

How Competent Do Elementary School English Teachers in Japan Need to Be?

Brian GAYNOR

日本の小学校教師に関して、どのようなコンピタンス
が必要ですか。

ブライアン ゲイナー

Abstract : Since April 2011 all public elementary schools in Japan now include in their prescribed curriculum for 5th and 6th grade students a subject entitled ‘Foreign Language Activities’. In practice this equates to the teaching of English. According to the official course of study issued by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT), the chief aim of the subject is to “help pupils actively engage in communication in a foreign language”. Such an aim assumes that teachers possess the experience, competence, and confidence in their English language abilities to realize this aim. This paper will draw upon the results of a two-year long longitudinal series of case studies of four Japanese elementary schools and their implementation of the new course of study. It will detail how the curricular aspiration of foreign language communicative competence is subject to the influences of an expansive circle of constantly interacting variables. These include teacher education, curriculum design, resource allocation, and societal expectations. In particular the paper will highlight how the desire for communicative competence must take account of classroom reality.

Key words : competence, elementary school English, professional development

1. Introduction

When we discuss competence in relation to teaching English to young learners (TEYL) we inevitably focus on the learner and the learning process. This is particularly the case with ‘communicative competency’ as it is the learner whom we want to achieve this competency. Thus, our efforts, both in terms of teaching and research, have rightfully focused on how the learner can best become an effective communicator in English.

However, during the 1990s the importance of teaching and the teacher began to receive increasing attention as can be witnessed by the number of seminal publications on that issue (Richards and Nunan, 1990; Wallace, 1991; Flowerdew *et al.*, 1992; Richards and Lockhart,

1994; Medgyes and Malderez, 1996; Hayes, 1997; Richards, 1998; Roberts, 1998; Wallace, 1998). Such a development was inevitable as it is now widely accepted that the quality of learning is affected by the quality of teaching. Therefore, when we consider communicative competency in EFL it is not just the learner we must consider, but also the competency the teacher brings to the classroom. Or rather the range of competencies the teacher must bring, for as this paper will argue, the effective teacher must be adept in a diverse set of skills that incorporate issues of pedagogy, classroom management, curriculum design, evaluation, and language ability, to name but a few.

This paper is therefore concerned with attempting to illuminate some of the possible answers to two fundamental questions: what is the nature of the competency - the skills and knowledge - needed by the EFL teacher? And related to this, what are the contextual issues that either promote or inhibit the teacher's acquisition of the necessary competencies? The teacher after all does not operate in a vacuum but is subject to an array of forces that, for better or worse, shape the nature of their teaching.

A final point to be made is that the generic term 'teacher competency' tends to mask the different types of teachers and teaching being done in the same way as the term 'learner' encompasses a huge amount of diversity in the many different people learning EFL. This paper draws on research I conducted over two years investigating early English language education in Japanese elementary schools. Thus, as I will outline in more detail later, it will be concerned with non-native, non-specialist teachers of compulsory English to young learners in fifth and sixth grades in public elementary school. This is a very different context to say, university students taking an advanced academic writing course at a specialized foreign language faculty in a liberal arts university. And it is these sort of contextual differences, I will argue, that tend to be overlooked in discussing communicative competency yet often play the most important role in determining whether or not such a goal is effectively met.

2. Competency in teaching

Competency in teaching is rather akin to the apocryphal definition of great art: it is nigh impossible to objectively define but nevertheless we recognize it when we see it. There is an underlying assumption that the characteristics of good and effective teachers are known and recognizable, albeit difficult to articulate in manner compatible with evaluation and emulation. This in turn points to the diverse yet complex interplay of factors that influence teaching, factors such as the subject matter, students' ages and proficiency levels, pre-determined curriculum, institutional resources, and the cultural values of the educational system. All belie the notion that a good teacher is simply an inherently 'good' teacher; rather she is a teacher who can marshal all these forces in to a pedagogical approach that best improves her students' learning.

Acheson and Gall (1997: 25-26) identify the following characteristics of successful teachers:

- 1: clarity
- 2: use of varied materials and methods
- 3: enthusiasm
- 4: task orientated, professional approach to teaching
- 5: avoidance of harsh criticism
- 6: indirect teaching (learners don't know they are learning)
- 7: emphasizing content covered on achievement tests
- 8: use structuring statements to provide an overview for what is about to happen
- 9: use questions at many cognitive levels
- 10: know their students
- 11: know their limitations

However, as any experienced teacher will testify, the above is not an exhaustive list nor do all the characteristics carry equal weight in every teaching situation. The concept of an objectively rated 'ideal' teacher "resists clear-cut definitions, because there are too many variables to consider" (Medgyes, 2001: 440). Again if we consider the vast range of EFL situations a teacher may find himself in we would have to concur with Strevens observation that "informed teaching in the primary school calls for many differences in practice as compared with, for example, teaching English for specific purposes to mature adults" (1989: 84).

This is not to say that no criteria can be applied to gauge effectiveness in teaching. Such criteria may not be measurable but they are, for the most part, observable and can be used as a basis for assessing and improving teaching. To return to Strevens he states that "a set of regularly co-occurring features can be identified so that one may refer to informed teaching as the type of instruction and learning/teaching conditions that commonly produce effective learning" (1989: 73). He identified six features of informed teaching:

- (1) The teacher has specialized training and experience.
- (2) The methodology and materials employed are varied, interesting, and perceived by the learners as relevant.
- (3) The teacher maintains a high intention to learn on the part of the learners.
- (4) The teacher promotes good relations with the learners and makes special efforts specifically for them.
- (5) There are ample opportunities for practicing the target language, in learner-centered and communicative ways.
- (6) Whenever possible teaching and learning are conducted at a high rate of intensity (20-25 hours per week).

These though are aspirational ideals and perhaps focus too closely on the teacher as the principal facilitator of ‘effective learning’. To take (6) as an example, the proposed weekly time given to teaching English would, at the Japanese primary school level, necessitate almost all daily class time being assigned to English lessons. Rather, as I will show, the other extreme is in fact the default position with English lessons being assigned to one 45 minute period in a week which has obvious (and detrimental) effects on learners ability to achieve communicative competence.

3. Effective teaching and communicative competence

The key principal in developing learners’ communicative competence in a foreign language is to “equip the learner with the knowledge, skills, and interpersonal strategies they need to be able to effectively communicate with speakers of the [foreign] language in question” (Sharpe, 2001:25). As can be seen from this definition there are a number of different yet interrelated competencies that need to be acquired by the learner, which in turn calls for a range of pedagogical approaches. Canale (1983) has identified four competencies required for the learner to communicate effectively in a foreign language. These are:

- Grammatical competence - the ability to formulate and comprehend sentences and other acceptable utterances which accord with the fundamental rules of grammar built into the language.
- Discourse competence - this is the knowledge necessary to know which vocabulary, language structures, and register are used in different discourses, e.g., applying for a bank loan versus writing an academic paper such as this one.
- Sociolinguistic competence - this is the knowledge necessary to know which language is appropriate (and inappropriate) in different social interactions and settings.
- Strategic competence - the knowledge needed to maintain meaningful communication even when language ability is less than fluent, e.g., negotiating meaning or repairing misunderstandings.

3.1 How competent?

To effectively teach these competencies then raises the question of what professional knowledge and pedagogical competencies does the teacher need to possess? But perhaps concentrating on such theoretical absolutes obscures the practical necessities of the classroom. Rather, the question should really be one of degree in relation to competency; the language demands placed on a teacher of an advanced level university academic writing class will be very different to that of a teacher of young learners in primary school. Therefore we need to match

teachers' linguistic and pedagogical competence to the level of language needed by their learners.

There is also the related question of how much English language expertise teachers need to effectively teach the subject. In my own research one of the principal concerns of the Japanese teachers I interviewed was their self-perceived lack of English language proficiency, a concern echoed in other countries too (Enever *et al.*, 2009). Yet, as Garton and Copland (2011) have observed, it is unreasonable to expect non-specialist teachers at the primary level to have expert proficiency in English. Nor is it needed. For the most part their students are beginners and given the low intensity of curricular mandated instruction (as with Japan often only one class a week), there is no great need for teachers to have a comprehensive knowledge of the language. That is not to say they don't need any knowledge of the English, but certainly not to the level of specialist language teachers at the secondary level.

What then are the core competencies a teacher of English to young learners should possess? Drawing upon the work of Pinter (2006), Sharpe (2001), Rhodes and Heining-Boynton (1993), Garton and Copland (2011), Maynard (2012), and Gaynor (2014), I tentatively propose the following criteria:

- 1: An understanding of second language acquisition in childhood and its relation to first language development.
- 2: Knowledge of appropriate TEYL methodology.
- 3: Knowledge of appropriate assessment and evaluation techniques.
- 4: The ability to integrate English into the teaching of other subjects across the curriculum.
- 5: English language proficiency appropriate to the learners' level.
- 6: Motivation to teach the language.
- 7: The willingness to undertake professional development courses in TEYL.

To see how realistic these criteria are I will follow a constructivist perspective (Williams and Burden, 1997) in applying them to an examination of English education in Japanese elementary schools that, for reasons of space, will concentrate on four main areas: context, professional development, competence, and motivation.

4. The context surrounding elementary school English education in Japan

Since April 2011, all public elementary schools in Japan now officially include in their proscribed curriculum for fifth and sixth grade students a course of study entitled 'Foreign Language Activities'. This is best understood as official policy catching up with actual practice, as prior to 2011 more than 95% of public schools already had some form of foreign language education in place (MEXT 2009).

However, 'Foreign Language Activities' should not simply be equated with the teaching of English to primary school students. The official course of study document (MEXT 2009) does

state that English is the preferred language of instruction, but describes such instruction in terms of activities rather than the teaching of the language per se. In addition, although compulsory 'Foreign Language Activities' is not deemed an academic subject in the same way Japanese, Maths or Social Studies are. Rather it comes under the domain of 'general integrated studies', akin to art and music and accordingly is limited to a total teaching time of 35 hours for each grade during one full school year.

What these issues highlight is how policy decisions very much determine the nature of the teaching and learning experience in the classroom. Without a clear understanding of the context in which these policies are formulated at the national and local levels, we cannot truly assess the impact of such policies on the actual practice of language learning and teaching.

To give one example of this effect of context on pedagogy: in Hokkaido prefecture, in northern Japan where I undertook my study, all public elementary schools are compelled by the prefectural Board of Education to participate in the annual 'National Assessment of Academic Ability' undertaken by the Ministry of Education (MEXT). These tests assess 6th grade students' knowledge of Maths and Japanese. Based on the results, schools, administrative areas and prefectures are all ranked. Hokkaido has consistently placed at the bottom of the national prefectural table. This has led to demands, particularly from parents, for steps to improve their children's scores (Asahi Shimbun, 2011), the implication being that both the problem and solution are found in the school system. In response, the prefectural Board of Education has initiated a series of classroom policies and professional teacher development programs to try and improve scores in the test.

All this in turn has a number of implications for the teaching of English. Foremost is the importance attached to Japanese and Math within the overall curriculum. English, as a non-academic, unevaluated subject, is not integral to students' (and schools') academic standing, and thus is not prioritized by schools, teachers, students and parents. In addition, the emphasis placed on teacher's professional development in teaching Japanese and Math by the Hokkaido Board of Education, crowds out what little time there is available for development in English language teaching. Finally, the presence of native speaking assistant language teachers in the majority of English lessons means that available financial resources are allocated to them (in the form of salaries), rather than the homeroom teacher (in the form of in-service professional development courses).

5. Professional Teacher Development

This lack of qualified teachers means that Japan, as with many other countries at the primary school level (see Garton & Copland, 2011), has to rely on existing 'generalist' homeroom teachers who are not trained to teach English to young learners. This in turn has an impact on learner outcomes and demands a realistic assessment of what can be achieved in

elementary school. In Japan there is the added concern that successful classroom initiatives and effective methodology are often the result of the efforts of these individual ‘generalist’ homeroom teachers rather than specialized school programs. Such a situation results in quality teaching being personalized rather than institutionalized so that when that teacher leaves the school (teachers are usually transferred every six years) much of the English program leaves with her.

Shortfalls exist too in the provision of both pre-service and in-service teacher training. As English is not an academic subject there is no specific qualification in TEYL offered at any of the 56 national educational universities in the country. The non-academic status of English also affects in-service training opportunities for teachers; greater emphasis is placed on career training in teaching Japanese, math and science (Izumi, 2006). The result is that with the limited time they have for in-service training, teachers understandably opt for training in those courses upon which they and their students are formally evaluated. Furthermore, in-service training is for the most part conducted by local boards of education (BoE); there are no set standards for such courses and the quantity and quality of provision is very much subject to the resources available to the individual areas (Benesse, 2010). Thus whereas BoE’s in a large urban area situated close to one of the national university’s of education can call upon such expertise, such an option is not available in distant rural areas. Even the MEXT mandated courses teachers must take every ten years in order to renew their teaching licenses are not standardized but left to individual prefectures. It is indicative of the neglect at the policy level in this area that the only recourse available to in-service teachers seeking some form of comprehensive training program in TEYL are those offered by private companies, the expense of which must be borne by the teachers themselves (Akiyama, 2010).

6. Competence and teacher motivation

A final issue that is sometimes overlooked is the rather uncomfortable fact that many primary school teachers simply don’t want to teach English; they are extremely busy as it is with the academic and administrative demands of their jobs, and adding an additional subject, particularly one for which they have received no formal pedagogical training, is something many of them resent. Such feelings, as I have observed, often manifest themselves in the classroom, where teachers sole aim is to ‘just get through’ the 45 minute English lesson. This often results in an over emphasis on games, teacher centered Japanese language explanations, late starts and early finishes so that the duration of the class is considerably shortened, and little pedagogical consistency from one lesson to the next. For many teachers, and unfortunately in my experience they are in the majority, elementary school English is regarded as an unnecessary burden rather than a rewarding challenge.

Resolving such problems requires a considerable increase in the quantity and quality of both pre-service and in-service teacher training. Butler (2005), in a comparative review of elementary school teachers in Japan, Korea and Taiwan, identified similar problems with teacher's attitudes to TEYL, their English language ability, and methodological competence. To alleviate these problems she suggested that teachers should receive comprehensive instruction in all areas related to child L2 learning along with systematic support in improving their English language ability. This is a call that has been echoed by many others (Edelenbos *et al.*, 2007; Enever *et al.*, 2009; Garton & Copland, 2011), yet in the case of Japan, such teacher support systems are not in place.

6. Conclusion

It is easy to find fault with the current program of elementary school English education in Japan, particularly in its deliberate ambiguity towards defining measurable learning outcomes for students. Less easy to do though is to provide workable solutions. Calls for greater resources, more qualified and competent teachers, better pre- and in-service training, are matched by calls for similar provisions for other subjects in the curriculum along with greater investment in school facilities, particularly in information technology. These competing claims have to be reconciled somehow. Politics is after all the art of compromise and such compromises manifest themselves in official policy documents.

Compromise though should not constrain possibility. In Japan, there is a significant emphasis placed on the lack of teachers' English ability and thus their ability to teach the language (Butler, 2005). However, such an assumption rests on the belief that high levels of English mastery are necessary to successfully teach the language at the primary level. Garton and Copland (2011), based on their findings from a global survey of primary school English teachers, suggest that 'the real issue is not the teachers' lack of proficiency, which may well be more than adequate for TEYL, but rather a lack of confidence predicated on the belief that native-like competence is required to teach ... successfully' (p.25).

The issue then is to consider what can be done given present circumstances rather than what could be done under ideal circumstances. One such opportunity, requiring little in the way of language ability or specific training but drawing upon generalist teacher's established competencies, would be to integrate TEYL with other subjects across the curriculum. Unlike the specialized and distinct EFL courses at the secondary level, the elementary school is institutionally structured to facilitate the natural diffusion of English learning across the whole curriculum and indeed, into most aspects of non-academic school life too. Within his classroom the homeroom teacher could conduct many of the usual routines such as taking attendance or assigning cleaning chores in English. At a more academic level English could be easily

incorporated in other subjects such as numbers and calculations in math, nomenclature in science, geographical features in social studies, and so on (for details, see Edelenbos *et al.*, 2007). Such an approach could draw upon various initiatives developed under the auspices of Content and Integrated Language Learning (CLIL) with an emphasis on developing teachers' competence not in the language *per se*, but rather in mediating between languages, curriculum content, and the development of inquiry and research skills in children (Arnold and Rixon, 2008). None of this requires expertise in English, but rather a willingness to both instigate and maintain such approaches so that the students become used to such linguistic transference and eventually consider them an integral part of their entire learning experience at school. As Sharpe rightly notes, '[students] are at an age to be taken along by a committed and enthusiastic presentation without the vulnerable self-consciousness of adolescents. The foreign language is in this way 'normalized'' (2001: 16).

Such an approach would also bring into focus the competencies teachers need to effectively teach English at the primary level. In Japan all elementary school teachers have received a minimum of eight years of English language education prior to joining the profession. They are, therefore, equipped with a foundation of linguistic knowledge which can be built upon. Given that most of their students are only encountering formal English education for the first time in fifth grade, it can be argued that teachers already possess an adequate knowledge of the language needed to teach young beginners. Rather, the emphasis in teachers' professional development should be on the how to teach the language, particularly in terms of CLIL-like cross-curricular initiatives. Doing this would enable English to become an integrated part of the students' entire learning environment, rather than the once-a-week isolated role it currently occupies.

Our guiding principal should be that 'competency begets competency': having a competent teacher in charge of the classroom is the most important factor in developing a communicatively competent learner.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based upon an earlier version presented at the 6th International CLS Conference at the National University of Singapore.

REFERENCES

- Acheson, K.A. & Gall, M.D. (1997). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications*. New York: Longman.
- Akiyama, T. (2010). The Challenging Tasks of Developing a Professional English teacher. *Bunkyo University*

- Bulletin of Institute of Educational Research*, 19, 19-26.
- Butler, Y.G. (2005). Current Japanese Reforms in English Language Education. *Language Policy*, 4, 1, 25-45.
- Arnold, W. & Rixon, S. (2008). Materials for Teaching English to Young Learners. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English Language Learning Materials: A Critical Review*, 38-58. London: Continuum.
- Asahi Shimbun (2011). *Hokkaidonai no kouritsu shouchuu, gakkuryouku tesuto kaishi (Test of Academic Ability starts in Hokkaido Elementary and Junior High Schools)*.
- Retrieved from <http://www.asahi.com/edu/news/HOK201109280003.html>
- Benesse Educational Research and Development Centre (2010). *dai 2 shougakkou eigo ni kan suru kihonn chousa [The second basic survey of elementary school English]*.
- Retrieved from http://benesse.jp/berd/center/open/report/syo_eigo/2010/index.html
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to language pedagogy. In J.C. Richards and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication*, 2-28. London: Longman.
- Edelenbos, P., Johnstone, R., & Kubanek, A. (2007). *The Main Pedagogical Principles Underlying the Teaching of Languages to Very Young Learners*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/young_en.pdf
- Enever, J., Moon, J., & Raman, U. (Eds.), (2009). *Young Learner English Language Policy and Implementation: International Perspectives*. Reading: Garnet.
- Flowerdew, J., Brock, M., & Hsia, S. (Eds.) (1992). *Perspectives on Second Language Teacher Education*. Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- Garton, S. & Copland, F. (2011). *Investigating Global Practices in Teaching English to Young Learners*. London: British Council.
- Gaynor, B. (2014). From Language Policy to Pedagogic Practice: Elementary School English in Japan. In S. Rich (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Teaching English to Young Learners*, 66-85. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hayes, D. (1997). *In-Service Teacher Development: International Perspectives*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Izumi, E. (2006). The role of homeroom teachers and teacher training in English language education in elementary schools. *Bulletin of Kyoto University of Education*, 110, 131-47.
- Maynard, T. (2012). *Mentoring Student Teachers*. London: Routledge.
- Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a foreign or second language*, 415-27. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Medgyes, P. & Malderez, A. (Eds.) (1996). *Changing Perspectives in Teacher Education*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2009). *Course of Study for Elementary School: Foreign Language Activities*.
- Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/eiyaku/1261037.htm
- Pinter, A. (2006). *Teaching Young Language Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Richards, J. & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. & Nunan, D. (Eds.) (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rhodes, N.C. & Heining-Boynton, A.L. (1993). Teacher training with a twist: A collaborative project in North Carolina. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 2, 155-70.
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language Teacher Education*. London: Arnold.
- Sharpe, K. (2001). *Modern Foreign Languages in the primary school*. London: Kogan Page.
- Stevens, P. (1989). The achievement of excellence in language teaching. In J.H. Esling (Ed.), *Multicultural education and policy: ESL in the 1990's* (pp.73-87). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Wallace, M. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, M. (1998). *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, M. & Burden, L.R. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers. A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Author's Information:

Brian Gaynor

Muroran Institute of Technology

Email: bgaynor@mmm.muroran-it.ac.jp