English edition

Online edition: ISSN 2188-8264
Print edition: ISSN 2188-8256

Language Teacher Education
言語教師教育

【Vol.7 No.2】

JACETSIG-ELE Journal

Language Teacher Education and Related Fields

August 2020
JACET SIG on English Language Education
http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/

【English edition】

Online edition: ISSN 2188-8264
Print edition: ISSN 2188-8256

Language Teacher Education

言語教師教育 2020

【Vol.7 No.2】

JACETSIG-ELE Journal
JACET 教育問題研究会 会誌

August 2020
JACET SIG on English Language Education
http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/

Language Teacher Education Vol. 7, No. 2, JACETSIG-ELE Journal
Published by the Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of College English Teachers on English Language Education
c/o Hisatake Jimbo, School of Commerce, Waseda University
1-6-1 Nishi-Waseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8050

Online edition: ISSN 2188-8264 Print edition: ISSN 2188-8256

Printed by Tobunsha for the JACET SIG in Japan.

Table of Contents

Language Teacher Education Vol.7 No.2

Editors, Reviewers and Contributing Authors

Contributing Authors (in order of mention)
Peter Broeder (Associate Professor, Tilburg University, Netherlands)
Carel van Wijk (Associate Professor, Tilburg University, Netherlands)
Natsue Nakayama (Associate Professor, Bunkyo University)
Takane Yamaguchi (Lecturer, Shumei University)
Sakiko Yoneda (Professor, Tamagawa University)
Shien Sakai (Professor, Chiba University of Commerce)

【Invited Paper】

Getting on the Same Page: an Inventory of Language Skills Needed Most in Secondary Education

Peter Broeder and Carel van Wijk

Abstract

School success often appears to depend on how well students have mastered the language register prevailing at school. This paper presents an inventory of language skills needed most in secondary education. Lists are presented for five communicative competences: linguistic (lexicon, formulating), textual (reading, writing), interactional (reception, production), rhetorical (content, presentation), and informational (organization, search). Each list is based on interviews with language experts and surveys with school teachers.

Keywords

school success, language competence, secondary education

1. Introduction

All over the world, teachers are confronted in their classes with cultural and linguistic diversity. Many of their students prove to be insufficiently proficient in the language they are expected to use at school. This brings them at a disadvantage because school success is not only dependent on cognitive abilities, but probably as much on this scholastic language proficiency as well.

This paper focuses on a better understanding of what kind of language proficiency is needed in the classroom. The first part discusses briefly two theoretical perspectives on the acquisition of (school) language. The second part presents in more detail an inventory of language skills students are assumed to have mastered in order to continue successfully their educational career. The paper closes with a plea to put language teaching in a central position, not for language proficiency per se but for the benefit of all subjects taught at school.

2. The Acquisition of School Language

Two distinct approaches try to explain for the changes and their additional difficulties that students meet when they enter secondary schooling: a socio-cognitive approach and a functional linguistic one.

The socio-cognitive approach stresses the fact that when entering secondary school, many relevant linguistic skills have not yet become fully automatized (see e.g.,

Cummins 2008). In everyday conversation, meanings can often be derived from context; at school, language is far more abstract, that is, meaning is much harder to recover and often even needs explicit explanation. Lack of contextual support when figuring out what exactly is being said or written, makes the mastery of school language a highly demanding task that asks for a lot of training.

The functional-linguistic approach is based on the idea that language always has a function according to the social context in which it is used. School language is best regarded as a register, that is, a set of linguistic features and meanings that are typically used within the school context (for more details, see Schleppegrell 2020). The mastery of this register depends on the input of parents and teachers; to familiarize students with a register requires an extensive amount of verbal exchanges.

Both approaches share their emphasis on the central problem: a students' success in school depends on the mastery of a specific language. They differ in their theoretical explanation: incomplete automatization (socio-cognitive) versus insufficient knowledge (functional linguistic). Consequently, they differ in their didactical policies: training (socio-cognitive) versus modelling (functional linguistic). The socio-cognitive approach focusses mostly on 'how to do', whereas the functional linguistic one does so on 'what to teach'.

If we want to discuss and remedy the language challenges students have to face, we cannot stick to the functional linguistic 'lengthy list' of register specific language features (Snow & Uccelli 2009). There is need for an inventory that is both concise, complete and practical. We propose to do so by combining functional linguistic feature descriptions with the socio-cognitive processing demands: the list of language features can be rephrased into a smaller set of language skills. A skill is defined as an instruction for a specific action, e.g., be able to 'avoid cumbersome constructions' where the term 'cumbersome' is shorthand for a list of sentence forms traditionally considered detrimental for understanding and attractiveness.

3. Characteristics of school language

Taking the models proposed by Byram (1997) and Thürmann and Vollmer (2011) as point of departure, we developed the inventory in Table 1. This table presents five communicative competences and the language skills associated with each of them. The competences are linguistic, textual, interactional, rhetorical, and informational. The first two are tied most directly to language, the second two take language into the world, the fifth and last one has mainly an auxiliary, meta-type function.

Two studies were done to check, reformulate and elaborate the skills listed in Table 1 (Broeder & Kistemaker 2015). The first study was a qualitative one in which European experts on language acquisition and language policy were interviewed. The second study was a quantitative one, a survey completed by secondary school teachers in Germany.

Table 1. Communicative competences and language skills associated with them

Linguistic competence	*Lexical skills*: get acquainted with ● course-related technical jargon ● conjunctions and prepositions ● modal (ad)verbs ● origin and meaning of loan words ● common idiomatic expressions ● regular abbreviations	*Formulating skills:* ● make specific and clear referential expressions ● make appropriate use of verb tense ● attend to *given-new* distribution ● avoid *run on*-sentences ● make careful use of preposed and embedded subordinate clauses ● make careful use of nominalization and passivization ● avoid cumbersome constructions (such as strings of PP's) ● be aware of informal expressions
Textual competence	*Reading skills:* ● identify main points ● make outline of larger texts ● attend to context and goal of text ● relate information found in various sources ● understand visualized information ● give a (critical) review	*Writing skills:* ● use correct spelling/punctuation ● make correct, careful formulations ● attend to coherence of the text ● avoid ambiguities and speculations ● differentiate basic text types
Interactional competence	*Receptive skills:* ● listen with (full) attention ● ask for clarification if needed ● ask relevant and critical questions	*Productive skills:* ● give relevant, appropriate answers ● participate actively in discussions ● give feedback to teacher and peers ● feel free to (counter)argue
Rhetorical competence	*Content skills:* ● name and define objects clearly ● summarize and structure clearly ● use description and narration in a relevant way ● know how and when to explain, to evaluate or to argue	*Presentation skills:* ● bear audience/readers in mind ● make relevant use of audio-visual materials ● edit written text in a clear and attractive way ● make spoken text accessible and vivid with nonverbal and para-linguistic cues
Informational competence	*Organization skills:* ● take notes and elaborate them ● follow '*prepare-execute-evaluate'* scheme in reading and writing	*Search skills:* ● find meaning of unknown words and unfamiliar concepts ● find sources in the library and on the Internet

Linguistic competence addresses lexical and formulating skills. Students have to get acquainted with various extensions of their vocabulary and to acquire fluency in the way they make their sentences more complex and eloquent at the same time. *Textual competence* refers to a number of skills needed when reading or writing longer stretches of text. Several of them are dependent on linguistic competence as well. *Interactional competence* has to do with language 'that comes to the open'. These skills are needed when listening or responding to others. *Rhetorical competence* has to do with maximizing effect, both in terms of understanding and of convincingness. These skills concern the content ('what') and the presentation ('how') of everything that is being written or said. *Informational competence* has to do with managerial concerns: meta-tasks that help direct an adequate performance in each of the other competences.

4. Perspective

Students do not enter secondary school with similar language skills, and certainly not all with the required levels of competence. This has serious consequences for the effectiveness of schooling, both from a cognitive and a motivational perspective. Learning results stay behind and 'joy of learning' evaporates. Schools need to attend far more closely to the training of linguistic skills. This has consequences all over the curriculum. Language is not one of these separate, isolated school subjects; it is the vehicle to bring forward the success in all school classes irrespective of their content. We do hope that the inventory presented here may contribute to any attempt to help students master the basics of learning: the understanding and production of language.

References

Broeder, P. & Kistemaker, M. (2015). More willingly to school: Tools for teachers to cope with linguistically diverse classrooms. *Intercultural Education*, *26*, 218-234.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 71-83). New York, NY: Springer.

Schleppegrell, M. (2020). The knowledge base for language teaching: What is the English to be taught as content? *Language Teaching Research, 24,* 17-27.

Snow. C. & Uccelli P. (2009). The challenge of academic language. In D. Olson & N.Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of literacy* (pp. 112-133). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Thürmann, E. & Vollmer, H. (2011). *A framework of language competences across the curriculum: Language(s) in and for inclusive education in North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany).* Strasbourg: Council of Europe (www.coe.int)

【Research Note】

Elementary School Teachers' Perceptions on the Qualities and Competencies of English Language Instructors: Results of a National Survey on the Descriptors of the J-POSTL Elementary

Natsue Nakayama and Takane Yamaguchi

Abstract

This paper reports the results of a national survey conducted by the JACET SIG on English Language Education (hereafter JACET SIG) in 2018 among in-service elementary school teachers in charge of "Foreign Language Activities." This survey consists of 74 out of the 167 self-assessment descriptors or SADs in the draft version of the *Japanese Portfolio for Elementary-school EFL Educators*, or J-POSTL Elementary, developed by the JACET SIG. The aim of this survey is two folds: to gain elementary-school teachers' perception of SADs and to explore some practical implications for the competency level or matrix of SADs. The results indicate that all the 74 descriptors are identified as core competences or didactic skills necessary for in-service elementary-school EFL instructors; especially, some descriptors regarding Category I Context and sub-category (c) Culture of the Category II Methodology are recognized as essential elements of foreign language teaching at elementary school. This study also suggests that, although it depends on the descriptor, participants' experience of teaching English at secondary school greatly affects the response. Thus, to create the competency matrix of SADs, participants' teaching experience should be considered as an important factor in setting the level. This also applies to in-service training and daily teaching practice. The result highlights the importance of promoting discussion and collaboration among teachers; especially those with their varied experience of teaching English in different contexts.

Keywords

elementary school teachers' attitudes towards English language teaching, experience of teaching English at secondary school, competency matrix

1. Background of the Research

The new Course of Study, or COS (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology; hereafter MEXT, 2017a) has brought about a major reform in Japanese elementary school foreign language (mainly English) education. Before the reform, English was taught to Year 5 and Year 6 students as "Foreign Language Activities." The

aim of this compulsory class was to “build a foundation for communication skills and raise their interest in English” through developing listening and speaking skills and enhancing interest towards foreign and Japanese culture (COS, 2008). However, with the COS revisions, this class was brought forward to Year 3 and Year 4. Furthermore, a new compulsory subject “Foreign Languages (English)” was introduced into the Year 5 and Year 6 curriculum. This new subject includes writing alphabets, basic grammar, and reading, formerly a part of the junior and senior high school COS.

According to Higashi (2017), there was a disconnection between the elementary school curriculum, which mainly focused on activities dealing with English pronunciation, and junior high school counterpart, which focused on reading and writing. The latest revisions are aimed at smoothing the transition between these two curriculums. On the other hand, according to the survey conducted by the MEXT (2017b, 2018), 5.9% of elementary school teachers have English teachers’ license for secondary schools and only 1% of them have obtained pre-1 level certificate of the STEP test, a bench mark for English teachers raised by the MEXT (2002). Thus, linking the elementary and secondary English curriculums effectively is difficult due to the lack of teachers with good English proficiency at elementary schools. One of the possible solutions to the present problems would be to educate and train both pre-service and in-service teachers to be able to conduct a lesson that realizes the aims of the revised COS.

JACET SIG on English Language Education developed the Japanese Portfolio for student teachers of languages (J-POSTL) in 2016, based on the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages, or the EPOSTL (Newby et al., 2007). The J-POSTL inherits the principles of action-oriented view of language and life-long autonomous learning. Furthermore, it adapted the EPOSTL to suit the Japanese educational context. The EPOSTL, derived from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, or CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001), includes 195 self-assessment descriptors (SADs) to visualize the qualities and competences language teachers need. However, the J-POSTL includes 180 SADs which describe pedagogical competences for English teachers of secondary schools in Japan. Previous research, (Yoneda, 2015; 2016; Osaki, 2016) implies many of the J-POSTL SADs are also applicable in the elementary English education context since they also include core competences for elementary school English teachers. These observations led us to initiate the present project, the J-POSTL Elementary from 2016. The aim of the project is to specify the core competences for elementary school English teachers by adapting the SADs in the J-POSTL and make a useful tool for English teachers at elementary schools so that both J-POSTL and J-POSTL Elementary can “support the establishment of consistent and systematic English education in primary and secondary education in Japan” (Yamaguchi, Osada, Hisamura & Benthien, 2019, p.38). This project is being carried out in five stages. Table 1 summarizes the outline of each development stage.

Table 1. Five stages of the J-POSTL Elementary development

Stages	Period	Outline
1	June 2016 to Jan. 2017	Collection of comments and opinions by teachers who have taught at elementary schools on 180 J-POSTL SADs (5 face to face sessions (*n*=90) and 10 emails (*n*=8)).
2	May 13th, & July 8th 2017	Two advisory conferences (including seven invited members) which resulted in the creation of 167 SADs (draft).
3	Jan. to Aug. 2018	Nation-wide survey on the 167 SADs (draft) among university faculty in charge of EFL training courses (*n*=63), which resulted in extracting 93 SADs for student teachers.
4	Nov. to Dec. 2018	Nation-wide survey on 74 SADs which are not included in the 93 SADs for student teachers, conducted to categorize SADs in terms of a competency matrix (novice, apprentice, practitioner, and expert).
5	Ongoing from Sep. 2018	Long-term study using the 93 SADs for student teacher (J-POSTL Elementary preliminary version) among students in teacher training courses at twelve universities (in progress).

The results and the analysis on the first three stages mentioned above are reported in the following research note: "Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators: Specifying Self-assessment Descriptors for Student Teachers," (Yamaguchi, Osada, Hisamura, & Benthien; 2019). The present study aims to report and analyze the results of the fourth stage survey.

2. Purpose of the Study: The Fourth Stage of the Project

The purpose of this paper is to answer the following two research questions (RQs) by analyzing the result of the nation-wide survey on 74 SADs which are not included in the 93 SADs for student teachers. Participants of the survey are elementary school teachers who are in charge of teaching English classes.

RQ1. What perception do the in-service teachers have regarding the necessity of the qualities and competences of the elementary school English teachers described in each SAD?
RQ2. Do differences in English teaching experience among in-service teachers at elementary schools affect their perception in judging the necessity of each SAD? If so, what kind of difference could be observed?

The participants' responses will also be used to set the competency matrix of the

SADs which can be targeted for teachers at four different levels: novice, apprentice, practitioner, and expert. SADs at the "novice" level consist of descriptors which many of the teachers judged necessary. Thus, we can regard descriptors in this level include core competencies that all teachers should have. On the other hand, "expert" level teachers need to be equipped with the competence to play the role of a mentor of teachers at the "novice" and "apprentice" levels (teachers with experience of five years or less experience). Thus, we can assume that the descriptors which are classified as "expert" mainly include competences which are at an advanced level and difficult to attain.

3. Method

3.1 Participants

In November 2018, 2,799 schools were selected based on the data extracted from elementary schools nationwide by using a systematic sampling method (Sakai, Aizawa, & Adachi, 2014). 223 public schools nationwide were also chosen, thus a total of 3,022 schools were targeted for inclusion in the study. However, since 64 schools did not receive the survey due to postal issues, teachers in charge of English classes at 2,958 schools were asked to fill out the survey by December 31. A total of 583 teachers responded to the survey, resulting in a response rate of 19.7% and 577 valid responses (Table 2).

Table 2. The number of surveys sent and their response rate (n=2,958)

Total number of surveys sent	Number of responses and valid responses	Response rate
2,958	588 (577)	19.7%

3.2 Survey Items

In addition to the SADs, participants were also asked to respond to some background questions. (see Appendix)

These items included (1) type of school, (2) type of establishment, (3) location of the current school, (4) years of elementary school teaching experience, (5) whether or not they were licensed to teach English in a junior or senior high school, and (6) whether or not they had any experience teaching English in a junior or senior high school.

Participants were asked to judge whether each descriptor includes pedagogical competences necessary for English teachers in elementary schools on a 5-point Likert scale (5. necessary, 4. somewhat necessary, 3. indecisive, 2. not very necessary, 1. not necessary). To make it easier for participants to understand the descriptors, a document explaining the technical terms used in the descriptors were enclosed with the survey.

3.3 Data Analysis

Apart from descriptive statistics for each SAD, a positive response rate (PRR) and negative response rate (NRR) were also calculated. The PRR refers to the percentage of all 4 and 5 Likert scale responses, and the NRR indicates the percentage of all 2 and 1 Likert scale responses. In order to detect significant differences in the proportion of responses for comparisons between groups, we performed a ratio test of columns with a *z*-test on the proportion of responses at the 5% level. Note that Bonferroni-adjusted tests were used when comparing more than two groups.

4. Key results and Discussions

4.1 Participants' Attributes

Teachers from all 47 prefectures in Japan participated in the study. They worked at different types of institutions: elementary schools accounted for 541 responses, or 93.9% of the total, with 34 responses (5.9%) of "combined elementary and junior high schools" and one response (0.2%) of "combined kindergarten, elementary and middle schools."

Public schools accounted for 568 responses (98.6% of the total), national schools accounted for six responses (1.0%), and private schools took up two responses (0.3%).

Participants' teaching experience in elementary schools were spread out across all experience bands (less than 5 years, 5-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, 26-30 years, 31-35 years, and 36 years or more).

The number of teachers licensed to teach English at the junior and senior high schools and those who had teaching experience in secondary schools is shown in Table 3. As mentioned above, the survey by the MEXT (2018) reported that 5.9% of elementary school teachers held a junior and senior high school English language teaching certificate. Since this value is considerably lower than that of the participants in the present study (37.8%), it is necessary to keep in mind that the results of this survey can deviate from the average educational setting in Japan.

Table 3. Number of teachers with teacher's license of English and their experience of teaching at junior and senior high schools

Licensed		Not licensed	In the process of obtaining the license
218 (37.8%)		338 (58.6%)	16 (2.8%)
Have teaching experience	No teaching experience		
93 (16.0%)	125 (21.4%)		

4.2 Descriptive Statistics for the Descriptors

Participants (*n*=577) commented on each SAD in the survey. The mean for each SAD was between 3.15 and 4.23. The median and frequency were both 4 for most of the descriptors, while the median and frequency for the descriptors #14 and #29 were 3 and 4, respectively (mean 3.31 for the descriptor #14 and 3.28 for the descriptor #29), and 3 for both the descriptors #16 and #30 (mean 3.15 for the descriptor #16 and 3.24 for the descriptor #30). The mean and frequency for all SADs indicates that, overall, there are no descriptors that have been rated as "not (very) necessary" for elementary school language teachers.

4.3 Overall Tendency of Perception of Elementary School Teachers on English Instructors' Qualities and Competences

4.3.1 Essential qualities. Of the 74, three SADs (#4, #31 and #66) were rated as very necessary by the participants. Therefore, it became clear that these three descriptors could be regarded as essential qualities and competences for elementary school English teachers.

Table 4. SADs indicating essential qualities

SADs	*M*	*SD*
4. I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate speaking activities (visual aids, texts, authentic materials, etc.).	4.23	0.78
31. I can vary and balance activities in order to respond to individual children's learning styles.	4.18	0.83
66. I can present my assessment of a child's performance and progress in 3 the form of a descriptive evaluation, which is easy to understand for the child, parents and others.	4.15	0.86

4.3.2 Positive and negative response rates. To grasp general views of participants' opinions, PRR and NRR were calculated. The descriptors with high PRR can be regarded as qualities and competences that elementary school English teachers should acquire, while those with a high degree of NRR can be viewed as qualities and

competences with lower priority. We will discuss the SADs categorized in PRR and NRR in detail.

The following four descriptors were identified as NRR (Table 5). Considering that the PRR for these four descriptors is in the range of 40%, while the overall average of all 74 SADs were 67.4%, this result could indicate that competences included in these descriptors were judged as particularly low in terms of necessity by the participants. Key words in these descriptors include terms specific to English language education, for example reading strategies (skimming/scanning), the use of dictionaries, and teaching using students' work as a learning material. Since competences included in these descriptors have traditionally been dealt with in junior or senior high school English classes, it is possible to point out that the participants might have judged these descriptors were beyond the scope of the revised COS.

Table 5. SADs with high NRR and low PRR

SADs	NRR	PRR
14. I can set different activities in order to develop reading strategies (e.g. skimming, scanning etc.) to gather necessary information from a text.	20.1%	45.8%
16. I can select and recommend appropriate dictionaries (e.g. English pictorial dictionaries, Japanese-English dictionaries) and help children learn how to use them.	27.6%	40.2%
29. I can recommend dictionaries and other reference books useful for children.	19.8%	44.8%
30. I can help learners produce materials for their own use and for other children.	21.2%	41.5%

4.3.3 Comparative analysis of categories and sub-categories. The 74 SADs adopted in this study are classified into six categories: I Context, II Methodology, III Resources, IV Lesson Planning, V Independent Learning, VI Assessment. Methodology is divided into three sub-categories according to the nature of the competence dealt with in each SAD: (a) Four Skills (b) Grammar and Vocabulary (c) Culture. To gain an overview of the characteristics of each category, a ratio test of columns with a *z*-test on the proportion of responses were conducted among the six categories and among the three Methodology sub-categories. The relationship between the categories is outlined in Table 6. The result suggests teachers gave the highest PRR to the SADs in Category I Context and lowest PRR to the SADs in Category V Independent Learning. Moreover, analysis among the sub-categories showed that the participants rated (b) Grammar and Vocabulary the lowest of the three sub-categories.

Table 6. The results of the analysis: categories and sub-categories

Categories	Sub-categories	Number of descriptors	PRR		NRR		*M*	
Ⅰ Context		3	76.4%		3.8%		4.02	
Ⅱ Methodology	(a) Four Skills	11	68.3%	71.0%	9.2%	8.1%	3.81	3.87
	(b) Grammar& Vocabublary	4		56.3%		15.4%		3.53
	(c) Culture	6		71.3%		6.9%		3.88
Ⅲ Resources		6	67.1%		10.0%		3.78	
Ⅳ Lesson Planning		11	69.8%		7.1%		3.85	
Ⅴ Independent Learning		21	63.1%		9.1%		3.71	
Ⅵ Assessment		12	70.0%		7.1%		3.87	

(1) Categories/sub-categories which were judged as necessary. Of the six categories, the SADs in Category I Context were rated the highest in terms of importance. Three SADs in this category are shown in Table 7. One possible reason for the participants' high rate of importance for these SADs in the category is inclusion of key words from the currently revised COS and other official educational policies, such as, core curriculum, curriculum management, children's developmental stage, and diversity.

Table 7. SADs in the Category of Context and PRR

SADs	PRR
1. I can understand the content of Japanese documents other than the Course of Study (e.g. Core Curriculum, Curriculum Management).	70.5%
2. I can critically assess my teaching based on the understanding of children's cognitive, mental and social development	80.2%
3. I can appreciate and make use of the value added to the classroom environment by learners with diverse cultural backgrounds.	78.4%

On the other hand, (c) Culture marked the highest average in PRR among the three sub-categories of the Category II Methodology (see Table 6). One of the explanations for the high PRR could be that "understanding language and culture" is stated as one of the goals for "Foreign Language Activities"/"Foreign Languages (English)" in the COS (MEXT, 2017a). Furthermore, the origin of this subject area, i.e., "Foreign Language

Activities"/"Foreign Languages (English)" seemed to have affected the perception of elementary school teachers as they have started as "a part of education for international understanding (Central Council for Education report, 1996)." The COS (MEXT, 1998) issued after this report by the Central Council explains that "when conducting foreign language conversation as part of the study of international understanding, the school should provide children with experiential learning appropriate for elementary school, such as exposure to a foreign language and familiarization with foreign life and culture, depending on the actual conditions of the school."

(2) Categories/sub-categories where perception on necessity was low. The category with the lowest PRR was Category V Independent Learning. As indicated in Table 8, seven of the 21 SADs in this category were in the 50% range. It is possible that many teachers considered the SADs less important in English education at primary schools.

Table 8. SADs in Category V Independent Learning with low PRR

SADs	PRR
46. I can plan and manage project work according to relevant aims and objectives.	59.0%
48. I can assess the process and outcome of project work in cooperation with children.	57.1%
49. I can plan and organize cross-curricular project work myself or in cooperation with other teachers.	58.5%
52. I can set specific aims and objectives of portfolio work (for coursework, for continuous assessment etc.).	57.1%
53. I can supervise and give constructive feedback on portfolio work.	55.7%
54. I can assess portfolios in relation to valid and transparent criteria.	55.3%
55. I can encourage self- and peer assessment of portfolio work.	57.2%

On the other hand, the descriptors in this category include terms such as "project" and "portfolio." Although many teachers might be unfamiliar with the terms or the actual classroom practice relating to them, we would like to argue that "projects" and activities using "portfolios" are the effective means for enhancing learners' autonomy, which is one of the basic principles underlining the J-POSTL. Abe (2018a) claims that the advantage of incorporating project work in classes is the possibility to make a foreign language lesson cross-disciplinary, exploratory, and collaborative. Moreover, Abe (2018b) points out the advantage of incorporating portfolio or alike (Abe adopts lapbooks in her study) in project work both for leaners and teachers. The former,

introduction of a portfolio, can assist learners to visualize learning outcomes and create opportunities to engage in autonomous learning. Also, it will create opportunities for the learners to reflect on their own achievements. For teachers, it could be used in evaluation. Abe (2018b, p. 128) also suggests that "the learning process and outcomes can be shared among children, teachers, and parents in a concrete way, leading to a highly transparent evaluation." Regardless of their low PRR, these SADs can thus be considered as important competencies for the elementary school English teachers.

The results of the analysis among the three sub-categories of Category Ⅱ Methodology, i.e., (a) Four Skills, (b) Grammar and Vocabulary, and (c) Culture, descriptors in (b) Grammar and Vocabulary were significantly lower than those in the other two sub-categories as mentioned above in (2) (See Table 6). As the revised COS states that "the main focus of foreign language learning (in elementary school) should not be on how much individual knowledge, such as vocabulary and grammar, has been acquired," it can be inferred that descriptors in this sub-category have become a lower priority for the teachers.

4.3.4 Comparisons between the groups based on junior and senior high school English teacher's license status and teaching experience. As discussed in section 4.1, the results of MEXT's 2018 national survey suggest the data from this study deviates from the current situation in terms of junior and senior high school English teachers' license status. Thus, we examined whether the results gained in this study would be different depending on the participants' teaching license status and whether they had any prior experience in teaching at junior and/or senior high school. We compared three groups ― Group 1: teachers who do not have a junior/senior high school English teacher's license (teachers without a high school teacher's license), Group 2: teachers who have a junior/senior high school English teacher's license but with no experience of teaching at junior/senior high school (teachers with an English teacher's license but without teaching experience), and Group 3: teachers who have a junior/senior high school English teacher's license and experience of teaching English at junior/senior high school (teachers with an English teacher's license and teaching experience). A notable difference was found between Group 1 and Group 3. A ratio test of columns was used to find out whether a significant difference could be observed in the "5. necessary" response for each descriptor.

Table 9. Descriptors that differed in positive responses between the three groups

Comparison	SAD number
Group 3 ＞ Group 1	1, 6, 7, 12, 17, 18, 21, 24, 36, 72, 74
Group 3 ＞ Group 2	4, 10, 11, 16, 18, 21
Group 1 ＞ Group 2	57

There are three ways in which two groups are compared among three groups. The comparison with the largest number of descriptors in which a differential relationship was found is between Group 3, having both an English teacher's license and teaching experience, and Group 1, not having a high school teacher's license, in terms of 11 descriptors. A comparison between the different groups in terms of educational experience among the license-holding groups Group 3 and Group 2 showed significant differences in responses in six descriptors. In this three-way comparison of the three groups, the most striking relationship is that the teachers in Group 3 believe that more descriptors are needed for the teaching of English in elementary school than Group 1. This result is not surprising given that the teachers in Group 3 have a relatively high level of expertise in English teaching and experience of teaching in secondary school.

The means and standard deviations of the 11 descriptors in the Group 1 and Group 3 comparison were also scrutinized (see Table 10). The 11 SADs were classified into three broad categories: core curriculum & curriculum management (#1), culture (#21, #24, #74), and vocabulary and skills (the rest). The general trend shows that relatively smaller standard deviations are found in the group with experience of teaching English in secondary schools. On the other hand, relatively strong variations are found in the group with no English teacher's license.

Table 10. SADs with significant difference between Group 3 and Group 1 (SADs are listed in order of mention)

SADs	Group 3 (*M*, *SD*)	Group 1 (*M*, *SD*)	Difference
1. I can understand the content of Japanese documents other than the Course of Study.	81.7% (4.06, 0.68)	66.9% (3.80, 0.84)	14.9%
21. I can evaluate and select a variety of source materials and activities to make children aware of the interrelationship between culture and language.	79.6% (4.02, 0.75)	64.5% (3.73, 0.91)	15.1%
24. I can evaluate and select a variety of source materials and activities to make children aware of stereotyped views and challenge these.	65.6% (3.77, 0.93)	50.6% (3.49, 0.96)	15.0%

74. I can assess the child's ability to respond to and act appropriately in encounters with different cultures.	80.6% (4.08, 0.77)	71.9% (3.85, 0.89)	8.7%
17. I can evaluate and select activities which enhance children's awareness of register differences.	81.7% (4.02, 0.89)	61.4% (3.67, 0.94)	20.3%
18. I can help children learn vocabulary by paying attention to high / low frequency words or receptive / productive vocabulary.	65.6% (3.72, 0.93)	48.4% (3.41, 0.95)	17.2%
6. I can coordinate a variety of activities which help children exchange notes or letters about familiar topics by using learnt vocabulary and word order.	84.9% (4.17, 0.73)	72.5% (3.91, 0.88)	12.5%
7. I can help children learn to identify the pronounced letters of the alphabet and cope with difficult or unknown vocabulary of a text.	93.5% (4.35, 0.63)	79.0% (4.04, 0.86)	14.6%
72. I can assess a child's ability to understand and interpret a written text such as reading for gist, specific or detailed information, etc.	64.5% (3.68, 1.01)	54.4% (3.52, 0.93)	10.1%
12. I can set developmental activities based on the contents and expressions I have taught.	89.2% (4.19, 0.64)	69.1% (3.83, 0.91)	20.1%
36 I can present language content (new and previously encountered items of language, topics etc.) in ways which are appropriate for individuals and specific groups of children.	82.8% (4.08, 0.77)	65.6% (3.75, 0.91)	17.2%

The first category of the three was concerning attitudes towards "core curriculum & curriculum management," and SAD #1 is applicable. This is the only descriptor that belongs to Category I Context. Even though this survey was conducted after the official announcement of the revised COS (MEXT, 2017a), the reason for this difference in attitudes can be that the elementary-school teachers' understanding of curriculum management is still in its infancy compared to teachers who have some experience teaching at secondary school.

In the second category, three SADs, #21, #24, and #74, are related with "culture." The differences in perceptions between the groups in these descriptors can be explained

by the presence or absence of their experiences of teaching about culture in secondary education. While the competence included in SAD #21 can be considered as basic, the competence described in SAD #24 can be regarded as more advanced. However, it would be desirable to emphasize this activity in the future because it would be helpful in enhancing learners to relativize their view towards their own culture. With regard to SAD #74, it seems that it is easier to evaluate because it is visible as an action. The challenge for the future seems to make the content of the "appropriate response" more transparent. Thus, it is found that there was a difference in the PRR towards the above three SADs, depending on the presence or absence of teaching experience at secondary schools. It should be noted that the high level of PRR on "culture" in this survey, contrasts with the result of a national survey conducted among secondary school English teachers (JACET SIG, 2012). The result of the present survey showed that unlike elementary school teachers, teachers in the secondary level had more confidence in teaching grammar and vocabulary than teaching culture.

In the last category, seven descriptors can be classified as "vocabulary and skills." Of these, explicit references to "vocabulary" are found in the four descriptors (#6, #7, #17, and #18). It can be presumed that the presence or the absence of vocabulary teaching experience in the educational experience at secondary school produced such a difference in awareness. In particular, SADs #17 and #18 have a strong focus on vocabulary. SAD #17 seems to be necessary considering that in the future, elementary schools will promote experiential language activities. Although it is presumed that SAD #18 did not have a high level of PRR due to the difficult wordings such as "productive vocabulary" and "receptive vocabulary," it is expected that these terms and their notions will permeate through elementary school teachers within a few years, since these terms are presented in the revised COS (MEXT, 2017a) commentary. SADs #6 and #7 are instructional skills that support the development of language activities while dealing with vocabulary in writing and listening activities. Both activities can be considered as basic pedagogical competence, since more than 70% of the unlicensed group rated them as necessary. With regard to SAD #72, starting from the 2020 school year, fifth grade students of elementary school will be required to engage in activities to "obtain the information they need about simple and familiar matters related to their daily lives, such as postings and reference." Even in the group of teachers who had experience teaching English in junior and senior high school, the PRR for this SAD was not high. However, we should keep in mind that this would be a competence that will be required in the future due to the revision of COS. SADs #12 and #36 deal with a more advanced competence, which may have led to a significant gap between the groups. Like the other SADs with significant difference, the participants' teaching experience seemed to have affected the results of these two SADs.

5. Implications

This nationwide survey of full-time elementary school teachers focusing on 74 SADs in the draft version of the J-POSTL elementary was conducted with the aim of understanding in-service teachers' perception of necessity toward the competences described in each SAD. The results were further analyzed according to participants' teaching experience in the secondary school English classes to gain some insights for determining the competency matrix. The results of this study revealed how necessary in-service elementary English language teachers rated each SAD. The three descriptors in Category I Context recorded the ceiling effect (Table 4). Also, descriptors in sub-category (c) Culture were rated highly. Qualities and competences included in these descriptors overlapped with the key points of the revised COS (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, 2017a). On the other hand, some of the descriptors that were judged to be of less importance belonged to Category V Independent Learning. SADs belonging to (b) Vocabulary and Grammar were rated to be less useful by the participants. The possible explanation is that these descriptors were interpreted as being beyond the scope of the curriculum guidelines or unfamiliar to in-service teachers.

Regardless of whether the need for each SAD was high or low, one factor that significantly influenced the results of this study was the attributes of the participants. Differences in teachers' perception were found in 11 descriptors between the groups described in Table 10. Considering the qualities and competencies that were introduced in this revision of the COS (MEXT, 2017a), it may be inferred that differences in teaching experience and teacher perceptions had an influence as to how teachers assessed the necessity of each SAD. It is thus necessary to take this into account when planning and implementing in-service teacher professional development workshops. In particular, when dealing with competence relating to "culture" and "vocabulary and skills," it is necessary to keep in mind that there may be differences in awareness among teachers. In other words, when setting up the competency matrix, it is necessary not only to focus on the mean value of each descriptor, but rather compare and contrast it with the participants' attribute information, i.e., whether they have teacher's licenses and teaching experience in secondary schools or not. Finally, since English language teachers at primary schools have various educational and teaching backgrounds, it is essential that they share their beliefs about English language teaching and work together to establish appropriate goals in their teaching context.

Acknowledgements

This project titled "Japanese Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (J-POSTL) Elementary" was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 16H03459 and

19H01288.

References

Abe, S. (2018a). *Shogakko eigokyoiku ni okeru jiritsu gakushu no jissen* [Practices of Independent Learning in Elementary School English Education], Presentation, Bunkyo University Kadai Kaikestu Seminar.

Abe, S. (2018b). *Shogakko eigokyoiku ni okeru Lap Book no shido to hyoka no kokoromi* [A Study on the Teaching and Evaluation of the Lap Book in English Language Education in Elementary Schools], *Language Teacher Education*, *5*(1), 115-129. JACET SIG on English Language Education.

Berndt, T. J. (2002). Friendship quality and social development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *11*, 7-10.

Central Council for Education (1996). *21 seiki wo tenbo shita wagakuni no kyoiku no arikata ni tsuite* [On the state of education in Japan with a view to the 21st century, First Report]. https://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chuuou/toushin/960701x.htm

Higashi, H. (2017). *Shogakko shin gakushu shido yoryo wo yomitoku* [Deciphering the new elementary school Course of Study). *The English Teachers' Magazine*, *66*(8), 5455. Taishukan Publishing.

JACET SIG on English Language Education (2012). J-POSTL Stage 1 Long-term survey. *A Comprehensive study on the framework of English language teachers' professional development in Japan.* 8-46. Heisei 23 (2011) Annual Report for Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (22320112).

JACET SIG on English Language Education (2014). *Gengokyoshi no Portfolio* [Japanese Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages: J-POSTL].

JACET SIG on English Language Education (2018). *Shogakko Eigo Shidosha no Portfolio* [The Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators: J-POSTL Elementary]. http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/DraftJPOSTLElementary.pdf

MEXT (1998). *The course of study commentary*: *Elementary school General Provisions*. https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/cs/1319944.htm

MEXT (2008). *The course of study commentary: Elementary school foreign language activities*. https://www.nier.go.jp/guideline/h19e/chap4.htm

MEXT (2017a). *The course of study commentary: Elementary school foreign language activities and foreign languages*. http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2018/05/07/1387017_11_1.pdf

MEXT (2017b). *Heisei 29 nendo, gimukyoikugakko (zenki katei) ni okeru eigo kyoiku jisshi jokyo chosa "Shukei kekka"* [2017 Survey on the implementation of English education in compulsory schools "The results"].

https://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2018/04/06/1403469_09.pdf

MEXT (2018). *Heisei 30 nendo, eigo kyoiku jissi jokyo chosa gaiyo* [2018 Summary of the "Survey on the Implementation of English Language Education"] https://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2019/04/17/1415043_01_1.pdf

Newby, D., Allan, R., Fenner, A. B., Jones, B., Komorowska, H., & Soghikyan, K. (2007). *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages. A Reflection Tool for Language Teacher Education*. Strasbourg, France/ Graz, Austria: Council of Europe Publishing. http://www.ecml.at/epostl

Osaki, S. (2016). *Shogakko Eigo Shidosha notameno Gengokyoshi Portfolio (J-POSTL) Kaihatsu -Bunkenkenkyu ni okeru jikohyokakijutsubun no kento*[Developing J-POSTL for Elementary School English Teachers: Verification of SADs Based on Literature Review]. *Language Teacher Education, 3*(1), 61-78. JACET SIG on English Language Education.

Yamaguchi, T., Osada, E., Hisamura, K., & Benthien, G. (2019). Developing Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators: Specifying Self-assessment Descriptors for Student Teachers and its Challenges. *Language Teacher Education,* 6(2), 37-61. JACET SIG on English Language Education

Yoneda, S. (2015). *Shogakkokyoshi shibogakusei ni motarasu shogakko eigo kyouikujisshu no koka ni kansuru chosakenkyu -'gengokyoshi no portfolio' shiyo no kokoromi kara* [Study on effects of elementary school teaching practicum on pre-service teachers: Aiming for utilizing "J-POSTL] *Language Teacher Education, 2*(1), 78-92. JACET SIG on English Language Education.

Yoneda, S. (2016). '*Gengokyoshi no Portfolio' o mochiita shogakko eigo kyoin yosei katei ni kansuru jissentekikenkyu* [Practical Study on Elementary School Teacher Education using 'J-POSTL'] *Language Teacher Education, 3*(1), 79-93. JACET SIG on English Language Education.

Appendix

Elementary EFL Educators Core Competences Survey

1. Respondents' personal data

1. Type of school where you work at: Please circle one number
   1. Elementary school 2. Kindergarten – Elementary attached school
   3. Elementary – Junior-high school attached school (compulsory school)
   4. Others ( )
2. Type of establishment of the working school: Please circle one number
   1. Public school 2. National school 3. Private school
3. Location of the school where you currently work at: Please write the name of the prefecture in the underlined section to the right. _____

4. Teaching experience at elementary school
   1. Less than 5 years 2. 5-9 years 3. 10-19 years
   4. 20-29 years 5. 30-39 years 6. More than 40 years
5. Do you hold a junior or senior high school English teaching license?
   1. Yes 2. No 3. In process

5.1 If you chose "1. Yes," circle one of the following items (1) to (3).

(1) Type of license you hold

1. Junior high school English teaching license
2. Senior high school English Teaching license
3. Both junior and senior high school English teaching license

(2) English teaching experience in junior or senior high school

1. Yes 2. No

(3) If you have chosen "1. Yes" for (2) above: Please choose one of the options that describes the length of years of your experience teaching English in junior or senior high school:

   1. less than 5 years
   2. 5 to 10 years
   3. 11 to 15 years
   4. 16 to 20 years
   5. 21 to 25 years
   6. 26 to 30 years
   7. 31 to 35 years
   8. 36 years or more

6. Do you hold the elementary school English teacher certificate from the Japan Council for the Accreditation of Elementary School English Teachers (J-Shine)?
   1. Yes 2. No

2. Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators self-assessment descriptors (Preliminary version)

The following 167 descriptors are being developed for elementary EFL educators as a trial. The portfolio is aimed at encouraging elementary school teachers to reflect on didactic knowledge and skills, and help them assess their own didactic competences.

Question: Do you think it is necessary for student teachers to acquire the competence indicated in each descriptor by the completion of the teacher training program?

Please respond to each item using the following scale:

Necessary	Somewhat necessary	Not sure or Neither necessary nor unnecessary	Somewhat unnecessary	Unnecessary
5	4	3	2	1

Ⅰ CONTEXT					
1. I can understand the requirements set in the Course of Study.	5	4	3	2	1
2. I can design language courses and year-round teaching programs around the requirements of the Course of Study.	5	4	3	2	1
3. I can understand the content of Japanese documents other than the Course of Study (e.g. Core Curriculum, Curriculum Management).	5	4	3	2	1
Ⅱ METHODOLOGY **Sub-category (a) Four skills**					
4. I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate speaking activities (visual aids, texts, authentic materials, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
5. I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to encourage children to develop their creative potential.	5	4	3	2	1
6. I can coordinate a variety of activities which help children exchange notes or letters about familiar topics by using learnt vocabulary and word order.	5	4	3	2	1
7. I can help children learn to identify the pronounced letters of the alphabet and cope with difficult or unknown vocabulary of a text.	5	4	3	2	1
8. I can encourage children to use their experiences	5	4	3	2	1

and knowledge related to a topic when reading phrases or sentences.					
9. I can recommend books and materials appropriate to the interests and language levels of the children.	5	4	3	2	1
10. I can apply appropriate ways of reading a text in class (e.g. aloud, silently, in groups, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
11. I can encourage children to read familiar phrases and sentences on their own.	5	4	3	2	1
12. I can set developmental activities based on the contents and expressions I have taught.	5	4	3	2	1
13. I can help children develop different strategies to cope with difficult or unknown vocabulary in a text.	5	4	3	2	1
14. I can set different activities in order to develop reading strategies (e.g. skimming, scanning etc.) to gather necessary information from a text.	5	4	3	2	1
Sub-category (b) Grammar and vocabulary					
15. I can provide various activities which help children become aware of English-specific rules such as word order and inflections.	5	4	3	2	1
16. I can select and recommend appropriate dictionaries (e.g. English pictorial dictionaries, Japanese-English dictionaries) and help children learn how to use them.	5	4	3	2	1
17. I can evaluate and select activities which enhance children's awareness of register differences.	5	4	3	2	1
18. I can help children learn vocabulary by paying attention to high / low frequency words or receptive / productive vocabulary.	5	4	3	2	1
Sub-category (c) Culture					
19. I can create opportunities for children to explore various regions, people and cultures by using the ICT.	5	4	3	2	1
20. I can evaluate and select a variety of source materials and activities which make children aware of similarities and differences in sociocultural 'norms of behavior'.	5	4	3	2	1
21. I can evaluate and select a variety of source materials and activities to make children aware of the interrelationship between culture and language.	5	4	3	2	1

22. I can evaluate and select activities (role plays, simulated situations etc.) which help children develop their socio-cultural competence.	5	4	3	2	1
23. I can evaluate and select a variety of source materials and activities which encourage children to reflect on the relationship with others and get aware of or understand different value systems.	5	4	3	2	1
24. I can evaluate and select a variety of source materials and activities to make children aware of stereotyped views and challenge these.	5	4	3	2	1
Ⅲ RESOURCES					
25. I can design ICT materials and activities appropriate for my children.	5	4	3	2	1
26. I can use and critically assess ICT learning programs and platforms.	5	4	3	2	1
27. I can select and use appropriate ICT materials and activities in the classroom which are in line with the children's interests and abilities.	5	4	3	2	1
28. I can help children use the library and the Internet for information retrieval.	5	4	3	2	1
29. I can recommend dictionaries and other reference books useful for my children.	5	4	3	2	1
30. I can help learners produce materials for their own use and for other children.	5	4	3	2	1
Ⅳ LESSON PLANNING					
31. I can vary and balance activities in order to respond to individual children's learning styles.	5	4	3	2	1
32. I can plan to teach elements of other subjects using the target language (cross-curricular teaching, CLIL, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
33. I can plan activities which link grammar and vocabulary with communication.	5	4	3	2	1
34. I can plan activities to emphasize the interdependence of language and culture.	5	4	3	2	1
35. I can involve children in lesson planning.	5	4	3	2	1
36. I can present language content (new and previously encountered items of language, topics etc.) in ways which are appropriate for individuals and specific groups of children.	5	4	3	2	1

37. I can cater for a range of learning styles.	5	4	3	2	1
38. I can encourage children's participation whenever possible.	5	4	3	2	1
39. I can help children develop appropriate learning strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
40. I can take on different roles according to the needs of the children and requirements of the activity (resource person, mediator, supervisor etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
41. I can supervise and assist children's use of different forms of ICT both in and outside the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1
42. I can assist children in choosing tasks and activities according to their individual needs and interests.	5	4	3	2	1
43. I can guide and assist children in setting their own aims and objectives and in planning their own learning.	5	4	3	2	1
44. I can set tasks outside of allocated classes to motivate learners to work independently.	5	4	3	2	1
45. I can encourage children to reflect on their work (diaries, logs etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
46. I can plan and manage project work according to relevant aims and objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
47. I can assist the children in their choices during the various stages of project work.	5	4	3	2	1
48. I can assess the process and outcome of project work in cooperation with children.	5	4	3	2	1
49. I can plan and organize cross-curricular project work myself or in cooperation with other teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
50. I can help children use relevant presentation tools.	5	4	3	2	1
51. I can set specific aims and objectives of portfolio work (for coursework, for continuous assessment etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
52. I can plan and structure portfolio work.	5	4	3	2	1
53. I can supervise and give constructive feedback on portfolio work.	5	4	3	2	1
54. I can assess portfolios in relation to valid and transparent criteria.	5	4	3	2	1

55. I can encourage self-and peer assessment of portfolio work.	5	4	3	2	1
56. I can collect learning resources on the Internet for children and share them with other teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
57. I can guide learners how to use ICT resources appropriately (email, web sites, computer programs, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
58. I can set up and facilitate various learning environments (learning platforms, homepages, discussion forums, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
59. I can help to organize exchanges in cooperation with relevant resource persons and institutions.	5	4	3	2	1
60 I can evaluate the learning outcomes of extra-curricular activities including, exchanges and international cooperation programs.	5	4	3	2	1
61. I can recognize when and where the need for extra-curricular activities to enhance learning arises.	5	4	3	2	1
62. I can set aims and objectives for extra-curricular activities to enhance and support language learning (exchanges and international cooperation programs, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
Ⅶ ASSESSMENT					
63. I can design and use in-class activities to monitor and assess children's participation and performance.	5	4	3	2	1
64. I can negotiate with children how their learning and improvement should best be assessed.	5	4	3	2	1
65. I can use reliable assessment procedures to chart and monitor a child's progress (reports, checklist, grades, etc.) and explain the result in an easy-to-understand manner.	5	4	3	2	1
66. I can present my assessment of a child's performance and progress in the form of a descriptive evaluation, which is easy to understand for the child, parents and others.	5	4	3	2	1
67. I can use the process and results of assessment to inform my teaching and plan learning for individuals and groups (i.e. formative assessment).	5	4	3	2	1
68. I can help children set personal targets and assess their own performance.	5	4	3	2	1

69. I can help children engage in peer assessment.	5	4	3	2	1
70. I can assess a child's ability to engage in spoken interaction according to criteria such as content, appropriate language usage and conversational strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
71. I can assess a child's ability to engage in written interaction according to criteria such as content and appropriate language usage.	5	4	3	2	1
72. I can assess a child's ability to understand and interpret a written text such as reading for gist, specific or detailed information, etc.	5	4	3	2	1
73. I can assess a child's ability to understand and interpret a spoken text such as listening for gist, specific or detailed information, implication, etc	5	4	3	2	1
74. I can assess the child's ability to respond to and act appropriately in encounters with different cultures.	5	4	3	2	1

--Some of the descriptors above are adopted from or modified those of the original document the *EPOSTL* (Newby et al. / Council of Europe, 2007).

【Research Note】

Qualities and Abilities Related to English Language Teaching Required of Elementary School Teachers Projected from a Pre-service Teacher Survey

Takane Yamaguchi and Sakiko Yoneda

Abstract

The authors' research group is at present involved in the development of the *Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators*. The portfolio currently comprises 167 self-assessment descriptors (SADs). For the purpose of this study, 93 SADs were selected for inclusion in the pre-service teacher version to be used in elementary education courses at universities in Japan. In order to examine the appropriateness of the descriptors, education majors taking elementary education license credits were asked to self-assess these SADs at the beginning and end of a semester length course in two phases. The usability of the trial version was also examined through thematic analysis of open items. Based on the quantitative and qualitative data, the study found that further investigation and modification of the SADs are required.

Keywords

survey of education majors' perceptions of teacher students, trial version of the J-POSTL Elementary, identification of SADs for pre-service teachers

1. Background of the Study

1.1 General Guidelines

The Elementary School Courses of Study (MEXT, 2017) was fully introduced in April 2020. The nurturing of elementary school teachers who can follow the aims of the Courses of Study is an urgent issue, as *foreign language activities,* previously conducted in Years 5 and 6, have been brought forward to Years 3 and 4, and *foreign language* as a compulsory subject has been newly introduced for Years 5 and 6. Prior to 2020, English as a subject has already been taught in some elementary schools as part of the transition period which started in April 2018. As of 2019, students wanting to obtain an elementary school license have been required to take credits in university teacher training courses to develop their English teaching skills for elementary school English classes. At the same time, a teaching curriculum based on the core curriculum has been implemented in universities, in addition to encouraging cooperation between elementary and junior/senior high schools. However, there are currently no educational reflection tools such as portfolios for elementary school language teachers in Japan.

The Japanese version of the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages

(henceforth J-POSTL) has been developed by a JACET SIG on English Language Education (henceforth JACET SIG on ELE) in 2014. Based on the philosophy of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001), this portfolio features 180 self-assessment descriptors (henceforth SADs) adapted to the Japanese environment to clarify the required qualifications and competencies of language teachers in secondary education. The portfolio is used in some university teacher training courses, and the J-POSTL was developed on the assumption that it would be used in secondary education. Subsequently, studies using the original J-POSTL with elementary school English teaching students were conducted by Yoneda (2015, 2016) and Osaki (2016). According to these studies, some of the SADs in the J-POSTL are useful for training English teachers in elementary schools.

Therefore, in the 2016 academic year, a project to develop the *Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators* (henceforth J-POSTL Elementary) was launched. A summary of each stage of the project's development is shown in Table 1. The draft of the SADs of the J-POSTL Elementary was prepared after the second stage of the review meeting, and the editorial policy included consideration of the consistency with the Course of Study published by MEXT in 2017.

Table 1. Development stages of J-POSTL Elementary

Stage	Period	Outline
1	June 2016 to January 2017	Face-to-face interviews (5 times) (*n*= 90) and e-mail interviews (*n*=8) with English language instructors at elementary schools on 180 SADs of the J-POSTL
2	May and July 2017	A total of 167 draft SADs compiled by the Advisory Committee (*n*=7) and the Editorial Board
3	January to August 2018	A nationwide survey of teacher training courses at universities (*n*=63) and selection of 93 SADs for the trial version for use in teacher training courses
4	November to December 2018	A national survey of full-time elementary school teachers (*n*=577) on 74 SADs not included in the trial version of the teacher training course
5	From September 2018 (in progress)	Longitudinal surveys of elementary teacher training courses (10 universities) using the trial version

The results and analysis of the first to third phase of the study are available in Yamaguchi, Osada, Hisamura, and Benthien (2019). The results of the fourth stage are reported in this journal by Nakayama and Yamaguchi (pp.5-27). This paper summarizes the results of the fifth stage, conducted between September 2018 and July 2019, and

aims to develop a perspective on the use of J-POSTL in elementary teacher training programs and the identification of SADs appropriate for pre-service teachers.

Previous similar studies for the development of the J-POSTL include Takagi and Nakayama (2012) and Nakayama, Yamaguchi, and Takagi (2013), who conducted surveys among pre-service teachers. The quantitative analysis conducted by Nakayama, Yamaguchi and Takagi (2013) revealed a significant increase of 5% in the self-assessment of SADs between the first and the third session. The study also examined the use of the portfolio trial version. However, both surveys focused on the students enrolled in secondary English language teaching programs. The present study aims to focus exclusively on the students enrolled in elementary education teacher license courses.

2. Aim

This study explores the heart of the final stage of the J-POSTL Elementary project. At this stage, the focus is on the clarification of the following two points:

(1) Are the 93 SADs selected in the third stage appropriate to be developed as a goal for students enrolled in elementary school teacher license courses?

(2) How did the students who participated in the survey feel about this portfolio after using the trial version for a semester?

As part of the fifth stage of the project, it is planned to use the same survey in four separate phases to increase the reliability of the results. In this research, we have analyzed some of the data obtained in the first and second phase.

3 Method

3.1 Participants

Participants in this research are students enrolled in elementary education license courses in national or private universities. The surveys were conducted during the *Elementary School Foreign Language Teaching Methodology* course, which is completed in half a year in the third year of study. The implementation of the core curriculum began in the 2019 academic year, and the students in this study were enrolled in the old curriculum.

The first survey phase lasted from September 2017 to January 2018, and a total of 88 responses were received from five universities. The second phase lasted from April 2019 to July 2019, and a total of 106 respondents from five universities completed the survey. There were some students from the same university who participated both in the first and second phase.

The authors aim to propose a set of criteria for developing SADs for elementary student teachers and their portfolios based on the results of the quantitative analysis.

The qualitative analysis is expected to provide resources on the benefits, challenges, and perspectives of using the J-POSTL Elementary in the teaching curriculum.

3.2 The J-POSTL Elementary Trial Version

3.2.1 Structure. The trial version of the J-POSTL Elementary consists of five parts, identical to the J-POSTL. The main part of the portfolio consists of a personal statement section, a self-assessment section and a dossier section. The self-assessment descriptors (SADs) are self-assessed on a scale of 1-5 (5: able, 4: somewhat able, 3: neither able nor unable, 2: not able, 1: not able at all). A glossary of terms containing explanations of basic teaching terms and a user guide are also included.

3.2.2 Structure of the SADs. The 93 SADs are clustered into seven main categories and most of these categories are further divided into subcategories. See Appendix 1 for details.

3.3 Procedure

Descriptive statistics for all quantitative data were calculated and analyzed for each phase. While the trial J-POSTL contains 94 SADs, #92 was excluded for the analysis because it had been inserted by mistake, and 93 SADs were analyzed. Two analyses were conducted to determine whether each statement was appropriate as a target for elementary education pre-service teachers. First, the presence or absence of changes in SADs before and after use was examined by means of a paired *t*-test and the effect size *r* for the magnitude of the change. Next, the authors examined the evaluative value of the descriptors of post-use. Since it is a self-assessment, its high value cannot simply be regarded as an indicator of a high ability to teach. On the other hand, it has been confirmed that self-esteem, once lowered, improves with learning and practice (Yoneda, 2015). Based on this, the authors decided to examine the value of self-assessment tentatively, as the authors expected that there might appear some trend in self-assessment at the end of this research stage by accumulating the data.

A questionnaire was sent together with the mark sheets at the end of each semester. The questionnaire included questions about the participants' impressions of utilizing the J-POSTL Elementary (cf. See appendix) as well as what the participants wrote in all sections of the J-POSTL. Participating instructors were asked to enclose the questionnaires with the mark sheets in the envelope and send them back to the authors.

3.4 Analysis

All participants were asked to use the trial portfolio comprising 93 SADs.

In the quantitative analysis, the number of corresponding data with complete values was reduced to 66 responses in the first phase and 71 responses in the second phase. For the qualitative analysis, all data obtained in the first phase (n=88) were

included in the study. In the second phase, there was a duplication of 22 participants from the first term. Because this study was conducted as an exploratory study, the investigation of the data corresponding to the above conditions was conducted regardless of the length of time the portfolio was used.

Thematic analysis based on Takagi (2015) was used for the open responses (questionnaire items 5 (1)③④⑤⑥, 5 (3)③, 8, 9, and 10) contributed by 88 participants. The comments were divided into a total of 730 meaningful segments (text segmentation) in an Excel file. Second, for each entry, a code, its definition and text sample was included. In addition, a subcode was added if necessary. Subsequently, the frequency of each code was counted. Since one response was sometimes divided into segments, frequency did not correspond to the number of the participants.

4. Results and Discussion of the Quantitative Analysis

4.1 Descriptive Statistics for SADs

The mean of each SAD in the first data collection phase period was between 2.18 and 3.48 before use, and between 2.71 and 3.92 after use. The mean of each descriptor in the second phase emerged between 2.21 and 3.56 before use, and between 2.56 and 4.00 after use. In Nakayama, Yamaguchi, and Takagi (2013), mean values of 1.9 to 3.6 at the time of portfolio distribution, 2.5 to 4.0 at the pre-teaching practice stage several months later, and 2.9 to 4.2 at the post-teaching practice stage were reported. Considering that the present surveys were conducted over about five months, the mean of pre- and post-use self-ratings in these surveys is not too low.

4.2 Changes in Self-assessment of Each SAD and Their Amount

In the first phase, a significant increase was found at the 5% level for all descriptors before and after use. In the second phase, significant increases were found at the 5% level for all SADs except for #29 before and after use. The effect size r was calculated and emerged between 0.39 and 0.73 in each statement in the first phase. In the second phase, it appeared between 0.20 and 0.69 in each SAD. The minimum value of the effect size for SADs in the second phase is 0.20, which is classified as “small” as an effect size and not as “almost no effect size” below 0.1. The difference in the actual mean is 0.17. Therefore, self-assessment of all the statements increased in both the first and second phases of the survey. Statistics on the evaluation of each SAD are presented in Appendix 2.

4.3 Comparison between Categories

The mean of the post-use self-assessment in the first phase is shown in Table 2, classified in 0.5 increments to account for the distribution of the mean values. Every SAD was found to have an effect size r of 0.3 or more. It indicates that the effect size as

the magnitude of change is “large” or “medium” (Mizumoto & Takeuchi, 2008).

Table 2. Classification of the average post-use self-assessment in the first phase

Category	Mean value of <3	Mean value between 3.0 and 3.5	Mean value of >3.5
I Context	2	4, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10
II Methodology	26, 27, 28, 30	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41	
III Resources		42, 43, 44, 45, 46	
IV Lesson Planning	51, 53, 57	47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63	59
V Conducting a Lesson	68, 73, 80, 81	64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79	75
VI Independent Learning		82, 83	
VII Assessment	84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89	90, 91, 92, 93	

The results of the mean post-use self-assessment in the second phase, similarly classified in 0.5 increments, are presented in Table 3. With the exception of SADs #29, #80, and #93, all of the descriptors were found to have an effect size *r* of 0.3 or higher, and the effect was found to be “large” or “medium.” Compared to the first phase, 20 descriptors moved to the lower average category, while SADs #11, #26, and #89 moved to the higher average category; the number of descriptors that were above 3.5, above 3.0 and below 3.5, and below 3.0 both in the two time periods were 6, 48, and 15, respectively, which accounted for 75% of the 93 descriptors.

Table 3. Classification of the average post-use self-assessment in the second phase

Category	Mean value of <3	Mean value between 3.0 and 3.5	Mean value of >3.5
I Context	2	1, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15	3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11
II Methodology	27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 37	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41	
III Resources	45	42, 43, 44, 46	
IV Lesson Planning	47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 57, 58, 60	48, 52, 54, 55, 56, 59, 61, 62, 63	
V Conducting a Lesson	65, 67, 68, 73, 79, 80, 81	64, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78	75
VI Independent Learning	82, 83		
VII Assessment	84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 92, 93	89, 90, 91	

Note. Underlines indicate that the classification results were the same as in the first period.

4.4 Statements with Higher Self-assessment in Both Periods

High self-assessment was noted on six SADs, with all SADs exceeding a mean average of 3.5. Five of the descriptors belong to the category "Context" and SAD #75 is part of the "Conducting a Lesson" category.

- SAD #3: I can understand the value of learning English.
- SAD #5: I can take into account children's motivation to learn English.
- SAD #7: I can take into account children's sense of achievement.
- SAD #9: I can accept feedback from my peers and mentors and build this into my teaching.
- SAD #10: I can gather information related to teaching and learning.
- SAD #75: I can manage and use resources effectively (flashcards, charts, pictures, audio-visual aids, etc.) in actual class situations.

All of these descriptive statements had a value of 0.44 or higher for the effect size *r*, indicating a high degree of "I have learned to do them."

It can thus be inferred that most pre-service teachers have become relatively more confident in terms of self-assessment on these particular SADs.

In addition, Nakayama, Yamaguchi, and Takagi (2013) pointed out that three out of 100 descriptors scored 5.0 or higher, in terms of the sum of the mean and standard deviation, on the trial version of the J-POSTL. This study was conducted after teaching

practice in a junior high and high school English teaching program. These three descriptive sentences were identical to SAD #75, and almost identical to SADs #3 and #9. Thus, it can be pointed out that these three descriptive statements may help pre-service teachers to improve their teaching skills in the teaching course, whether it is for primary or secondary education.

4.5 Statements with Lower Self-assessment in Both Periods

Fifteen SADs (#2, #27, #30, #51, #53, #57, #68, #73, #80, #81, #84, #85, #86, #87, and #88) were found to have lower self-assessment over both periods, with an average mean of less than 3.0. Nine of the descriptors are in the areas of "Conducting a Lesson" and "Assessment of Learning."

4.5.1. SAD #2: *I can design language courses and year-round teaching programs around the requirements of the Course of Study*. This SAD, which had a low self-assessment, was included in the sub-category "Curriculum ," along with SAD #1, "*I can understand the requirements set in the Course of Study* ," which had a high self-assessment. This sub-category, together with the others, constitutes "Context." SAD #1 had an average mean of 3.55 after the second collection in the first phase and 3.21 after the second collection in the second phase, while SAD #2 had an average mean of 2.95 after use of the first phase and 2.77 after use of the second phase, showing a gap of more than 0.44. A possible reason for this gap is that, although the understanding of the curriculum guidelines shown in the SAD #1 has a positive effect on the judgment of skills that may be improved in half a year, developing a foreign language curriculum and a year-long lesson plan schedule remains a challenging task for pre-service elementary teachers.

4.5.2. SADs #27 and #30 in the category "Methodology." These two SADs comprise half of the four descriptors that make up the sub-category "Writing Activities." This category is one of the six sub-categories (including the so-called four skills, grammar, vocabulary and culture) that make up the category "Methodology." Two SADs, #28 and #29, which were judged not to be so low in self-assessment, are summarized as instructional skills that set up "activities in which children copy or write down English words and expressions with which they are familiar." On the other hand, the two relatively low descriptors are related closely to the ability to set up activities that motivate children to copy and write, and the instructional skills to set up activities that motivate children to copy and write with an awareness of word order. These two descriptors require more advanced teaching skills than the others, and more actual instructional experience is essential to develop these skills.

4.5.3. SADs #51, #53, and #57 in the category "Lesson Planning." These three SADs belong to the category "Lesson Planning," which consists of 17 descriptors. SAD #51 mentions setting goals that take into account children's different proficiency levels and special needs; SAD #53 refers to flexible design of lessons based on annual instructional plans; and SAD #57 informs the ability to develop instructional plans that comprehensively incorporate the five domains of speaking (interaction), speaking (presentation), listening, reading, and writing." Considering the participants had no teaching experience, it is not surprising that the skills described by the SADs are judged to be rather difficult by the education majors.

4.5.4. SADs #68, #73, #80, and #81 in the category "Conducting a Lesson." In this category, four descriptors were given a low self-assessment.

- SAD #68: I can adjust my time schedule when unforeseen situations occur;
- SAD #73: I can keep and maximize the attention of children during a lesson;
- SAD #80: I can use appropriate strategies if children have trouble understanding classroom English; and
- SAD #81: I can encourage children to relate their knowledge of Japanese language to English learning contents where and when this is helpful.

One possible reason for the low mean is that these SADs relate to instructional skills that would be difficult to judge without actual teaching experience.

4.5.5. SADs #84, #85, #86, #87, and #88 in the category "Assessment." Five descriptors presented with a low mean in this category (SADs #84, #85, #86, #87 and #88). Six subcategories are identified in this category. One of the five SADs is the SAD #84: "I can evaluate and select valid assessment procedures (portfolios, self-/peer-assessment, etc.) appropriate to lesson aims and objectives." In the trial version, there is only one SAD belonging to the subcategory "Designing Assessment Tools." The remaining four SADs make up the entire sub-category "Evaluation." These four SADs are as follows:

- SAD #85: I can assign grades using procedures which are reliable and transparent;
- SAD #86: I can identify strengths and areas for improvement in a child's English performance;
- SAD #87: I can assess a child's ability to work independently and cooperatively; and
- SAD #88: I can use reliable assessment procedures to chart and monitor a child's progress (reports, checklist, grades, etc.) and explain the result in an easy-to-understand manner.

One reason for the low mean can be that participants had almost no opportunities to actually assess children's English abilities.

4.5.6. Other sub-categories belonging to "Assessment." These include "Self- and Peer Assessment," "Language Performance," "Culture," and "Error Analysis." For the subcategory "Self- and peer Assessment," the name of the category is listed in the trial version, but any of the SADs related is not excluded after the third stage survey of this project. Accordingly, it can be judged that the self-assessment is not so low for the SAD #89, which is the only one belonging to the sub-category "Language Performance," and the remaining three SADs belonging to the sub-category "Culture."

4.5.7. Comparison with English teaching courses for secondary education. The category of "evaluation" was judged to be an area of slow growth in self-assessment, even when the portfolio was used over one year and included a teaching practice in a study of students enrolled in a secondary English teaching course (Nakayama, Yamaguchi & Takagi, 2013). The study points out that one of the reasons for the slow growth was limited opportunities for students to experience evaluation in teaching courses. The results obtained by Nakayama, Yamaguchi and Takagi (2013) and the present study both indicate that some learning may have taken place over the duration of the study in all descriptors, including the category "Assessment," although there is a difference in the growth of self-assessment, but at the same time, it is necessary to devise ways to improve the teaching abilities represented in the "evaluation" descriptors for further learning.

4.6 Categories with Significant Increases in Self-assessment

The effect size *r* was calculated in each phase, and the numbers of the SADs whose effect size *r* values were judged to be "large" (value of 0.5 or more) and "medium" (value of less than 0.5 or more than 0.3) in the first phrase were SADs #78 and #15, respectively. Descriptors whose *r* values were judged to be "large", "medium" and "small" (value of less than 0.3 or more than 0.1) in the second phase were SADs #47, #43 and #3, respectively. This subsection examines the categories in which self-ratings increased significantly over both periods by presenting descriptive statements in which the value of effect size was judged to be "large" (Table 4).

Table 4. SADs with an effect value of 0.5 or more in both phases

Category	SAD number
I Context (11/16=68.8%)	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15
II Methodology (11/26=42.3%)	18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 35, 39, 40, 41
III Resources (2/5=40.0%)	43, 44
IV Lesson Planning (6/17=35.3%)	50, 52, 53, 55, 59, 61
V Conducting a Lesson (9/18=50.0%)	64, 66, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77
VI Independent Learning (1/2=50.0%)	82
VII Assessment (1/10=10.0%)	84

Note. The numerical information in parentheses in the first column indicates the ratio of the number of descriptive sentences with the larger effect size to the total number of descriptors in the category.

The number of descriptors that had a large effect as well as the percentages in the categories to which they belong suggest that the student teachers may feel that, by participating in the teacher training course, they are now "able to do it," especially skills and abilities described in the "Context," "Methodology," and "Conducting a Lesson" categories.

4.7 The Need to Revisit the Criteria for Classifying Averages

One of the biggest problems that arises from the classification of SADs by dividing the mean value by 0.5 increments is that by dividing them by these increments, the category "Independent Learning" itself becomes a less necessary category in the second phase and may not be included in the completed J-POSTL Elementary. The criteria for classifying averages, including consideration of whether it is desirable to exclude independent learning under the circumstances in which English has become a subject in elementary schools, will be determined by data collected in the third phase and beyond.

5. Results and Discussion of the Qualitative Analysis

Results are shown in the order of the questionnaire. Due to space limitations, frequency results are shown in parentheses (e.g. (51)) instead of using tables and figures.

5.1 Participants' Learning Experiences

Question 5 related to the participants' learning experiences described in the Personal Statement Section. Reflection on one's own learning experience and practice is important, as it helps raise pre-service teachers' awareness of what teaching skills are required in the trial version of J-POSTL Elementary (JACET SIG-ELE, 2018).

5.1.1 Learning experience. Four themes emerged from this open item: teaching methods, content, and instructors in elementary schools (55); those in secondary schools (43); learning experience in tertiary education including overseas study experience (22); and teaching methods, contents, and feelings in general (32). In this paper, the authors focus mainly on the first theme. The most frequently mentioned themes of elementary school teaching were as follows:

- The typical class consisted of activities designed to combine movement with music (songs). (23)
- Fun classes and instructors were motivating for students. (14)
- Improvement and Innovation are required in L2 classes. (11)

English is now implemented as a regular subject like Japanese and math in elementary schools. This is different from the participants' experiences, and pre-service educators may need to reflect on the fact that the participants experienced "Foreign Language Activities" which was aimed at providing elementary school students with an introduction to L2 study.

15 segments mentioned that this section gave participants good opportunities to reflect on their learning experiences.

5.1.2 Aspects of teaching the pre-service teachers look forward to. Question 5 (1) ④ asked to write the participants, expectation for the course. Responses were obtained from 83 participants out of 120. The most frequent theme was methods of teaching and didactic competences (88), followed by English proficiency (13), understanding the growth and development of children and how to cope with the children (8), becoming an ideal teacher (6), and understanding the reality of Japanese schools (5). The highest frequent themes include:

- I want to learn methods and acquire the skills necessary to teach English to children. (61)
- I want to make class fun so that children like it. (19)

The comments above—wanting to learn methods and acquire skills—indicate a possibility of effective use of the portfolio in pre-service teacher classes at university. On the other hand, the participants want to learn something that can be used in their actual class, thus a reflection-centered portfolio may require guidance and explanations by the educators in pre-service teacher classes for students to appreciate the importance of reflection.

5.1.3 Expectation and anxiety about teaching practice. Question 5(1)⑤ obtained answers from 72 participants. The frequency totaled 112. Seven themes emerged: interaction with children (38); conducting classes/instruction (34); working on site (14); English proficiency (10); status of being as a student-teacher (9); and flexibility (7). Subthemes showed that anxiety was more frequent than expectations. A possible reason explaining this result is that the participants did not have any experience interacting with children, and were concerned about being in the classroom.

5.1.4 Didactic competencies and skills participants' think important for a language teacher. 69 participants replied to this question. The frequency totaled 114. Five themes emerged in this section: skills/abilities to conduct/manage class (84); teacher's personality (21); abilities/skills to cope with issues in class (5); ability to complete teacher's job (2); and cross-cultural understanding (2). These results indicate that for pre-service teachers, being able to conduct and manage classes is considered important.

5.2 Dossier

Question 5(3)③ about the dossier section asked if the participants kept a record of their practices and learning evidence to show that their self-assessment of the 'can do' statements was an accurate reflection of their specific skills and abilities. However, only 47 out of the 88 participants replied to this question. The frequency totaled 67.

The following six themes emerged: conducting classes/practice (35); reflection and what they learned (10); proficiency test results and study abroad (10); competencies and skills required for a teacher (8); attending academic conferences (2); current situation of English education at elementary schools in Japan (2). Subthemes of the most frequent theme included mock classes and writing lesson plans (18), and on-site practice (14). The results above may indicate that instructors need to clearly emphasize the primary function of Dossier, and have discussions in class based on their record.

5.3 The First Impression the Participants Had on Receiving the J-POSTL Elementary

The J-POSTL is a new reflection tool for L2 pre-service and in-service teachers in Japan. The following themes emerged after the coding of the responses of Question 8: negative feelings (40); positive feelings (29); and regarding questionnaire (5). Even though educators explained the purpose of the J-POSTL survey, the results indicated that more than half of the pre-service teachers were unhappy to be forced to take part in the survey. In order for the J-POSTL to be an effective reflection tool, this issue needs to be resolved. For instance, in classes the relationship between the J-POSTL and syllabus could be clarified, and the J-POSTL SADs corresponding to class content could be highlighted after each session.

5.4 Good Points about Utilizing the J-POSTL Elementary

80 participants replied to Question 9, and the frequency totaled 77. The themes emerged were as follows: reflection (46); points of view (16); changes (8); and detailed (7). The comments below indicate that the participants understand the main aims of J-POSTL Elementary.

- Reflection made me aware of my abilities and skills.
- I learned what is required in teaching English and what I need to be careful about.
- I was able to know my changes and growth by comparing the previous data and now.
- Can-Do statements were detailed.

There does seem to be a contradiction in the responses. While participants clearly and accurately understood the aims of the J-POSTL, and felt they were of importance, the actual labor involved in filling out the J-POSTL resulted in a negative impression of this reflection tool.

5.5 Points That Need to Be Improved in J-POSTL Elementary

16 participants replied to Question 10, and the frequency totaled 14. The themes emerged were the self-assessment descriptors (7), self-assessment (5), and format (2). Regarding the self-assessment descriptors, some students pointed out that the same things are repeatedly asked like the examples below.

> SAD #4 (Context Section)
> I can take into account the attainment of target based on the Course of Study and students' needs.
>
> SAD #47 (Lesson Planning Section)
> I can identify the Course of Study requirements and set learning aims and objectives suited to my students' needs and interests.

The points of view are different, yet those parts underlined may look the same to the participants. Educators may need to make additional opportunities to discuss the descriptors to deepen the participants' understanding. Overall, even though the number of responses in this section was small, their comments added important insights of the pre-service teachers into our study.

6. Implications

6.1 Implications from Quantitative Analysis of Descriptors

As a result of examining the average SAD means in the two phases, and the changes that occurred over the course of the semester, there were no SADs judged to be inappropriate for inclusion in the final version of the J-POSTL Elementary. Consequently, at least three steps to identify potential SAD candidates should be included in the criteria for selecting descriptors in the J-POSTL Elementary for pre-service teachers.

The first candidates can be identified by classifying SADs in 0.5 increments based on the average mean of 3.0 for post-use self-assessment. The results show that the number of SADs with a high average mean of 3.5 or higher was a single digit in both periods. The second candidates are the statements with a significant increase in self-assessment. From Table 4, it can be seen that all descriptors that fall into this category are included in all the categories. There are SADs with low self-assessment such as SAD #84, but if we consider that pre-service teachers improve through learning, they are appropriate for students taking the course. In the third step, candidates are descriptive statements with a mean value of 3.0 or higher. The number of applicable descriptors for both periods was 54. These third candidates will probably make up the majority of the descriptive statements needed for students, but it is speculated that they will eventually need to be readjusted in terms of the overlap with the first and second candidates, in addition to ensuring a balance of the number of descriptive statements in each category. In future research, it may be necessary to carry out an analysis with a view to comparing long-term users of the J-POSTL with those who use the portfolio over duration of a semester.

6.2 Implications from the Qualitative Analysis for the Use of the Portfolio

A thematic analysis of the open-ended comments from the questionnaire survey was conducted. Pertaining to the usability of the J-POSTL Elementary, first of all, many of the students felt the portfolio was important. It enabled them to reflect and obtain the necessary perspective for teachers, and it is clear that their impressions were consistent with the purpose of the portfolio. On the other hand, it was also found that some students thought it was cumbersome because they did not know the meaning of many SADs. As for the self-assessment process, participants felt it was impossible for them to judge their own skills because of lack of experience. It would thus be beneficial to not only complete a self-assessment, but also for the pre-service teachers to be assessed by others, providing a reference opinion for future research and J-POSTL Elementary development. In addition, the “learning and practice record,” which is an important basis for reflection, was used only by half of the respondents, indicating that it was

either considered to be of less importance, or the participants simply forgot about this section.

Furthermore, the following trends were found by analyzing comments in the "About myself," "Expectations and anxieties about the teaching program," and "Expectations and anxieties prior to the teaching practice" questions. The participants thought that learning through games and using voice and body in elementary schools led to an increase in motivation, and they expected to enhance their teaching skills in elementary English so that they could create fun lessons based on the ones they had experienced in their English methodology course at university. On the other hand, it was found that some of the students did not have much experience in being with or teaching children, and were unsure whether they could plan and teach fun classes. It is suggested that these feelings of insecurity are due to the low level of actual teaching experience and consequently resulted in participants struggling to rate these SADs.

In the second half of the present paper, a qualitative analysis was conducted to find out how students used the portfolio and what their perceptions of the portfolio were. The findings obtained here will guide future research. Since this analysis only focuses on the first two phases of research conducted in Stage 5 of the J-POSTL elementary development, further scrutiny and research needs to be continued to generalize the results obtained in this final stage.

References

Council of Europe (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. http://www.coe.int/

JASET SIG on English Language Education. (2014). *Japanese Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (J-POSTL)*. http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/JPOSTL.htm

JASET SIG on English Language Education (2018). *Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators (J-POSTL Elementary)*. http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/TrialJPOSTLElementary.pdf

MEXT (2017). *Elementary School Guidelines for the Course of Study (published in 2017) Commentary on Foreign Language Activities and Foreign Language*. https://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2019/03/18/1387017_011.pdf

Mizumoto, A., & Takeuchi, O. (2008). Basics and Considerations for Reporting Effect Sizes in Research Papers. *Studies in English Language Teaching, 31,* 57-66. Kansai English Language Education Society. Retrieved from: http://www.mizumot.com/files/EffectSize_KELES31.pdf

Nakayama, N., Yamaguchi, T., & Takagi, A. (2013). Report on the Second Longitudinal Study. *A Comprehensive Study on the Framework of English Language Teachers'*

Professional Development in Japan. 73-93.
http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/2012_report_j.pdf

Nakayama, N., & Yamaguchi, T. (in press). Elementary School Teachers' Perceptions on the Qualities and Competencies of English Language Instructors: Results of a National Survey on the Descriptors of the J-POSTL Elementary. *Language Teacher Education, 7*(1)
http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/VOL7NO1.pdf

Osaki, S. (2016). Development of a Language Teacher's Portfolio (J-POSTL) for Elementary School English Teachers: An Examination of Self-Assessment Descriptors in a Literature Study. *Language Teacher Education, 3*(1), 61-78. http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/VOL3NO1.pdf

Takagi, A., & Nakayama, N. (2012). The First Longitudinal Study of J-POSTL. *A Comprehensive Study on the Framework of English Language Teachers' Professional Development in Japan.* 73-93.
http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/2012_report_j.pdf

Takagi, A. (2015). Reflections by English Department Teacher Students: Using the Portfolio of Language Teachers (J-POSTL). *Language Teacher Education, 2*(1), 59-74. http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/VOL2NO1.pdf

Yamaguchi, T., Osada, E., Hisamura, K., & Benthien, G. (2019). Developing Japanese Portfolio for Elementary English Educators: Specifying Self-assessment Descriptors for Student Teachers and its Challenges. *Language Teacher Education, 6*(2), 37-61. http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/VOL6NO2.pdf

Yoneda, S. (2015). A Study on the Effects of Primary School English Teaching Practice on Student Teachers Who Want to Become Elementary School Teachers: An Attempt to Use the Language Teacher's Portfolio. *Language Teacher Education, 2*(1), 78-92.
http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/VOL2NO1.pdf

Yoneda, S. (2016). An Exploratory Research of Elementary School English Teacher Training Using Language Teacher Portfolios. *Language Teacher Education, 3*(1), 78-93. http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/VOL3NO1.pdf

Appendices

Appendix 1. Self-assessment descriptors in the trial version of J-POSTL Elementary

I CONTEXT
A. Curriculum
1. I can understand the requirements set in the Course of Study.
2. I can design language courses and year-round teaching programs around the requirements of the Course of Study.
B. Aims and Needs
3. I can understand the value of learning English.
4. I can take into account the attainment of targets based on the Course of Study and children's needs.
5. I can take into account children's motivation to learn English.
6. I can take into account children's intellectual curiosity.
7. I can take into account children's sense of achievement.
C. The Role of the Language Teacher
8. I can identify specific pedagogical issues related to my children or my teaching while planning, teaching, and reflecting on classes.
9. I can accept feedback from my peers and mentors and build this into my teaching.
10. I can gather information related to teaching and learning.
11. I can observe my peers and offer them constructive feedback.
12. I can critically assess my teaching based on child feedback and learning outcomes and adapt it accordingly.
13. I can take into account children's knowledge of Japanese, and make use of it when teaching English.
14. I can explain the value and benefits of learning English to children and parents.
D. Institutional Resources and Constraints
15. I can assess how I might use the resources and educational equipment available in my school and adapt them to my teaching as required.
II METHODOLOGY
A. Speaking
16. I can create a supportive atmosphere and provide specific situational English usage opportunities that invite children to actively take part in speaking activities.
17. I can evaluate and select meaningful interactional activities to encourage children to greet people they know or meet for the first time, and to respond to or decline instructions / requests from them.
18. I can evaluate and select meaningful interactional activities to encourage children to express their feelings and opinions about familiar topics.
19. I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to help children develop interactive competences to initiate or respond to simple utterances.
20. I can evaluate and select various activities to help children make effective use of non-verbal communication (facial expressions, gestures, etc.) and engage in interaction with others.
21. I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to help children develop skills to confirm and clarify utterances made by the other person.
22. I can evaluate and select various activities to help children develop the ability to describe likes, interests, or strengths by using simple phrases and expressions.
23. I can evaluate and select various activities to help children develop the ability to describe their everyday life or events by using simple phrases and expressions.
24. I can evaluate and select various activities to help children develop the ability to describe their feelings or opinions about the area they live in, school life, friends and acquaintances, etc. by using simple phrases and expressions.
25. I can evaluate and select various activities to raise child awareness of stress, rhythm and intonation.
26. I can evaluate and select a range of oral activities to encourage children to communicate using vocabulary they have learned or non-verbal communication without hesitation.
B. Writing / Written Interaction
27. I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to motivate children to copy or write letters, words, phrases and expressions.
28. I can evaluate and select activities which help children copy or write familiar phrases and expressions.
29. I can evaluate and select activities which help children write familiar words, phrases and expressions, paying attention to lower and upper case letters, word units, basic symbols, etc.
30. I can evaluate and select familiar sentences for copying to help children become aware of word order.
C. Listening
31. I can select texts appropriate to children's interests.

32. I can encourage children to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text before listening.
33. I can structure activities in such a way that children are able to identify the main points of a text.

D. Reading

34. I can use picture book storytelling strategies such as voice and actions to get children interested in the content and text.
35. I can select texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of children.
36. I can set activities to help children identify the letters of the alphabet and learn their proper pronunciation.

E. Grammar

37. I can recognize that grammar underpins communication, and can create a variety of language activities (for introducing a grammatical item) that will help children become aware of grammatical patterns through meaningful contexts.

F. Vocabulary

38. I can introduce vocabulary which will enable the children to be able to express themselves appropriately.
39. I can evaluate and select activities which enhance children's awareness of register differences.

G. Culture

40. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which awaken children's interest in and help them develop their knowledge and understanding of their own and the target language culture.
41. I can evaluate and select activities which enhance the children's cultural awareness.

III RESOURCES

42. I can make use of ideas, lesson plans and materials included in teachers' handbooks and resource books.
43. I can identify and evaluate a range of materials appropriate for the age, interests and the language level of my children.
44. I can select expressions and language activities from textbooks or source materials appropriate for my children.
45. I can design learning materials and activities appropriate for my children.
46. I can locate and select materials appropriate for the needs of my children from a variety of sources, such as pictorial books, encyclopedia, illustrated books, literature, mass media and the Internet.

IV LESSON PLANNING

A. Identification of Learning Objectives

47. I can identify the Course of Study requirements and set learning aims and objectives suited to my children's needs and interests.
48. I can plan specific learning objectives for individual lessons and/or for a period of teaching.
49. I can set objectives which challenge children to reach their full potential.
50. I can set objectives for the four macro skills of listening, speaking (spoken interaction and production), reading and writing respectively, according to the focus of individual lessons and/or a period of teaching.
51. I can set objectives which take into account the differing levels of ability and special educational needs of the children.
52. I can set objectives which encourage children to reflect on their learning.

B. Lesson Content

53. I can structure lesson plans flexibly based on the year-round teaching plans.
54. I can vary and balance activities to enhance and sustain the children's motivation and interest.
55. I can design activities to make the children aware of and build on their existing knowledge.
56. I can take on board children's feedback and comments and incorporate this into future lessons.
57. I can plan activities to ensure the interdependence of listening, spoken interaction and production, reading, and writing.
58. I can accurately estimate the time needed for specific topics and activities and plan accordingly.

C. Lesson Organization

59. I can select from and design a variety of organizational form (teacher-centered, individual, pair, group work) as appropriate.
60. I can plan lessons and periods of teaching with other teachers and/or assistant language teachers.
61. I can plan for child-to-child interaction.
62. I can plan lessons taking into account where, when and how to use English, including metalanguage I may need in the classroom.
63. I can plan for child presentations.

V CONDUCTING A LESSON

A. Using Lesson Plans

64. I can start a lesson in such a way that the children become interested in a topic.
65. I can be flexible when working from a lesson plan and respond to children's interests as the lesson progresses.
66. I can ensure smooth transitions between activities and tasks for individuals, groups and the whole class.
67. I can time and change classroom activities to reflect individual children's attention spans.
68. I can adjust my time schedule when unforeseen situations occur.
69. I can wrap up a lesson effectively and efficiently.

B. Content

70. I can relate what I teach to children's experiences and knowledge, current issues, and the culture of those who speak the language.

C. Interaction with Learners

71. I can gain children's attention at the beginning of a lesson.
72. I can be responsive and react supportively to children's initiative and interaction.
73. I can keep and maximize the attention of children during a lesson.

D. Classroom Management

74. I can provide opportunities for and manage individual, partner, group and whole class work.
75. I can manage and use resources effectively (flashcards, charts, pictures, audio-visual aids, etc.).
76. I can manage and use instructional media efficiently (OHP, ICT, video etc.).

E. Classroom Language

77. I can conduct a lesson in English, but can make effective use of Japanese if necessary.
78. I can explain learning content and methods in English using visual aids, gestures, demonstrations, etc.
79. I can design activities which motivate children to use English.
80. I can use appropriate strategies if children have trouble understanding classroom English.
81. I can encourage children to relate their knowledge of Japanese to English learning contents where and when this is helpful.

VI INDEPENDENT LEARNING

A. Learner Autonomy

82. I can help children to reflect on their own learning processes and outcomes.
83. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help children to reflect on their existing knowledge and competences.

VII ASSESSMENT

A. Designing Assessment Tools

84. I can evaluate and select valid assessment procedures (portfolios, self-/peer-assessment, etc.) appropriate to lesson aims and objectives.

B. Evaluation

85. I can assign grades using procedures which are reliable and transparent.
86. I can identify strengths and areas for improvement in a child's English performance.
87. I can assess a child's ability to work independently and collaboratively.
88. I can use a valid grading system in my assessment of a child's performance.

D. Language Performance

89. I can assess a child's ability to speak and write.

E. Culture

90. I can assess children's level of awareness in terms of being able to make comparisons between Japanese culture and other cultures.
91. I can assess the children's motivation, interest and passion towards learning about different cultures.
92. I can analyze children's errors and provide constructive feedback to them.
93. I can deal with errors that occur in class in a way which does not disrupt the flow of the lesson or communicative activities.

Appendix 2. Descriptive statistics of self-assessment for each SAD in phases one and two

SAD	The first phase (n=66)							The second phase (n=71)						
	pre		post					pre		post				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Difference	*t*	*r*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Difference	*t*	*r*
1	2.83	1.09	3.55	0.91	0.712	8.055	0.71	2.63	1.16	3.21	1.18	0.577	6.664	0.62
2	2.26	1.06	2.95	0.98	0.697	6.104	0.60	2.21	1.11	2.77	1.17	0.563	6.024	0.58
3	3.48	1.10	3.92	0.86	0.439	3.907	0.44	3.56	0.89	4.00	0.72	0.437	5.169	0.53
4	2.76	1.12	3.32	0.93	0.561	4.811	0.51	2.63	1.09	3.08	1.00	0.451	4.706	0.49
5	3.00	1.11	3.53	0.95	0.530	4.991	0.53	3.04	0.99	3.52	0.79	0.479	5.357	0.54
6	2.95	1.17	3.61	1.02	0.652	5.464	0.56	2.93	1.09	3.42	0.89	0.493	5.379	0.54
7	2.88	1.18	3.62	1.02	0.742	5.958	0.59	3.03	0.97	3.51	0.84	0.479	5.814	0.57
8	2.68	1.11	3.26	0.98	0.576	4.785	0.51	2.70	0.98	3.24	0.82	0.535	5.710	0.56
9	3.21	1.23	3.83	1.00	0.621	5.187	0.54	3.13	1.13	3.66	1.11	0.535	5.710	0.56
10	3.12	1.12	3.61	0.89	0.485	4.302	0.47	3.28	0.94	3.79	0.83	0.507	6.344	0.60
11	2.91	1.20	3.42	0.96	0.515	4.846	0.52	2.93	0.96	3.52	1.00	0.592	7.471	0.67
12	2.86	1.11	3.39	0.97	0.530	4.891	0.52	2.79	1.05	3.30	1.14	0.507	7.045	0.64
13	2.58	1.07	3.08	0.88	0.500	5.278	0.55	2.70	1.05	3.14	1.06	0.437	4.780	0.50
14	2.55	1.10	3.05	1.10	0.500	4.803	0.51	2.72	1.02	3.07	1.05	0.352	4.517	0.48
15	2.58	1.08	3.32	1.20	0.742	7.280	0.67	2.55	1.05	3.11	1.17	0.563	7.871	0.69
16	2.85	1.11	3.32	0.99	0.470	4.248	0.47	2.92	1.09	3.35	0.96	0.437	5.487	0.55
17	2.85	1.06	3.41	0.98	0.561	5.079	0.53	3.17	1.00	3.41	1.01	0.239	3.525	0.39
18	2.86	1.11	3.39	1.01	0.530	4.991	0.53	2.86	1.03	3.28	0.97	0.423	5.322	0.54
19	2.89	1.14	3.44	1.04	0.545	5.034	0.53	3.23	1.00	3.65	0.81	0.423	5.699	0.56
20	2.91	1.13	3.39	1.04	0.485	4.383	0.48	2.94	1.08	3.34	1.04	0.394	4.997	0.51
21	2.67	1.04	3.23	0.99	0.561	4.985	0.53	2.82	1.07	3.20	0.95	0.380	5.185	0.53
22	2.85	1.22	3.47	1.03	0.621	6.167	0.61	2.99	1.08	3.44	1.00	0.451	5.654	0.56
23	2.79	1.07	3.36	1.02	0.576	5.126	0.54	3.04	0.99	3.41	0.89	0.366	5.017	0.51
24	2.80	1.18	3.35	1.02	0.545	4.937	0.52	2.85	1.04	3.30	0.93	0.451	5.327	0.54
25	2.26	1.00	3.11	0.98	0.848	7.394	0.68	2.56	0.94	3.00	1.03	0.437	4.900	0.51
26	2.50	1.01	2.98	0.81	0.485	5.257	0.55	2.68	1.00	3.11	1.04	0.437	4.291	0.46
27	2.41	1.05	2.86	0.96	0.455	4.195	0.46	2.41	1.01	2.85	1.10	0.437	4.565	0.48
28	2.53	1.06	2.98	0.98	0.455	5.079	0.53	2.63	0.99	3.04	1.02	0.408	4.383	0.46
29	2.52	1.08	3.02	0.94	0.500	4.608	0.50	2.80	1.08	2.97	1.04	0.169	1.686	0.20
30	2.39	0.97	2.89	0.91	0.500	5.278	0.55	2.58	1.06	2.90	1.06	0.324	3.631	0.40

SAD	The first phase (n=66)							The second phase (n=71)						
	pre		post					pre		post				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Difference	*t*	*r*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Difference	*t*	*r*
31	2.95	1.23	3.39	1.04	0.439	3.707	0.42	2.89	1.10	3.32	1.05	0.437	6.100	0.59
32	2.58	1.19	3.21	1.02	0.636	5.938	0.59	2.55	1.01	2.94	1.09	0.394	4.702	0.49
33	2.45	1.07	3.03	0.91	0.576	5.034	0.53	2.52	1.00	2.94	1.07	0.423	4.526	0.48
34	2.77	1.19	3.17	1.02	0.394	3.455	0.39	2.65	0.96	3.06	1.00	0.408	4.489	0.47
35	2.68	1.17	3.18	1.01	0.500	4.909	0.52	2.54	0.97	3.01	0.93	0.479	5.649	0.56
36	2.56	1.11	3.18	1.01	0.621	5.902	0.59	2.86	0.91	3.18	0.95	0.324	4.518	0.48
37	2.55	1.08	3.09	1.06	0.545	4.937	0.52	2.54	1.09	2.85	1.05	0.310	4.190	0.45
38	2.68	1.13	3.23	0.87	0.545	5.034	0.53	2.86	1.11	3.18	1.07	0.324	3.727	0.41
39	2.71	1.15	3.30	0.96	0.591	6.282	0.61	2.90	1.07	3.30	1.03	0.394	4.843	0.50
40	2.67	1.19	3.29	0.99	0.621	6.030	0.60	2.80	1.01	3.21	1.01	0.408	5.526	0.55
41	2.62	1.16	3.26	0.98	0.636	6.062	0.60	2.69	1.02	3.15	0.95	0.465	5.487	0.55
42	2.85	1.18	3.41	0.94	0.561	5.286	0.55	2.82	1.06	3.15	1.10	0.338	3.518	0.39
43	2.73	1.13	3.33	1.00	0.606	5.868	0.59	2.66	1.03	3.18	1.07	0.521	6.327	0.60
44	2.68	1.11	3.26	0.97	0.576	5.436	0.56	2.66	0.98	3.14	1.02	0.479	5.994	0.58
45	2.39	1.07	3.03	0.98	0.636	6.195	0.61	2.45	0.95	2.79	0.97	0.338	3.682	0.40
46	2.59	1.07	3.21	0.97	0.621	6.471	0.63	2.76	0.89	3.06	1.05	0.296	3.188	0.36
47	2.61	1.19	3.15	1.03	0.545	4.200	0.46	2.46	1.05	2.87	1.01	0.408	4.383	0.46
48	2.64	1.15	3.12	1.05	0.485	4.153	0.46	2.72	1.17	3.06	1.15	0.338	3.308	0.37
49	2.53	1.10	3.14	0.94	0.606	6.638	0.64	2.62	0.95	2.97	0.97	0.352	4.675	0.49
50	2.38	1.08	3.00	0.88	0.621	6.471	0.63	2.56	1.04	2.97	1.06	0.408	5.333	0.54
51	2.21	0.97	2.91	0.91	0.697	6.593	0.63	2.48	0.98	2.73	0.97	0.254	2.921	0.33
52	2.41	1.14	3.11	0.93	0.697	7.049	0.66	2.56	1.01	3.08	1.01	0.521	5.829	0.57
53	2.23	1.05	2.79	0.97	0.561	4.895	0.52	2.25	1.04	2.70	1.15	0.451	5.483	0.55
54	2.79	1.25	3.29	0.99	0.500	4.210	0.46	2.72	0.96	3.17	0.99	0.451	4.606	0.48
55	2.70	1.15	3.42	0.88	0.727	7.431	0.68	2.76	1.01	3.24	1.06	0.479	5.497	0.55
56	2.79	1.18	3.33	0.95	0.545	5.247	0.55	2.89	1.02	3.28	1.11	0.394	4.242	0.45
57	2.29	1.12	2.95	0.97	0.667	6.259	0.61	2.34	1.03	2.79	1.09	0.451	4.706	0.49
58	2.50	1.11	3.05	0.88	0.545	5.364	0.55	2.48	1.03	2.86	1.03	0.380	4.686	0.49
59	2.82	1.09	3.52	0.95	0.697	6.887	0.65	2.94	0.98	3.48	1.03	0.535	7.174	0.65
60	2.65	1.16	3.41	0.94	0.758	6.509	0.63	2.58	1.17	2.83	1.18	0.254	2.846	0.32
61	2.74	1.13	3.41	0.96	0.667	6.259	0.61	2.90	1.04	3.37	0.96	0.465	5.076	0.52
62	2.64	1.06	3.29	0.94	0.652	5.755	0.58	2.59	1.08	3.01	1.02	0.423	4.241	0.45

SAD	The first phase (n=66)							The second phase (n=71)						
	pre		post					pre		post				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Difference	*t*	*r*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Difference	*t*	*r*
63	2.76	1.22	3.33	1.00	0.576	5.327	0.55	2.85	1.04	3.27	1.01	0.423	4.634	0.48
64	2.65	1.14	3.26	1.00	0.606	5.627	0.57	2.69	1.01	3.17	0.97	0.479	4.887	0.50
65	2.59	1.14	3.11	0.95	0.515	4.749	0.51	2.46	1.05	2.89	1.05	0.423	4.750	0.49
66	2.65	1.10	3.23	0.99	0.576	5.811	0.58	2.83	0.99	3.30	1.02	0.465	5.648	0.56
67	2.38	0.97	3.09	0.92	0.712	6.765	0.64	2.46	1.01	2.92	1.05	0.451	4.606	0.48
68	2.24	1.08	2.97	1.10	0.727	7.094	0.66	2.21	0.91	2.56	0.97	0.352	4.375	0.46
69	2.58	1.18	3.02	1.02	0.439	3.771	0.42	2.52	1.11	3.03	1.16	0.507	4.876	0.50
70	2.55	1.18	3.12	1.09	0.576	5.327	0.55	2.65	1.00	3.11	1.15	0.465	5.076	0.52
71	2.68	1.25	3.32	0.96	0.636	5.240	0.54	2.75	0.98	3.13	0.96	0.380	5.391	0.54
72	2.70	1.29	3.39	1.02	0.697	6.593	0.63	2.86	1.06	3.31	0.95	0.451	6.840	0.63
73	2.18	0.99	2.86	0.93	0.682	6.708	0.64	2.34	0.97	2.68	1.01	0.338	3.978	0.43
74	2.74	1.15	3.32	0.90	0.576	5.811	0.58	2.86	1.05	3.42	1.04	0.563	7.081	0.65
75	3.12	1.27	3.70	1.08	0.576	5.327	0.55	3.15	1.18	3.68	1.09	0.521	5.318	0.54
76	2.44	1.14	3.41	1.11	0.970	8.492	0.73	2.54	1.16	3.08	1.22	0.549	5.614	0.56
77	2.47	1.03	3.12	1.00	0.652	5.755	0.58	2.87	1.04	3.32	1.04	0.451	4.928	0.51
78	2.77	1.09	3.39	0.94	0.621	5.781	0.58	2.83	1.10	3.25	1.10	0.423	4.330	0.46
79	2.38	1.05	3.00	0.86	0.621	5.902	0.59	2.54	1.08	2.94	1.07	0.408	4.724	0.49
80	2.26	0.98	2.80	0.85	0.545	5.034	0.53	2.45	0.92	2.68	1.01	0.225	2.564	0.29
81	2.35	1.06	2.80	0.88	0.455	4.195	0.46	2.39	0.92	2.69	0.98	0.296	3.265	0.36
82	2.47	1.07	3.03	0.84	0.561	5.787	0.58	2.54	0.98	2.97	0.97	0.437	5.873	0.57
83	2.48	1.11	3.06	1.01	0.576	6.108	0.60	2.49	0.98	2.82	0.96	0.324	4.351	0.46
84	2.23	0.99	2.82	0.98	0.591	5.476	0.56	2.45	0.97	2.90	1.10	0.451	5.654	0.56
85	2.21	1.10	2.89	0.93	0.682	6.425	0.62	2.42	1.00	2.68	1.05	0.254	3.002	0.34
86	2.35	1.05	2.79	0.92	0.439	4.060	0.45	2.62	0.98	2.90	1.02	0.282	3.206	0.36
87	2.30	1.08	2.71	0.97	0.409	4.137	0.46	2.58	0.98	2.93	0.96	0.352	3.734	0.41
88	2.26	1.06	2.74	1.00	0.485	4.658	0.50	2.49	0.98	2.77	0.94	0.282	3.126	0.35
89	2.35	1.09	2.92	0.95	0.576	6.108	0.60	2.79	0.98	3.06	0.89	0.268	3.339	0.37
90	2.53	1.18	3.05	1.06	0.515	5.586	0.57	2.86	1.05	3.17	1.03	0.310	3.683	0.40
91	2.56	1.08	3.14	1.08	0.576	6.654	0.64	2.82	0.96	3.17	0.94	0.352	4.517	0.48
92	2.55	1.07	3.06	1.04	0.515	4.571	0.49	2.66	1.15	2.97	1.12	0.310	4.353	0.46
93	2.56	1.11	3.05	1.00	0.485	4.761	0.51	2.58	1.02	2.77	1.03	0.197	2.487	0.28

Appendix 3. Questionnaire on using the J-POSTL (Trial Version of the Teaching Course)

1. Did this portfolio help you understand the professional competencies required to teach English in elementary schools?

5 Helpful 4 Somewhat Helpful 3 Neither
2 Not so helpful 1 Not Helpful

2. Have you been able to reflect on yourself in the course of your teaching career through this portfolio?

5 Yes 4 Somewhat Yes 3 I can't say either
2 Rather No 1 No

3. Have you been able to make use of this portfolio?

5 Yes 4 Somewhat Yes 3 I can't say either
2 Rather No 1 No

4. If you answered 2 or 1 in question item 3 above, please write your reason.

5. Answer to each section of this portfolio.

(1) The Personal Statement Section

①Was this section easy to use?

5 easy to use 4 rather easy to use 3 difficult to say
2 rather difficult to use 1 difficult to use

②If you answered 2 or 1 in question item 3 above, please write your reason.

③What did you write in the learning experience section?

④What did you write in the "Expectations for the Teaching Program" section?

⑤What were your expectations and anxieties of teaching practice?

⑥ What items did you fill out in the "Teacher's Qualifications" section?

(2) The Self-Assessment Section

①Did you find this can-do list easy to use?

5 easy to use 4 rather easy to use 3 difficult to say
2 rather difficult to use 1 difficult to use

② If you answered 2 or 1 in question ① above, please write your reason.

(3) The Record of Work Section is relevant to teaching and evidence of progress in English.

① Was this section easy to use?

5 easy to use 4 rather easy to use 3 difficult to say
2 rather difficult to use 1 difficult to use

② If you answered 2 or 1 in question ① above, please write your reason.

③What information did you provide in the Record of Work? Write a few things that you think are particularly important to you.

6. Have you had an opportunity to have your portfolio reviewed by your teacher in charge of the subject or at your teaching practice (except for the last submission)?

3 More than 3 times　2 1 or 2 times　1 No

7. Have you had opportunities to use your portfolio to discuss the teaching profession and classroom practices with other students?

3 More than 3 times　2 1 or 2 times　1 No

8. How did you feel when you received the portfolio?

9. What was the best part of using your portfolio?

10. Please write any other comments you have to improve the portfolio.

【Research Note】

A Study on Plurilingual Education Using Machine Translation in Japanese Universities

Shien Sakai

Abstract

Globalization has created a worldwide expansion of prosperity, material goods and problems, and its success has increased the acceptance of foreign products, systems, and international cooperation. Therefore, people need to develop a consciousness related to understanding different cultures and to coexisting with people from other cultures. Concerning education, globalization makes it necessary to educate students to adapt to changes in lifestyles and consciousness. Although foreign language education is largely responsible for such teaching, just because someone can speak English well does not mean they have an understanding of different cultures. English education alone does not always cultivate the ability to understand different cultures. Hence, in the age of globalization, intercultural understanding and plurilingualistic classes will be important. However, at present, those classes are not given much importance. With regard to plurilingualism, rapidly developing machine translation (MT) will be a contributing factor. Classes using MT can enable the learning of foreign languages and improve writing efficiency in those languages, especially in college classes, which can be less than 100 minutes. For the above reasons, this paper introduces plurilingual lessons and lessons in intercultural understanding in addition to traditional lessons.

Keywords

university foreign language education, plurilingual education, intercultural understanding, machine translation, globalized society

1. Background of the Study

1.1 What Is Globalization?

First, let's examine the globalization phenomenon by employing *Kotobank*, a Japanese word bank that consists of several dictionaries and encyclopedias. According to *Chiezo*, one of the dictionaries, "Globalization represents a situation where a global problem involves various countries and many nations due to the movement of people across borders and the closeness of national relations in the political and economic fields because of the development of transportation."* The description in Digital *Daijiisen* states, "To spread and unify beyond the boundaries of nations, especially to

expand economic activities and ideas of things on a global scale,"* while the Encyclopedia *Mypedia* says that "things will expand and develop on a global scale."* From the *Daijirin* 3rd edition regarding globalism: "…expanding on a global scale. It means that politics, economics, culture, etc. extend beyond national borders on a global scale."* The common theme of the above statements is that economic and other types of activities will expand globally.

What do foreign language teachers think about globalization? A Global Poster Session: College English Education for Global Human Resource Development was held at the 52nd Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET) International Convention in 2013, where the author interviewed and emailed questions to 85 poster presenters (Sakai, 2014). The interviews comprised five survey items, including "Q1. How does your university view globalization? How is globalization different from internationalization?"* The answers from 39 of the 51 respondents revealed that they felt there was a need to comply with globalization, because standards, along with other trends, were moving toward unification. In comparison, there appears to be almost no difference between the answers of the university instructors and the definitions provided by the dictionaries and encyclopedias.

Comparing internationalization to globalization, five respondents answered: "The difference between internationalization and globalization is that the main axis is shifted from Japan to the whole world." One respondent opined:

> Globalization and internationalization do not necessarily refer to the same thing, but I think the meaning is slightly different. The term “internationalization” incorporates foreign (especially European and American) systems and philosophies into Japanese systems and organizations, including educational fields, but it seems that the roots are often used with the image of maintaining Japanese style. In addition, the domain is mainly in Japan. The term “globalization,” like “internationalization,” adopts foreign (European and American) style systems and philosophy; however, in some cases, it seems that the nuance is to introduce a foreign style even if the Japanese style has been completely changed, and that the territory encompasses not only Japan but also overseas.*

Nishi (2018) described internationalization as follows: "In ‘internationalization,’ states and borders strictly exist and play a particularly important role. ‘Internationalization’ is where humans, goods, money, or political and cultural exchanges go beyond international borders."* The opinions of the respondents closely reflect those of Nishi. A search for the frequency of use of the terms globalization and internationalization in the *Asahi Shimbun's Monzo* II, the *Asahi Shimbun*'s (newspaper) morgue, shows that the term internationalization was overwhelmingly used before 2000, but from 2005 to 2013 globalization was more frequently used. In 2013, the use of

globalization was nearly double that of internationalization.

It can be said that the recent developments in technology have changed people's consciousness in relation to the world they live in. From this perspective, internationalization can refer to the acceptance of people, things, and systems from different cultures, while preserving the traditions and customs of one's home country and maintaining its standards. Globalization, on the other hand, allows changes in many of the world's ideas and institutions to be understood and used by many in the world. Comparing the difference between the two sports, sumo and judo, can provide a good example. Both sports originated in Japan, but their positions are very different. Sumo accepts foreign wrestlers, but since the sport is based in Japan, at the award ceremony for the champion, even if the champion is from a foreign country such as Mongolia, it is the Japanese national anthem that is played. Judo has adopted systems from abroad, such as blue judo uniforms and a points system. As a result, it has become a sport practiced around the world. Sumo accepts foreign wrestlers, so it can be said that it is internationalized, but judo has become globalized because it has evolved into a sport that many people around the world can practice, understand, and appreciate.

1.2 Changes in Awareness Brought About by Globalization

Interactions with different cultures that encourage globalization will continue in the future due to the development of modern shipping and travel methods. As a result, at least two salient trends have emerged. One is the standardization movement, and the other is the diversification movement. As for the former movement, more suitable or unsuitable things are often aggregated into or discarded from one culture to another. The cultures and customs of large nations are generalized, and functional aspects such as convenience are often required. For example, in men's apparel for business, wearing a suit and a tie, originally a European custom, has become more common globally. The production and sale of appliances, automobiles, smartphones and other goods are all integrated in the same structures around the world. On the other hand, as for the latter case, continued technological developments will bring unprecedented varieties of goods and activities to isolated parts of the world and will expand the phenomena of diversity. As part of these trends, at ordinary Japanese dining tables, various dishes such as coffee, salad, pasta, naan, and yogurt are now enjoyed, instead of the simple meals of the past.

Not only the adoption of goods and systems, but also the increasing number of people with foreign nationalities in local areas in Japan, leading to increasing cooperation and intermingling with those foreigners, requires a consciousness of understanding and coexistence.

Concerning foreign language education, English education has become the mainstream because it is a powerhouse language and it possesses a practicality stemming from people who use it spreading all over the world. On the other hand, advances in machine translation will help expand the diversity of language education.

Therefore, people from around the world interact with each other more and more.

However, as the number of foreigners around them increases, the voices of those who oppose such diversity have become more prominent. Hate speech, which Japanese people rarely heard in the past, has had to be regulated by law. An example can be found in a newspaper column titled "*Tensei-Jingo* or Heavenly Voice Means People's Voice" (*Asahi Shimbun*, 2018):

> "Friends Have No Borders—Movie *Chibi Maruko-chan,* a Boy from Italy," released in 2015, was supported by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), which distributed movie posters to schools nationwide. A member of Parliament was not happy with the movie title. He wrote in a blog, "I saw this poster and was almost involuntarily rebellious." He said, "If we were to execute education administration without state awareness, Japan would disappear." He claims that he requested remorse from MEXT. As he detected the crisis of national awareness without overlooking children's advertising, he must have had a keen sensitivity to the danger of acknowledging that friends have no borders.*

Persons such as this member of Parliament strongly oppose some aspects of globalization. However, this attitude is nothing new. Some people are curious to see new things or to visit unknown countries, but some have no wish to mix with others who are different from themselves nor any desire to accept new and different cultural norms or customs. Underlying this rejection is the fact that the world is constantly changing, but it is inferred that there is a feeling that one's life can remain as it is, that there is no need to change further by accepting new products, activities, and ideas. Some students share this feeling. However, the current wave of globalization will not stop as long as innovation continues. There are areas where the waves rush in fast and areas where they rush in slowly, but on the whole, sooner or later, the wave of globalization will swallow almost everything, forcing a change in lifestyle and consciousness. In education corresponding to globalization, it is necessary to instruct students so that they can adapt to these changes.

1.3 The Need for Education to Understand Others

Foreign language education is responsible for helping students adapt to the coming changes. It is no exaggeration to say that foreign language education currently conducted in Japanese schools is almost all English education. But does English proficiency improve the ability to understand different cultures? On the Sakai (2014) questionnaire, Q4 asked the respondents, "Some say that if mainly English is taught in foreign language education, students may have only Japanese and English-speaking values and may not be able to adapt to globalization. What do you think?"*

The majority of respondents answered from the viewpoint that "English is an

international lingua franca." Eighteen respondents thought that their students could use English as a tool of international communication, and eight took this one step further, saying that English was an international lingua franca. "First English and then plurilingualism"* was the answer given by four people: "I think the starting point is English. I will teach the students to gradually lead them to plurilingual teaching,"* and "I think that the current foreign language education has the meaning of developing global human resources and other educational meanings. If the purpose is the former, I guess English should be good at first, and then it is a plus to learn foreign languages other than English."* One respondent said, "English is currently the dominant language in academic fields, so if students have the ability to read in English, they will be able to better understand the values of countries around the world." Some expressed almost the same opinion.

However, Otani (2007, pp.117-127), using the example that before and during World War II, Kan Kikuchi, one of the masters of the English language those days, and Yasuo Yamato, a leader of English academic society, looked down on Britain, the United States and their cultures. Otani said, “That just because a person has English ability does not mean that he or she has to be able to understand different cultures.”* If English proficiency does not lead to an improvement of the ability to understand different cultures, it is necessary to train that ability separately in education. For this reason, the purpose (3) of the Course Study for junior high schools (MEXT 2017, p.129) states, "To deepen the students’ understanding of the culture behind foreign languages."* Unfortunately, the reality in junior high and high schools is that instruction to enhance the ability to understand different cultures is not given much importance. There are two reasons for that. One is from a 2012 survey conducted by the JACET Special Interest Group on English Education, on which high school English teachers (valid responses: 5,658) nationwide were asked sets of questions in three areas: “awareness of teaching ability to develop English teaching skills,”* “awareness of cultivating ability to have students understand different cultures,”* and “awareness of efforts to have students develop their learning autonomy.”* Nakayama (2013, p.34) concluded that the survey data demonstrated a problem with class practices for promoting students’ cross-cultural understanding.

The other reason is from a survey among 12th graders (MEXT, 2015), on which they were asked, "What do you want to learn English for?"* There were eight options, but no option for studying English to understand other cultures. The following three options barely touched on learning different cultures: "I want to be able to play an active part in the international community using English (11.2%),"* "I want to be able to enjoy homestay and language training overseas (5%),"* and "When traveling overseas I want to be able to enjoy everyday conversations and enjoy communication in English (36.7%).”* MEXT, which developed the questionnaires, appeared not to have had studying English to learn to understand different cultures in mind.

1.4 Education in a Globalized Society

English education is the mainstream in foreign language education in Japan, but if foreign language education is chosen for its practicality, Chinese education will be more popular in the future. Should we educate using one of these two languages in the future, or is it better to consider plurilingualism in foreign language education, allowing students to learn not only one language, but plural languages? Hisamura (2017, p. 17) states:

> In order to maintain a plurilingual society (in the idea of plurilingualism) and to promote continuous harmony, peace and human exchange, communication and ideas are required in all languages. People must recognize that all the languages have equal value as a means of expressing an entity and that learning plural languages of equal value enables people to recognize linguistic diversity, understand different cultures, and accept cultural differences.*

Parmenter (2004, p. 32) explains that children who have studied or spoken more than one foreign language are less likely to have a dichotomous understanding and to have a pluralistic perspective.* Otani (2007, pp. 193-194) states that school English education should abandon the idea of English as an international language and make a distinction from an international or large language orientation. Such foreign language education is considered to have a strong and positive communication that contributes to diverse cultural understandings.* Tukahara (2015, p.121), a Spanish language education researcher, criticizes the following situation in Japan, where foreign language education at elementary schools is becoming English only:

> In the current situation of Japan, where English is the only foreign language mainly taught, regardless of the teacher's individual thoughts and consciousness, the "evaluation" that "English is valuable" is being conveyed to children. And the evaluation that "English has value" is easily converted to the evaluation that "a foreign language other than English has no value." If there is any value in a foreign language besides English, it must be taught in class. It cannot be helped for a child to judge that a foreign language which is not taught is worthless. Teachers intend to teach the “knowledge” of the English language during foreign language activities, but they also convey their evaluation of the language at the same time.*

In the survey by Sakai (2014) mentioned above, nine people said that they supported plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. One said:

> If such teaching is given, Japanese and English-speaking values will increase to some extent in the students’ minds, and as for other cultural and linguistic spheres, it

will be considered difficult for students to obtain these cultural values. However, in reality, there are many other parts of the world, such as Asia, the Islamic world, Latin America, Africa, Europe, etc. I think it is difficult for students to appreciate all of those areas' cultural values. In that sense, it is very difficult to truly develop global human resources. It may be too late to start learning many foreign languages from the stage of tertiary education. Therefore, at present, I think it would be realistic for a student to select a certain foreign language or culture to learn, depending on what kind of culture or language will be exposed to him or her in the future."*

A typical opinion was that learning multiple languages was significant, but difficult due to human resources and time constraints.

Regarding students' opinions, in July 2019, 43 student participants in a private university department of English study read "Recommendation of Plurilingualism in Japanese Educational Settings " (Sakai, 2018) and wrote their comments. The following statements are representative examples of the answers that show how the respondents' values have changed after reading the paper. (Multiple keywords were found in some answers because they were free descriptions):

(1) Cross-cultural understanding (29 people); "I agree with the idea that the key point in learning a foreign language is to develop intercultural understanding."*
(2) Plurilingualism (13 people); "The world will be better if the number of people who learn other languages as cross-cultural understanding increases around the world."*
(3) Western values imposed (8 people); "I thought that a language other than English was not necessary."*
(4) Obsession (3 people); "I realized that I was obsessed by the notion that I had to be able to speak English."*

University students who will be living in a more globalized society in the future simply, by being asked about plurilingualism, have admitted the importance of intercultural understanding and the significance of learning not only for English but also for plural foreign languages.

In light of the current situation of foreign language education in Japan, in which exists a weak emphasis on cross-cultural understanding, the main motivation of English learning is for taking tests. Current foreign language education does not train students to develop the ability to interact with foreign people, which is one of the key competencies described by the OECD (2005). If we discuss foreign language education in Japan in general, it may be internationalized because foreign assistant language teachers have been introduced into classrooms, but it is hard to say that it is the type of education needed in the age of globalization.

2. The Basic Idea of This Research

As mentioned above, a new view of education is necessary for education in response to globalization. It should involve intercultural education and plurilingual education, for which my proposal is described below. But before that, I will explain about education by machine translation (MT).

Since the advent of MT based on neural networks, translation accuracy has dramatically improved and will continue to improve. Some may think this means that foreign language education is no longer necessary. As MT has evolved, English as a tool for conversation between non-native speakers has become virtually unnecessary. If, for example, MT is used more frequently in business translation, the demand for foreign language classes as a tool for business will decrease sharply. However, over the years, new technologies have overwritten existing technologies and concepts on a number of occasions, and each time humanity has improved its performance as well. A comparative study on language learning with and without a dictionary has no more meaning than a comparative study on language learning with and without MT. Rather, we should focus on the use of MT, with which an individual can perform more than with just his or her existing language skills because MT enables the use of several languages, a good reason why we should provide education to enhance the ability to utilize MT.

If beginning learners are taught how to use a dictionary, they can then use the dictionary effectively as a study guide. In an environment where there is no daily opportunity to use foreign languages, MT needs to be taught and mastered in class. An example is using portable machine translators. Colleagues sometimes ask me to lend them portable machine translators for their use on seminar trips abroad. A group who went abroad without practicing how to use them beforehand on their return said, "We rarely used them (the machines).” They could make themselves understood with simple English and body language. On the other hand, some groups that practiced how to use the translators in advance reported that they had achieved significant communication. Therefore, without learning how to use them, there is no point in taking portable machine translators abroad.

Regarding whether MT is useful for learning a foreign language, Gally (2019, p.10), an educator and an MT researcher using a teaching report by Nishiyama, one of his PhD students, states that, if students write a complete draft in Japanese beforehand and run it through MT, such a practice may contribute to acquisition but may also be harmful. Gally asserts that if a student checks the meaning of machine-translated sentences and uses MT interactively, MT might help the student learn a foreign language. The author’s students who wrote English essays using MT commented: "Oh, I know what to say,"* and "I can learn English with a translator."* Moreover, students can learn English pronunciation by imitating the pronunciation provided by MT. It becomes possible to use it effectively as a learning device by doing so, and it was possible to show high performance. The key

competencies of OECD (2005) also include "using tools interactively (e.g., language and technology)."

Using MT with such a pronunciation function can provide an education that enhances student performance in using foreign languages. One of the general thoughts on English education current in Japan is to learn English first and then use it. However, that attitude has certain limitations. For one, it leads to the situation described in *Newsweek*: "There are a lot of Japanese who shrink in the strike zone where the test English is too severe and cannot throw the ball" (2011). Surveys of senior high school students (MEXT, 2014, 2015) found that most seniors' English proficiency level was at an *Eiken* Grade 3 level (equivalent to the A1 level on the CEFR). As the above indicate, the number of Japanese who can use English is not increasing, a great loss for both the country and its people, one that necessitates a change in Japanese language education. In a global age, people need to study several languages to communicate with people of different nationalities. Why don't teachers give students opportunities to study and use several foreign languages with MT? Enhancing linguistic performance could mean students using various languages with MT, following a multilingualism and/or plurilingualism approach. In this paper, plurilingualism is employed.

Until now, many teachers have thought that the inability to implement plurilingual education at the university level may be due to the need for a competent acquisition of English first and the acquisition of another foreign language later. But with MT, you can use English without having to learn it to a significant degree. Using MT, students may be able to communicate in English, be able to write cohesive essays, and be able to use other languages as well. It could also provide students with the freedom to decide which language they want to learn and which culture they want to learn about. Regarding employing MT to teach a foreign language, some English instructors may say, "You need to be able to judge whether the translated sentences are correct or not."* While that may be correct when considering only English ability, one feature of MT is that it is effective for dozens of foreign languages and enables communication without having to learn those languages.

3. An Educational Example Based on New Language Education

According to Gally (2019, p. 13), "The widespread availability of MT will lead to growing dissatisfaction with current language education policies and methods and to increased pressure for fundamental reforms. Language educators need to think deeply, both individually and collectively, about how best to respond." Let us consider the current educational environment of Japanese universities. There are three physical conditions to think about: longer class hours, the evolution of MT, and the ability to use PCs, iPads, and smartphones in classrooms. The current standard class time for many universities is 90 minutes, which could be extended to 100 or 105 minutes. How much time is enough or

too much in foreign language classes? Yamauchi (2013), a university education researcher, reported, "Yale University schedules 50 minutes for a language class."* (Location of Kindle No. 850/1985). Yamauchi asked why it was fifty minutes and was told that students could not stay focused for more than 50 minutes. (Location No. 850/1985).* In addition, Yamauchi states that classes at the Perpetual University in the Philippines are usually 60 minutes long and workshops there are 90 minutes long (Location No. 781/1985).* In 2006, the author of this paper visited ESL courses at the University of Regina and the University of Calgary in Canada; the classes were 50 minutes long. These examples show that a foreign language lesson should be 50 to 60 minutes long at most. It is certainly no easy task to actively engage a large number of students for close to 100 minutes with the current method of foreign language classes. Therefore, the author decided to propose the following lesson reforms for first-year foreign language compulsory classes at his school, starting from fiscal 2020, when the class time will be 105 minutes.

In this study's educational plan, each instructor conducts a lesson in his or her own style for 60 minutes out of 105 minutes, and as for the remaining 45 minutes, the full-time instructors discuss and prepare lesson plans with the part-time teachers. Each teacher is not required to use the lesson plans, but they are encouraged to do so. For the 45 minutes of activities, two lesson courses are prepared: (1) having students learn other foreign languages with MT and (2) teaching students intercultural understanding. Many part-time instructors are English language experts but are not well versed in education using MT; hence, full-time teachers should prepare lesson plans for using MT.

3.1. Language Education Using Machine Translation for 45 Minutes

With MT, you can communicate with people who speak different languages and come from different cultures. In a class using MT, students learn languages other than English. Even if the language they are learning is, for example, Chinese, the same process can be used for French, German, or most any other language. Considering the practicality of Chinese, many students choose to study it using MT after 60 minutes of English lessons. In consultation with part-time teachers, full-time teachers create lesson plans that allow students to study Chinese, even if the part-time teachers cannot speak Chinese. A lesson plan for a class with a low level of English proficiency will be described as an example. In the latter half of the 45 minutes, the fundamental policy is to let students use the target language. The dialogue learned during the first 60 minutes of the example English lesson (Kiyota et al., 2006, p.7) is:

Yuki: Linda plays the guitar, and I play the keyboards. Do you play any musical instruments, Sally?
Sally: Yes. I play the *shamisen*.
Yuki: What? Did you say *shamisen*?

Sally: Yes. I love Japanese traditional music as well as rock music. Actually I play the drums, too.
Linda: Fabulous! We are going to have a concert next month. We started a band four months ago. Please join our band.
Sally: Sounds exciting! OK.

Students use MT to translate the dialogue into Chinese. In the beginning, roughly two sentences are enough. The Google Translate translation is as follows:

结城：琳达弹吉他，我弹键盘。 你会弹奏乐器吗？
莎莉：是的。 我弹三弦琴。

Students can listen to the Chinese pronunciation as often as they like or need to, and they can see the Chinese pinyin. A Chinese education expert said that she could accept the Chinese written above without any problem. After having students practice this dialogue using MT, have them talk in pairs and have them shoot a video with their smartphones and send them to the teachers.

This is a way for teachers who do not understand Chinese to have students study Chinese. Some part-time English teachers may have studied German during school, some may have liked French, and some may have a Spanish high school teacher's license. Such teachers can allow students to study German, French, and Spanish instead of Chinese. It is important to learn how to use MT and to understand that learning any language is possible with MT. Students will understand that, once they have a fair command of English, they will be able to speak multiple languages.

3.2. Intercultural Understanding Education for 45 Minutes

From the survey referred to above regarding English education in Nakayama (2013, p. 34), it can be seen that currently, in junior high and high schools, education for understanding different cultures is not being carried out successfully. This is not only because of a lack of education for intercultural understanding. Arimoto (2011) states, "In recent years, young people have lost interest in foreign countries and have become more introverted."* This trend seems to be continuing. Regarding overseas literature, Jeffrey Archer (2010) said in an interview, "My book has ceased to sell in Japan, so I looked into the situation. I am relieved that Stephen King and John Grisham are losing sales. I worry about Japan's stagnation. The Japanese are punctual and have strength in organization, but they lack the flexibility to change."* In February 2013, there was no new guide for *Shincho* Bunko's (pocket book) overseas novels in their hanging advertisement inside commuter trains. Neither was there one in February 2020. Foreign literature is becoming less popular in Japan, possibly because the purpose of studying a foreign language for understanding different cultures has seldom been taught.

A 2020 interview with Sputniko!, who is an artist and researcher, was titled, “Inward Japan still male dominant— Sputniko! who has already protruded (out of Japanese society)!”* In the interview, she said, “I think that if people’s awareness is not directed outside, Japan will become an increasingly more exclusive society."* For foreign language education, it is necessary to teach the purpose of cultivating intercultural comprehension skills, and when encouraging plurilingual learning, it is particularly necessary to cultivate such skills. Learners who have been studying English to prepare for university entrance examinations and/or certifications do not seek to understand different cultures, as can be seen from the above-mentioned MEXT survey on awareness of English learning. Some comments from the students who read the above-mentioned author’s essay, "Promoting Plurilingualism in Japan,"* suggested that teachers needed to provide guidance on understanding different cultures, as many felt that there is a need for understanding different cultures.

In inter-cultural understanding education, after teaching the English language for 60 minutes, instructors can change their classes’ mood and conduct their lessons in Japanese. The important thing is to create the feeling that students are learning a foreign language to get to know other people; successful classes encourage students to understand the significance of inter-cultural understanding. The author has taught the class Intercultural Understanding for 15 years, but at the beginning only a few students registered for it. This was because the author’s faculty was business oriented, and few students were interested in cultural lessons. Therefore, the content of the theoretical lesson for understanding different cultures was changed, and the lesson was designed to explain understanding different cultures from a viewpoint that was familiar to students. Specifically, people’s own culture works to make it normal and to make other cultures seem foreign. Therefore, the author told the students that if they improved their ability to understand different cultures, they would be able to see various things objectively, that when cultures mix, wonderful things like *napolitan* (tomato ketchup-based spaghetti), *tarako* (cod roe) spaghetti, and *miso* ramen are born. Students responded, "When I look at the field of view from abroad, I feel that the usual way is not normal for me,"* "The more I learn in this class, the more places I want to go, the more things I want to do after commencement,"* and "I realize that it is important to think about various things which I usually do not take seriously."* These comments show the students had become interested in studying a foreign language. This class is now so popular that there are more than 80 students who wish to attend it, even though this class is only for juniors and seniors.

In addition, the author was given the opportunity to talk about the fun of language learning and the importance of understanding different cultures to all the first-year students in the faculty of his university. First, the author spoke about an experience of one of his students who stayed with a family in Australia as a high school student. Her homestay was with an Indian family, and she realized that she had prejudice against certain groups of people. The author also talked about using local languages as much as

possible when visiting a foreign country, making open communication possible. After the lecture, some attendees commented: "I thought it was unnecessary to have cultural lessons, but I was wrong,"* and "I had no interest in understanding different cultures until now, but I learned its importance."* This example might illustrate that the lessons of intercultural understanding starting with the episodes familiar to the leaners can awaken their interest in and help them to change their attitudes toward different cultures and the need of foreign language leaning as well.

4. Closing Remarks

Since December 2019, several meetings for Faculty Development were held to guide part-time teachers in understanding and implementing the two lesson plans mentioned above. Some full-time teachers commented that most of the part-time teachers understood how to instruct inter-cultural understanding, but that it would be difficult for them to help students study other languages using MT. Therefore, the author decided to demonstrate lesson plans on how to teach other languages using MT. During the first hour, teachers help students mainly in downloading software to their PCs, introducing Google Translate sites, and providing guidance on how to submit assignments. The second hour's teaching plan is a good example of one lesson plan with MT that is linked to a textbook. In cooperation with the Chinese teachers, the teaching plans will be prepared for 13 hours of class time, and the part-time teacher will refer to them. Below is an example of the second hour's lesson plan.

4.1 Teaching Example for the Second Hour (Sample of a Teacher's Instructions)

Until now, foreign language education has been based on the idea of learning a foreign language before using it. However, in language education using MT, the idea is to learn a foreign language and use a foreign language at the same time. In this period, you will study English and experience Chinese by using MT. Experience means that, in this class, I don't teach Chinese, but I'll show you how to study Chinese by yourself through MT.

First, open Google Translate and set "English" on the left and "Chinese (Simplified)" on the right. If you see a blue line below the language, you have set it up. In English, please type "I love you." You will then see「我爱你」displayed in Chinese (Simplified). Below that, the Chinese pinyin [Wǒ ài nǐ] is displayed. Over o, a, and i, there is a sign that indicates the pronunciation of the letter, but don't worry about it now. When you read those letters in Japanese romaji style, you can read "Wo ai ni." Click the speaker icon below. The first time the Chinese is read at normal speed, and the second and subsequent times it is read slowly. You can listen as many times as you want. Let's imitate the pronunciation a little in a quiet voice. It is not difficult. As for the meaning, 「我」means I and「爱」is a little different from Japanese *kanji*, but it is love. "你" is not found in

Japanese *kanji*, but you can see that it means you. The MT translation accuracy of English and Chinese is said to be very high.

Let's move away from Chinese and play with Google Translate. Click downward ″く″ in the Chinese (Simplified) area on the left to display the screen for selecting the language to translate. When that screen appears, choose German. What was displayed as 「我爱你」will change to [Ich liebe dich]. Roman letters are not displayed below the German letters. In German, there are some differences, such as reading /ch/ as /hi/, but other than that, romaji reading is usually OK. It is pronounced /Ihhi liibe dihhi/. Let's listen on the speaker. You can pronounce this too.

Now, let's try French. The display is "je t'aime," which is /ju tee mu/. Although it is a little bit tough for students to read French spelling with their knowledge, the pronunciation of the sentence seems to be understandable. Next, let's choose Korean. Korean characters are displayed and cannot be read without knowing them, so the romaji is displayed. If you ignore the sound of /g/ in the middle and read it, you can read /saranhe/. Let's listen and confirm that. With MT, if you can use English, you will be able to speak various languages besides Chinese.

If you have a translator, you may be convinced that it is okay to use Japanese instead of English. Yes, but it is far more accurate in English than in Japanese. This is especially true for long sentences. This method can also help you learn English.

Let's go back to Chinese (Simplified). The first sentence I learned last week in the textbook's UNIT 1 was "Oh, you are eating ice cream and potato chips." In translation, this is「哦，你在吃冰淇淋和薯片. It is a little long to practice this in Chinese for beginners, so practice only "You are eating ice cream." When you type the sentence, 「你在吃冰淇淋」[Nǐ zài chī bīngqílín] will be displayed. In pinyin, the Chinese Roman alphabet, /za/ is the sound /tsa/, /zi/ is the sound /tsi/, /ze/ is the sound /tse/, and /zo/ is the sound /tso/. /g/ is not pronounced, and /qi/ is the sound /chi/. The sentence is pronounced /Niet zeichi bin chi lin/. "Yeah, I love ice cream" is not tough: 「是的，我爱冰淇淋」[Shì de, wǒ ài bīngqílín]. Practice your pronunciation with Google Translate. Pair with your neighbor and practice it in English and Chinese.

Today's assignment is to write and send your impressions of today's class to me. If you find anything difficult or questionable, please write it down. Please write down also whether or not it was resolved. If you have a question, please write that down too. The submission of this impression is considered attendance.

Each instructor can read the lesson plan as it is, show it in PowerPoint, and print it out in class. When the author demonstrated it to the part-time teachers, there were many favorable opinions, such as, "I would like to study the language with the students," and "I totally agree with the teacher's opinion." Basically, the lessons are left to the arbitrariness of each teacher. At the end of the first semester in July, a set of questionnaires will be given to teachers and students. It will be interesting to see how plurilingual learning has been accepted.

As globalization progresses, the need for English and Chinese will increase from a practical standpoint. However, by making full use of MT, individuals will be able to come into contact with a wider variety of languages and understand more diverse values by learning several foreign languages. As a result, educated students will be able to cope with a multi-cultural society in which various values must be respected. Let us educate students that way.

[notes] Comments marked * are originally written in the Japanese language, and they are translated into the English language by the author.

References

Archer, J. (2010). *Oita 2dai seitou* [The old political parties]. *The Nikkei*, The morning paper of 4th July 2010, page 9.

Asahi Shinbun (2018). *Tensei jingo, daily column*, The morning paper of 23rd March 2018, page 1.

Asahi Shinbun Monzo II. Retrieved from <http://database.asahi.com/library2/main /top.php>. on 27th December 2013.

Arimoto, S. (2011). *Wakamono no uchimuki shikou, Kokusai kyousou ryoku no teika --- Nihon shakai no shikumi no konponteki henkaku wo!* [Young people are inward orientated. International competitiveness decline. --- Fundamental change in the structure of Japanese society is necessary]. Retrieved from http://news. searchina.ne.jp /disp.cgi?y=2010&d=0811&f= column_ 0811_007.shtml on 4th January 2011.

Gally, T. (2019). The Implications of Machine Translation for English Education in Japan, *Language Teacher Education*, 6(2), 1-14.

Hisamura, K. (2017). *Gaikokugo kyouiku no mokuteki to igi* [Purpose and significance of foreign language education] in JACET SIG on English Language Education (eds) Action-oriented teaching and learning, Tokyo: Sanshusha Press.

Kiyota, Y., Sakai, S., Minowa, M., Tanabe, A., Oosaki, S., Farquharson, M. (2006). *ENGLISH QUEST BASIC*, Tokyo: Kirihara Press.

Kotobank. What is globalization., Retrieved from: https://kotobank.jp/word/%E3%82%B0%E3%83%AD%E3%83%BC%E3%83%90 %E3%83%AB%E5%8C%96-181351, on 27th December 2019.

MEXT. (2014). School year 26 of Heisei's A Report of Survey of English Ability for Reform of English Education, http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/ gaikokugo/ 1358258.htm onv30th April 2017.

MEXT. (2015). School year 27 of Heisei's A Report of Survey Results of 12th graders' English Ability (Summary) Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/

shingi/ chousa/shotou /117/shiryo/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2016/05/24 /1368985_7_1.pdf, on 30th April 2017.

MEXT (2017). Chapter 2 Each subject Section 9 Foreign languages, in *Course of Study*, Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail /__icsFiles/afieldfile/2017/06/21/1384661_5.pdf, on 1st May 2017.

Nakayama, N. (2013): Section 4: Perceptions of in-service Teachers of English regarding Descriptors Focusing on the Development of Learners' Intercultural Competence in Hisamura (Eds.) *A Comprehensive Study on the Framework of English Language Teachers' Professional Development in Japan.* JACET SIG on English Language Education.

NEWSWEEK (2011). *Eigo to Nihonjin* [English and Japanese], The issue of 5th May 2011.

Nishi, T. (2018). *Guro-baru ka to kokusai ka* [Globalization and internationalization] Retrieved from http://www. world-economic-review.jp/impact/article1005.html, on 27th December 2019.

OECD (2005). The definition and selection of key competencies: Executive summary. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/47/61/35070367. pdf, on 1st May 2017.

Otani, Y. (2007). Nihonjin ni totte eigo towa nanika [What Is English for Japanese], Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten Press.

Parmenter, L. (2004): *Shougakkou deno gaikokugo kyouiku wa eigo dake?* [Is only English taught in foreign language education in elementary school?]. *English Education Magazine*. Vol. 53, no. 2, 30−32. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten Press.

Sakai, S. (2014): *Global ka notameno gogaku program wo tantousuru nihonjin daigaku kyouin no ishiki ni kansuru kenkyu* [A Study on the consciousness of the Japanese university faculty members in charge of the language program for globalization]. *Journal of Japan Association of Developmental Education,* 9(1), 57−68.

Sakai, S. (2018). *Nihon ni okeru fukugengo shugi no susume* [Recommendation of plurilingualism in Japanese educational settings] , LET Kyushu-Okinawa BULLETIN 18 (0), 1-14. Kyushu-Okinawa branch of LET.

Tukahara, N. (2015). *Dai 4 sho Aran dani ni okeru souki tagengo kyouiku* [Chapter 4: Early pluri-'language education' in the Val d'Aran]. In Ohki, M. & N. Nishiyama (Eds.), *Sekai to nihon no shougakko no eigo kyouiku* [*The primary school English education in Japan and around the world]* (pp.102−124). Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.

Spotniko! (2020). *Mada dansei yuui na uchimuki Nihon --- Hamidashi zumi no Spotniko!* [Japan is still inward and male-oriented --- Sputniko! has already been

protruding.] Retrieved from The Asahi Shimbun Digital Edition, on 14th January 2020.

Yamauchi, D. (2013). *Daigaku no uso hensachi 60 ijou no daigaku wa iranai* [Lies about universities in Japan --- No need to enter a university with a deviation value of 60 or more], Tokyo: Kadokawa Press, Kindle version.

【Chronicle】

April 2019 — March 2020

Presentations by the SIG members:

Date	Title and Presenter(s) Venue	Event
June 22-23	**June 22** 1. "Can Public Primary School Children Reach CEFR A1: Results from a Follow-up Survey Using a Four-Skills Test and Questionnaire follow-up survey" Sakiko Yoneda & Yoichi Nishimura 2. CELES Theme Project "The practical examples of CLIL practices in Japanese elementary schools", Adachi Rie Hokuriku University	The 49th CELES Annual Conference
June 27-29	**June 27** "How to conduct CLIL in primary schools in Japan" Rie Adachi **June 28** 1. " Core Competences of EFL Instructors at Elementary Schools in Japan: Preliminary Findings" Ken Hisamura, Hisatake Jimbo, Fumiko Kurihara, & Shien Sakai 2. "A reflective tool for Japanese student teachers' professional development in foreign language teaching" Yukie Endo The Ambassador Hotel, Bangkok, Thailand	ASIA TEFL 2019
July 7	"Findings From 'J-POSTL Elementary' Nationwide Survey Targeting Elementary School Teachers" Natsue Nakayama, Takane Yamaguchi, & Ken Hisamura. Toyo University	The 12th JACET Kanto Chapter Conference
July 20-21	**July 21** JES Project Study: "The effects of CLIL practices on elementary school pupils", Adachi Rie, Abe Shino, Kashimoto Hiroko, Kitano Yuki, Takeda Rika, Matsunobu Aki, & Yasuda Mari Hokkaido Kagaku University	The 19th National Conference of the JES in Hokkaido
July 29	"Planning Lessons to Foster Intercultural Competence among Students" Natsue Nakayama Yokosuka City Education Laboratory	Yokosuka City International Education Research Group

August 3-4	Workshop: "Cross-curricular foreign language education: Why don't you introduce CLIL?" Rie Adachi Nagoya Gakuin University	The 56 National Conference of New English Teachers' Association in Aichi
August 10-11	**August 11** "The Qualities and Abilities Required of Students Enrolled in an Elementary School Teaching Course: Based on the Analyses of the First Student Survey" Takane Yamaguchi & Sakiko Yoneda Yokohama National University	The 43rd KATE Conference
August 17-18	**August 17** "Qualities and abilities related to English language teaching required of elementary school teachers projected from a questionnaire survey" Takane Yamaguchi & Shien Sakai **August 18** "An international project-based learning and EFL education -A case study at a private elementary school-" Adachi Rie, Hirosaki University	The 45th JASELE at Hirosaki
August 22	Lecture: "Systematizing Portfolios as Reflection Tools", Hisatake Jimbo & Ken Hisamura Wayo Gakuen Sky Building (Wayo Forum)	The 71 AJELC Regular Study Meeting
August 28-30	Activity Report of the JACET SIG on English Language Education JAAL in JACET (JACET SIG) Poster Session Nagoya Institute of Technology	The 58th JACET International Convention
October 24	"English Learning Portfolio and Project-based Learning" Yoichi Kiyota Niigata Prefectural Niigata Chuo High School	Lecture sponsored by English Conference of the Niigata Prefecture High School Education Research Association
October 27	"Proposals for Intercultural Understanding Activities that are Appropriate for Learners' Cognitive Developmental Stages: Focusing on Cultural Differences in the Way We Perceive Color" Natsue Nakayama, Junya Narita, & Kagari Tsuchiya. Osaka Seikei University	JASTEC 39th Autumn Convention

November 2	"Team-Teaching for In- and Pre-service Teachers (Practice-Oriented Long Workshop)" Kaori Yoshizumi, Hiromi Kawai, Neil Curry, Isra Wongsarnpigoon, Phoebe Lyon, & Jennie Roloff Rothman WINC Aichi, Nagoya City, Aichi	JALT 2019
November 9	"Developing tools for English educators in Japan: Towards effective implementation of 'proactive, interactive, and deep (reflective) learning' at elementary, junior, and senior high schools" Ken Hisamura & Fumiko Kurihara Toyo University, Hakusan Campus	Lecture Meeting co-hosted by JACET Kanto Chapter and Toyo University
November 9-10	"Language Learning in Cooperation with Museums" Yoichi Kiyota, Shino Abe, & Georgette Wilson Chien Tan Overseas Youth Center, Taipei	28th International Symposium and Book Fair on English Teaching
December 14	Lecture: "Learners' View of Learning Foreign Languages: What to Teach in the Age of Globalized Society and Machine Translation", Shien Sakai Toyo University, Hakusan Campus	JACE Kanto Chapter Regular Meeting

Abbreviations

AJELC: The Association for Japanese and English Language and Culture
CELES: Chubu English Language Education Society
JACET: The Japan Association of College English Teachers
JES: The Japan Association of English Teaching in Elementary Schools
JASELE: The Japan Society of English Language Education
JASTEC: The Japan Association for the Study of Teaching English to Children
JALT：The Japan Association for Language Teaching
KATE: Kantokoshinetsu Association of Teachers of English

Language Teacher Education

Submission Guidelines

1. Requirements

Contributors and co-authors should be SIG or JACET members. However, contributions from the users of J-POSTL or researchers/practitioners of language teacher education as well as primary/secondary foreign language education are welcome.

2. Editorial Policy

Language Teacher Education, a refereed journal, encourages submission of the following:

Genre	Contents	Number of words
Research Paper	Full-length academic articles on the transportability or the use of *J-POSTL* or on language teacher education and related fields.	Within 8,000
Research Note	Discussion notes on *J-POSTL* or on language teacher education and related fields.	Within 6,000
Practical Report	Reports on classroom application of J-POSTL or on language teacher education and related fields.	Within 6,000
Other	Reports of conferences, PD activities, materials, research programs, etc. related to *J-POSTL* or language teacher education and related fields.	Within 4,000
Book Review	Book reviews on language education	Within 2,000

3. Submission Procedure

- *Language Teacher Education* invites submissions for both Japanese and English editions.
- Data Entry: The data with the name(s), affiliation(s), e-mail address(es), and abstract should be sent to the e-mail address below no later than November 31 for Japanese edition and April 30 for English edition.
- The complete manuscript for publication in March issue (Japanese edition) should be sent to the email address below no later than January 10, and that for publication in July issue (English edition) no later than June 15.

Email to: 大崎さつき　Satsuki Osaki　soosaki@soka.ac.jp

4. Formatting guidelines for submissions in English

Full-length manuscripts in MS W, conforming to APA 6 edition style, should not exceed 8,000 words on A4 paper (Leave margins of 30mm on all sides of every page / Use 12-point Times New Roman, 80 letters×40 lines), including title (14-point Times New Roman), headings (12-point Times New Roman in bold type), abstract (200-300 words), key words (no more than 5 words), references, figures, tables , and appendix. (See, template on the SIG website)

Language Teacher Education
言語教師教育 2020
Vol.7 No.2
Online edition: ISSN 2188-8264　Print edition: ISSN 2188-8256
令和 2 年（2020 年）8 月 25 日
発行者　JACET 教育問題研究会
JACET SIG on English Language Education
http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/
代表 清田洋一
〒169-8050 東京都新宿区西早稲田 1－6－1
早稲田大学商学学術院　神保尚武　気付
電話　03－5286－2081
印刷所　有限会社　桐文社
〒142-0053　東京都品川区中延 6－2－22　エボンビル 1 階
電話　03－3781－4010
本書の印刷費には科学研究費補助金（基盤(B)）（課題番号：19H01288）が使われています。

JACETSIG-ELE Journal
Language Teacher Education and Related Fields

成長のための省察ツール

言語教師のポートフォリオ

JACET教育問題研究会　<http://www.waseda.jp/assoc-jacetenedu/>
監修：神保尚武／編集：久村　研，酒井志延、髙木亜希子、清田洋一

■　「言語教師のポートフォリオ」には，【英語教師教育全編】【英語教職課程編】【現職英語教師編】の３編があります。それぞれの用途によって使い分けることができます。本ポートフォリオの主な特徴は次の通りです。

・英語教師に求められる授業力を明示する。
・授業力とそれを支える基礎知識・技術の振り返りを促す。
・同僚や指導者との話し合いと協働を促進する。
・自らの授業の自己評価力を高める。
・成長を記録する手段を提供する。

■　本ポートフォリオの中核には，Can-Do形式の180の自己評価記述文があります。これらの記述文は，授業力に関する系統的な考え方を提供しており，単なるチェック・リストではありません。教職課程の履修生，現職教師，実習や教員研修の指導者・メンターなどが利用したり，お互いに意見を交換したりする際に，省察を深めるツールとして機能すること，教職の専門意識を高める役割を果たすことが期待されます。