE policy is that
they are willing to collaborate with their colleagues to improve their teaching skills (see Table 5 above). Teachers need opportunities to interact within a professional dialog (or discourse) with colleagues so that they can reconstruct better understandings of teaching (Freeman, 1996, Takegami, 2015). Thus, it should be recognized that professional dialog is significant to teacher learning as the participants in this study indicate below. For example, in the comments of TC, we can see that she is not totally sure that what she is doing is effective and would like feedback from colleagues,

TC: Studying English only for fun will not firmly establish the proficiency ability of students and communication might be more than just fun. I feel we JTEs can train students in the classroom, which might be effective, though, I don’t spend my class time explaining all the materials, which students can do by themselves. I would like to implement something that they only can do at school. So I would like to share my ideas with many teachers because I am not confident that what I think and what I am doing is effective. In addition I would like to know what other teachers do and consider effective. It may be the case that “two heads are better than one,” as the proverb goes.

TC’s comment indicates that there is potential for JTEs to help each other in professional development. She first mentions that she would like to share her existing teaching knowledge with others through collaboration and getting feedback on what she is doing. TA also shows that she is very open to the idea of learning from colleagues as well,

TA: I assume that what I can do now is to ask some teachers to let me observe their classes. I want to observe the classes operated by ALT teachers or JTEs who can handle English effectively. I would like to learn how they use English and teach English in English and how we teachers can use useful phrases in English. I want to know what kinds of phrases ALTs are using in what kinds of situations in class….and I want to know some effective approaches if possible, as it is painful to see students’ unpleasant faces during classes.

The above comments from participants are relevant to the role of dialog in teacher development. John-Steiner & Meehan (2000) write, “Teachers, too, need colleagues in the staff room with whom to talk through the various phases of their inquiries” (p.50). They add that teachers need
colleagues to whom they can talk reflectively about what they are learning and how new learning experiences can be put into practice in ways that lead to a change in practice. The fruitfulness of dialog and its relationship to teacher development also plays an important role when constructing teacher workshops. Nishino (2011) stresses the importance of opportunities for teacher development, where teachers can continuously learn from their colleagues. This issue will be addressed below when the Japanese teacher development system, known as lesson study, is discussed as a teacher framework to engage JTEs in their development as teachers.

3. Discussion and Future Directions

Through the outcomes of the questionnaire and interviews, I have analyzed the data in each category. In the discussion section, I comprehensively examine these outcomes, using the data from the five thematic categories and responses to the questionnaire, to substantially address the research questions set out at the beginning of the study in the following:

1. How are the new national curriculum reforms generally perceived by JTEs?

Overall, the JTEs accept the policy to TETE although they are conflicted in how to carry it out. On the one hand, they agree with the stated goal in the COS to develop students’ communicative skills in English. However, they also believe that the new reform policy does not take into consideration the students low level of English and the need for teaching grammar in L1. Moreover, the JTEs admit that they lack teaching skills to apply more English in class as well as ways to create communicative activities, which are strongly influenced by their own experiences as learners. Exploring the teachers’ mental construct on how they perceive why they do (through thinking/reflecting) what they do (in practice) touches on studies in teacher cognition. For example, Borg’s (2009. p.3) research on teacher cognition, referring to the relationships between teachers’ cognition and practice, summarizes what is generally accepted today about the nature of teacher cognition and its relationship to what
teachers do by positing

- teachers’ cognitions can be powerfully influenced by their own experiences as learners;
- these cognitions influence what and how teachers learn during teacher education;
- they act as a filter through which teachers interpret new information and experiences;
- they may outweigh the effects of teacher education in influencing what teachers do in the classroom;
- they can be deep-rooted and resistant to change;
- they can exert a persistent long-term influence on teachers’ instructional practices;
- they are, at the same time, not always reflected in what teachers do in the classroom;
- they interact bi-directionally with experience (i.e. beliefs influence practices but practices can also lead to changes in beliefs).

In relation to the list above on teacher cognition, we can see that teachers’ perceptions informed by beliefs are powerful motivators for teachers’ actions in the classroom. Beliefs formed by prior experiences can help explain why teachers do what they do, and they can shed light on why they may be resistant to change. The issue of teacher beliefs, therefore, can offer explanations for the perceived gap that JTEs feel exists between the new reform policy and what they believe should be done in practice. For example, in Borg’s list above, teacher cognition relates to JTEs’ uses of English that are based on their experiences as learners. Although a majority of JTEs in the questionnaire report that they are using more than 50% of their instruction in English (see Table 3), the uses of the target language are for instructional purposes, which were referred to as CRE. The implication of CRE, as it is used in this study, shows that the JTEs are directing most of the L2 uses in an instructional manner concerning classroom management tasks or in grammar translations. For the JTEs in this study, this is the way they were taught, so they view TETE as means to use more CRE, not recognizing the difference between the two. This brings us to the next research question.

2. To what degree are JTEs ‘filtering’ the new policies?
In response to this question, there are two significant results concerned with teacher beliefs that emerge. One is that JTEs were conflicted in their beliefs about what language (L1 or L2) should be used to teach grammar,
and the other is the lack of beliefs over the role of CLT in terms of appropriateness for learning and their abilities of instruction. The JTEs report that developing students’ communicative abilities is needed, but that they are conflicted over to what degree of instruction should be devoted to doing so. The strong belief that students need more L1 and grammar translation because of their (students) level of proficiency and difficulties of teaching grammar indicate a heavy reliance on L1. The result of these beliefs has led to less inclusion of communicative activities that would have required students to use more English. In short, the outcomes of the study show that JTEs are using a lot of Japanese in the class to teach grammar, and they report that they lack knowledge of teaching approaches to introduce communicative activities in the classrooms. This point is significant because much of the English instruction in Japan is done with grammar translation methods resulting in a predominant use of Japanese (see, for example, Nishimuro & Borg 2013, who point out a number of beliefs for the reasons that underpin JTEs’ predominant approach to grammar instruction). Again referring to Igawa (2013) and Willis (1982) as cited in this study, what is lacking in the use of English by the JTEs is that they are not using English in conversational or communicative interactions. If we follow Vygotsky (1978) that learning is heightened through social interactions, then the JTEs, who offer limited opportunities for meaningful exchanges, also limit the opportunities to develop the students’ communicative skills. Moreover, echoing Larsen-Freeman’s stance (also previously cited above) that grammar is learned through meaningful practice, Celce-Murcia and Hilles clearly state,

If grammar instruction is deemed appropriate for a class, the teacher’s next step is to integrate grammar principles into a communicative framework, since the fundamental purpose of language is communication. Unfortunately, grammar is often taught in isolated, unconnected sentences that give a fragmented, unrealistic picture of English and make it difficult for students to apply what they have learned in actual situations. Realistic and effective contextualization of an isolated grammar point is not always easy (1988, p.8).

The results indicating that JTEs lack CLT skills, and largely use L1 instruction to teach grammar suggests that their teacher development should focus on these areas. In turn, a positive outcome from the data reports that an overwhelming number of the participants in the sample questionnaire are open to teacher training and also open to sharing ideas
with colleagues in their teacher development. This result is substantiated by the participating three JTEs, who reported that they are willing to engage in teacher development through collaboration, which has implications for the next direction of this study.

3. What are possible approaches to take in the teacher development of JTEs

The outcomes documented in this paper show that JTEs use English for limited reasons, mostly for classroom management and thus, instructing or ‘talking at’ students as opposed to conversing ‘with’ them. If we follow the CLT principle that learning is heightened through social interactions, then the JTEs are limiting in their instruction and not supplying meaningful exchanges with students that would increase opportunities to develop their communicative skills. Moreover, another outcome is that JTEs strongly believe that to teach grammar, L1 needs to be the dominant medium of instruction. Nagamine (2012) emphasizes the importance of teacher development stating, “The enactment of the new policy certainly requires teachers to change their beliefs regarding English learning and teaching, their pedagogical approaches and teaching practices” (p. 132). In this study, the challenge for the teacher/educator (as in the case of the author) is to attempt to get the participating JTEs to alter or change their teaching beliefs regarding the two outcomes.

A possible approach to teacher development would be to provide an opportunity for the three JTEs to participate in their own collaborative teacher development with the aim of finding ways to TETE. The data in this study confirms that JTEs are open to receiving in-service training, studying teaching methods, improving their English and collaborating with their colleagues. These factors showing JTE’s willingness to be engaged in teacher development represent a very positive result that is significant in helping them to alter their instructional approaches. The next logical direction would be to plan an intervention focusing on getting the JTEs to TETE by having them go through a collaborative Japanese teacher-learning framework, known as lesson study (Jugyokenkyuu).

In lesson study, teachers can take control of their professional development by going through a cyclical research process centered on preparing a lesson (Lewis, 2002). During the research process teachers go through several stages as they prepare a research lesson, teach the lesson, observe the lesson, reflect on it, revise it and report on its outcomes (Laskowski, 2011). Stigler and Hiebert (1999) highly praised lesson study and encouraged its spread in America, particularly because it supported their belief that the improvement in teaching takes place within the context
of the classroom. In Japan, since lesson study is deeply ingrained in the educational culture “[w]ith a long history and rich professional background...as school-based in-service teacher training (Kuno, 2011, p.11), it is a most suitable teacher development framework to use in language teaching as an effective model to integrate CLT in TETE. Thus, now having been informed of the outcomes in this study, a future direction would be to have the three JTEs go through a lesson study cycle (LSC) focused on developing skills to TETE and report on the findings.

4. Concluding remarks future directions

This study has implications for teacher development. The perceptions of JTEs were explored in a sample questionnaire and then an in-depth analysis was conducted with three participating teachers. The aim was to gain insights into how they view the new reform TETE policy, and how they are implementing it. After gaining insights reported in this study, a future direction would be to arrange an intervention through teacher development, especially since the outcomes provide a needs analysis of the three participating JTEs. Therefore, a future direction would be to report on the three participating JTEs going through a LSC with the goal of improving their instruction to meet the COS new reform policy. As Kumaravadivelu (2001) claims, “Teacher educators function as external change agents whose job is not so much to change the teachers directly but to create the conditions necessary for change” (p. 555). In a future study, the role of a teacher/educator (as in the case of the author) would be to participate as a collaborating teacher developer in order to help the JTEs plan interventions to develop their skills in CLT and in using more of L2 in the teaching of grammar. Through meaningful interventions within the reflective and classroom based LSC framework, it is hoped that the JTEs will improve their instruction. Sakui (2004, p.162) writes, “Teacher education, which encourages reflective practices, can foster the clarification of teachers’ developing pedagogical theories and goals, which in turn will guide their navigation through new instructional environments.” In doing so, along the way, the aim is to have teachers alter or change their beliefs to welcome new ways of teaching.
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Appendix 1 Sample questionnaire items
（英語の授業における英語の使用に関するアンケート）
1. 最初に、先生の勤務校についてお教えてください。
   (1) 現在の勤務：□公立高校 □私立高校 公□立中学校 □私立中学校
   (2) 英語を何年教えていますか。 □5 年以内 □5 年から10 年以内
       □10 年から20 年以内 □20 年以上
2. 平成21年3月に公示された新しい高等学校指導要領（平成23年度より実施）では、4.
   英語に関する各科目については、その特質にかかわり、生徒が英語に触れる機会を
   充実するとともに、授業を実際のコミュニケーションの場面とするため、授業は英
   語で行うことを基本とする。その際、生徒の理解の程度に応じた英語を用いるよう
   十分配慮するものとする。」と明記されたことについてどうお考えですか。
   □おおいに賛同する □ほぼ賛同する □どちらとも言えない
   □あまり賛同しない □全く賛同しない
3. 下の表は、英語の「授業を英語で行う」利点として考えられるものを挙げたものです。
   それぞれについて、どう思われかご回答ください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>全くその通り</th>
<th>ほぼその通り</th>
<th>どちらとも言えない</th>
<th>役りそうとも言えない</th>
<th>全く言えな</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>英語を使う自然な環境をつくることができる。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>生徒が英語により多く触れるに</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>いつも英語を聞いていてする英語を</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>いつも英語を聞いていてする英語を</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>授業が英語で行われると語学力をつ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>生徒に英語を学ぶという内村動</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>実際のコミュニケーションで使った</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. 下の表は、英語の「授業を英語で行う」場合の問題点として考えられるものを挙げたものです。
   それぞれについて、どう思われるかご回答ください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>全くその通り</th>
<th>ほぼその通り</th>
<th>どちらとも言えない</th>
<th>役りそうとも言えない</th>
<th>全く言えな</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>全て英語で授業をすると、困惑する</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>重要事項が理解できないことがある。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>日本語は言語活動の指示には必要である。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>日本語は文法説明には必要である。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>日本語で説明したほうが効率的なこと</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>生徒のレベルに合った英語を使うの</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>日本人教師にとって、常に英語で話す</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. 授業では、どれくらい日本語を使われますか
   □全く使わない □あまり使わない □少し使う □たくさん使う

5. 授業は、どのくらい英語で行っていますか
   □言語材料の提示（テキストの英文や例文提示のみ）
   □言語材料の提示とclassroom Englishを使う時
   □言語材料の提示と生徒に英語でコミュニケーション活動をさせる時
   □ほとんど全て
   □その他（  ）

6. 先生が話す英語を生徒に理解させるのに、どのような工夫をされていますか。あ
   てはまるもの全てに〇を入れてください。
   •ゆっくり話す 5 4 3 2 1
   •繰り返す 5 4 3 2 1
   •ジェスチャーを使う 5 4 3 2 1
   •写真・絵や実物を見せる 5 4 3 2 1
   •演技をする 5 4 3 2 1
   •日本語に訳す 5 4 3 2 1
   •その他（  ）

7. 今後、「授業は英語で行うことを基本」としていくとると、次のどのようなこ
   とが必要と思われますか。それぞれについて、どう思われるかご回答ください

|  | とても必要 | ほぼ必要 | どちらとも
   |  | 言えない | あまり必要 | 全く必要で
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>でない</th>
<th>でない</th>
<th>でない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>大学入試での英語の試験の改</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>教育研究所などの主催による教員研</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>個々の教員が必要に応じて自由に研</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>それぞれの学校で教員が相互に研修</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>教員の英語力の向上</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. 「授業は英語で行うことを基本」にすると、あなたは、次のどのようなことをして
   いこうと考えられますか。それぞれについて、どう思われるかご回答ください

|  | 全くその通り | ほぼその通り | どちらとも
   |  | 言えない | あまり思わ | 全く思わ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ない</th>
<th>ない</th>
<th>ない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>日本語を使用するのは授業効果の高</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>教師が新しい考えや教え方などの変</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>現在の自分の教え方に満足している</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>自分の学校の特性に沿った指導のあり</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>教師の英語力を向上させる</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 General interview questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you think of the ongoing Course of Study (COS) English goal to focus teaching on developing students’ abilities to communicate in English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are you aware of the new change (in the COS) of MEXT to enhance the use of English in classrooms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Why do you think they added EIP to the COS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What do you think about the concept of EIP (English in principle)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MEXT is asking teachers to use EIP, so do you think teachers need help in meeting this goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Roughly about what percent of English do you use in your classes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roughly about what percent of English do your students use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kind of English are you using (or try to use) in your class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For example, what situations/activities/teaching acts in the classroom, do you use English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you want to use more English (or teach English in English) as MEXT emphasizes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes (Please tell me more) / No (Why?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think using English is effective for the students? Yes (More) / No (Why?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How were you taught English? Do you think that influence your own teaching?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>