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ABSTRACT:
This is a study of how EFL teachers’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds and attitudes are articulated as authentic and powerful practices in pedagogical spaces (Presence.) Presence is defined using a poststructuralist framework as the production of meaningful interactions between teachers and students in classroom settings. Using a qualitative research design, three case studies of Japanese EFL teachers at a rural Japanese High School were used, collecting data on-site from interviews, observations, lesson plans, and school reports. The results showed Presence when teachers articulated authentic and powerful language pedagogy directly connected to their attitudes and cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and not simply through the automatic delivery of the prescribed lesson. Theoretically, results critically rethink EFL pedagogy; authentic language practice is a continuum of multiple, site-specific relationships demanding mutual intelligibility, not the application of a decontextualized curriculum. Educational implications offer evidence for integrating pedagogies of Presence into transformative EFL education classrooms.
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Chapter One: Purpose of the Study and Statement of the Research Problem:

Spaces, Systems, and Intelligibility

As a classroom teacher since 2003, I often would spend hours planning a lesson, making activities, perhaps even doing research into teaching methods that had empirically sound evidence to support why or how that lesson should be useful. Trying it out in a real-time classroom, however, I often found myself surprised and confused why the lesson sometimes failed, why students sometimes completely misunderstood the directions, or why the finished product at the end of the lesson came out considerably different than I (or the researchers who designed the lesson with their sound methodology) had intended. Indeed, as a classroom teacher, so much of what actually happened in that real time, dynamic, hybrid classroom setting seemed mysterious, accidental, or unknown to me: a product perhaps just of individual differences, esoteric environmental factors, or some other hidden element simply impossible to determine. It was a mystery to me why some students did better than others, despite having similar achievement or proficiency levels, why some students appeared to enjoy the lesson while others appeared to hate it, even though they seemed to share similar interests and backgrounds, why some classrooms produced more demonstrable linguistic or learning outcomes despite having the same curriculum, textbook, or even teacher as the one next door or next period, or why one approach worked well on one day and not on another. All things being equal, I should have found similarity, therefore why was I continually finding such difference? Given the demands of a busy schedule and an ever-increasing stack of papers to grade or activities to plan, I found that these differences just became, over time, viewed as simply the challenges to be faced in any class, the product of a change in the barometric pressure, a full moon, that 5-to-10% chance of rain or storms present on any sunny day, or something towards which I’d simply have to accept as a
classroom teacher working with young people, to be lamented over extended coffee breaks in the Teacher’s Lounge.

Quite simply put, the purpose of this dissertation research will be to challenge those assumptions and traditionally held attitudes about classroom pedagogy and account for those mysteries seemingly present in its margins. The study intends through a qualitative research methodology to increase the practical and theoretical understanding for teacher education into how individual pedagogical spaces are produced, deployed, and maintained in the English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) classroom, spaces which will dictate quite literally the practices, teaching strategies, and linguistic outcomes that are possible therein. More specifically, it will be shown how these spaces are produced as self-structured and determined social systems (Luhmann, 1984), and how that production will also account for all of its practices, even those that seem mysterious or uncontrollable. Through this analysis, we will see that why and how things work and function in a classroom are less a product of chance than instead a product of real-time, hybrid, complex relationships that are produced and modified continuously between participants (Larsen-Freeman, 2008; Walkerdine, 1997). More than simply the physical location in which EFL teaching and learning will take place, instead pedagogical spaces for this study will be the multiple, dynamic, individually-created and deployed-in-real-time vehicles by which negotiations of meaning happen, always with and in relation to others (Bhabha, 1994; Gutierrez, 2008). It is in these spaces that classroom relationships will form, and where EFL linguistic outcomes (in whatever final form) will take place.

My practical contribution to the field of EFL research will be to take away the mystery and the frustration teachers (like myself) had when, for example, I tried the same lesson with three different classrooms, two of which worked, and one of which fell completely flat. My
purpose will be to show that there are demonstrable, observable, and understandable factors present in the pedagogical space itself which account for these differences, and which can help classroom teachers become more attuned, flexible, and site-specific in their teaching practice. My theoretical contribution will be to illustrate how specific factors (cultural attitudes and power) interrelate with the real-time environment itself and foster the production of these spaces for the participants as self-determined systems, which will then dictate very clearly the types of pedagogy that become possible in those spaces. This will be accomplished by means of a reflexive ethnography of the classroom practices at a rural Japanese high school, with three close case-studies of the individual teachers there and their daily teaching schedules (Clifford, 1986) over the course of a full academic term of approximately three months.

**Operational Definitions**

This study will utilize multiple categories and terms in specific ways that require clear elaboration from the outset (also see Appendix F: Glossary of Key Terms.) First, *pedagogy* will be defined not only as the practice of teaching or the strategies designed to produce learning from students, but instead as a relationship between dynamic participants in a specific pedagogical space that is without clearly pre-defined or generalizable parameters. As such, this definition incorporates, but also expands upon, a large body of critical pedagogy research (Freire, 1970; McLaren, 1986), and seeks to move beyond a dualism of teacher/student (or pedagogue/learner), instead creating a fluid continuum in which teachers are also sometimes learners from other participants, and learners also sometimes teachers to other participants. These multiple roles take place dynamically in real time, in concert with those other participants, and in and of themselves are not necessarily parsed out into defined “roles” as the classroom practice continues.
Next, *attitudes* for this study will be defined as the vehicle of exchanges of intelligibility between participants, composed of two analytic categories: (1) their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and (2) expressed motivations and purposes for teaching (Baker, 1992; Felix-Holt & Gonzalez, 1999; Gardner et al., 1983; Gonzalez, 1994). These attitudes are brought into the classroom space by participants from the first day, made up of their previous experiences and their individual ideas about pedagogy. The articulation of these experiences and ideas set the initial stage for the types of practice that are intelligible in the pedagogical space, which continues to develop in real-time during the lessons themselves. By *practices* (Abasi & Akbari, 2008; Bourdieu, 1978), I mean the entire ways in which participants in the pedagogical process affect and instigate teaching in a real, material and situated space: for example, the uses of classroom space and time, daily instructional routines, and the fluid, dynamic, and interactive sets of power exchanges that make them intelligible. Following, *power* (Bourdieu, 1982; Foucault, 1976) will be defined as the practice or exercise in real-time and space by which participants in the pedagogical space articulate those attitudes and effect intelligibility. Like participant attitudes, power for this study will be composed of two further categories, each of which take place in real, observable, and intelligible spaces: (1) verbal articulations (for example, *what* participants said when, to whom, and how), and (2) non-verbal articulations (for example, *how* participants voiced their verbal articulations, including gestures, facial expressions, movements, etc., or the gestures or movements themselves in absence of verbal articulation.) In utilizing such categories, power can be analyzed in multiple ways for multiple effects: for example, who spoke or remained silent in the classroom space, how and what one said (or did not say), who was called upon to answer or who volunteered, how others reacted to that answer or volunteering, who supported or resisted the classroom atmosphere, who dominated or
subordinated discussions, and so forth are all intelligible and meaningful in the pedagogical space.

Through the interplay of all of the factors described above, power plays the key role of defining the pedagogical spaces along the lines of attitudes (Bashir-Ali, 2006; Harklau, 2000; Miller, 2007; Pierce, 1995), by articulating through individual practices what is meaningful and intelligible in the pedagogical space for participants, though not always consciously. For these teachers, power will articulate their attitudes, for example, about the types of answers they expect or believe to be “correct,” the types of performances or linguistic outcomes that have meaning for the lesson and which they are willing to accept, or conversely the types of behaviors, expressions, or practices that they consider unacceptable, wrong, or counterproductive. Since these articulations are never in isolation, but are constructed as exchanges with other participants, we can see perhaps that for students, power can be articulated in a very similar way, though with demonstrably different results: it can be used to suppress their own feelings in staying “quiet,” or in accepting whatever the teacher tells them, or conversely to articulate their own attitudes about what responses they feel are comfortable, easier, correct, or even incorrect (in the case of rebellion, or “bad” behavior) (Bashir-Ali, 2006).

From these articulated exchanges of intelligibility and meaning, the pedagogical space is produced as a self-contained, self-determined, “autopoietic” system (Luhmann, 1984; Maturana & Varela, 1992), which sets in motion all of the pedagogical and linguistic outcomes that take place within and continue to change and adapt in real-time. Thus, autopoietic systems for this study will be defined as the self-determined, self-generated enclosures (such as language classroom spaces) produced conceptually and physically by participants together within much larger environments of infinite complexity (such as schools, towns, nations, or the undesignated
physical environment outside the classroom.) Understanding this production and following through on an ethnography of such individual classroom spaces, it will then become clearer how and why the classroom functions as it does (or, as the case may be, does not function productively) in a complex, hybrid, real-time environment.

In order to elucidate these factors, a reflexive ethnography (Bettie, 2003; Clifford, 1986) was employed to document the production of pedagogical spaces as dynamic continuums of participatory exchange in the second language (L2). A reflexive ethnography was chosen because, in contrast to traditional ethnographies, the “reflexive” component always takes into account and allows for the individuality and humanity of the researcher, observer, and participants as an integral part of the research. Instead of searching for some contrived sense of “objectivity,” instead a reflexive ethnography realizes that the researcher himself or herself changes, chooses, adapts, and responds to the research and observations in ways that should be taken into account, and included as a part of the research process itself. Further, it also takes into account the preferences, biases, and individual relationships that the researcher naturally has with his or her research and its participants; we choose the type of research in which we engage, we seek out those participants, and we feel that such research and participants have a stake within a larger body of discourse and knowledge. As such, in reflexive ethnography, these biases are spelled out clearly as constitutive elements of the research process itself, and not as problems or situations to be hidden, or avoided altogether.

Within this ethnography will be three case-studies of native-Japanese English teachers at a rural high school in Western Japan, documenting the specific pedagogical practices that constructed and conditioned the classroom spaces as systems, their deployment, and the reactions to them by students. In presenting these data, my further contribution will be to show how L2
learning in these spaces is less about the integration or application of transcendental linguistic rules from a prescribed curriculum, less about achievement through close attenuation to the very lessons themselves, and instead more about how the individual, dynamic, and multiple negotiations of meaning (as articulated practices) become intelligible to and determined by exchanges of “presence” (Gumbrecht, 2006; Nancy, 1993) in real-time with the other participants. Though this term will be explained more fully in the literature review, by “presence,” (hereafter spelled Presence to differentiate between the normal usage of the word and this more specific meaning) I build upon a body of work in Social Systems and Post-structural Theory that look for exchanges between individuals that are less based on transcendental interpretations, meanings, abstract formulas, translations, or rules, and instead on creating a sense of being, immediacy, reality, and site-specificity that constantly generates (and re-generates) its own rules and meanings. Or, to be more precise, Presence is an attunement within a situated space, as a system, to the rules, formations, and generated practices that conditioned the production of that space. For this study, this “attunement” will be called an anti-transcendental attitude, meaning quite literally a focus on site-specificity instead of generalization, immediacy instead of deferment, observable practices instead of abstractions (Larsen-Freeman, 2002; Lozar, 2009).

Though the above research is largely theoretical within the literary, social science, and critical studies of Luhmann and Gumbrecht, for the purposes of teacher education research, I will operationally define Presence as the articulation (as reproduction and deployment) in a pedagogical space of the sets of constitutive practices under which the content being instructed became intelligible to the instructor. While this definition will be further examined in detail in the following sections, within the more specific field of L2 studies, this definition could be explained as the sets of dynamic practices that more closely mimic, produce, or utilize exchanges
in the L2 or C2 much like native-language speakers would have in their “real” L1 home environments. In the same way that one’s native language is always “present” to them, the goal of Presence for EFL education is to produce structurally the same types of attitudes, along with their articulation through power as practices, in the L2 classroom. Nevertheless, the key is that such articulation must be dynamic, is not necessarily conscious or fully intentional, and is always produced and deployed for specific exchanges with real stakes. Further, this definition does not mean the reproduction of the literal practices (for example, copying a curriculum from or trying to recreate a classroom in Japan that looks like one in England, Australia, or the United States), but instead a broader conceptual reproduction by teachers of the situations and techniques by which such L2 exchanges became intelligible for them individually.

As such, this study has two major, interrelated, goals: (1) to show the steps by which pedagogical spaces form as systems, attempting to account for and give an analytic measure of the range of the dynamic, hybrid practices produced therein; and (2) to show how the spaces that produce the strongest and most varied linguistic outcomes were those that showed an attunement to the site-specific concerns generated within that system, and that both structurally and conceptually approached a Present L1 learning space, while still situated in a non-native EFL environment with a non-native English teacher.

Nevertheless, it is essential to note from the start that this study will not argue that such an “L1 learning space” can only be produced by a teacher who has spent time in a native-English speaking environment; instead, it will argue the opposite: that structurally the rules and practices of an autopoietic system, and of classroom Presence within it, require attunement to its own rules of formation for intelligibility to occur, which allows for the multiplicity of learning styles and approaches of each individual to be the articulated means by which such linguistic outcomes will
be produced. As such, the recommendation will not be that “all Japanese teachers need to go, or have been, to a native-English speaking nation in order to produce Present classrooms in Japan.” Instead, the recommendation will be for a more localized, more multiple, anti-transcendental attitude that will allow each individual teacher’s multiple, dynamic set of practices to relate to each of the other participants in the learning space, and allow intelligibility and linguistic outcomes to occur multiply, based on the individual needs, demands, and even idiosyncrasies of those participants.

**Importance of the Study**

In accomplishing the above goals, this study gives valuable empirical evidence that EFL pedagogy are a constantly produced continuum of relationships between real individuals, each with his or her own sets of dynamic spaces and attitudes for learning. Further, these are produced and deployed by means of real, analytically observable factors that are intelligible to all teachers, searching to serve better the needs of their students and transform their own practice. Thus, there is no teacher who is better prepared, as such, than his or her peers for teaching, simply because they have attended a lecture, teacher training workshop, or a university program with internationally high rankings. Though of course teachers who have these experiences are not necessarily at a disadvantage, it is critical to understand that such experiences are not universally applicable as such. In carrying over those experiences directly into a different pedagogical space, the application becomes transcendental, for it has taken the practice out of alignment with the dynamic rules of intelligibility under which that space formed as a system.

For the many EFL teachers in Japan working within very complex, difficult school situations who have not had these opportunities of travel or specific types of teacher preparation, it is essential to present strategies by which intelligibility with their students can, fundamentally,
occur. For at the end of the day, these teachers are professionals, motivated by numerous personal and professional pressures to help their students, help their schools, and help themselves. This study gives these teachers the tools to understand that it is not what they have that ultimately counts, but instead how that “what” is articulated in real-time and in accordance with the dynamically produced rules of their classroom as a system of exchange.

**Statement of the Problem**

The above goals and purposes are not academic exercises or projects for conceptual thought; in looking at these issues for Japanese EFL studies within the scope of nearly two decades of empirical research, it is clear that they could not come at a more critical or important time. Simply put: English within the Japanese education system is at a crossroads and in grave trouble. Looking at any of the hundreds of studies about the English education programming instigated in Japan since the 1980’s (MEXT, 2006; MEXT, 2008; et. al) one can see that despite large-scale funding, international and cultural interaction, and even a native-English speaking government-level exchange program (the JET Programme, funded and sponsored by the Education Ministry), Japan still has lower English proficiency and linguistic outcomes than its Asian neighbors (MEXT, 2003.) Further, even within the Japanese classroom itself, research suggests the extent to which participants (meaning both teachers and students) have great difficulty creating and maintaining pedagogical spaces that promote communication, interaction, and authentic linguistic outcomes (Manto, 1988) and are unsure how even to define core concepts for language learning like communicative competence (Nazari, 2007.)

The problem is real, and exists well beyond academic journals and empirical research; it is also a problem that I have seen personally affect teachers and students in Japanese schools, despite their years of training, practice, intense accountability, pressure, and study. Since the
summer of 2007, I have been working with a local school district in rural western Japan (hereafter called by the pseudonym Matsuoka), helping to develop their English programs for their local High School (which corresponds to grades 10-12 in the United States) in coordination with their three English teachers (who I will call by the pseudonyms Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe, and Ms. Nakamura respectively.) In this district, I could see very clearly what the research has suggested, namely a sense of frustration and often alienation on the part of students as they tried to grapple with English and its various, often impossibly difficult, idiosyncrasies. Asking any one of them randomly what they thought of their English learning and the answer was invariably the same, “I hate it. It’s so difficult, the grammar is so tough, and there are so many exceptions to the rule!” On the other hand, glancing down at the book in their hands, or at the music playing on their Ipod during the lunch break, invariably it would be a translation of *Harry Potter* (or more recently *Twilight*), and the music would be Britney Spears, Eminem, Tupac Shakur, or even the Beatles. Asking them about this seeming discrepancy, they would turn their heads quizzically, failing to connect the “boring” and difficult language they just studied in second period and the real, natural setting in which it was used. They loved the US; they loved Britain, they just hated English.

At the same time, I could sense frustration and alienation on the part of teachers, as well, as they tried to negotiate their own stressful schedules, requirements to accommodate a large amount of standardized tests, lack of student motivation, and their own varied educational and personal backgrounds with language teaching. Even though they taught from the same textbook, prepared the same lessons, and divided the students up into levels of comparable proficiency, there were vastly different outcomes from day to day (and from term to term) between the individual classes and the language skills the students in them were able to demonstrate. Unsure
how to account for these differences, the teachers fell further and further into their established plans, rigidly adhering to the same types of prescribed lessons that they had taught the term before, sometimes to demonstrably positive effect, and other times completely missing their students’ attention and producing almost no linguistic outcomes. Speaking with me during my visits to their school, all three of the teachers expressed frustration and bewilderment as to why some lessons worked, why some did not, and how best to integrate their own teaching ideas and background into their lessons.

This dissertation addresses these concerns for the purposes of alleviating these frustrations. By giving a detailed account of how articulated attitudes form dynamic spaces, which condition the very possibility of language pedagogy and dictate the practices that can occur, followed by an account of how their own attempts (or, indeed mis-attempts) at classroom Presence articulated specific types of practices, this study can give critical help to these teachers as they struggle with large classrooms of unmotivated students, vast differences in interest and personal style, and hectic, difficult schedules that push them to the limits of physical and mental endurance. From such a personal and localized examination, the findings can then illuminate the assorted, often abstract data borne out in the published reports mentioned above.

Theoretical Framework

In order to address the above concerns, this study utilizes a theoretical framework of transformative education, applied to the EFL setting. Defined simply, transformative education is a body of pedagogical practice that questions both the foundations and purposes of classroom education, with the goal of avoiding general, transcendental, dualistic, or authoritative categories in place of site-specific, situated, and individualized strategies built around the free interaction and relationship of participants (Gilpin & Liston, 2009; Hooks, 1994; Morrell, 2009.) Such
practices allow a research focus on the dynamic structures present in classroom spaces (Crookes & Shin, 2005; McLaren, 1986), attempting to take nothing as given and nothing for granted in creating egalitarian, participatory, and empowered learning contexts for teachers and students. Further, transformative educational practice allows these participants (meaning teachers, students, as well as researchers) to utilize their power as unique individuals with real cultural and linguistic attitudes in articulating their own needs and interests (Giroux, 1987; Horkheimer, 2002.) Questioning a traditional classroom structure of lecturing, active teachers and passive, “oppressed” students (Freire, 1970), transformative practice research dissolves binary and dualistic categories (teacher/student, good/bad, right/wrong, top/bottom, etc.) in place of dynamic, fluid, multiple relationships between participants. Indeed, in transformative practice, the entire notion of just who or what teachers and students are is questioned, seeing them not as separate or oppositional units, but instead as forces working together along a fluid continuum, in order to accomplish pedagogical goals and increase outcomes according to their individual needs.

Further, implementing the research related to Presence within classrooms as systems (Eco, 1990; Larsen-Freeman, 2006; Luhmann, 1984; Vattimo, 1997), this theoretical framework shows how those relationships function to creating authentic activities in the EFL classroom that have demonstrable and observable effects, which then create real linguistic outcomes. Though this particular body of research has not hitherto been utilized in language or education studies (coming instead from literature and critical studies), I address this gap by outlining in the next chapter numerous applications for these factors in real pedagogical spaces (see Figure 1).
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Figure 1: Relation of Attitudes to Power
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Chapter Two: Research Objectives and Review of the Literature:

Multiple Practices and the Articulation of Power

Research Objectives

This study shows not general, binary, or dialectical evidence of its outcomes and methods, but instead a continuum of multiple, hybrid practices in real settings, all of which are adapted and modified in non-linear ways through the attitudes of the individual participants. These attitudes are not always intuitive, smooth, or intelligible along the lines of traditional qualitative research, nor do they necessarily fall within pre-established methodologies and research designs. Nevertheless, these sometimes contradictory, fluid practices are fundamentally made intelligible by means of transformative, exploratory social science research. As such, instead of specific research questions to be answered in a definitive way, the study instead offers three main research objectives that nurture such evolving practices:

- The first objective is to document the attitudes that contribute to the pedagogical practices of the three native-Japanese English teachers.
- The second objective is to show how power conditions the articulation of those attitudes as practices, and organizes their pedagogical spaces in specific, observable ways, as relationships and exchanges between their fellow participants.
- The final objective of this study is to show, document, and analyze classroom Presence as the articulation of specific types of practices, situated within dynamic pedagogical spaces and observable within individual lessons.

The next section will support these objectives with relevant data drawn from the literature, grounding the discussion in prior research in language studies, education, and philosophy.
Review of the Literature

Many factors contribute to classroom practices, the construction of the classroom space, and the ways in which those practices are (or are not) articulated in those settings as Presence. As such, the literature review that follows first discusses the theoretical framework of transformative teacher practices, followed then by an examination of how such practices are articulated and defined in the classroom space according to power and the attitudes of participants. Finally, this review will show the importance of pedagogy, introducing Presence to foster the growth of participatory and empowered pedagogical spaces for participants.

Background: Post-structuralism and the transformation of practice

Starting in the late 1960s, researchers began critically to question the development and use of social structures and practices in lived historical and material settings. Far from being natural, inherent, or inevitable, instead these studies found that certain ideas, attitudes, norms, and people were privileged over and above other groups, utilizing social institutions for their own purposes and benefit (Baudrillard, 1978; de Certeau, 1984; Deleuze, 1972; Foucault, 1980; Luhmann, 1984). These studies, grouped loosely under the category of poststructuralism and systems theory, articulated and described without recourse to transcendental or general categories how this privilege took place, how those institutions were used, the rules of formation for the concepts used to enforce such privilege, and how the groups existing at the margins were impacted upon by them in dynamic settings. They found that the key component at play in emphasizing or articulating certain ideas or groups, or in advancing one agenda over another, was power (Bourdieu, 1976; Foucault, 1977). In poststructuralist inquiry, power is a multiple, dynamic social practice that is always exercised, always something used and articulated, and never something static that can be held in one place or contained in and of itself. It is a
complicated exchange between parties in real situations, observable in terms of who speaks or
remains silent, what they are allowed to say, who is allowed to move in certain situations and
how, what behaviors are allowed to be displayed or hidden, and how these are expressed both
socially and symbolically (Bourdieu, 1982; Butler, 1997). This latter designation illustrates how
such articulated exchanges, in the form of social discourses, institutions, and ideas perpetuate
and ensure over time that those privileged discourses can be reinforced above others.

Transformative teacher practices as a method of analysis, a tool for social change, and a
real set of practices that can be used in classrooms for dynamic transformation, utilizes such
ideas of institutions, power, and exclusion in order to re-evaluate how our education came to be,
and for whose ultimate benefit. Beginning in the work of Paulo Freire (1970), Henry Giroux
(1987), James Gee (2000), and Paul Willis (1978), these researchers saw that everything from
the curriculum to the organization of the classroom space itself, to the subjects it taught, even to
the particular way in which those subjects were taught, were given to identifiable rules of
development that excluded many (especially minority or non-mainstream) groups. Attempting to
switch the emphasis from the privileged to the exploited, these studies found that it was no
accident that the incidence of failure in schools, drop-out rates, low scores on standardized tests
in multiple subject areas, and lack of access to social and educational resources were
disproportionately higher among such groups. Further, they found that often the entire
arrangement, construction, and deployment of curricula in real learning spaces were arranged in
ways that ultimately doomed these groups to failure, or that perpetuated the cycles of poverty
and oppression that kept these groups situated at the very bottom (Heath, 1983; Willis, 1978).

In addition to the more theoretical foundations of poststructuralism, these frameworks
also build upon empirical Vygotskian (1962) and sociocultural perspectives, which argue that all
learning and language are social in nature and find their meaning and development in real-life, active historical contexts and not in conceptual or transcendental abstractions. Blending these perspectives together, transformative teacher practices have been able to enact a powerful indictment of how social practices and structures work, and how those structures developed under specific, intelligible rules that often become articulated for the benefit or concern of some above others. Understanding this, the goal of such research is to show how such structures and placements are not inevitable, nor are they mysterious, but instead that they are intelligible in their historical and material development. Understanding how they developed and how they function, therefore, allows participants (in the realm of education, teachers and students) to analyze their own classroom practices to see their own history of development, and how their practices relate to the other participants present. In short, these theoretical and conceptual foundations articulate practice itself in order to expose their development, and most importantly how they might be changed. They alter the focus from static institutions and more towards the dynamic individuals within them that give them life, credence, and legitimacy.

Nevertheless, it is not simply enough to analyze the background and theoretical foundations of transformative teaching practices, or how these practices find application in real classrooms. Instead, further intelligible factors that contribute to transformative practices must be sought and isolated for their interaction in the classroom. If transformative practices function in altering classroom dynamics towards creating real, participatory pedagogical spaces by means of transformative pedagogy, then there must also be intelligible structures and relationships within them that can be articulated.

Factors and Power in Classroom Practice and Spaces
In this section, I discuss those structures and relationships through a review of the literature related to three main factors, which construct how practice works work in real, dynamic settings: power, the contexts and spaces of teaching, and participant attitudes. I show that power plays the key role of defining those spaces and contexts of teaching along the lines of participant attitudes, all of which are articulated in the practices of participants and the pedagogical processes in L2 classrooms. In short, the interaction of these factors will present both space and the practices within that space, as it is articulated in real time, dynamic ways. From such an understanding, we will then see the important role of pedagogy and Presence in shaping those spaces into non-dualistic, empowered, and participatory contexts that produce positive and multiple linguistic outcomes.

In analyzing power in relation to practice in the L2 classroom, it plays the key role of “defining” (Bashir-Ali, 2006) roles in the spaces of teaching for participants (meaning both teachers and students) along the lines of factors such as attitude. Power conditions, affects, and underlies these by organizing real spaces along the lines of what the individual participants in those spaces perceive as possible or meaningful, and how they articulate those attitudes to others (not necessarily consciously or reflectively, but instead simply through their practices as participants). These spaces themselves, in both their constitution and their deployment, function not as neutral, abstract settings where any and all learning can occur, but instead as site-specific autopoietic systems (Maturana, 1980). Defined initially in Biological studies, and then incorporated later into the social sciences, autopoietic systems are those “that are defined as unities as networks of productions of components that recursively, through their interactions, generate and realize the network that process them and constitute, in the space in which they exist, the boundaries of the network as components that participate in the realization of the
network.” (Maturana, 1980.) Understand how such individual entities function in relation to others, this definition of space articulates how enclosures within larger fields of complexity (such as communities, cities, states, etc.) set the stages for the practices within them, and which are defined in real-time, dynamic ways. For this study, such a definition of pedagogical spaces as autopoietic systems helps set the stage for determining how and why classrooms of similar format, with demographically similar students, utilizing the same curriculum (and perhaps even the same teacher!) nevertheless produce vastly different types of practices and linguistic outcomes. Argued below, the constitutive element in defining and articulating such a system is power.

In the literature for L2 studies and theoretical social science research, this constitutive component of power has been analyzed as an interrogation of dualisms in real social contexts (Harklau, 2000; Miller, 2007; Pierce, 1995), which historically have allowed one part of the binary to be enunciated above and beyond the other in affecting the perception of practice: black vs. white, good vs. bad, rich vs. poor, gay vs. straight, teacher vs. student, just to name a few. These researchers wondered how the use of power in specific settings helped to organize and to define (1) the classroom space itself; and (2) the attitudes of its participants along the lines of those dualisms, for example, “good” vs. “bad” or performing or non-performing, requiring that participants aligned themselves along with the established categories.

Upsetting the often negative results of such imbalanced dualisms, the body of L2 research has offered an egalitarian view of practice and power that could be “inscribed” (Miller, 2007) on classrooms at all levels and with all participants. Most importantly, this research has wondered how might participants use certain factors such as attitudes (in the form of previous experiences and motivations) to allow greater personal freedom in affecting (1) the construction of real
pedagogical spaces; and in (2) forming relationships with others in the L2 classroom. The next section will show exactly how this might function.

**Influence of Participant Attitudes on Pedagogical Spaces**

As described above, research in second language acquisition (SLA) has found that the socially enacted practices of participants create the stage upon which they can interact and by which such interactions become intelligible (Auerbach, 1996; Canagarajah, 1993). This does not happen randomly or by accident, however; it is conditioned by a vast network of interrelated relationships and exchanges that can be observed within the contexts of the interaction.

First, all practice is highly functional, individually organized, and constructed for the purposes of self-socialization in real spaces and contexts (Arnett, 1995; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Ghani & Daud 2006; Ibrahim, 1999; Kubota, 2006) as participants attempt to find socializing agents through their language practice. These agents and purposes serve multiple, dynamic functions dependent upon the individual participant: ultimately seeking to instruct them, to entertain them, to integrate them into their pedagogical communities, to help identify them with their peers in establishing the make-up of the spaces, and so forth. These practices for self-socialization, thus, function in creating bridges (Bloome, 1993) between related semiotic systems, texts, social discourses, and the individual participants in relation to others in a real context. In short, these practices are dynamic, hybrid articulations of the ways in which participants understand and organize their worlds; in articulating these, they also relate to and interact in the dynamic exchange of power in those settings in order to effect intelligibility.

Nevertheless, practice as such an articulation is always hybrid (Duff, 2004); though one may try and isolate independent factors, nevertheless the way in which this self-socialization in real spaces takes place is also influenced immediately by attitude factors, such as social and
discursive norms that affect motivations, as well as pervasive social attitudes of a given environment at a given time (Zuengler, 2003). As such, self-socialization is not a dualistic, binary, or linear relationship between two opposite parties; instead, it is a multiple, dynamic and varied practice in real-time and space. As much as it can function as a contextually positive tool for integration, it also can function simultaneously as rebellion, as attitude factors allow participants to use their language contexts in order to play against expectations in the classroom and against the roles they perceive as being “forced” upon them (Bashir-Ali, 2006). Thus, power and practice as articulation are not formed simply or from only one set of influences. They are also multidimensional and not fully-formed, conscious, or reflected upon at each stage; instead, they are formed in real-time and pull elements from many sources at once, deployed together as a concrete set of acts in relation to others.

Practices in the classroom, thus, are these hybrid mediating devices for participants, helping them to find a “place” in the classroom space and in their larger lives in general (Schecter & Bayley, 1997). Such lives each contain real histories, attitudes, and backgrounds that condition the ways in which they see the world. In relating themselves to their language pedagogy, they also must relate themselves to the social environment in which that language takes place; they are not simply abstract objects teaching or being taught in a binary, or oppositional, context. Instead, they are both active and passive agents in a series of power relationships with others in the classroom, not as simply a neutral space of interaction, but instead the very vehicle by which they can articulate, interact, and function. As such, these dynamic practices in real spaces, always in relation to other participants, take on many forms, such as coping strategies, performativity, or intertextuality in action (Arnett, 1995; Bloome, 1993; Pennycook, 2003). Students and teachers alike approach foreign language pedagogy with a
keen awareness of the socially constructed nature of texts, codes, speech acts, and signs in the classroom, attempting to locate themselves and to negotiate meaning within (and by means of) that space. This contextual and social construction of the classroom as a real, dynamic space of pedagogy negotiates meaning in several ways: participants need to define themselves in relation to others (and also reflectively back upon themselves), they need to form social groups of peers, and they need to articulate their previous experiences and how those fit (or do not fit) into their current circumstances. From these negotiations of meaning, they then can create, maintain, and articulate the practices that give them a role or a place within the classroom environment. This does not happen fully consciously, however, nor in a linear fashion, and is not composed along a dialectical progression of self/other through which the space acts as mediation. Instead, the process and articulation of practice is multiple, varied, and self-referential; the participants relate, react, and respond to others, as much as to themselves, within and by means of spaces that dictate attunement to multiple social, cultural, and physical considerations simultaneously.

Thus, despite centuries of such analyses, the body of research in L2 suggests that binary structures in the classroom do not adequately address individual participant needs; pedagogical practices are always multiple and hybrid in nature, existing in multiple dimensions, for multiple purposes, articulated by power and not isolated in only one way or as a single side of a binary that is “dominant” or “dominated.” It is thus critical in articulating transformations in classroom practice that teachers utilize, or at least recognize and give space, to these multiplicities and allow them to flow freely.

*Influence of Power on Pedagogical Spaces and Participant Attitudes*

As described above, the contextual and spatial factors of self-socialization are immediately complicated and conditioned through multiple exchanges with attitudinal factors as
well. For example, English is not simply a neutral language with neutral sets of nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, etc., spoken or taught in neutral settings. It is also a language with a definite cultural and historical legacy lived by real individuals with their own attitudes, purposes, and ideas about pedagogy (Hagan, 2004). As such, contextual issues such as self-esteem, popularity, family or socioeconomic status, or familiarity/background with the target language also play a part in how participants self-socialize and, thus, begin to form their practices as participants in those spaces. All of these will function, in turn, in how participants perceive the possible relationships open to them with the others in the classroom, which in turn fuel and spawn other sets of dynamic practices as attitudes, all articulated along the lines of power.

The research for practice as self-socialization, power, and integration into real spaces in L2 begins to show its complicated role for all participants, especially for those acquiring or teaching a second language whose cultural and ethnic history may be different from their own (Ghani & Daud, 2006; Ibrahim, 1999; Motha, 2006; Schecter & Bayley, 1997). Practice along the lines of these attitudes in real contexts and spaces seeks to give participants a place; since these environments are social in nature, their practices form socially in relation to what they see, hear, and experience (and what they have seen, heard, and experienced in the past) around them in complex ways (Kubota & Angel, 2006; Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006.) In forming what participants do in relation to their pedagogy, they often assume and perform these aspects from multiple sources in multiple ways. As such, it is therefore essential to show the extent to which pedagogy and power influence these aspects and performances, as outlined below.

**Pedagogy and the Importance of Practice**

Given the important role of practices as exchanges constructing pedagogical spaces, specific strategies (as types of exchange) thus become critical for all participants; in constructing
spaces, the observable types of pedagogy pursued play a key role in how the participants relate to, socialize within, and adapt their attitudes and practices to their individual needs. Through these exchanges, it therefore becomes clearer how and why the linguistic outcomes within those spaces are structured as they are, how or why some classroom situations respond differently than others, despite similar proficiency levels or the same curriculum, without simply having to relegate all such practices to the realm of mystery, or the unknown.

In studies of power and its use in classroom situations for structuring its rules of intelligibility, teaching practices as pedagogical strategies of instruction were analyzed to look for the aforementioned preferences, privileges, and additionally who has (or does not have) the “right to speak” (Pierce, 1995) in the classroom space. These practices structure the classroom space, determining everything from the appropriateness of individual outcomes all the way to the lack of any demonstrable outcomes (or responses to the strategies) at all (Dasilva & Katz, 2007; Hammond, 2006; Harklau, 2000; Liu & Chen, 2008; Miller, 2007; Pierce, 1997; Thesen, 1997; Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005).

Power plays throughout these studies the important role of articulating a system of meaning, a way of seeing the world that organizes and makes intelligible for participants practices in real spaces, which themselves are formed by their attitudes (backgrounds, ideas, experiences, etc.) These articulations have often led to the establishment of those transcendental, general, or dualistic categories that produce a set of preferences and norms, or enunciations of one system of meaning or attitudes over others, making some components more right, correct, “intelligent,” and so forth. Nevertheless, these views of power have also begun to show that such an enunciation or “asymmetry” (Cherryholmes, 1981) of power is neither inevitable nor essential to classroom practice or the pedagogical strategies contained within it; in its most basic form,
power is simply practice as an articulation of meaning, and a way of organizing or placing oneself in relation to real others in a real, dynamic space.

DaSilva and Katz (2007), for example, looked at how power affected classroom teaching practices, giving participants the “space” for pedagogy as Hispanic Language learners, including the opportunities that could be created to perform extracurricular roles within the classroom structure (for example, bringing in those attitude factors of background or past experience, such as home or community lives). The goal of such integration was to allow self-socializing practice as the articulation of attitudes that created a more unified learning and teaching perspective. Hammond (2006), likewise, critically analyzed the discourse around classroom exchanges, observing racial inequality in Japan in order to show participants how their seemingly “homogenous” Japanese culture nevertheless presented ample opportunity for expanding pedagogy to understand the subjugation of minority groups along the lines of power throughout history and how these could be transformed into strategies of equality. By showing participants how power is a practice and an exercise, not an inherent or static element “held” by certain individuals (Foucault, 1981), participants were able to understand themselves and expand their practices in seeing the dynamics of English as a language that exists in real settings, with real material histories that affect real people.

One of the most important discussions of pedagogical practice and power along the lines of attitudes and their effects on real L2 spaces was offered by Pierce (1995), analyzing the issue of second language acquisition in terms of investment and motivation. Presenting a case-study of two female non-native English participants in Canada, Pierce looked not only at the issue of how participants communicated in the classroom, but also how what they communicated was impacted by how they felt or related themselves to the pedagogy and its context. Utilizing both
Critical Literacy frameworks as well as poststructural theory, Pierce questioned the traditional roles of student and teacher in the classroom and attempted to see how female, non-native participants might feel marginalized, disenfranchised, or disempowered in their language learning, attitudes which would directly impact their possible linguistic outcomes. Pierce then analyzed the ways in which these attitudes were conditioned and reinforced by the very pedagogical strategies of the classroom space; such attitudes contributed to their investment in their language learning, which were then translated into their classroom practices as participants. She found that each participant’s role as a double minority (meaning both female and non-native language speaker/immigrant) in Canadian society, and not linguistic ability, affected their language learning and linguistic outcomes. Given these attitudes, both participants were less committed, motivated, and invested in their language learning, which led then to specific types of linguistic outcomes (or lack thereof.) Since the power roles and practices in the classroom space and outside in general life seemed to belittle them or not to take them into account at all, they articulated an attitude of “powerless,” not because they “had” no power, but because the entire construction of the classroom space and its pedagogical practices did not allow them to articulate their attitudes related to L2 learning. These problems and frustrations then carried over into their language practices, not because of their inherent ability or proficiency, but specifically because of their attitudes, as they tried to make sense of themselves in a new or alien language environment that was hostile to them and in which they felt, literally, as though they had no “place.”

Classroom Presence

Even though the above studies are critical in helping to illustrate the complex role of pedagogical practice and the linguistic exchanges that occur therein, for EFL studies in particular,
discussions of motivation or investment are not enough. For example, in an ESL setting, participants are able to utilize a real external environment for their pedagogy outside of the classroom; if the classroom setting feels unmotivating and uninvested, nevertheless there are alternatives for them in trying to create a useful, necessary set of practices to help them integrate and socialize into their environment.

For the students and teachers at Matsuoka High School, however, this same situation does not exist. Though students often lack motivation, and teachers often lack the ability to use their English language skills outside of class, nevertheless even those that have intrinsic motivation and investment in their language pedagogy may not automatically be producing or deploying speaking practices that would be useful for them in a native setting. As such, simply having motivation or investment, articulated as a component of an individuals’ attitudes, are not enough to ensure that the linguistic outcomes produced will be ones that effect intelligibility and exchanges of authentic meaning with others.

It is in this way that the concept of Presence (Gumbrecht, 2006; Nancy, 1993), as outlined in the first chapter of this study, becomes critical as a pedagogical tool. Defined simply, Presence theory “does not refer to a temporal but to a spatial relationship to the world and to its objects… something… that is tangible for human hands…[and] can have an immediate impact on human bodies” (Gumbrecht, 2006.) Spatiality, tangibility, and immediacy of impact as Presence (more than motivation or investment) are the key factors for pedagogy in EFL studies that will help to ensure positive linguistic outcomes. When seen alongside the various structures constructing those pedagogical spaces, Presence will help to account for the varied, multiple, and dynamic practices that go on within them, giving “no limits to what might be relevant in understanding classroom activity and behavior” (Larsen-Freeman, 2007.)
Building initially on the philosophical work of Martin Heidegger, especially *Being and Time* (1927) and *On the Origin of the Work of Art* (1952), as well as the theoretical work of social scientist Niklaus Luhmann (1984, 1990), contemporary Presence theory also integrates poststructural frameworks in order to move beyond not only binaries and dualisms, but also beyond hermeneutic and “meaning-based” (Gumbrecht, 2006) practices in the classroom itself (it should be noted, however, that the sense of “meaning-based” used here, and the earlier use of “meaning” throughout this study are in two different ways; “meaning-based” refers to finding “the” meaning of a situation as a fixed locus, not an “exchange of meaning” as intelligible signs and significations between two or more participants). Meaning-based practices and interpretation, for these theorists, have been the traditional modes of inquiry in critical studies, attempting to find the deterministic motivations, reasons, and definitions of practices, ideas, and spaces. Meanings-based practices and interpretations, themselves developed along a Cartesian framework of dualisms (sense/nonsense, meaning/non-meaning, right/wrong, self/other, positive/negative, etc.), frame practices according to tensions and binaries that struggle in opposition to find a tentative synthesis, resolution, or equilibrium at a fixed locus. They attempt to find an analytically static idea or element which can be offered or upon which can be agreed, which can then be used as a new starting place for inquiry that repeats the process over again in steps along a curve or progression.

Presence theory, on the other hand, rejects the very notion of the static and a smooth progression towards some hierarchically structured point, offering instead that the entire way in which life moves, in which people interact and in which spaces and ideas form, is organic, hybrid, dynamic, multiple, and constantly moving. Instead of struggles, paradoxes, or problems needing real and final solutions, or “having” real meanings, instead both Gumbrecht and Nancy
situate possible “moments of difference,” three of which will be modified and applied to the L2 classroom as observable categories in the empirical sections of this study: (1) authentic interactions, (2) presentification, and (3) deixis. In outlining each of these three briefly, it will become clearer how the concept of Presence in the classrooms of Matsuoka help to move beyond motivation or investment in order to see how real classroom production leads to real demonstrable outcomes. Further, analyzing these three elements will also help to ground further our operational definition of Presence for L2 studies (as defined in the previous chapter) as the articulation (as reproduction and deployment) in a pedagogical space of the sets of constitutive practices under which the L2 being instructed became intelligible to the instructor.

The first component of such an articulation is authentic interactions, described as observable exchanges of dynamic practice (both verbal and nonverbal) between participants in a real setting and time (Gumbrecht, 2006, p. 97). This element acts as the “what” of Presence, meaning the literal linguistic exchanges and outcomes produced by participants. In terms of observable behaviors, for example, this could be analyzed along the lines of linguistic outcomes of mutual understanding or articulation, or the ways in which participants respond to or initiate discussions from others. In terms of the qualitative element of such articulations, such outcomes could articulate the form of shared experiences between participants, as they realize the vast complexity of English as not simply an abstract system, but a set of lived experiences generated within real individuals (of varying cultures.) Compared to their fellow participants as native Japanese speakers, they can also see that the ways in which intelligibility in English occurred for them may be very similar, in that they share a culture, a language, and a socialized framework of thinking. Interestingly, they may also see through such immediate, spatial, and tangible interactions that their feelings or movements towards intelligibility may be completely different.
The importance, in this example, is simply that the concerns and immediacy of the situation allow for these multiple, dynamic approaches to the content (in this case, English language learning). Similarity or difference, thus, both become equally possible points of entry into new practices and understandings of how intelligibility may occur for each of the dynamic individuals in the pedagogical space. Presence theory for education attempts to document, thus, and continually produce these moments, individually, giving a real educational stage and space in which these moments can occur, at the speed and at the behest of the individual participants themselves, without a standard or rigid guide propelling them to make the same decisions, or have the same moments of clarity. Further, this body of research does not attempt to seek reflection upon such moments after they occur, but instead values the moment itself as propelling and spinning-off new elements to create other new moments, in a vast continuum, not a single thread of inquiry.

The second component, Presentification, is just that: the teacher presents the stage and the space in which such real interactions and in which Presence can occur. Acting more as the “how” of Presence, this element is defined by Gumbrecht (2006) as “techniques” to produce the backgrounds and attitudes of those teachers in the circumstances and situations in which English Language pedagogy became intelligible for them. These are done fluidly and in real, site-specific ways, as the teacher presents himself or herself (1) as a real person with a real material body and material history; (2) as a fellow student continually producing new learning and teaching practices; and (3) as a person whose attitudes are real and whose background affects his or her power and production in class. In short, the teacher does not attempt to hide his or her humanity, his or her mistakes, his or her reality, or the steps through which he or she learned English; he or she is not simply an abstract intellect teaching abstract material written on the
chalkboard, but is instead a living, breathing human being presenting the knowledge he or she has gained through his or her experience. Nevertheless, for later sections of this dissertation study, it will be important to show that presentification for an EFL classroom does not, fundamentally, require experience in the L2 native culture, for example having lived or studied in America, England, or any other native-English environment. Though of course this can be beneficial, nevertheless the definition of a classroom as an autopoietic system requires that any such experiences cannot be brought into the new space, as such. They, like everything else, have to be adapted to its constitutive concerns, and redeployed as site-specific practices.

Instead of recommending that all Japanese teachers of English spend time abroad (some of whom have, but many of whom have not and cannot, given schedules, budgets, and the concerns of their classroom settings), Presence theory applied to L2 settings shows why the teachers instead need to produce, or allow to be presented, the practices by which they learned English. This intelligibility for them, and the means by which it occurred, were not transcendental; even if the teachers believed that they learned through writing notes from a board, nevertheless the steps that took English from an abstract grammar in their notebooks to a living, working system of language intelligible as an attitude (even one that allowed them to pass certification examinations, or work with native-speaking faculty, etc.) were both site-specific and multiple. In this way, presenting the multiplicity of data and information for their students allows those students, individually, to adapt themselves to the language and to produce, quite literally, a Present atmosphere of attuned language learning for themselves.

Finally, the third component of pedagogical Presence, closely related to the other two, is “deixis” (Gumbrecht, 2006, p. 95) or a pointing out of complex material through condensations that nevertheless are constructed according to the rules generated by the individual pedagogical
spaces. This element functions as the “why” of Presence: opposed to transcendental ideas about language such as abstract grammar study, translations, or worksheets that move real experience to an academic exercise, deixis instead requires that teachers know their students, their strengths, weaknesses, and needs in learning, and know their own as teachers, and build those into the daily instructional practices in order to produce new practices that spin off in multiple directions and in new arrangements. Further, the teacher utilizes his or her training in language instruction to create real, “condensed” lessons from the infinite complexity of language pedagogy for students that require contextual (meaning the classroom space itself and its participants) clues for understanding, and that are generated or understood in multiple, hybrid ways. Compared to the other two articulated steps of classroom Presence, Deixis is the approach by which Presentification can occur, which then can lead to Authentic Interactions in these real classroom spaces. Nevertheless, as multiple and dynamic practices, all of these are interlinked together, and are separated in this discussion and in the following results of data analysis for the sake of clarity and intelligibility only.

In seeing the theoretical discussions of Presence theory and the close interaction and exchange between all of these described factors, the importance of such pedagogy in the body of L2 research for attitudes, power, and spaces of teaching is clear. This research clearly calls for pedagogy that allow everyone to participate, to articulate their own systems of meaning and attitudes by means of their own power, and that allow these to flow freely in a real classroom setting with real social and linguistic outcomes. Pedagogy, thus, is contained in the sets of practices enacted in every corner of those real spaces; it is the articulated viewpoints, ideas, questions, curricula, etc. that the participants receive, and to which they respond in real time (Gonzalez, 2004). This space, as such, is not neutral, and the ways in which it is generated are
always malleable, adapted as autopoiesis to the individual needs, concerns, materials, and practices present in those spaces. Thus, for much of transformative practice literature, the role of pedagogy is not only to help shape and expand participant attitudes, but also to play a critical role in “generating” (Freire, 1970) their very being as individuals, constructing and developing their pedagogy in real situations. Keeping this in mind, it becomes clearer how practices of Presence might work in defining, and transforming, real EFL spaces. The following chapters will attempt to implement this body of theoretical research into an empirical study with the teachers of Matsuoka High School.
Chapter Three: Methodology:

Reflexive Ethnography and the Multiplicity of Data

The research questions, theoretical framework, review of the relevant literature, and the instruments for this study use a qualitative research design (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), with a reflexive ethnography (Clifford, 1986; Haraway, 1988) consisting of three main instruments (see Figure 2): (1) semi-structured interviews and discussions with the three native-Japanese English teachers (Seidman, 2006; Spradley, 1979); (2) classroom observations for each of the three teachers of individual lessons and participation in school activities in order to give valuable environmental, social, and contextual data of the atmosphere of Matsuoka High School and its English Department (Bettie, 2003; Leedy, 1993.); and (3) an analytic instrument designed to highlight classroom Presence as articulated through classroom practices [built upon instruments (1) and (2)] that created an attuned, anti-transcendental attitude of language teaching (Gumbrecht, 2006.) This instrument, outlined in more detail below, categorizes the classroom practices into observable categories for analysis and discussion, giving an observable and intelligible means by which to situate the larger theoretical discussion of Presence. Specifically, this instrument articulates how and where the individual teachers work in non-dualistic ways to produce linguistic outcomes, present situations of mutual intelligibility through attitudes, and contextualize the complexities of English in ways related specifically to the classroom content, and also to more general social interactions.

To analyze the sets of data, the participants’ interview responses and classroom observations are separated into categories within the ethnography, and are then adapted to fit the analysis for the final Presence instrument, according to the above areas of the theoretical framework and research questions.
Research Objectives

Document the attitudes that contribute to the pedagogical practices of the three native-Japanese English teachers.

Show how power conditions the articulation of those attitudes as practices, and organizes their pedagogical spaces in very specific, observable ways, as relationships and exchanges between their fellow participants.

Analyze classroom Presence as the articulation of specific types of practices, situated within those dynamic pedagogical spaces and observable within individual lessons.

Theoretical Framework

Area 1: Initial Cultural Attitudes and Practices of Participants

Area 2: Practices (verbal/non-verbal) within classroom learning space.

Area 3: Transforming Practice and Accounting for Practice within classroom learning space.

Instruments

Interviews with Participants

Classroom Observation and Recording of Practices in the Learning Space

Category A: Cultural and Linguistic Backgrounds
Category B: Motivations and Purposes for Study

Category A: Verbal Practices
Category B: Non-Verbal Practices

Category C: Spaces of Interaction

Presence Instrument

Category A: Authentic Interactions
Category B: Presentation
Category C: Deixis

Categories and Sub-Categories of Factors Related to Instruments

1. Previous spaces/contexts of L2 Learning
2. Previous spaces/contexts of L2 Pedagogy
3. Previous relationships in L2 Learning
4. Previous relationships in L2 Pedagogy
5. Travel abroad experiences
6. Individual experiences and background

1. Personal motivations for Pedagogy
2. Professional motivations for Pedagogy
3. Perceptions of motivations for students
4. Perceptions of motivations for colleagues

1. Initiations
2. Responses

1. Non-verbal accompanying verbal
2. Non-verbal as such

1. Physical spaces
2. Conceptual spaces

REFLEXIVE ETHNOGRAPHY

1. Linguistic exchanges related to content
2. Linguistic exchanges related to attitude
3. Linguistic exchanges related to routine

1. Techniques of presenting content
2. Techniques of assessing attitudes

1. Contextualizations of content
2. Contextualizations of attitudes
Research Objectives

Described briefly in the review of the literature, this section will outline in more detail each of the three research objectives:

- The first objective is to document the attitudes that contribute to the pedagogical practices of the three native-Japanese English teachers. The two specific factors studied as composing those attitudes are (1) their cultural and linguistic backgrounds; and (2) their motivations and purposes for teaching. Through the documentation of these factors, we can understand more clearly each of the participants and the attitudes they bring with them each and every day into the classroom, and the particular ways in which each constructs (both consciously and unconsciously, intentionally and unintentionally) her teaching practice.

- The second objective is to show how power conditions the articulation of those attitudes as practices, and organizes their pedagogical spaces in very specific, observable ways, as relationships and exchanges with their fellow participants. The attitudes described in the first objective do not take place in a vacuum, nor are they arbitrary. They appear through a definite, lived history with real stakes and experiences (again, not necessarily consciously apprehended) for each teacher. Nevertheless, these attitudes are primarily articulated, and this research objective shows how. We cannot know (nor is it methodologically pertinent) the secret, hidden inner-workings of these teachers, or to psychoanalyze their practice. Instead, it is enough to document the attitudes, and then show how those attitudes are articulated as real practices, in real time, by means of a multiply-oriented understanding of power. This objective thus documents reactions to, exchanges with, and deployments of those attitudes within the overall pedagogical spaces.
themselves, by means of the observable relationships, linguistic outcomes, activities, and so on, in those spaces.

- The final objective of this study is to show, document, and analyze classroom Presence as the articulation of specific types of practices, situated within those dynamic pedagogical spaces and observable within individual lessons. This objective highlights the more general practices described in the second objective, more specifically to expand upon the discussion set up in the Statement of the Problem for this study of (1) how and why various differences in linguistic outcomes occur in different classrooms, even when these classrooms show demographically or relatively similar populations or environments; (2) how and why those attitudes and reactions are structured and deployed in specific ways, often unintentionally or unconsciously but still intelligibly; and finally (3) how such elements, defined as Presence, can be more consistently produced towards further positive or appropriate pedagogical outcomes.

**Participants**

This study focuses on three case studies of native-Japanese English teachers. These three teachers, Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe, and Ms. Nakamura (pseudonyms), were chosen because they are the three teachers present at Matsuoka High School, they have agreed to take part in the study, they are all three very interested in understanding and transforming their teaching practice, and they have developed a strong collegial rapport with me over the past few years as we have worked together on English projects. As such, they feel comfortable with me as a researcher and observer in their classroom, they trust my reasoning and methodology, and are willing to give very thorough, candid responses to questions and materials, all of which are key components to an effective reflexive ethnographic methodology (Clifford, 1986.) Further, the three teachers
have very different backgrounds and levels of education, training related to native-English environments, outlook as to the purposes and uses of English study in Japan, and different life circumstances (including ages, physical features, socio-economic status), all of which will be described at length in the Results section of this study. Finally, this school and its English Department represent a controllable, reasonable, useful sample and space for conducting such an ethnography, presenting ample data for analysis and review, but also giving certain controls for the ethnographer and the research (for example, Matsuoka is the only High School in the town, and indeed in the district, which is itself rural, so students have little interaction with other types of English Instruction beyond these three teachers, and very little chance to use their English with native-speakers.)

**Instruments (also see Figure 2)**

- **Interviews**: This instrument utilizes phenomenological and descriptive questions (Seidman, 2006; Spradley, 1979) in order to elicit participant attitudes, divided into two categories: (1) the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the participants; and (2) their motivations and purposes for language teaching. Each of these categories is further divided into sub-categories and factors for the research, as outlined in Appendix C (also see Appendix A for a sample Interview Guide).

- **Classroom Observations/Discussion**: This instrument uses observations to record the articulation of participants’ attitudes via in-class discussions in real spaces during the observed sessions of the treatment over the course of the academic term (Galton, 1988). Participants were observed during instructional activity for approximately ten weeks, (June 7 through August 13, 2010) with a total of twenty observations (eight for Ms. Sato, seven for Ms. Watanabe, and five for Ms. Nakamura) of approximately fifty minutes.
each, via field notes, photographs, and digital audio. These observations were then coded based on three categories: (1) Verbal practices used in the classroom (i.e. Power as Talking); (2) Non-verbal practices, (i.e. Power as Doing), and (3) Spaces of Interaction (i.e. Power as Being). See Appendix B for a sample Classroom Observation Chart used to organize the field notes and Appendix C for full categories and codings.

- **Verbal Practices (Category 1), or “power as talking,”** were further divided into two sub-categories: (1) verbal practices as initiations of discussion; and (2) verbal practices as responses to the initiations of others (for example, when the teacher asks a question or begins an activity, or conversely when the teacher is responding to a question or comment from someone else.) It should be noted that, as a part of a reflexive ethnography, the ethnographer/researcher himself may be involved in either of the two above categories during certain parts of the study.

- **Non-Verbal practices (Category 2), or “power as doing,”** were also further divided into two sub-categories: (1) non-verbal articulations accompanying verbal articulation (for example, what non-verbal gestures, facial expressions, etc. accompanied their responses or initiations in class); and (2) non-verbal articulations in absence of verbal articulation (for example, basic gestures, motions, where the students sat, how they sat, etc.) In order to document these categories, photographs, videos, and audio recordings captured each class session as needed or allowed.

- **Spaces of Interaction (Category 3), or “power as being,”** is a general category to describe and document the spaces in which these interactions took place, to give further valuable environmental and contextual data to the ethnography (Chabram,
1990). They were also further divided into two sub-categories: (1) Physical spaces (i.e. classroom, teacher’s lounge, gymnasium, school parking lot, etc. and the physical description thereof); and (2) Conceptual Spaces (i.e. group or pair work within the classroom, students not paying attention [talking to others, staring out the window, etc.], ‘cliques’ in class or social dynamics, etc.) In order to document these categories, photographs, videos, maps, drawings, and schematics of the spaces were captured during the interactions.

- Analytic “Presence” Instrument: This instrument analyzed the raw material of classroom discussions, observations, and interviews, in order to elucidate theoretical elements of classroom practice, and were broken into three observable categories based on the literature review: (1) Authentic Interactions; (2) Presentification; and (3) Deixis.
  
  o Authentic Interactions (Category 1), or the “what” of Presence: As described in the literature review, authentic interactions are defined as those that produce real activities for real results, as opposed to transcendental applications of abstract systems (for example a language speaking activity as opposed to writing down grammatical rules from the chalkboard). This category was further divided into the following two sub-categories: (1) Linguistic Outcomes related to Content (i.e. the specific and appropriate articulations related to the classroom lesson or content being taught) and (2) Linguistic Outcomes related to Attitudes (i.e. the specific and appropriate articulations not specifically related to classroom content, but general discussions, questions to the teacher, conversations, etc.)
  
  o Presentification (Category 2), or the “how” of Presence: This was defined as the techniques by which the teachers presented (both literally and figuratively) their past
material in site-specific, attuned, relational ways with their students and fellow participants (for example, the ways in which English language learning became intelligible for these teachers in their backgrounds and reproduced these strategies or experiences in their current instruction). This category was further divided into the following two categories: (1) Techniques of Presenting Content (i.e. task-related, attuned, or meaningful use and purposeful instruction related to the classroom lesson) and (2) Techniques of Presenting Attitudes (i.e. attuned, meaningful use and purposeful instruction related to personal history, background, motivations, etc. not specifically related to the content of the lesson.)

- Deixis (Category 3), or the “why” of Presence: This was defined as the “condensation” (Gumbrecht, 2006) of complex conceptual material requiring context, site-specificity, and construction according to the rules dictated by the individual learning spaces (for example, “drawing our students’ attention towards complex phenomena and problems, rather than prescribing how they have to understand certain problems and, ultimately, how they must deal with them” [Gumbrecht, 2006, p. 128] This might include giving students an overall pattern for language learning to be applied in multiple ways to individual students, as opposed to memorization of a set of word or sentence lists for all of them in the same way, thus creating a stage for continued production individually through context.) This category was further into the following two sub-categories: (1) Contextualization of Content (i.e. in which the teacher utilized the students’ knowledge, skills, or interests as a foundation for new knowledge related specifically to the classroom lesson) and (2) Contextualization of Attitudes (i.e. in which the teacher utilized the students’ knowledge, skills, and
interests as a foundation for new knowledge or discovery related to non-lesson activities, or perhaps personal or social interest.)

**Procedure and Researcher’s Role**

The procedure for collecting the specific data for the analysis had five steps and took place over the course of one academic term at Matsuoka High School (roughly June through August, 2010, with follow-up communications and discussion as needed through December, 2010). Nevertheless, the entrée to the site, collection of demographic data, and various components of the ethnography of the school and community settings took place at varying stages over the past three years, since June of 2007:

1. Obtain consent to conduct the study from the University of Cincinnati IRB (Protocol number 09-06-05-01-E approved for data collection from May 7, 2010 through 2011).
2. Obtain consent from the teachers to participate in the study and set up a schedule for conducting the research in coordination with them. (June, 2010)
3. Conduct the interviews with the participants. (June-July, 2010)
4. Conduct the observations of the participant classroom spaces. (June-August, 2010)
5. Conduct the ethnography of the classroom spaces at Matsuoka High School, along with a larger discussion of the community and environment, situating these spaces within a larger social and learning context. (June-August, 2010)

For conducting the interviews with each teacher, appointments were scheduled in person at a time convenient to them (and continued to do so for follow-ups, as needed). Meeting at the school in Matsuoka at a neutral, quiet location, or via the internet (Skype, GoogleChat, etc. for follow-ups), the participants were interviewed for approximately one hour each for two sessions,
and were digitally recorded in order to increase the accuracy of the data analysis, which was then transcribed. The interviews were conducted mostly in English, though the participants were encouraged to code-switch into Japanese, depending on their level of comfort and preference. All three participants were interviewed independently in order to obtain data about the initial attitudes and practices that they bring with them into the classroom space.

Observations of daily instructional routines and classroom practices were scheduled with each participant at a time convenient to them and took place approximately once each week over the course of one summer term (approximately ten weeks, June 7 through August 13, 2010.) The scheduling and frequency for each individual participant depended upon not only the schedule of each teacher, but also the planned instructional items, cancelled class days for evaluations, sports tournaments, etc. with a total of twenty observations (eight for Ms. Sato, seven for Ms. Watanabe, and five for Ms. Nakamura.) These observations were planned to be recorded via field notes, audio description, photographs, and digital video for the full class sessions, both in person in Matsuoka and via webcam for follow-ups. Nevertheless, the participants felt self-conscious very early about the recorded video elements and, as such, traditional field notes were utilized instead for the classroom observations, followed by charts, diagrams, or photographs of classroom spaces as needed to provide a multiplicity of data.

As Primary Investigator and ethnographer, I conducted the interviews, recorded the observations, and conducted the reflexive ethnography. Given that transformative practice and a reflexive ethnography are always about interactions between multiple, dynamic individuals with rapidly changing and developing practices and attitudes, it is therefore critical that I (the Primary Investigator) was the one who perform all of the above duties. One critical component of transformative practice is the ways in which dualities and binaries dissolve because of real
interactions and relationships; it therefore would have changed the focus, the application, and the purposes of the research to have outside instructors or researchers perform the actual duties or engage their own multiple practices onto the treatment. Further information about researcher’s role will be described in following sections on Reflexivity and Bias.

Methodology of Data Analysis and Explanation

The results of this study will be presented in the following chapter as individual cases, given that this is an exploratory study within a larger ethnography. As well, it uses multiple sources and instruments in order to triangulate data related to multiple, dynamic practices, happening in real-time in hybrid learning spaces. This multiplicity of data and evidence allows for greater application to the research objectives, and the triangulation of data can thus present multiple patterns in different ways that ultimately lend greater support to the continuum of dynamic practice being sought (Felix-Holt & Gonzalez, 1999; Yin, 2003). The collected data was then analyzed using: (1) Constant Comparative Analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in order to elucidate major themes and organize data into the above-mentioned categories; (2) Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1992; Foucault, 1969; Gee, 1997) in order to analyze participant verbal and physical responses, looking specifically for the interaction of key events, recurring themes between the comments and the data (which also might include textual elements such as handouts given to the class, lesson plans, administrative routines, etc), and especially areas of consistency and inconsistency between the interview, the discussions or remarks in class, and the non-verbal gestures and physical or textual elements from the ethnography; and (3) Content Analysis (Berg, 1995; Cresswell, 2002) in an effort to triangulate between the three data sources and to bring out the elements of Presence and articulation for the third analytic instrument.
In the data analysis, based upon my review of the research, I assumed (based upon my literature review) that the pedagogical spaces are constructed autopoietically by power, according to the initial attitudes of the participants; or, more conceptually, that these classroom spaces were constructed along the lines of what the individual participants saw as necessary for intelligibility to occur based on their past learning contexts and interactions in those contexts (DaSilva and Katz, 2007; Pierce, 1997.) I viewed their classroom teaching practices and responses to their students (as fellow participants) as the articulation of these dynamic, hybrid attitudes, expressed both verbally and non-verbally in a multiplicity of ways that adapted themselves in real-time and in specific ways. In addition to the transformative practice research quoted in the earlier review, other researchers in behavioral psychological studies (Felix-Holt & Gonzalez, 1999; Gonzalez, 1994; Kagan, 1990; Richardson, 1992) have also shown the extent to which such attitudes construct the articulation of practice in real spaces, and the extent to which the attitudes of participants along the lines of necessity, reasonableness, and possibility of intelligibility (not necessarily always consciously articulated) condition the arrangement of those spaces.

As such, this study and the analysis of its data have the objective of exploring the relationship between those attitudes, the spaces in which and means by which they are articulated, and how these attitudes and practices contribute to an atmosphere of classroom Presence. In clarifying and documenting these by means of real behaviors and practices, it also has the objective of showing how intelligible classroom interactions are, in all of their multiple forms, and how malleable the pedagogical spaces in which they take place can be. It is, thus, no accident that participants speak, teach, learn, move, and respond in specific ways, or that their
attitudes condition their responses, based on the interrelation of the above factors and their articulation through real classroom practices.

**Limitations, Reflexivity, and Potential Bias**

No qualitative study is ever truly objective, and no study (qualitative or quantitative) is ever perfect. No matter how scientific our methods or explicit our methodology, there will always be elements of preference and interest, elements selected for real reasons that were neither inevitable nor untainted with the subjectivities, desires, and hopes of the individual researcher. This study is no exception, in that even though the ultimate goal is a better understanding of the real, dynamic factors that contribute to practices in real settings, it would be incorrect to assume that the interest simply stops there. In short, as a researcher and as human being, I have concern for both these teachers and their students; my own experiences with the community in Matsuoka have conditioned the ways in which I structure my study and my analyses. Further, my work as a classroom teacher since 2003 have given me the desire, now in the role of a researcher, to give back to the practice to which I’ve devoted much time and energy, and my positive interactions in rural Japan have thus determined Matsuoka as the site in which that body of research will take place. While the attempt is nevertheless to produce a rigid conceptual framework for analyzing pedagogical practice, nevertheless this study is designed to be practical and helpful, utilizing these teachers as examples to show how practices form, in an ultimate attempt to help them understand and transform their teaching practice.

This goal, and this understanding about the limits of objectivity, is one of the benefits of a reflexive ethnography: it makes no such claims that qualitatively or quantitatively, the researcher is unconcerned, unbiased, or disinterested in the overall structure of the research. Even if dealing in purely statistical or numerical analyses, the researcher is choosing subjectively the
methodologies, the analytic tools, and setting up the framework in which those statistical or numerical analyses will make sense. Further, a reflexive ethnography presents itself as an understanding of such subjectivities, without attempting to hide or eliminate the elements where bias can (and does) enter the study, giving it both its overall impact and, in many cases, its timeliness. At the same time, such a framework also gives the researcher the tools for being attuned to his or her own practice as a concerned, subjective researcher, in keeping these biases in check: while objectivity is impossible, complete and total subjectivity without concern for rigid, scientific applications of method is also undesirable.

For this study, a reflexive ethnography with the frameworks selected (and outlined in the literature review) offer healthy checks of subjectivity continually to keep the researcher conscious of his or her role in the research. For example, even though there is great concern for these teachers and the community of Matsuoka, there is also great concern for transforming practice in real, demonstrable, producible ways for the overall field of teacher education. As such, this sometimes means that uncomfortable or unflattering details may come to light: a lesson that was not adequately prepared, a day in which the teacher being observed was preoccupied or bothered by some outside factor, an off-hand remark that, said unintentionally or off-the-cuff, colors the way in which an observer sees him or her. This also includes the researcher himself or herself: perhaps a question was asked in a particularly leading fashion, or a personal feeling about how or why a classroom should be structured may condition the way in which a discussion between respondent and researcher takes place. Nevertheless, in presenting the overall framework as a dynamic continuum of practice, the possible negative effects of “sugar-coating” the research to portray the respondents and the community in the best possible light is offset by that framework’s own non-binary construction. Things are not so simple as
“good” or “bad,” “flattering” or “unflattering.” A researcher or a teacher is not simply “committed” or “uncommitted,” “biased” or “non-biased” as a static, set condition. Overall performance and practice in any setting is a dynamic, continuous, complex and hybrid set of relationships that develop and are deployed in multiple ways; as such, the only adequate presentation of such information is to present that complexity, and document that multiplicity, in all of its forms. In this way, while bias and “preference” are always a part of any empirical examination, nevertheless the non-binary nature of a transformative educational study goes far in presenting complex situations in all of their complexity, even when that complexity reveals details that may not make us look perfect as respondents or researcher. In short, transformative practice attempts to create human beings as teachers, not super-heroes; elements of imperfection, off-hand comments, or preoccupation during a lesson are ultimately more valuable as data sources for transforming that practice than the elements that seem to go perfectly smoothly. At the same time, having real concern and empathy with the community in which the teachers are a part keeps the researcher, determined to “transform” practice, from going too far in the other direction and attempting to find fault in (or the need to transform) literally everything he or she is observing.

Even with such documentation of reflexivity and potential bias, and even with a framework that attempts to compensate for such bias by being multiple, hybrid, and dynamic in nature, nevertheless this study may have some limitations that I can already foresee. Though these limitations should not impact the results of the study or its findings, they do present areas of critical reflection for subsequent research. The most obvious limitation is in the nature of the framework and research aim itself in relation to traditional modes of social scientific research: in seeking a continuum of practice, as opposed to a dialectical, binary, or fixed set of questions that
seek single, definitive answers, the possibility of external validity as point-for-point reproducibility is diminished, as is the possibility of creating any actual “conclusions.” Though that is a major part of this study, to show how dynamic practices change, develop, start, stop, etc. in real-time settings according to multiple factors, for the sake of current social scientific research, the lack of a fully structured generalizable research methodology and framework may limit the extent to which some researchers can implement or relate to the findings of the study. Nevertheless, as one of the keys to this study is in the requirement that all data and research take place in close coordination to real, historical, and enculturated settings, this study perhaps can create a further step towards a more comprehensive methodology of the possible, dynamic and the multiple develop as practices, and can be documented, in real time.

Validity and Reliability Measures

Even though, as mentioned above, a reflexive ethnography takes the individual, unique, and subjective attitudes and practices of individual researchers as key components to the study, it is still critical for qualitative research to be approached in a methodical, logical manner that is transparent in its codings, categories, methods and instruments, and focused in its objectives. As such, reliability and validity were checked during the data analysis with two independent judges, both qualitative researchers who viewed a sampling of the raw transcript data. Following a brief training session into the codings and categories (see Appendix C), each judge coded samples from transcripts and field notes from the research objectives in order to test the transparency and reliability of the categories and behaviors coded. Following this session, the codings were compared with codings marked by the Primary Investigator, and the codings reached agreement approximately 85% of the time (meaning that the two independent judges were able to arrive at a coding for data a majority of the time.)
Thus, even though a reflexive ethnography takes into account such subjectivities and individual applications to the research, nevertheless the goals of transparency and intelligibility were attempted and reached through independent observers, able to utilize the categories and codings provided to analyze the observed phenomenon in the same ways. Though in a reflexive ethnography the complete agreement of codings is not the goal, nevertheless it is important for qualitative research that transparent, clear, and logical discussion and articulation of the observed behaviors be possible for grounding the research. For the study overall, this lends greater support to its methods, its instruments, and its objectives, and helps to give further evidence that the following results and discussion are supported by observations and transparent, valid ideas.
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion:

The results of the study are presented as case studies of the three Japanese participants, elaborated in an ethnographic discussion of the findings related specifically to each of the research objectives. Each of the three case studies yields important data and information by means of the research instruments, each of which connects to the framework of transformative practice and the ways in which participant attitudes in real, dynamic spaces are made intelligible by means of their pedagogical practices (see Appendix C for a summary of findings for individual subjects.) Nevertheless, in relation to the ethnography, it is critical to show first the community in which these attitudes formed, and the overall spaces in which those attitudes (and research objectives) were articulated.

Introduction to Matsuoka

Matsuoka lies several miles off of any main highway or train line in western Japan’s Niigata Prefecture, nestled right at the foot of a large mountain that provides more rain and snow than protection or a beautiful view. It’s a large mountain, but not as large as those in the towns a few miles to the north and the south. It’s a scenic mountain, but its shape is somewhat squat and disproportionate at the top, with a wide arm jutting out haphazardly on its western slope, so that photographers and artists tend to take snapshots or drawings of other mountains in other towns that have a better balance and symmetry, and thus in most of the travel books, tour guides, and paintings of the region it barely gets even a passing mention.

Like its mountain, Matsuoka is largely overlooked and forgotten by everybody but those who live there; for any sort of shopping beyond necessities, you need to go to Senba (pseudonym), the larger metropolitan city just to the north. To catch the train or the bus, too, you also need to go to Senba, for there hasn’t been a direct line to Matsuoka since Japan Railways
disassembled the lone track due to disrepair and budgetary problems in the 1980’s. For good
food, yet again you go to Senba, or perhaps to Matsuda to the west. If you want to get to Tokyo,
you have to travel down to Shijo and pick up the high-speed bullet train. There really are not
even any factories here anymore; for work in something other than a small family business,
you’d have to go over to Kanda or north once again to Senba.

As such, Matsuoka is the sort of small, sleepy town that has been more or less oblivious
to the drastic changes in Japanese life and history over the past hundred years; a photograph
taken of the main street at the beginning of the Meiji period in the 1860’s, hung in a small
wooden frame in the town’s local museum, looks more or less the same as one that might have
been taken last week. The four-hundred year old map stored in the archives of the Town Hall
shows the same haphazard layout of narrow streets and districts, unchanged even to this day,
right down to the names and the spellings on the signposts (Baba-cho, or ‘district where the
horses are kept’ is still there, though now full of houses and parking lots in place of stables).
Though the two largest cities in the prefecture and an hour north and south of Matsuoka
(respectively) were targets for American bombers during the Second World War, Matsuoka was
left untouched and largely unknown by anybody until long afterward, and even then only started
to gain some recognition during the post-war annual Spring Festivals, given the over 2000
blossoming cherry trees in its Civic Park.

Given its rural setting, ample precipitation, numerous rivers and streams, and the large
rice fields and vegetable patches all around town, residents here were even spared the food
shortages and the abject poverty that typified the post-war experience for millions of other
Japanese. As it had been doing for hundreds of years, Matsuoka life just kept going on at its
usual pace, hovering around its average population of about 20,000, while being largely ignored by (and uninterested in) the larger world around it.

The language of Matsuoka, too, is like a snapshot from the past. They call it “Matsuoka-ben” and everything from the pronunciation to the intonation to the words themselves are a completely different dialect from standard Japanese. Much more than simply a regional accent or a slightly altered pronunciation, instead the particular patterns, intonations, and types of speech that flourished here for centuries are so unfamiliar to non-Matsuoka residents (all the way down to greetings, personal pronouns, and forms of address) that if a reporter from a Tokyo television station were to interview an elderly man who’d lived his entire life in town, they’d almost certainly have to put in Japanese subtitles for the rest of the viewers in order for them to have any idea what he was saying. This dialect, though largely unintelligible to the outside, is nevertheless something of a badge of honor for older Matsuoka residents; they mark its extremely polite tone and exaggerated use of honorifics, noting that the language dates all the way back to the distant past, when Matsuoka was one of the few Castle Towns in all of Niigata Prefecture (then called “Echigo”), and is thus considerably more refined, nuanced, and delicate than the gruff, business-like dialect from neighboring Senba (which had no castle, but grew due to a larger merchant class and access to the larger cities nearer the Sea of Japan coast.)

Nevertheless, not everything is so quaint and rustic as a casual visitor to Matsuoka might be apt to think, or that the snapshots and friendly, slow pace of life might suggest; though the town had largely been spared the effects of the earthquakes, wars, or famine that typified some nearby areas throughout history, it had been forced to adapt to changing economic conditions.

Japan’s late-twentieth century economic history is well known and documented: after a decade of intense, almost staggering growth in the 1980’s, in which Japan briefly eclipsed even
the United States in terms of economic growth and size, the late 1990’s and early 2000’s signaled a collapse and recession nearly as dramatic, and ultimately stagnant as the earlier period was chaotic (Wood, 2005). This boom, fueling incredible speculation and inflated prices, is now famous in apocryphal stories such as the brief period in the early 1990’s when the 200-or-so acres on which the Imperial Palace sat in the center of Tokyo were valued more than the entire state of California, or the tennis court owned by one of the foreign embassies in Aoyama, which was purchased for the equivalent of $10,000,000 US dollars in order to build a tall, but very slim, office tower. The period after, however, was marked by a collapse of these prices, a failure of banks, and a vast selling off of assets at prices that barely would have covered the amount paid in taxes during the boom.

Matsuoka, too, was not spared from this boom, bust, and change. For a tiny town of 20,000, Matsuoka boasts a Civic Center large enough to hold nearly everyone in the town, filled with meeting rooms, a restaurant, an arena, art gallery, and classroom facilities for teaching traditional arts (such as tea ceremony, Obon dancing, or calligraphy). Nearly twenty years old at the time of this writing and built during the boom at a cost of many millions of dollars (or hundreds of millions of yen), this Civic Center now sits largely unused, a concert or event taking place once only in a few months, and even then barely selling enough tickets to cover the costs of electricity; it’s light brown walls and green roof now in need of a new coat of paint; it’s decorations kept clean by city-employed janitors, but boasting décor now almost two decades out of date. Nestled into a climate-controlled room behind the stage of the arena also sits a $175,000 Bosendorfer 290SE Piano, the most expensive handmade piano in the world (a piano known by connoisseurs as the home-piano of choice for the greatest composers and pianists of history, from Rachmaninov to Horowitz, but not known for being particularly cost-effective enough or
producing the adequate sound large enough for most concert halls, and as such eclipsed in
Concert Performance by Steinway or Yamaha, which cost about half as much for a similar size),
another purchase during the boom times that virtually nobody ever gets to see, and upon which
almost nobody actually plays.

**Matsuoka High School**

Matsuoka High School, in many ways, acts as a microcosm of this change in
demographic and economic history in Japan and in Matsuoka itself, highlighting in stark detail
many of the changes in the town’s culture that otherwise could go unnoticed. Like the town,
Matsuoka High School is a story of steady decline, compounded by natural or logistical factors,
and made even worse by various social and economic factors impacting the nation as a whole.

Ask anyone in the town over the age of fifty their opinion about the school, and most
will discuss its history, perhaps even remarking how they were once students at the school
themselves. Historically, Matsuoka High School was one of the highest and most prestigious in
the region, being famous for producing more “teachers and policeman” than just about any other
city its size in the region. Indeed, looking at the number of teachers, principals, police officers,
and firefighters in the ranks of local offices from here all the way to Fukushima Prefecture, one
finds a steady stream of Matsuoka High School graduates (for example, the current mayor,
Chairman of the Education District, Vice-Mayor, and Superintendent all attended the school).

Inevitably, however, after remarking about its glorious history, a slightly darkened
expression will come over their faces as they discuss Matsuoka High School’s more recent
history: more than a few remark “*Syou ga nai,*” a quintessentially Japanese expression with no
English equivalent, which roughly means, “it can’t be helped/there is nothing that can be
done/who knows how it got this way but there is virtually no conceivable way to reverse it.”
Chronically underfunded, with some of the lowest scoring students in the region, Matsuoka High School in 2010 is trying desperately to keep its head above water. Where once the School Gate in front shown a brightly polished metal gate and sign, now the bricks and concrete are chipping away, the sidewalk is cracked, and the school building itself has largely gone unrepaired for years. Where students once numbered six or seven hundred, filling both large wings with eager students, the numbers are now down to less than four-hundred, with one entire wing left largely closed and used only for after-school clubs or the occasional elective class. The remaining students (corresponding to grades 10, 11, and 12 in the United States) are crammed into three 37-to-40 student homerooms per grade, with a single teacher overseeing the group and reporting back after each period to a centrally located “Teacher’s Room” where they all sit together, with the Vice-Principal at the head. (see photograph).

Asking more specifically about this drastic decline, and residents and teachers at the school will note several factors. Logistically, Matsuoka is unable to compete with other schools in the region, given its remote geographic location and lack of public transport, “we don’t have any railways,” one teacher notes, “[and] we don’t have useful bus system, so many good schools built in more useful place.” Given that Japanese High School enrollment is placed by test score, not simply place of residence, students have the choice to attend a high school based on their performance on nationally standardized entrance examinations. Much like how American students decide on colleges, Japanese high school students study, and memorize the minimum scores required, to enter their particular high school of choice. Largely tracked, these schools then dictate (conceptually or psychologically if not in actuality) the type and possibility of college attendance; though a student at any school in the United States with the right scores might decide to apply to Harvard or Yale, in Japan the idea of a student from Matsuoka High
School, or even one of the larger schools in a neighboring town, applying to the University of Tokyo is exceedingly rare (and, indeed, in my nearly seven years of experience with Japanese middle-and-high-school students, of the dozens of times I’ve asked the top-scoring students where they planned to study, I never once got a reply of the top two or three schools in Japan). Nevertheless, students who attend Niigata High School, in the prefectural capital, almost invariably then go on to National Universities; students at other “high level” high schools such as Southern Niigata, Furuzawa, or some of the private or specialized high schools, also attend various universities around the nation.

As such, the best and brightest students, regardless of place of residence, choose high school based largely on how it can or will affect their future goals, and travel each day large distances if the school of choice is not in their immediate area. Matsuoka High School, given its remote geographic location, and (in the aftermath of the economic downturns) its lack of industry or other jobs in the vicinity post-graduation, therefore steadily began to lose those high-level students. Those living in geographic proximity to the school who had the test scores to attend other schools did just that, riding their bicycles or having their parents drive them north to Senba to the train station or to Senba High School. As these higher-level students began to go elsewhere, even those who lived in Matsuoka (unlike in the past where the highest students, such as the Mayor or Superintendent, would stay), the school itself had to lower its entrance examination minimum score, to give it “easy access,” (as one teacher noted), making it “easy to come here” to the point that as of this research in 2010, the scores were such that a student unable to enter Matsuoka would largely be unable to enter any high school at all, and thus would be sent straight into the workforce.
Over the course of several years, this trend continued, both physically as well as psychologically, giving Matsuoka High School both a student body made up of lower-level students, as well as the reputation of being a difficult school in which to study and to work. Students were often, literally, one step from dropping out or being unable to attend any school, with “no other choice,” and this knowledge and dissemination in the public sphere also set up a set of individual and self-esteem attitudes about the students themselves: they were described as, and often felt, as though they were one step from failure, the proverbial “bottom of the barrel.” Indeed, in discussion with various school personnel, the responses to surveys about self-esteem, psychological reports of students with counselors, and discussions of goals and dreams were described as virtually minimal. “They have no dream,” one notes, with another adding that they were “beaten” with schooling (especially with English learning) since “their Junior High School days,” causing them to hate to study and to hate to go to school. Finally, in addition to the lower test scores (or perhaps in conjunction with them), a disproportionate number of the students also reported low self-esteem, low goals, and virtually no feeling of being a part of a larger learning and social process. They were, and largely felt that they were, simply there because they had to be, with “no other choice,” uncertain where or what they planned to do next, and without larger social or cultural incentives to push them to make that decision.

This was the landscape and the environment in which this study of education practice took place, and in which the three participants worked and struggled each and every day. In turning next to the outlined research objectives related to these three teachers placed into this unique setting, I believe we can begin to articulate many of the complex structures forming the classroom spaces and dynamics of Matsuoka High School, and how their unique practices helped to generate real pedagogical spaces.
First Research Objective

- Document the attitudes that contribute to the pedagogical practices of the three native-Japanese English teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1: FACTORS STUDIED to address above Objective (See Appendix C for Complete Categories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor A: Cultural and Linguistic Background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous spaces/contexts of L2 Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous spaces/contexts of L2 Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous individuals/relationships in L2 Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous individuals/relationships in L2 Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Abroad Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Experiences and Family background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor B: Motivations and Purposes for Pedagogy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Motivations for Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Motivations for Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Motivations for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Motivations for Colleagues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is in this complex environment that all three teachers found themselves. In an effort to elaborate upon this dynamic pedagogical environment and how its spaces are constructed and deployed, it is necessary for the first research objective to document the cultural attitude factors that contributed to the initial classroom practices of the three teachers, which they brought with them to Matsuoka High School and adapted there as practices. These attitudes included their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and their motivations and purposes for studying and teaching English (see Table 4.1 for macro and micro factors studied, and Appendix C for full codings). This initial research objective was related to the transformative practice framework developed in the literature review in that it shows how the articulated classroom practices that Ms. Sato, Watanabe, and Nakamura brought with them into the classroom space were not formed randomly or only in response to environmental factors present in Matsuoka, but instead could be observed
and related to their first-cultural and linguistic attitudes, as captured most clearly in the interviews. Indeed, the patterns found through the three case studies showed that attitudes did influence their initial classroom practices and ideas about teaching, which were also observable in terms of how they organized and articulated their previous experiences (see Appendix C as well for summary of findings across subjects). The major themes that emerged from this research objective and the factors analyzed above were, interestingly, that none of the respondents saw English in a purely “practical” sense, meaning necessary primarily for their high school graduation or entrance into college. Instead, each saw English as a skill in itself, or as a further tool for thinking and expanding their students’ overall conceptual horizons. A further trend that developed (though under different circumstances for each) was the internal motivation to become a better English speaker and teacher because of frustrations or difficulties in their pasts related to the preparation they received.

Category A: Cultural and Linguistic Background of Participants

The cultural and linguistic backgrounds of Ms. Sato, Watanabe, and Nakamura were investigated by means of the interview and follow-up discussions, whose topics included focusing on their life history, detailing their experiences, and reflecting on the meanings of those experiences (Seidman, 2006). Though each had very different background experiences, upbringings, and come from different age groups and socioeconomic backgrounds, nevertheless each could articulate a number of experiences that led them to their chosen professional path.

Ms. Sato

Ms. Sato is a warm, cheerful woman in her mid-thirties, hair fixed simply and straight, falling just above her shoulders. She dresses relatively informally for a Japanese teacher, many of whom still wear (for females) long skirts or dark colored suits, with blouses and conservative
shoes. She often wears brighter colors, and almost never wears a skirt (but instead pants or some sort of cropped slacks.) She also smiles and enjoys making puns and jokes, both in English and in Japanese. She lives in Niigata City, about an hour away, and commutes to Matsuoka by car. She has one small daughter, and is pregnant again at the time of the research and interview with a due date around New Year’s Eve. Her husband is an executive in a bank in Niigata City, and she mentions that she plans to take extended leave to spend time with her new baby and other young daughter after giving birth.

Related to her cultural and linguistic background, Ms. Sato felt an inherent and intrinsic belief in the power of speaking English; “since I was four,” she said, “and had the chance to visit United States several times,” (Coding A.5.a) she was fascinated with the language and the cultures in which it was spoken natively. In both her university and graduate studies, at two of the more prestigious foreign language and education programs in Japan, Ms. Sato studied topics related to English: American History (with a focus on American Racial History) in college, and English Education in her graduate program (Coding A.1.a.2).

She noted that in her background she was constantly encouraged to study English from an early age, even though neither her parents nor anyone in her immediate family were teachers. However, one of her aunts and an uncle live abroad, working in business and in public service. From them, she said, she garnered an early interest in foreign languages and travel: “my parents,” she said, “wanted me to be like them, I guess” (Coding A.6.b and A.6.c). This influence also rubbed off onto her older sister, who later became a teacher of English in another town on the other side of the prefecture.

After university, Ms. Sato applied to teach within the Niigata Prefectural High School system, corresponding with grades 10-12 in the United States. Her first assignment was at
Tokagi High School (pseudonym), a mid-level high school in the middle of the prefecture, “about five years ago, after my graduation from graduate school” (Coding A.2.a) She initially was unsure exactly what area she wanted to teach, or whether she wanted to pursue work in administration or research, but “the prefectural office got me as a service teacher, so I accepted the job,” and then began her tenure there (Coding A.2.b) Unlike preK-12 programs in the United States, Japanese teachers are required to move to different schools in the region every three years (Hood, 2001), and are largely unable to choose their assignments or locations. While there are certain exceptions to this rule (veteran teachers with families in a particular town, or the personal or family requirement to work/stay closer to their homes), the vast majority of teachers are given new assignments by the Prefectural Education Authority without their consent, and largely without repeal, and in almost no circumstances can a teacher remain in one school longer than ten years. As such, a teacher such as Ms. Sato might be placed into a large, general high school near their home for one period, and then placed into a smaller specialized school far away on the other end of the prefecture, for the second (as we will see below, this happened through each of Ms. Sato’s assignments). The purposes behind this system are to cycle teachers at all levels through all schools, and to ensure an equalization of teacher training and expertise regardless of geographic location. For example, as we will see, various logistical and social factors lead to the lowering of student achievement and test scores at Matsuoka High School, factors that could also contribute to a lowering of teacher commitment and expertise if not addressed proactively (long commute, lack of public transportation, access to resources, etc.). This policy of rotation attempts to prevent just this: in short, it attempts to prevent every teacher from wanting to teach in Niigata City, and none of the teachers wanting to teach at Matsuoka. In this way, Matsuoka at
any one time may have the highest-ranking, or most published teacher in a particular subject, or perhaps a new teacher having just graduated from college.

Ms. Sato, like her colleagues and fellow participants, were placed into and subject to the demands of this system. After her term at Tokagi, she was transferred to Honae High School, which was a very different work and teaching environment from Tokagi, as it was “a kind of English Centered High School,” with specialized English planning, including “two ALTs there all the time” (Assistant Language Teachers, meaning native-English speaking faculty), and excellent resources in the form of computers, technology, and access to Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL.) She thrived in and enjoyed this environment, given the focus on English, where she could use her skills and background effectively (Coding A.4.b)

This trend continued when she was next transferred to Southern Niigata High School, a top-tier school in which virtually all of the students go on to higher education in college upon graduation. She was excited and initially worried about the daunting demands of teaching at this school, which had students at such a high level that “they told me, ‘We don’t actually need teachers; we can have textbook, we can have some material’ by themselves.” Nevertheless, she was also excited about the high level of motivation and skill-level present in the students there, but even still, she quickly found that “translating” her interests and background related to a love of English speaking were difficult. Even though “it’s a high level school,” she says, she found that it’s “English Education is not for English speaking, but for the entrance examination for the university,” so instead of practical or functional speaking units, instead “they taught grammatical thing, and they taught how to read the English papers, or English writings.” In short, she found that instead of teaching the speaking and appreciation of English to her very high-level students,
often the teachers “taught for the tests” and the students were only really interested in their potential scores.

Following her three-year tenure at Southern Niigata, Ms. Sato was then transferred to Matsuoka High School, going from two assignments in high-level schools in which virtually all students attend college, to a school in which most students do not even sit for the entrance examinations, much less actually matriculate. Of the nearly 100 students who graduate each year, only a handful go on to any sort of college (vocational, community, 4-year university, etc.) and almost none attend the higher-level national public universities. Filled with years of practicing many targeted, dynamic English lessons with higher-level students who were highly motivated, including many activities related to reading and writing, and accustomed to working regularly with native-English-speaking teachers and researchers, Ms. Sato found that many of her ideas and practices would be put to the test in her new teaching assignment, and that she’d have to become a creative problem solver in addition to an English teacher.

Ms. Watanabe

Ms. Watanabe is in her mid-forties, with slightly reddish hair, colored from its natural black and fixed stylishly in a cut trendy during that summer. Attractive and well dressed, she almost looks like she could step from the pages of a Japanese magazine, carrying herself very straight with a close attention to detail, perhaps a habit from her years spent as a Tour conductor, a career in Japan in which everything from personal appearance, demeanor, to the inflection of the voice used over the loudspeaker is scrutinized very closely and regimented through strict training (Coding A.4.b and A.6.b). She does not share many personal details, for example whether she is married or has children, but she mentions that she also lives in Niigata City and commutes each day by car to Matsuoka. Friendly, yet business-like, she does not smile or joke
as often as Ms. Sato, but her occasional flashes of a sly smile and comments about her past (for example, enjoying surfing and water sports in Miami, Florida, during her college days) betray a hint of rebellion. As well, when speaking Japanese, she tends to enunciate more clearly and use more formal language than the other two participants (especially Ms. Sato, who speaks relatively informally), perhaps another habit picked up during her Tour conductor years, when speaking to clients required use of a highly stylized, formalized Japanese grammar that is not present in English (consisting of varying grammatical forms that change depending on the social position of the speaker and listener [Tsujimura, 1996]). Further, she is slightly nervous in speaking English, and does so quite slowly and deliberately, pausing to choose her words very carefully.

Ms. Watanabe came to English teaching along a very different line from Ms. Sato, though she as well expressed an interest in foreign language learning and travel from an early age. In fact, she was interested in travel so much, that her first job after university was as a tour conductor, in which she was able to speak with foreigners from all over the world. She also studied Russian, but admits today that it was too difficult and that she was never able to use it much, and so she doesn’t “remember anything; it’s too tough for me.”

Also graduating from a high-level National Public University, where she studied English literature “like Shakespeare… and something [else], but I can’t remember,” she noted, smiling (Coding A.1.b.2). She also noted in her background an interest in foreign languages and travel, though there was no one in her family who were English teachers or who lived abroad (her brother also later became a teacher, but of biology. Coding A.6.a) Nevertheless, she traveled abroad when she was twenty one years old, staying “four months in San Francisco, then… I took a plane and bus and went down to Miami” (Coding A.5.b.) She smiles when mentioning her past travel in America, quickly adding, “actually Fort Lauderdale.” She travelled always in warm
places because, she notes, “I hate the snow,” a fact that produces a small laugh when she is reminded that she is currently living in Niigata, perhaps the snowiest region on earth for its latitude. “Well, I came home, you know,” she says.

These background travels and interests preceded her passing of the English teaching certification exams, after which (like Ms. Sato), she was given her first teaching assignment. Before coming to Matsuoka, she taught at two different high schools, Kato High School and Sakai High School (both pseudonyms), in different parts of Niigata Prefecture.

Kato High School, she notes, is similar to Matsuoka, and is a lower-to-mid tier High School where most students either go straight into the workforce or to a vocational and technical college upon graduation. Sakai, however, was a mid-to-upper tier high school, which she notes had two courses, one regular and one “kogyo-ka,” a course specifically designed for students planning careers in industry. As such, she noted that “the ability was different, [because] ordinary course students can try to enter good university… more than kogyo-ka [students.]” (Coding A.2. b and A.2.c)

As such, given these two assignments, after which she was transferred to Matsuoka two years ago, Ms. Watanabe had a specific set of defined attitudes and backgrounds related to her English teaching and study. Her assignments were more closely related in level and type than were Ms. Sato’s, and as such the sets of activities and types of students with whom she had interacted before were relatively close in motivation, interest, and level to those at Matsuoka. Nevertheless, as we will see in the next research objective, there were many challenges and surprises waiting for her as well as she tried to “translate” these cultural and linguistic background as attitudes into her practice at Matsuoka High School.

Ms. Nakamura
Youngest of the three English teachers at Matsuoka High School, and also the most recently assigned (sent to this school only the previous April, about three months before), Ms. Nakamura is in her late twenties, and has a much quieter, softer demeanor than her two colleagues. Whereas Ms. Sato is almost boisterous, and Ms. Watanabe warm and with a quick, dry wit, Ms. Nakamura is quieter, softer, and more reserved in her demeanor and speech. With a quiet voice, she speaks slowly and with very carefully chosen words, not volunteering information unless asked directly. Nevertheless, at certain times or with topics about which she is concerned deeply, she will lean forward and her voice will take on considerably more strength and volume. Her hair is very conservatively cut just above her shoulders, and her dress is the most conservative of the three, usually wearing a dark suit with a skirt, flesh-colored stockings, and dark pumps. Like Ms. Watanabe, she doesn’t volunteer many details, and whether she is married, has children, or lives with her family and in what city, is not disclosed. This is not atypical, it should be noted, and is not a sign of discomfort or dissatisfaction with the research or researcher; whereas in the United States it often seems as though we learn a person’s most intimate details in the first meeting, in Japan, personal family details are generally not shared, even with colleagues or acquaintances (Reischauer, 1989). This will be important to note in both the second and third research objectives, for this cultural component will come to play as we outline and analyze elements of Presence. Related to this cultural component, for example, this researcher observed in one situation at the Board of Education and in discussions that it was considered a breach of public/private manners to display photographs of family members, or to inquire too closely about them. As such, a colleague mentioned being acquainted for some years with another teacher in another department; when I asked if that teacher had children (curious if I perhaps had met them or taught them while visiting schools), she remarked that “she didn’t know”
if that teacher had children or not. Therefore, the lack of family or personal details from Ms. Watanabe or Ms. Nakamura are quite typical, and the volunteering of that information by Ms. Sato perhaps a result of her familiarity and exposure to American cultural norms.

In addition to the differences in age and demeanor, Ms. Nakamura’s cultural and linguistic backgrounds are quite unique from the other two teachers, while nevertheless sharing certain structural or conceptual similarities. Initially, she notes that she didn’t like English or studying it at all, “because English teachers focused on grammar, most, I hate grammar, so I didn’t like English,” (Coding A.3.b) but over time began to appreciate it and be interested in it as well. Like both Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe, Ms. Nakamura has teachers in her family background, but none that were English teachers and none, she notes, that particularly encouraged her to study English specifically. Her aunt and uncle, she notes, are “taiku (physical education) teachers,” still teaching and working in her hometown at the southern tip of Niigata Prefecture, in the tall mountains not far from the area featured for downhill skiing in the Nagano Olympic games in 1998 (Coding A.6.a). Unlike Ms. Watanabe, Ms. Nakamura notes her affection for this climate and the snow.

As well, like both other teachers, Ms. Nakamura studied at a large Japanese national university, known for its undergraduate education programs and its large international student population (Coding A.1.b.1). Though she mentions that she doesn’t like traditional grammar teaching, nevertheless she was interested in the structure of English and majored in English Education with a focus on linguistics. “I hated grammar,” she notes, “but linguistics… my professor is a linguistic teacher… and he influenced me…” to study linguistics, including “Chomsky and others,” such as structural linguists like Barthes and Saussure.
Unlike Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe, Ms. Nakamura has never lived or studied English abroad, or in an environment in which English is spoken natively. Nevertheless, she mentions that she has travelled abroad, “only for traveling, three weeks… and I went to Washington DC, and then London, Paris, and Rome.” (Coding A.5.c)

Following graduation from university and successful completion of the English teaching certification examinations, Ms. Nakamura was assigned to Sangyo Higashi High School, about thirty minutes away from Matsuoka, and then to Yoshimi Commercial High School (both pseudonyms), before coming to Matsuoka in April. Sangyo is a “second level high school” in the Sangyo-city area, meaning that it is in between a city and school like Matsuoka and one like Southern Niigata (where Ms. Sato was assigned.) About half of the students who graduate go on to some sort of vocational or national university, so she noted how “it’s easy to motivate them to study English, because they have to take entrance examinations.” As such, she was able to bring many of her ideas and activities from her background and university days into her early teaching, with students who were motivated to learn and pass the examination tests. (Coding A.2.b; A.2.c)

Her next assignment at Yoshimi Commercial High School, however, was very different, given the particular demands and requirements of the program itself. Given that most of the students were there to learn crafts, trades, and vocational training that would translate to apprenticeships or jobs immediately upon graduation, “it was difficult to motivate them” to study English, she notes. She thus compares the relative level of English interest and ability between Yoshimi and Matsuoka as being quite close, related mostly to their interests and the ways in which they would constantly ask her “why” they have to study English, if they are planning to be plumbers, electricians, or factory workers. Though they knew that they would almost assuredly never need to use English in their daily lives or work in the future, and thus had no motivation or
interest in learning it, they felt resistant in being forced to learn it, through Japan’s compulsory use of English as a required subject for all levels through High School.

Following Yoshimi, Ms. Nakamura was transferred to Matsuoka High School, where she initially felt that her background at both a lower-level and a mid-to-upper level school would give her a wide range of experiences and attitudes for her work at this school. However, like Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe, we will see in the next research objective the ways in which the particular and site-specific requirements and environmental factors present in Matsuoka High School presented particular challenges to how their attitudes were articulated in real time.

Category B: Motivation and Purposes for Teaching

Participants’ motivations and purposes for study were captured through descriptive interview topics, including a “grand tour” and a “mini-tour” of the daily interactions and experiences in their previous backgrounds and lives (Spradley, 1979). The themes and trends developed from these topics revealed Ms. Sato, Watanabe, and Nakamura as having motivation and purpose related first and foremost to factors outside English teaching itself, for example concern about student thinking or feelings beyond just their English ability. With these conceptual or more abstract attitudes in mind, they then chose a career in English, but each felt (though differently) unsatisfied, even frustrated, with the ways in which that background prepared them as such. Nevertheless, perhaps the most interesting trend in this category was how these frustrations did not create a negative attitude towards language teaching, but instead helped to compensate, even to reinforce, their motivation to develop stronger skills.

Ms. Sato

Ms. Sato’s expressed motivations and purposes for studying English were fairly unique from the other two, and quite pragmatic. There was little discussion into larger conceptual
themes or grand theories related to her view, but at base simply a love of English itself. “To tell the truth,” she said, “there is no way using English in Niigata, so as an English teacher, I can use English as an occupation. So, I decided to be a teacher.” She smiled and put the matter to rest, simply put.

She further notes that she was not necessarily motivated or pushed to study abroad or study English for an occupation by her social setting or by her parents, but rather quite emphatically noted that she was the one who decided to study English, “I did it,” she noted with particular stress on the “I.” Nevertheless, her parents and other family members were quite supportive of her decision, and she remarks that she is “so grateful that my parents taught me, my parents gave me a chance to study English.” For Ms. Sato, English is an interesting and useful skill in itself, since “nowadays, English is such a common language all over the world and [this] is so useful for me to speak English.”

Interestingly, this feeling of utility and the sense of accomplishment and positivity it gives her to be able to speak to so many different types of people, are also her motivations for teaching English: “I hope some of my student can build the same feeling” that she had as she experiences these situations first hand. Further, she sees English learning as an end in itself, not necessarily just as a means to other types of learning (a contrast which will become clearer in the motivations and purposes of the other two participants.) Interestingly, Ms. Sato never noted English as a vehicle most importantly to some other type of thinking, or to some other type of skill, but that English was valuable enough in itself that when asked by her students “why” they have to study English (if, for example, they plan simply “to work at Supaa Saito,” the local Grocery Store, or a Car Mechanic’s shop), she mentions to them the satisfaction of being able to speak with a foreigner in English, or of being able to get outside of one’s own comfort zone in
order to learn about other ways of living. Thus, for Ms. Sato, personal and professional motivations merged to lead her directly to her chosen path of being an English teacher, one that she knew and pursued literally from the time she was very small.

Ms. Watanabe

As described above, Ms. Watanabe did not know as early as Ms. Sato that she wanted to be an English teacher, but instead decided to change careers well into adulthood, when she felt that she could no longer “continue to be a Tour conductor forever [because] it takes too much energy.” As such, she chose to take the Certification Examinations “when my friend recommended [it] to me,” in an interest to use her English skills professionally, merging both her university study and her language skills from her previous career.

Like Ms. Sato and Ms. Nakamura, Ms. Watanabe expressed a larger, or deeper, conceptual motivation for English pedagogy. Whereas Ms. Sato’s motivation was in the feeling of accomplishment of English itself, Ms. Watanabe is slightly more expansive: English is not necessarily a skill in itself, or useful as an end in itself, but instead is “one tool to get some knowledge,” or a type of “thinking skill.” Her “first purpose,” she says, is that she “wants them to know something new through English, so if they can read English they can get some knowledge from books, so I want them to use English as a skill, too.”

Like Ms. Sato and (as we will see) Ms. Nakamura, Ms. Watanabe also expressed slight frustration at her background and preparation, contributing to one of the main reasons she chose her first job as a tour conductor and also her decision to teach English. She enjoyed travel from a very early age, having the “dream [since] I was a little girl, I want to go abroad. I tried to learn abroad,” seeing the overseas travel and study as useful motivators to get better at English, because like Ms. Sato, there were not enough chances to study English by staying in the “small
world” around her in which only Japanese was spoken. As such, she wants to encourage and motivate her students not only to have the increased thinking skills associated with foreign language (in this case, English) learning, but also to have those “dreams,” because “these students have no dream; they don’t want to go abroad; they don’t even want to go to Tokyo. They want to stay in their small world.”

*Ms. Nakamura*

Ms. Nakamura’s motivations and purposes for teaching, like her demeanor and background, were also unique from the other two participants. Whereas both Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe expressed early interest in English, and a desire to continue studying it given that interest, Ms. Nakamura had the opposite approach: she initially disliked English intensely. As described above, she “hated” the grammatical teaching style, but most especially she felt “they didn’t understand student feelings about English classes,” because if they did, they would be more concerned about how their students were feeling and how they were (or were not) learning the language. “I thought all English teachers like English,” she said about her school days, but because the students like herself did not like it, she felt the problem therefore was one of sensitivity. As such, “I wanted to be a teacher [who] knows students feelings about English,” to correct the problem that she saw within teaching. As such, though Ms. Sato also remarked that she was motivated to create a sense of feeling in her students (to have the same feeling of accomplishment she felt at being able to communicate with people from around the world), nevertheless Ms. Nakamura’s motivation is unique in that she was more interested “not just in English,” but in their personal feelings, about treating them “like human beings.”

Thus, her motivations were largely personal, but translated into professional motivations as she studied further in university about English linguistics, the structures of language pedagogy,
and especially about the psychological aspects of young learners (she noted several times being concerned about student “depression” and lack of motivation, goals, or dreams.)

Like Ms. Watanabe, however, Ms. Nakamura also noted that the purposes of studying and teaching English were not just about English itself, but more conceptually that “studying English means studying the way of thinking, the way of thinking of people who speak English, so it is related to them know many things in the world.” Like Ms. Sato, however, Ms. Nakamura also notes a desire not just to deal with students conceptual feelings or thinking skills, but also that they have the sense of feeling or accomplishment, “…I think it’s important for students to… feel… for students to… understand (no, that’s not it)…” she then paused, “Manzoku! I got it.” She smiled after exclaiming this word, a Japanese concept coming closest to the English word “fulfilled.” Nevertheless, it is slightly more expansive, meaning both a sense of feeling accomplished, but also literally being “filled” with something (like English knowledge.) For example, after eating a big meal, you also use this word to note that you are completely full and satisfied and can eat no more.

Thus, Ms. Nakamura, like her two colleagues, is acutely concerned with her students as full, unique, independent human beings, and is motivated to address not only their critical and conceptual thinking, but also their personal feelings, in trying to increase English language proficiency and competency for multiple ends, though she is also acutely aware of the many difficulties this entails when these attitudes are exposed to a real-time environment of living, breathing, students.

Conclusions and Discussion for the First Research Objective

Based on the summaries of the interviews and discussions with Ms. Sato, Nakamura, and Watanabe, and the topics and factors outlined in Table 4.1, we are able to see some of the diverse
attitudes that each brings into the EFL pedagogical spaces, and how their backgrounds and motivations condition or define (Bashir, 2006) those attitudes and spaces. The main theme that emerged throughout the interviews showed how each teacher had to “translate” their attitudes and their backgrounds into the difficult, dynamic, and unique learning spaces at Matsuoka, but nevertheless were far from blank-slates, adapting only to whatever the situation demanded. Instead, these adaptations were articulations of their backgrounds, both cultural and linguistic (Felix-Holt & Gonzalez, 1999). It was thus necessary first to hear those backgrounds articulated, both in the form of a life history and also the more abstract or conceptual ideas about motivation and purpose for English study and teaching. Indeed, the conclusion reached for this research objective was that given the various factors involved in each of the main research categories (see Table 4.1), we can see very clearly how each teacher had an articulated set of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, coupled with a clear set of motivations and purposes, that they brought in with them from the first day of class, and adapted each and every time to fit specific needs and demands (Miller, 2007.) In this way, the stated factors observed and the instruments used to gather them were able to accomplish the stated research objective of documenting the diverse sets of attitudes that inform each teacher’s pedagogy.

As will be fully explored in the following research objective, we will see exactly how this process of “informing” will work in real time. Ms. Watanabe, for example, should rely on the skills learned in her previous teaching assignments in planning lessons, not to mention her education, and also her experiences both as a tour conductor and as an international student traveling and living in the United States. Further, Ms. Nakamura will use her own experiences in school, in which she felt teachers were not sensitive to the particular psychological and motivational factors and feelings of students, in reacting to her students’ needs, interests, and
demands. For Ms. Sato, her rewarding experiences communicating successfully with foreigners will give her both the conceptual and practical tools to create lessons for students that also could lead to that success. Each of these experiences can be observed and categorized for research, documenting the previous spaces and contexts of L2 learning and pedagogy, and the individuals and relationships in those spaces, each of which contributed to their pedagogical attitudes (Baker, 1992).

Additionally, and as a part of these unique sets of attitudes, each individually felt some sense of frustration or a lack of personal preparation within certain parts of their backgrounds or circumstances, leaving them feeling unprepared for their chosen future careers in and of itself and unsure of their possible place or role within them (Schecter & Bayley, 1997). Nevertheless, these frustrations did not remove their motivation for further study, but instead fostered and encouraged it (through the micro-factor observed of personal and professional motivations for pedagogy): Ms. Sato, for example, felt frustrated with the chances of daily conversation, “to tell the truth, there is no way using English in Niigata!” but instead of giving up, decided that, “as an English teacher, I can use English as an occupation.” This frustration and desire factored into her decision to become a teacher. Likewise, Ms. Nakamura’s dissatisfaction with the lack of sensitivity on the part of her teachers, and also her own personal “hatred” of abstract, grammatical styles of teaching, led her to be a different kind of teacher, one who would both give practical ideas to her students and also would care about them as individuals. Likewise, Ms. Watanabe felt unable to continue her work as a Tour conductor, and was also frustrated with the lack of basic skills and critical thinking in the students with whom she interacted, all of which factored together into her decision to “take the Certification test” and become a teacher.
In turning to the next research objective, we will see how these attitudes were translated and deployed into the real, site-specific circumstances of Matsuoka High School, and how each of these teachers tried to negotiate multiple demands and relationships in articulating those attitudes as practices in ways that stayed “true” to their own ideas. As we will see, this translation was not always direct, literal, or even possible given certain restrictions and demands that confront any teacher working in a very complex, difficult environment.

Table 4.1.b: Summary of Conclusions for the First Research Objective

**Objective:** Document the attitudes that contribute to the pedagogical practices of the three native-Japanese English teachers.

Conclusions reached to address objective:

**(1) Teacher attitudes that informed and contributed to teacher practices took the form of Cultural and linguistic backgrounds and motivations and purposes for pedagogy**

*Sato- background communicating successfully with foreigners provided conceptual and practical tools to create lessons for students that also could lead to that success.
*Watanabe- background in Tour Conducting and travel abroad informed her pedagogy.
*Nakamura- background with decontextualized English informed her sensitivity in teaching

**(2) These attitudes were dynamic, hybrid, and complex: even frustrations and limitations in those backgrounds became further motivations and purposes to be addressed in pedagogy, as attitudes.**

*Sato- Inability to use English regularly led her to pursue English teaching as a career.
*Watanabe- Inability of students to acquire basic skills led to specific teaching style.
*Nakamura- Dissatisfaction with insensitive and unconcerned faculty led her to teaching.
Second Research Objective

- Show how power conditions the articulation of those attitudes as practices, and organizes their pedagogical spaces in very specific, observable ways, as relationships and exchanges between their fellow participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2: FACTORS STUDIED to address above Objective (See Appendix C for Complete Categories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor A: Verbal Practices (i.e. Power as Talking)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor B: Non-Verbal Practices (i.e. Power as Doing)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor C: Spaces of Interaction (i.e. Power as Being)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This objective was to show how power conditioned the articulation of those participant attitudes explored in the previous objective, and organized their classroom space, by means of what the individual participants believed to be possible, useful, and meaningful in that space. As developed in the literature review in Chapter Two, this “possibility, usefulness, and meaningfulness” was not always conscious and not always direct; indeed, what was “meaningful” in a specific situation changed by the moment, and defining or locating the source of such utility or meaning was both impossible and irrelevant. Further, what was “possible” in a particular lesson also changed given multiple circumstances, ranging from everything from lack of preparation on the part of students (if, for example, they did not study or do their homework, thus making it impossible to move on to the next chapter in the book before the previous chapter had
been learned), to demands of the school calendar (if, for example, the national Ministry of Education had determined that week to be the week in which examinations or tests were to be given to all students.) These practices were documented via observations of classroom instruction with each of the three teachers over the course of the summer term, 2010 (June through early August, as described in the Methodology), over the course of eight observations for Ms. Sato, seven for Ms. Watanabe, and five for Ms. Nakamura. These observations will be condensed and a sampling of practices articulated in the narrative that follows in order to show the deployment of such practices and power in real time and real spaces. Further, codings for the behaviors observed will be included in the relevant locations, (for the specific categories for coding the behaviors and a summary of findings across subjects, see Appendix C.)

In bringing back the operational definition of power, it is important to note that we are not looking for fixed, centralized “meanings,” but instead at observable relationships and effects, and as such observing these interactions as verbal and non-verbal articulations of participant attitudes in a real, dynamic space. As such, we will see throughout the narrative two very real trends: first, the “translation” of each of the three teacher’s attitudes (their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and motivations and purposes for pedagogy), and second, the demands of a real-time, dynamic, continually developing pedagogical space within Matsuoka High School. Indeed, as outlined in the literature review, in each and every class, the relationship between the teachers and the students became itself an autopoietic system (Luhmann, 1984), an enclosure of English Language Teaching within an overall larger and complex environment. As such, each class generated and dictated its own sets of operational rules, based on a complex series of verbal and non-verbal articulations between the participants. Therefore, power for this objective is not only “how” the attitudes of the teachers were articulated, but the very real, and very multiple,
demands of the space as a system itself negotiating with those attitudes in order to produce intelligibility. Indeed, even though each teacher had long-term experience with English teaching, along with definite attitudes and ideas about what and how to do it, nevertheless they found themselves confronted with a number of issues that made a “literal translation” of those ideas very difficult. As outlined in the methodology, these articulations were analyzed and documented both verbally and non-verbally (including initiations and responses), and along the lines of spaces both conceptual and physical (for example, physical classrooms or, as the class progressed, spaces such as students staring out the window, not paying attention, talking to each other, etc.) looking at power along the lines of “talking,” “doing,” and “being.”

This process of “adaptation” and “translation” took three major forms: (1) the teachers’ use of power as a creative adaptation of their earlier expressed attitudes, meaning that in each and every class, the teachers were forced to “translate” their attitudes to fit the unique demands of Matsuoka High School; (2) the adaptation of their teacher training, prepared lessons, activities, and experiences to the unique demands of Matsuoka High School, as opposed to other sites in which they had worked previously; and (3) an adaptation of their own interest, enthusiasm, and love of English teaching to fit the expressed lack of interest, motivation, or participation on the parts of their students.

Each of the three teachers had a unique set of cultural attitudes and backgrounds, coupled with a high degree of teacher training, experience, and interest in sharing the knowledge of English as a thinking skill that could benefit their students’ lives. Many of these skills, they felt, could not be immediately brought into their teaching experience at Matsuoka High School upon coming for the first time. Given Japan’s unique educational structure, however, it would be incorrect to say that these teachers chose this assignment willingly or looked at it simply as a
unique challenge to be addressed: as described in the previous research objective, Japanese
teachers are required to move to different schools in the region every three years (Hood, 2001),
and as such were assigned to Matsuoka High School for their term. Even though this policy is
established and understood throughout Japan, thus giving no teacher preference over his or her
assignment except in special extenuating circumstances, nevertheless the teachers themselves are
well aware of the schools in the prefecture considered “the best” and those considered “the
worst.” Matsuoka, unfortunately, has this latter designation, causing at times for teachers at other
schools jokingly to refer to “hazard duties” or even “hazard pay” for making the long commute
out to work with the students and faculty at Matsuoka. Further, this author once was even privy
to a joke made by an older resident of Matsuoka about the school, who (upon hearing that I was
working with the students and faculty there) asked me “what were the three most dangerous
things in Matsuoka?” I replied that I didn’t know, to which he smiled and responded: “Kuma
(the type of black bear that still roamed the mountains in the area), Mamushi (a small poisonous
snake), and ‘Matsukousei’ (a portmanteau word meaning ‘students at Matsuoka High School.’)”

Category A: Verbal Practices

Participant verbal practices, or “power as talking,” related to the articulation of their
attitudes in real-time classroom settings were captured via the observations, compressed here as
samples of behaviors observed, with supplements from the interviews and discussions to help
ground the discussion to follow (Galton, 1988). This category was further divided for data
analysis into appropriate sub-factors and categories for analysis (see Appendix C.)

Ms. Sato

Ms. Sato begins each class with American style greetings; telling the students “good
morning” and beginning each time asking a few, at random, how they are doing. Students who
look sleepy or unorganized are softly teased about what time they went to bed the night before (for example, during a class in early June, in which she asked one student whose eyes were very red, body swaying slowly forward as though he might fall asleep at any moment, “Why are you sleepy?”) (Codings 1.A.1.a), and on occasion she will ask questions related to current events or about popular television programs that were on recently. In July, for example, students keenly watched a show every Tuesday called “Utaban,” in which their favorite musicians were interviewed and performed their latest songs, and Ms. Sato asked one student if they watched the show the night before (or, during the next observation on a Tuesday, if they would tune-in that night (Coding 1.A.1.c/e.) Students on sports teams will often be asked simple questions about their practices or their tournaments, especially in late July as the regional tournaments begin. These are asked in easy, slow English, and the students asked directly will generally respond, while most of the others appear not to pay attention or listen to the answers. Often the students answer the questions in Japanese, though some will attempt to answer in English if the question is direct or simple enough.

Instructions as well (for example, open the textbook, take out your notebook, etc.) are generally conducted in English, repeating them several times slowly if the students do not follow the direction or appear not to understand. During all of the observed lessons, “open your notebooks,” “look at page XXYY,” “take out your pencils,” and other instructional language took place using English only (Coding 1.C.3, 1.F.3). About once each month, an Assistant Language Teacher (ALT), a native-English speaking teacher assigned by the Prefectural Board of Education named David (pseudonym) visits the school and team-teaches with her, and during an observation of them both in July, it was observed that while team-teaching she will occasionally use Japanese as a foil to the ALT’s use of English-only (Coding 1.E.1/2/3)
For activities in class, Ms. Sato generally checks the meaning of new material using Japanese, supplementing with English when she believes that the students can understand and depending on the particular level of the classroom. Since she is responsible for multiple English classes, she gauges each class differently, though tends to use Japanese in almost all levels (including the special elective English class that students choose from among many choices, including gym, calligraphy, and computer technology.) During a June lesson about the Japanese poet Kaneko Misuzu, whose quiet, simple, and personal poetry discusses the relationship of the individual to their natural environment, Ms. Sato supplemented the English translations provided in the textbook with a few poems by the American poet Emily Dickinson, with whom Misuzu shares some thematic similarity. In addition to the original English versions, she would also provide the Japanese translations, so the students could look for the parallels in the texts (Coding 1.F.1.a). In the other observations as well, if the students appeared to understand, she would use slightly more English (or provide supplementary “real” materials like the above); if they do not, she will immediately transition into Japanese or provide Japanese language materials as supplements. Though she stated quite explicitly that she wants to use English as often as possible, in order to produce a sense of “self-satisfaction” with students in learning English, she nevertheless learned very early in her time at Matsuoka that this approach would not work. “I tried to have students read by themselves,” she noted, “but some of the students couldn’t read any words, any English words,” even though all of the students had studied English for 3-4 years prior to entering Matsuoka High School. More than this, she also noted, was a problem not only with English learning, but also with the explanations she would give the students in their native language. “If I explain in, kind of… ‘adult Japanese’… they don’t understand the meaning. So, I ask other students, if they know the meaning in Japanese, and many students try to think about
it, and they try to understand the meaning of that Japanese,” before she then tries to get them to understand the English (Coding 1.F.2.c/e).

As such, in keeping with the trend of “translation” in this research objective, Ms. Sato’s teaching practice as an articulation of her attitudes is not only a desire to get students to feel the joys of speaking English, but also the very practical, and very basic, needs required in the lesson activities to get them there. “I started to teach them how to pronounce,” she says, “so that’s the first trial… and I didn’t help them at all, or, no, students ask me, ‘I don’t know how to read,’ but I told them how do you pronounce ‘re,’ like ‘ree,’ so like reborn, or something. So, I divided the words into small blocks, and have them read.” (Coding 1.C.1.a/b/e)

Thus, even before moving on to actual English literacy, she found herself breaking the words into component pieces in order to help them build the basic blocks to form full words. In each of her lessons, she continues to do this; for example, during a lesson in July in which the textbook utilized a simplified version of an Agatha Christie short story, instead of first getting students to read the entire story or “solve” the mystery, she quite literally went through and provided a glossary or “word bank” of terms that they would encounter (Coding 1.F.1.a/b/c/e.) This built on the earlier “blocks” of words she had utilized in the beginning, and as such by this summer term of the school year the students had moved up to complete words and sentences, with continued further explanation in Japanese as needed.

During each of the observed classroom lessons themselves, Ms. Sato utilized almost exclusively one long activity, with few transitions (Coding 1.A.3.c.1/2). For example, if the lesson involves reading passages from the textbook (as in the above Agatha Christie example, or the earlier example about the poet Kaneko Misuzu), students would generally continue with the reading for the duration of the class, spending up to twenty minutes in reading and repeating of
passages or in silent reading, followed by questions or follow-ups to check the meaning (again, conducted largely in Japanese with supplements in English when available.) When asked about this practice as well, or in viewing this alongside her initial attitudes about English teaching, she notes that though a more dynamic amount of activities would be preferable, again, “they are such… SHY… students, so they hesitate to express themselves.” As such, she falls back to reading and writing exercises, or repeating exercises that require the students simply to produce responses, without requiring them to produce original aspects of the patterns being taught and without many transitions to other activities (Coding 3.C.2). Indeed, when asked direct questions, often the students will sit blankly, or shake their heads and say in Japanese that they “don’t know” the answer. During “check-ups” with questions about the reading (again, using the Agatha Christie lesson as an example), one student was asked “what was written on the dirty envelope?” (in reference to a key scene in the unfolding of the mystery in the story), to which he simply sat, saying nothing at all (Coding 1.C.1.b/d). This was but one of many examples of such behaviors, one of which Ms. Sato is well aware. In an effort to compensate for this, and attributing it further to their overall shyness, she notes that “so, the first step is reading, reading textbook, second is express their own writing. It’s okay to be really short sentences, or really easy way… easy words… but their mental… how do you say?… mental trying… is a second thing.”

As such, Ms. Sato’s verbal articulations tend to be mostly initiations, with the responses from students being required as parts of the lessons or activities themselves (for example, repeating sentences following her.) For initiations to the questions of others, she will generally use Japanese, or English if possible (though in almost all cases the questions or initiations from students begin with “Sensei,” a polite form of address meaning “Teacher,” and continue on in Japanese.)
Asked about the lack of initiations and responses from the students, not just occasionally but almost completely (and, indeed, over the course of the term and the observations the number of actual initiations on the part of students was almost minimal, across the board), Ms. Sato notes that “…because I think, from their young days, from elementary school, they [the students] didn’t get much chance to express themselves, and I guess more intellectual students did the part, like express or to be the reader, so they were always like, um, … I wonder how to put it… behind these intellectual students, I guess. That’s why.” In elementary and middle schools, which in Japan are compulsory according to geographic location, these students were placed with students at all levels, including those at the bottom, but also those at the top according to test scores and proficiency examinations. When it comes to high school, however, these top students left and went to other schools (for example, Southern Niigata where Ms. Sato taught previously.) These students who dominated the classroom discussions and initiations were now gone, leaving the students who did not take part previously all together in one group, and suddenly unable to “disappear” into the background of the classroom. As such, Ms. Sato’s verbal practices as articulations of her attitudes, by means of her power as an English Teacher, were translations and adaptations to try and compensate for these multiple, unique and difficult situations. We will see these trends continue as we discuss in the next sections how these affected her non-verbal practices, and also the spaces of the classroom itself.

Ms. Watanabe

Ms. Watanabe began each of the observed classes very differently from Ms. Sato, using traditional Japanese greetings (Coding 1.D.2.c/d). Highly ritualized, these include very formal Japanese language expressions in which the students all rise at the beginning of class as the teacher enters (one student calls out “stand up”), all of whom bow in unison (the same student
calls out “bow”) and then they all sit back down (this same student calls out “and now sit.”) The teacher then bows back, generally with a nod of the head, and greets them with the usual morning or afternoon greeting. Ms. Watanabe generally does not banter with the students, asking questions of them in English or in Japanese. Only occasionally, if for example one of the students did not stand up or is already asleep when the class begins, she will smile and ask them why they are tired, usually in Japanese though occasionally looking towards this researcher with a smile and asking them in English (as she did during observations in June and July). If asked in English, they are asked in very slow, easy terms (“Are you sleepy?” “Did you eat lunch?” etc.), and very rarely do they respond in English. Instead of banter, Ms. Watanabe generally begins by giving instructions and talking about the plan for the day (Coding 1.C.1/2/3; 1.F.1/2/3).

Instructions as well (for example, take out your pens, open your textbook, write down these notes, take out your notebook, etc.) are conducted in Japanese, repeating them several times if the students do not follow the direction or appear not to understand. Individual students who do not follow direction are called out by name, and occasionally she will walk over to their desk to speak to them directly. There is one student in particular, a male student who sits toward the middle of class, who gets particular attention and to whom, during at least three of the observations, she repeated these practices (Coding 1.F.3). Unlike Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe generally does not team-teach with the ALT (during the term no observations were seen or conducted with him.) She mentioned only that the infrequency of visits by the ALT (perhaps once a month), coupled with her own very hectic teaching schedule (she was mostly responsible for the lower-level second and third-year students), were thus not conducive to such team-teaching, though on occasion she would “work with Hana-san or kyouiku-jishu,” meaning team-teach with Ms. Nakamura (who was new to the district that year) or with the native Japanese
student-teachers who would be assigned there for internships before graduating with their teaching degrees.

For activities in class, Ms. Watanabe generally checks the meaning of new material using Japanese, supplementing with English when she believes that the students can understand and depending on the particular level of the classroom. During a lesson about sign language in June, for example, she continually referred, and used in asking questions (even if the other components of the question were in English), the Japanese term for sign language, “Shuwa,” in place of the English (Coding 1.F.1.a).

Like both Ms. Sato and Ms. Nakamura, Ms. Watanabe is responsible for multiple English classes, and so she gauges each class differently, though tends to use Japanese in almost all levels, including asking questions in Japanese about the English material (for example, during a June class about the Picasso painting “Guernica,” after reading a sentence that said, “Guernica, a town in Spain, was bombed by the Nazis,” she asked a student “Where is Guernica?,” but in Japanese.) Though she, like Ms. Sato, stated explicitly that she is interested in using English as much as possible, in order to “get some knowledge, [and] know something new through English [or from] books, so I want them to use as a skill,” nevertheless she also ran into difficulties both with ability and with attitude, especially in the particularly low-level classes to which she has been assigned.

In addition to their problems with “basic skills; they don’t know the words, and… what’s the right way to put it… and the grammar, that’s why they are a little bit behind,” which prevent her from using English more explicitly, she also ran into attitude problems related to motivation. Doing a needs-analysis with her students, she found that, “one time I asked some questionnaire about learning English, and I found out they didn’t like studying English.” In an effort to
compensate for this, “to make my class more interesting, I think,” she asked them about increasing the use of English in the classroom, with more English-centered activities. She found, with this as well, that “…I ask them if I do the class in English, only in English, what do you think? And they say, it’s okay, but I don’t want everything in English. A little bit is okay.” As such, she works to find a balance between her desire to “change my class to try and speak English a little bit more, to ask them questions a little bit more in English,” and also the lack of basic skills and understanding that her students have upon entering the classroom.

Interestingly, in her classroom practice with each activity, she utilized in all of the observations a component she refers to as “Question Time,” in which she puts this attitude into practice, in an effort to produce student responses but also because she “believes my class is a little bit… boring… I believe so myself, maybe a little boring, so I have to think, you know… a lot about the class.” However, for question time during the observations, most of the students either do not ask questions, or continue to look at their books, or out the window. Only one student, that same boy sitting towards the middle of the class mentioned earlier, asks regular questions, but they are odd questions having little to do with the lesson, to which he gives her an odd smile and to which she is unable to answer clearly. Indeed, during one June observation, the question (asked in Japanese) was so bizarre this researcher had trouble even understanding what he was asking; Ms. Watanabe, too, shaking her head and glancing in my direction, also seemed unable to determine what he was talking about (Codings 1.C.1; 1.F.1.a; 1.F.2.c/e). Other students may ask simple questions (for example, a female student asked her “Do you know sign-language, Ms. Watanabe?”), but they are always in Japanese.

As such, in keeping with the earlier established trend of “translation” in this research objective, Ms. Watanabe’s teaching practice as an articulation of her attitudes as power is not
only a desire to get students to develop greater basic skills as thinkers, putting “a lot of energy to make them have more interests… and motivation,” but also the very practical, and very basic, needs required to get them there. Whereas Ms. Sato began teaching them very basic components of language (especially parts of words first through pronunciation and then through use), Ms. Watanabe uses more motivational or contextual items to produce interest in English, and thereby the desire to develop greater basic skills. “I tried to talk about a lot of things outside Japan,” she notes. “Like, for example, if you open the textbook, finding some interesting pictures, maps, so I tried to make them think about other countries, other contexts.” Nevertheless, this too proved difficult, for as with the problems with language, providing this contextual data and “interesting” information ran into problems with very basic skills limiting intelligibility. “One thing that made me surprised,” she notes, “was when I asked them… where to find England on a map… and they answer, ‘It’s in America.’” Given this lack of “basic knowledge” related both to formal and content issues with the language, in addition to a realization similar to Ms. Sato’s about their L1 proficiency (“Their Japanese ability is low… it’s so low…” she notes), Ms. Watanabe sighs and mentions that “it’s tough!”

During the observed classroom lessons themselves, Ms. Watanabe typically utilizes one long activity, with few transitions, much like Ms. Sato. During the observed lessons, as well, Ms. Watanabe did not bring in the “motivational” pieces like pictures or how she “sometimes” brings in experiences from her days as a tour conductor, but instead kept closely connected to the lesson topic and the textbook or worksheet based materials (1.A.3.c.1/2; 3.D.2). For example, (as during both the Guernica lesson and the Sign Language Lesson) if the lesson involves reading passages from the textbook, students will generally continue centered around this activity for the duration of the class. However, unlike Ms. Sato’s classes, Ms. Watanabe rarely spend much time in silent
reading, and instead asks questions about the passage (English-centered questions, but in Japanese), with follow-ups to check the meaning and translations of each sentence into Japanese. Interestingly, this practice is in contrast to her stated lesson plans and here, too, required “translation;” for example, in the June lesson about Guernica, she provided before the class began an outline of her intended activities, of which there were at least four. As the class continued, however, the number of activities was condensed into a very long explanation of the passage, just trying to get the students to understand literally what was on the page (1.C.1.a/b/3; 1.F.1.a/b/c/e).

When asked about these changes as well, or in viewing this alongside her initial attitudes about English teaching, she (like Ms. Sato) notes that though a more “interesting” classroom is her desire, one in which dynamic activities keep students active with each other, and with her as the teacher. But, like Ms. Sato, there are certain issues preventing this direct “translation” of her attitude, “they need to be disciplined,” she notes, “some of them, I think… are sort of… illness, have some sort of illness and they can’t understand, or stay in the classroom. They can’t keep seated.” As such, this impacts the degree of dynamism she can have with her students and in her classes, because while some students may do the activities, these students needing a “special kind of care” would disrupt. For example, as mentioned earlier, in the activity related to “Question Time,” one student (who rarely followed directions in class) would ask bizarre, or sometimes even inappropriate questions, having nothing to do with the lessons themselves. In addition, many of the students lack the skills required to finish one activity, and move on to another that is more dynamic. For example, in the Guernica lesson, the students did not grasp the meaning sufficiently then to move on to the other components outlined in the Lesson Plan. As such, like Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe needed to fall back to simple reading and writing
exercises (usually always with the CD that accompanies the textbook), or repeating exercise that require the students simply to produce responses, without requiring them to produce original aspects of the patterns being taught, in order to get the basic meanings. “I want them to be able to write English also, not just to speak,” she notes, and she wants them to grasp satisfactorily the meaning, rather than simply moving on to another activity in order “to be more interesting.” And, as such, though she wants to make those classes more “interesting,” she also notes this need for balance between ability and behavior, basic skills and dynamic teaching, “because I have to evaluate them, right? If I don’t have any exam, they don’t study,” and as such, won’t get those “basic knowledge” needed in order to produce the types of increased conceptual thinking that is her overall purpose and interest in teaching. Like Ms. Sato’s students, when Ms. Watanabe asks a direct questions, often the students will sit blankly, or shake their heads and say in Japanese that they “don’t know” the answer. Unlike Ms. Sato, however, who will generally get a few seconds before this answer is given, Ms. Watanabe’s students answer almost immediately. When she then goes on to ask the same question of another student, they will repeat the response, almost as quickly.

As such, Ms. Watanabe’s verbal articulations are almost completely initiations, with (like Ms. Sato) the responses from students being required as parts of the lessons or activities themselves (for example, repeating sentences following the CD that accompanies the textbook, and that is played on a radio at the front of the class.) For initiations to the questions of others, she almost always uses Japanese; even if she uses English, she will immediately translate what she has said into Japanese.

Whereas Ms. Sato noted the lack of initiations and responses from the students that the students were not encouraged to be expressive or give their opinions, and that often the “top”
students in the class would dominate the discussion, Ms. Watanabe feels that the problem was simply “discipline” (something she mentions three times during the interviews), without enough “responsibility” on the parts of students. As such, these types of behaviors were not addressed early in their educational careers, and as such have become habits that are tough to break now that they are in high school. As such, Ms. Watanabe’s verbal practices as articulations of her attitudes, by means of her power as an English teacher, were (like Ms. Sato) translations and adaptations to try and overcome all of these problems with discipline, lack of motivation, and a lack of basic skills needed to function properly in both the first language and the second. Like Ms. Sato, these adaptations also affected her non-verbal practices and her classroom spaces, creating an atmosphere designed to increase both personal responsibility and that personal motivation.

Ms. Nakamura

Ms. Nakamura, like Ms. Watanabe, begins each class with traditional Japanese language expressions (1.D.2.c/d). However, following this, she will generally spend a few minutes bantering with the students, in both Japanese and English. These questions, usually simple expressions such as “how are you?” or “Are you hot?” will be immediately translated into Japanese if the student does not answer, or appears not to understand (1.B.1.d/e; 1.E.1.c/e; 1.E.2.c/e). Following the greetings and banter, Ms. Nakamura then gives a short vocabulary quiz at the beginning of each class, which consists of words in English and in Japanese, needing to be translated. These quizzes, such as a quiz provided during a June observation, consisted of four sections intending to evaluate different kinds of conceptual or linguistic tasks: one in which students selected the appropriate word to finish a sentence, another in which they circled
definitions in English, another in which they wrote the English word, and a final one from which they circled a Japanese definition from the provided English term.

She follows this routine in every class, she mentions, not only because she wants to create a habit of “responsibility” and discipline (much like Ms. Watanabe), but also because she wants to use these interactions and subsequent short daily quizzes as an easy motivational tool for students. “It’s important to give them some task to feel… those [fulfilled] feelings,” she notes, “…and because there’s a lot of pressure to pass tests, they think fulfillment is about a test.” As such, these easy quizzes both give her an evaluative measure for her students, but also a chance for fulfillment by targeting the pressurized test atmosphere. But, she also notes with a smile, that sometimes the students don’t study for these quizzes either, and so they “maybe not” feeling as fulfilled as she hopes. Greetings, like Ms. Watanabe, are in Japanese (including standard “Stand Up. Bow” also in Japanese) and follow the standard routines of all of the Japanese teachers in all of the subjects, from Physical Education to Science.

Like Ms. Watanabe, classroom instructions are conducted in Japanese (I.F.3), repeating them several times if the students do not follow the direction or appear not to understand. Individual students who do not follow direction are not called out by name, though she will repeat the directions until all of the students have complied (in a June observation, for example, she repeated the same instruction, “Take out your notebook and pencils” at least eight times, until finally all of the students had complied.) Like Ms. Watanabe, and unlike Ms. Sato, Ms. Nakamura also generally does not team-teach with the ALT, less because of the infrequency of his visits, but both because of the problems of “discipline” with her students, and also the need she has to get them prepared for examinations. Like both Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe, Ms. Nakamura expresses a frustration with the lack of basic skills in her students, “I was surprised
some students have some trouble studying, even in Japanese,” she notes, “So… I give them some instruction in Japanese, but even then some of them didn’t understand.”

For activities in all of the observed classes, Ms. Nakamura checks the meaning of new material using Japanese almost exclusively (1.F.2.c/e). Like both Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe, Ms. Nakamura is responsible for multiple English classes (usually the first-and-second-year students of both lower and mid-levels), though most of her classes, she notes, have similar problems both with L1 and L2 comprehension and use. For example, during one July lesson in which students were studying vocabulary words by writing the printed English term in Japanese, one student raised his hand that he was finished. Looking at his paper, he had written down the Japanese term for “warmth” using the katakana script, a script that is generally only reserved for foreign or borrowed words (such as “football,” “Chrysler,” “taxi,” etc.). It is almost never used for regular Japanese terms that have a pictographic symbol (especially something as common as “warmth”) and when asked about this, he remarked that he didn’t know how to write the appropriate character (something that is generally taught and mastered by the second grade of elementary school.) Though she, like Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe, stated explicitly that she is interested in using English as much as possible, in order to “make it more real” to her students, and increase their motivation, “because Japanese high school students don’t have situation that they have to use English in their daily life,” nevertheless she also ran into difficulties both with ability and with attitude.

In addition to their problems with basic skills in both Japanese and in English, she also ran into similar problems related to motivation. In fact, she went even further than saying that the students lack “motivation” to study, “it depends,” she notes, “but some of them have motivation, but some of them, well, others have a real problem… like Depression.” This problem, she notes,
is much “more than motivation,” and is harder to solve than by simply increasing English use in
the classroom, or creating more “interesting” classroom activities. “Family or community have
influenced them much,” she notes, and so she’s having to work simultaneously with, and against,
these outside pressures. Like her colleagues, Ms. Nakamura works to find a balance between her
interests in “interactive” classrooms, and the “surprising” difficulties and lack of basic skills of
her students, always in an effort to make them feel more “fulfilled” in their lives and their work.
It is this feeling, she notes, that can solve both the motivational and, perhaps, even the depression
issues for her students.

In keeping with the trend of “translation” in this research objective that was seen clearly
in both of her fellow teachers, Ms. Nakamura’s teaching practice as an articulation of her
attitudes is not only a motivation to get students to develop greater basic skills as thinkers, using
English as a “means of studying the way of thinking, the way of thinking of people who speak
[it],” but also the basic needs required to get them there. Whereas Ms. Sato began teaching them
very basic components of language, and Ms. Watanabe contextual items to produce interest in
English, Ms. Nakamura looks to psychological components to address issues both of motivation
and depression, and of having no “dreams” or “goals” for their study. In addition to classroom
activities designed simultaneously to evaluate and produce English learning (such as the daily
vocabulary quizzes), she also tries, as a teacher, always to consider “students feelings about
English” and to treat them as “human beings” in order to produce (as discussed in the first
research objective) a feeling of fulfillment in her students.

Following the daily quizzes and during the observed classroom lessons themselves, Ms.
Nakamura typically utilizes several different classroom activities, always centered around the
textbook lesson for that week. For example, during a July lesson about “The Festival of the Cats,”
which involved reading passages from the textbook, she brought a radio and the accompanying CD provided by the textbook company, and had the students work with and repeat passages with a native-speaking male voice reading the passages. Unlike Ms. Sato’s classes, but similar to Ms. Watanabe’s, Ms. Nakamura does not give much time to silent reading, but instead will give continuous translations of the English passages in Japanese, with grammatical notes of the words written down. As well, she will ask a few Japanese language questions, but generally instead lectures or provides material verbally for students to write down as notes.

Like her colleagues, when asked about these classroom practices, she notes the degree to which a more “interactive” classroom is her goal, but their sense of “depression” and lack of responsibility and responsiveness prevent her from changing her overall routines and practices. Like her colleagues, these real issues impact the degree of interaction she can conceivably have in the classroom. Further, as she noted in relation to both L1 and L2 problems, these issues all congeal together to produce a difficult classroom situation, in which motivated goals of English learning have to be tempered with real projections and realizations about what the students are capable of accomplishing during a fifty-minute lesson. For example, during a June lesson, Ms. Nakamura developed a unit about origami (traditional Japanese paper sculpture) for her students. Utilizing a content-based structure, in which students would learn English structures (in this case, following directions or commands) through a real activity, that of making an origami frog. Broken down into eighteen steps, the lesson involved starting with a flat piece of paper, moving through each step (“First fold the paper in half, and then unfold it; Fold in half along the broken line, etc.”), ending with a finished product that was both interesting to the students, relevant to their Japanese culture, but that also utilized English language learning. The lesson, however, turned out to be incredibly difficult for the students, and those who attempted to follow the
English directions ran into constant trouble (needing translation help with the directions), while the others simply skipped ahead and looked at the pictures, making the frog without even considering the English instructions. The goal was for the class to go through each step together, but after approximately ten minutes, a third of the class already had a finished frog, another third hadn’t even touched the piece of paper on their desk, and the final third tried with her to varying degrees of success (some students with a partial frog, others with some sort of unintentional post-modern sculpture on their desks.) Indeed, as Ms. Nakamura noted during the class, she didn’t realize that the instructions would be so difficult; structurally, they were not. However, the process oriented nature, and detail of some of the directions (“Bring A1 and A2 to the center and fold. The upper part of the fold should go under the triangle”) confused the students, several of whom still had difficulty understanding the meaning when it was explained to them in Japanese.

As such, and illustrated through these above examples, Ms. Nakamura’s verbal articulations (most especially like Ms. Watanabe, but also similar to Ms. Sato) are almost completely initiations, with very few responses from students being required as parts of the lessons or activities themselves (outside of repeating sentences following the CD that accompanies the textbook.) For initiations to the questions of others, she always uses Japanese, as in the class lesson about Origami. During this lesson, there were more responses than in the other observations, and also more initiations, but these came out chaotically and were a result of frustration from the students because they appeared interested in making the origami frog correctly, more than they were about taking part in the lesson or learning the English components.

Whereas Ms. Sato noted the lack of initiations and responses from the students that the students were not encouraged to be expressive or give their opinions, and Ms. Watanabe that the problem was simply “discipline,” Ms. Nakamura goes back to the issues of a lack of “feeling”
with her students, and a psychological component that is difficult to target simply in the
classroom. Citing the familial and community dimensions, she notes the degree to which the
students come into her classroom already with certain attitudes that are much more than “habits;”
it is not enough simply to “break” these routines. Thus, Ms. Nakamura’s verbal practices as
articulations of her attitudes by means of her power as an English Teacher were translations and
adaptations to try and overcome all of these issues, including also a lack of ability to function in
Japanese. In the next section, we will see some of the ways in which she attempted to address
these concerns through her non-verbal practices, as continued articulations of her attitudes in a
dynamic, changing, and difficult real-time classroom space.

Category B: Non-Verbal Practices

Participant non-verbal practices, or “power by doing,” were also captured through the
observations and field notes, with supplements from the interviews and other demographic data
related to cultural norms or classroom routines present in a Japanese school environment. This
category was further divided for analysis into two sub-categories: (1) Non-verbal articulations
accompanying verbal articulation (for example, what non-verbal gestures, facial expressions,
tone or register of voice, etc. accompanied their responses or initiations in class); and (2) non-
verbal articulations in absence of verbal articulation (for example, basic gestures, motions, where
the students sat, how they sat, etc.)

Ms. Sato

As in the interviews, Ms. Sato exhibits a warm and inviting personality, and smiles very
often all through the class ([B].1.a.2.c). Even in terms of feedback when students make mistakes,
she generally will smile or gesture openly, sometimes even offering a lighthearted laugh that will
often provoke the student to smile in return. She notes that she uses these gestures, smiles, and
laughs in order to compensate for her students’ “shyness,” and also to try and get them more interested in “expressing themselves.” She also notes, however, that it is difficult for her to do this in Japan, because even though Americans tend to be more openly affectionate, she notes that Japanese teachers are afraid “of touching, or making contact” with their students, even in a gestural sort of way. Nevertheless, having both lived and studied in America on several occasions (also having studied in college specific American History topics), she uses gestures, smiles, and non-verbal articulations very much like those used in American classrooms, with much more expansive arm and body movements than is typical in a Japanese classroom (and, indeed, more than we will see in the non-verbal articulations of her two colleagues).

In class, she continues these gestures along with all of her verbal practices; for example, joking with the students (if, for example, as during a June observation in which a student was particularly sleepy in class and not paying attention, provoking her to joke with him about going to sleep earlier the night before), and also in greetings. During all of these activities, and despite whatever actual content is actually being said, she will use a slower, slightly exaggerated tone of voice in speaking English that does not carry over into her Japanese. On days when the ALT is present, she will look back and forth from the ALT to the students when the ALT is reading.

Physically, Ms. Sato is not a large woman, and dresses during all of the observed lessons relatively casually in class (as described in the first research objective, she usually wears slacks or even long ‘capri’ shorts, and during the observed term, she never wore formal pants or a skirt [2.e.2.b]. As well, she generally wore some sort of shirt or sweater, and never a blouse.) Pregnant at the time of the research, nevertheless she moved often around the classroom as she taught, walking up and down the rows from front to back, glancing down at student work, using open gestures to get students to the right page, or making slight corrections as they would work.
When the ALT is present, she will stand on the opposite side of the room from him, playing off of his gestures or initiations in order to mediate for her students.

As in each component of this objective, Ms. Sato’s non-verbal articulations acted alongside the “adaptations” she made in articulating her attitudes by means of power in real spaces. These non-verbal components supplemented her verbal components, factoring into her desire to show a sense of satisfaction and warmth in being able to communicate in English, both as a skill and as an end in itself. These gestures and non-verbal articulations helped to ground and to augment her verbal articulations, showing further the multiple nature of power in expression of both formal and content related attitudes, by means not only of words, but also the varying and supplemental gestural articulations which couch them.

Ms. Watanabe

Ms. Watanabe, as in the interviews, exhibits a more “business-like” demeanor than her two colleagues, quite serious and deliberate in her word choice and, as we will see, in her non-verbal articulations (1.a.3.c). Nevertheless, beneath this business-like demeanor is subtle warmth, indeed, even something that could even be described as a dry sense of wit. Nevertheless, in class, she does not exhibit this sense of wit, noting that in addition to feeling that the students lack “discipline” (and, as such, need to be shown structure in the classroom), she also does not feel it appropriate to interact outside the established bounds of a teacher/student relationship. In conversation with me, when asked about interacting with students, she laughs and says, “You mean, do I hang around with them?” exhibiting a flash of a smile that made her answer more than clear. Whereas Ms. Sato utilized very open, friendly gestures, smiles, and laughs in order to compensate for her students’ “shyness,” Ms. Watanabe maintains a businesslike demeanor in order to address their lack of basic skills, while also requiring of them that they stay in their seat
and maintain a sense of discipline and order in the classroom. Whereas her colleague utilized a very American style of exaggerated gestures in the classroom, Ms. Watanabe utilizes a more traditional Japanese demeanor. Though the connection with their expressed attitudes do much to give meaning to these differences, it is also important to note that though Ms. Watanabe lived in the United States, she never actually studied there (but instead was there for travel and living experience), which is quite different than her colleague Ms. Sato (who also studied abroad.)

Her desire to maintain order, but also to address basic skills and the lack of understanding of English by her students, also carries over to her voice inflection, tone, and pronunciation while speaking English (1.a.3.c). When speaking with a native speaker, Ms. Watanabe is very precise, speaking with a normal tone of inflection and only a mild Japanese accent on certain vowel or consonant sounds. In class and with her students, however (and during each of the observed lessons in June, July, and August), she uses a much slower, much more exaggerated tone, even mispronouncing words in key places in order to conform more closely to Japanese syllables (called “Katakana”) that her students understand and use everyday. As such, she quite noticeably alters her pronunciation, intonation, and voice from normal English usage to “katakana English,” which in many cases renders them almost unintelligible to a native English speaker (for example, conforming English words to the Japanese phonetic alphabet generally causes a loss of both accents and stress, and also expands its number of syllables… the 2-syllable word “textbook” becomes the six-syllable “tekisutobukku” with no stress, the word “English” becomes “Ingurishu,” and so on.)

In class, and in keeping with her overall demeanor, Ms. Watanabe does not use a large degree of gestures (1.a.4), either by themselves or accompanying other verbal gestures; for example, whereas Ms. Sato often joked with the students (if, for example, one student is sleepy
in class, or is not paying attention), Ms. Watanabe will often continue teaching the lesson without noticing or paying attention to that student, or walk over to the student in question and say something to them quietly. Further, she does not often engage the students directly, with gestures or with speech, but will often use the “filter” of the CD that accompanies the textbook, repeating after it or having students repeat with her after the CD, as she holds the textbook in her hands or moves towards the board to write down notes.

Physically, Ms. Watanabe is taller than her two colleagues, but even still is not a large woman, and holds herself very erect, in keeping with her overall business-like demeanor. In fact, taking her out of the classroom, she could almost be a lawyer or a business executive, ready to go to a meeting with clients, in the way she carries herself, moves, and dresses (2.e.2.a). Nevertheless, like Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe does not stay centered at the front of the classroom, but instead walks up and down the rows from front to back, glancing down at student work, but does not often gesture to students, but instead simply continues moving while teaching the lesson or reading from the textbook.

As in each component of this objective and similar to Ms. Sato described above, Ms. Watanabe’s non-verbal articulations acted alongside the “adaptations” she made in articulating her attitudes by means of power in real spaces. These non-verbal components adapted her verbal ones and attitudes as supplements for observable intelligibility, factoring into her attitudes to foster in her students English as a “tool to get some knowledge,” while also increasing overall basic skills in both L1 and L2, and imparting a sense of responsibility and discipline in her students. These gestures and non-verbal articulations, neither fully intentional nor accidental, but instead observable articulations by means of power (especially the way in which she altered her voice tone, inflection, and pronunciation, a practice which will also be analyzed in the third
research objective about Presence) provided the base and the vehicle for her verbal articulations, showing further the multiple nature of power in expression of attitudes.

*Ms. Nakamura:*

Youngest of the three teachers at Matsuoka High School, and the newest English teacher there (having come only that previous spring), Ms. Nakamura appears much more soft-spoken, quiet, even shy than her two colleagues, though presents quite a unique set of non-verbal articulations in the classroom that do not necessarily follow one’s expectations, given these tendencies. Like Ms. Watanabe, she is quite serious, careful, and deliberate in her word choice, even precise, yet like Ms. Sato, she is considerably more open and direct in her non-verbal articulations. There was a glimpse of this that came out in conversation (as described in the first research objective), when talking about her area of interest, that of helping student “feelings” and also trying to think of strategies to make them feel “fulfilled,” she leaned forward in her chair and became considerably more animated than she had hitherto. In class, this continues in the form of direct nonverbal articulations to students, and accompanying the content and instruction activities, much as (in the interview) something that piqued her interest caused a sudden gesture. Whereas Ms. Sato consistently utilized very open, friendly gestures, smiles, and laughs in order to compensate for her students’ “shyness,” and Ms. Watanabe a businesslike demeanor in order to address their lack of basic skills and discipline, Ms. Nakamura appears to use comforting or open gestures as a way to address the “depression” some students feel, which she sees as inherently more important (and difficult to address) than simply “motivation.” (2.e.1)

This articulated attitude also comes through in her tone and inflection while speaking or gesturing; when speaking with a native speaker or with her students, she often smiles, but uses a slow, slightly exaggerated tone of voice (though, it must be noted, she very rarely uses English in
the classroom, except when repeating or reading a passage in the book. 1.a.3.b) Whereas Ms. Sato tended to gauge her English to the level of her class (slowing down or exaggerating differently than when speaking during the interviews), and Ms. Watanabe changed her intonation and pronunciation almost completely, Ms. Nakamura keeps the same type of careful, deliberate, quiet voice in both circumstances.

During observed class times, Ms. Nakamura generally always smiles and uses soft gestures to accompany them, and often engages students directly (gesturing to a student if he/she raises his/her hand, walking over to them and pointing to the right page in the textbook, or occasionally picking the student’s textbook up and finding the page for them, if they are sleeping or not paying attention. During the origami lesson mentioned above, for example, she often would walk over to student desks directly and help them produce a fold, or follow an English direction, supplementing the linguistic component with a literal demonstration of the step to be completed.) Unlike Ms. Sato and similar to Ms. Watanabe, however, she does not use these gestures in a humorous way, but instead as a further tool of instruction, pointing out or augmenting the particular item in question from the lesson. Though, like Ms. Watanabe, she tends to use the CD that accompanies the textbook, nevertheless she walks around the classroom and continues smiling and gesturing to the students directly.

Physically, Ms. Nakamura resembles Ms. Sato in size and stature, though considerably more soft spoken. Whereas Ms. Watanabe exhibited a very business-like demeanor, and Ms. Sato an open, almost boisterous character, Ms. Nakamura exhibits a slight shyness that also comes through in her dress, which is considerably more conservative than her colleagues (as described in the first research objective, 2.e.2.b.) However, like her two colleagues, Ms. Nakamura does not stay centered at the front of the classroom, but instead walks up and down
Like her two colleagues, Ms. Nakamura’s adapted her attitudes by means of power in real spaces in order to articulate a set of real, intelligible behaviors. These non-verbal components supplemented and informed her pedagogical practice, factoring into her attitudes to foster in her students English a feeling of “fulfillment,” while (like her colleagues) also increasing overall basic skills in both L1 and L2, in order to give them the “means [of] studying the way of thinking… related to [knowing] many things in the world.” These articulations, like those of her two colleagues, showed further the multiple nature of power in expression of attitudes and, as will be shown in the next section, took place in real, dynamic settings whose importance cannot be overlooked.

Category C: Spaces of Interaction

The spaces of interaction, or “being,” were captured through the documentation of observations and field notes, discussions with participants, or review of discursive data related to the schools, community, etc. (see Appendix E for sample photographs.) This element is a general category to describe and document the spaces in which these interactions took place, to give further valuable environmental and contextual data to the ethnography (Chabram, 1990) and the definitions of power being offered, which show the articulation of attitudes in real, dynamic spaces of interaction. This category, however, was also further divided into two sub-categories for analysis: (1) Physical spaces (i.e. classroom, teacher’s lounge, gymnasium, school parking lot, etc. and the physical description thereof); and (2) Conceptual Spaces (i.e. group or pair work
within the classroom, students not paying attention [talking to others, staring out the window, sleeping, etc.], ‘cliques’ in class or social dynamics, etc.)

As described in the ethnographic component of the first research objective, Matsuoka High School is a very old school that has been added onto many times over the decades, as student populations ebbed and waned. At its peak, it contained nearly a thousand students, but for nearly the past decade, the number of students has hovered at less than four hundred. Originally built during the early twentieth century, the school building has undergone several renovations, the most recent in the 1960’s. As such, many parts of the building sit unused, and those that are used are clean, though often in disrepair, with patches of plaster or concrete in places where water damage, the impact of snowy winters, or the drastic humidity may have necessitated repairs. As well, many classrooms are closed off or used as storage areas for the decades of accumulated banners, posters, supplies, or musical instruments that are no longer used on a regular basis. The school itself is built around three large wings of classrooms of three stories each that run parallel to each other and are connected by corridors. At the front of the building is a service wing containing the Principal’s Office, the janitorial areas, and the large entryway where the students place their outdoor shoes before slipping into the shoes that they only wear inside the school building. On the second floor of this service wing is the large teachers room (see Figure 3 and Appendix E, photograph 3), where all of the teachers and administrators in the school have their desks. Unlike many American schools, teachers in Japanese high schools do not have their own classroom that they use exclusively; instead, all of the teachers work in this centralized teacher’s room, and then carry their materials to the particular classroom in question (organized by grade level and broken into three or four homerooms.) Most of these classrooms are of the same size and shape, and as such, in the
Figure 3: Layout of Matsuoka High School
following analysis of the use of these spaces, particular attention will be paid to how the three participants negotiate multiple demands and relate individually to these spaces and the many students within them.

*Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe, and Ms. Nakamura in the Classroom*

Each English classroom has a raised wooden dais at the front, with a desk or lectern in the center, and blackboards both in front and behind (see photograph 2.) The seats are arranged in rows, all facing forward towards the dais and the lectern, on which each teacher places her daily grade book, attendance sheet, and seating chart ([C].1.a.1.b.1). Ms. Sato, when solo-teaching, stands on the dais infrequently, and only when writing notes or examples on the chalkboard. She does not tend (at least during the observed lessons) to use the rear chalk boards, all of which are covered instead with student drawings and notes from the homeroom teacher about school activities, etc (1.a.1.b.3.b). When David (the ALT) is present, she tends to stand to the side, near the windows, with David on the other side, standing on or near the Dais, just off-center from the lectern (2.b.1.b). Ms. Watanabe almost never stands on the dais, but instead will stand in front or to the side of it; in fact, other than to write quickly notes or assignments on the board, she almost always stands off to the side or moves around the classroom space (1.a.1.b.3.b). Ms. Nakamura, however, tends to write on the board at the front of the classroom more often than her two colleagues, and as such stands on the dais at the front more often, both during the initial classroom routines (especially while students take the daily quizzes) and then also when instructing from the notes on the board (1.a.1.b.3.c).

As with each category of this research objective, the classroom space (both physically and conceptually) is an adaptation and a translation for the teachers, and, in the case of Matsuoka especially, a compromise. For example, most of the English classes contain at least thirty
students, with a maximum of thirty-seven (1.a.1.a.2). For some at the higher-levels, they are divided in half, with an occasional class of 18 (which though more useful for doing activities, nevertheless increases the teaching load of the participants, given that the extra class has to be taught then by one of the others. 1.a.1.a.1) As such, the rooms are stuffed full of desks with only a narrow aisle to move between each of the rows, and a space of about a foot between the dais and the front row of desks. All three of the participants noted the difficulties of this space; Ms. Watanabe noted how “narrow” the classrooms were (narrow, in this sense, meaning cramped, a translation of the Japanese word “semai” which has a more expansive meaning than in English, expressing both literal size but also a feeling of not being large enough or uncomfortable.) Further, Ms. Sato noted the difference this classroom format brings in contrast to some of her other teaching assignments; at Honae High School, for example, “[they have] a special room, like computer at the center of the student, and the students cal all see the same screen, so the teachers can send one information to all the students, which is useful for Flash Cards, or practicing the same expression.” At Matsuoka, however, the teachers note how the students all sit in tight rows, with so many students involved that it is easy for students towards the back to “disappear” into the crowd. When asked about this physical space, all three respondents shrug their shoulders, with Ms. Sato noting “Shou ga nai,” the expression described earlier as both a sign of resignation and an acceptance of the facts, and further, “the budget is limited.”

Given this “narrow” and cramped space at Matsuoka, and the large number of students within which a single English teacher must negotiate, the conceptual spaces produced also play a large part. With each of the participants, at least two, sometimes as many as five (depending on the time of day, or what activities have been happening outside of class) students fall asleep as the class progresses. If the teacher sees them, often they will calmly ask them to wake up, but
generally the students continue to sleep, having “disappeared” behind the student in front of them. Further, while the teacher writes on the board or walks around the room, students begin talking in small groups (especially those seated farthest away from wherever the teacher is at that moment), and other students slip comic books or novels into their textbooks and read during class (2.b.4.a/b). Others stare out the window, play with electronic dictionaries, and some even try to play with their cellular phones during class, an activity that (if caught) will result in its confiscation until the end of the day. As such, both physically and conceptually, the spaces at Matsuoka High School, for all three participants, is one of adaptation, translation, and compromise as they deal with a very small budget, a very small classroom filled with students who lack “motivation,” “discipline,” and are “depressed,” and a need to utilize whatever resources they can in order to produce the real learning outcomes and purposes they express in each and every lesson. As we will see in the following conclusion to this research objective, each of these teachers negotiated multiple concerns in articulating their attitudes given a wide range of concerns and limitations.

Conclusions and Discussion for the Second Research Objective

From this research objective, we can see many of the complicated and multiple ways in which attitudes are articulated in real spaces by means of power (Bashir, 2006; Miller, 2007). As well, documenting the verbal and non-verbal practices of the participants, and the spaces in which they occur, we have added further evidence to our initial operational definition of power, supported also in the literature review. Through the ways in which Ms. Sato, Ms. Nakamura, and Ms. Watanabe negotiate their attitudes in real-time settings, we see quite clearly that Power is not simply a dualistic or binary operation of self/other, teacher/student, but instead a continuum of multiple negotiations, all at the same time, with multiple effects, limitations, and
purposes. Each of the defined factors (see Figure 4.2) helped to make this articulation clearer, in
that through each of the practices, power was the motivating and organizing force: power as
meaningful or intelligible initiation, response, or transition; power as a meaningful or not
meaningful non-verbal articulation, or power’s role in shaping physical and conceptual spaces
and the individuals within them.

These factors help to show that even though the teachers are negotiating their attitudes
with each individual student, they are also continuing to negotiate their attitudes with themselves,
(as described in the previous research objective) as strategies, adaptations, and applications of
their backgrounds and ideas into each classroom at Matsuoka, each of which presents difficult
and unique circumstances (Harklau, 2000; Pierce, 1995). At the same time, the teachers are also
negotiating and self-socializing with their physical and conceptual environments, as the
classroom space itself, the resources present at Matsuoka High School, and the various demands
related to expectations on the part of teachers, preparation for nationally mandated examinations,
and also the “atmosphere” for teacher/student and teacher/teacher relations set up by the
principal, the authority at the board of Education, and the culture at large (Arnett, 1995).

The key theme developed in this objective, based on the factors described in Figure 4.2,
adaptation or “translation,” also shows the multiplicity of power and the way in which attitudes
are articulated as power in real spaces (Ibrahim, 1999). For example, all three teachers expressed
attitudes that were not directly articulated in their practices as classroom teachers. What they
“said” did not necessarily correspond exactly to what they “did,” which impacted by and related
to where they “were” (related to “being”) when they said and did it. While on the one hand, it
might be possible to see this as a contradiction between their theory and practice, or a divergence
between what a teacher thinks (agency) and what a teacher does (practice), on the other hand,
this difference illustrates this dynamic and hybrid nature of power as articulation in real spaces. Each teacher found herself facing specific, multiple, and dynamic problems in the classrooms at Matsuoka that were unlike any situation they had encountered before, whether in their preparation for teaching or their teaching assignments before coming to Matsuoka High School. At the same time, these teachers had real goals, purposes, and desires related to their English teaching that they wanted to articulate for their students, believing that these would lead to greater insight, greater personal satisfaction, and greater investment in English language learning (Pierce, 1995). Nevertheless, given real conditions on the ground (for example, the “lack of basic skills” and “lack of discipline” articulated most clearly by Ms. Watanabe, but also echoed by Ms. Nakamura and Ms. Sato), each of these three had to become creative problem solvers, attempting to compensate for the inability of direct translation for their ideas into their real practices. For example, Ms. Sato’s attitudes about English teaching were related to the personal satisfaction gained through speaking English and therefore learning about people all around the world by speaking with them directly. As a teacher at Southern Niigata High School and at Honae High School, two of the top English programs in the prefecture, she was able to create lessons that directly accomplished this goal and created, in a relatively short amount of time, sets of dynamic English speakers ready to talk to foreigners in their future settings (though even at top programs such as these she ran into the problems of students wanting less dynamic activities, and instead ones that would help them pass their entrance examinations). On the other hand, coming to Matsuoka High School, suddenly she found (as did the other two teachers) that the students often lacked very basic Japanese skills, and further had virtually no ability to read even the English Alphabet, despite having studied English for three to four years in elementary and middle school.
Thus, for this research objective, it was important to show how this theme of adaptation fit directly into the operational definition of power, and further how this translation showed the articulation of their attitudes in multiple, dynamic ways. Power is always an exchange between dynamic individuals, in real spaces, for real purposes and real effects that are both observable and intelligible. Even in the simplest exchange, the teachers were negotiating a multiplicity of information, attitudes, and spaces in order to effect intelligibility, and sometimes these articulations took the form of adapted compromises with their own stated motivations, goals, and spaces (Lee, 2000). For example, being unable to create a lesson using only English, Ms. Watanabe noted how often she spoke in Japanese, and provided the students explanations of grammar not only about the English lesson, but also of the Japanese used to explain it. Likewise, Ms. Nakamura noted how the students wouldn’t understand even when “I give them some instruction in Japanese,” and as such had to adapt her lessons to come to terms with these multiple demands as well. These adaptations and articulations were not done out of an interest to use more Japanese in their classrooms as such, but simply because their students lacked the requisite skills to make any of the connections, and thus she was forced to compromise in order to produce intelligibility.

Having documented thus the multiple attitude factors present in each of the participants, and then the ways in which those attitudes were articulated and intelligible via their classroom pedagogical practices, we can now turn to look for and document elements of classroom Presence, in an effort to find ways in which those expressed motivations and purposes might be able to find effective articulation even amidst these multiple, difficult concerns. For example, how might Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe, and Ms. Nakamura find situations to overcome those difficulties and effect dynamic exchanges of intelligibility with their students, even while lacking
basic skills, or even within cramped, underfunded, overcrowded classrooms. It will be the 
purpose of the following objective to see if such elements can be found, produced, and deployed 
in the spaces at Matsuoka High School, and if (indeed) at some points they may already be in 
action every day.

Table 4.2.b Summary of Conclusions for the Second Research Objective

Objective: Show how power conditions the articulation of those attitudes as practices, and organizes 
their pedagogical spaces in very specific, observable ways, as relationships and exchanges between 
their fellow participants.

Conclusions reached to address above objective:

(1) **Power was a translation and negotiation of attitudes for all three teachers in the classroom; 
this translation and negotiation took the form of (1) talking, (2) doing, and (3) being**

*Sato- Attempted to translate previous experiences teaching top high-schoolers in the region, 
but had to negotiate student lack of basic skills in both L1 and L2*

*Watanabe- Attempted to translate attitudes about English as a “tool of knowledge” but had to 
negotiate student lack of discipline and (as above) lack of basic skills.*

*Nakamura- Attempted to translate attitudes about sensitivity in teaching but had to negotiate 
student psychological problems (depression, for example) beyond lack of basic skills.*

(2) **Power, in being the above, was therefore a set of exchanges seeking intelligibility. This 
necessity of intelligibility between participants thus shaped the structure, format, and 
practices in the pedagogical space in real, observable ways.**

*Sato- Sought to use English sentences/constructions, but found lack of skills required her to 
begin teaching the alphabet (“basics”) to be intelligible.*

*Watanabe- wanted to make her lessons “interesting,” but found lack of discipline prevented 
her from making them intelligible.*

*Nakamura- Sought to nurture student feelings and interests using English, but found that even 
L1 skills were so low that she had to supplement in order to be intelligible.*
Third Research Objective

- The final objective of this study is to show, document, and analyze classroom Presence as the articulation of specific types of practices, situated within those dynamic pedagogical spaces and observable within individual lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3: FACTORS STUDIED to address above Objective (See Appendix C for Complete Categories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor A: Authentic Interactions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linguistic Exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Authenticity/Appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spontaneity/Memorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content-Based/Attitude or Social-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-Authentic Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor B: Presentification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedagogical Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cultural and Linguistic Backgrounds/Motivations and Purposes for Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content-Based/Attitude or Social based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-Presentification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Factor C: Deixis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contextualizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Literal/Conceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reproducibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creativity/Generatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-Deixis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final objective of this study was to build upon the previous two research objectives to show, document, and analyze elements of classroom Presence in the real-time, dynamic classroom spaces during the individual lessons. These elements were isolated and articulated by means of an analysis of the data resulting from the first two research objectives (Berg, 1995; Cresswell, 2002; Fairclough, 1990), in coordination with appropriate discursive and demographic data related to the school and community at large (see Appendix C for a summary of codings used in the data analysis).
While the first research objective introduced us to the dynamic individuals teaching English at Matsuoka High School, and the dynamic attitudes that they brought with them into their English pedagogical spaces, the second research objective then showed how power conditioned the articulation of those attitudes in becoming their teaching practices used during individual lessons (in whatever form they took, and in whatever spaces). These two objectives documented their practices and attitudes in real time, showing the multiplicity of data and conditions affecting them at every moment, helping to ground their practices in a continuum of evolving relationships with their students, their fellow teachers, and the larger social environment around them. This final research objective, however, will seek to isolate elements within that practice that produced the elements of classroom Presence, the parameters, definitions, and purposes of which were outlined in the literature review and the methodology (essentially, creating an anti-transcendental attitude in which the teacher focused her attentions and attitudes on the very structures through which the space formed as an autopoietic system, in conjunction with the other participants.) It is important to highlight the practices conducive to classroom Presence, which occur as constitutive pieces for their overall practice, for it is these elements that can lead the teachers toward greater interaction, intelligibility, and a sharing of mutual humanity between the participants in the classroom spaces.

The purpose of this objective will not, however, be to hierarchize the teachers (for example, saying that Ms. Watanabe ranks “higher” on a Presence scale than Ms. Sato because of certain practices, and is therefore a “better” or more effective teacher). Nor will the purpose be to compare each teacher to each other along a rubric, progressive scale, or “points” system designed simply for convenience or to create a set of standards or principles that will be applied to any classroom, in any situation (indeed, to attempt such a translation would be, itself, to fall prey
methodologically to a transcendental attitude that has been avoided from the start). Instead, the purpose will be to show the practices within their individual pedagogy that produced outcomes in their dynamic spaces, according to the definitions and categories set up in the Methodology, that could lead to further productions and further Presence in their practice as a dynamic continuum.

As well, the purpose of this objective will not be to create an exhaustive “list” of Presence examples, but instead to situate specific instances within the larger theoretical and practical discussion. Indeed, as we will see in the narrative, the number of examples of Presence in the observations was relatively few, and often surprising in their format, taking place in locations different from where one might expect or that might seem logical if designing such a “rubric” as mentioned above. Nevertheless, again, the purpose of this objective (and this overall research) is not to criticize these individual teachers, or point out examples where they “failed” to produce Presence. Instead, it is the purpose to look at their existent practice, and see within that, and without any training, preparation, or changes from their normal routines, they may perhaps be producing elements of real Presence in real-time. Methodologically, the observable categories for this instrument, as outlined in Chapter Three, were (1) Authentic Interactions, (2) Presentification, and (3) Deixis, with appropriate sub-categories as outlined in Figure 2.

In considering all of these factors, the findings for this objective added considerable support to the theoretical and methodological definitions and parameters set out in the earlier chapters. In those sections, for example, the initial operational definition of Presence was the articulation (as reproduction and deployment) in a pedagogical space of the sets of constitutive practices under which the content being instructed became intelligible to the instructor. After analyzing the data, the narrative findings of which will be examined below, we will then be in a position to clarify further that operational definition, seeing specifically how it works and how it
connects to the real time pedagogical spaces in Matsuoka High School. In short, the findings show that the areas where each of the teachers showed classroom Presence were not necessarily in the areas where they had received the most training, or where they had the most experience in teaching. The areas where they were most specifically attuned to the constitutive rules and systemic structures of their spaces were also not those where they had done the most preparation, or the most methodologically sound or research-based lesson plan. Instead, as will be shown below, the areas where the teachers exhibited the most classroom Presence were in the very areas where they were articulating their attitudes most literally, defined earlier in the study as their own cultural and linguistic backgrounds and their motivations and purposes for learning (these behaviors were coded as B.1.A/B.1 through 6, and B.2.A/B.C 1 through 6, outlined in Appendix C, or translated as “Presence as techniques of presenting an element of the teachers cultural and linguistic background and motivations and purposes for teaching as a supplement of the lesson content, or related to personal/attitude/non-content issues”). Nevertheless, it is important to note that these were not always conscious articulations; instead, they were quite literal: the teachers exhibited classroom Presence when they were making manifest those real motivations for pedagogy, directly and without transcendence (for example, in the second research objective, we noted how power articulated the expression of attitudes as their classroom practices, though the difference in this objective is in how literally, or basically, they could be applied.) In making this “literal articulation” clearer, it is important to note that in keeping with our operational definitions, Presence in this way will be decidedly unique and independent to each teacher. Thus, the most important finding of this objective is that each of the teachers exhibited Presence in surprising ways, but that ultimately corresponded to the very motivations and purposes as expressed through the other components of the narrative. As such, this research
objective will find that Ms. Sato exhibited Presence most clearly when she was using English pedagogy in the *recreation of a lived world*; Ms. Watanabe exhibited Presence when she was using English pedagogy in the *structuring a conceptual tool*; and finally Ms. Nakamura exhibited Presence most when she was using English pedagogy as a *sensitive means of creating fulfillment*.

In looking back to the previous two research objectives, we found that each teacher noted very different ideas of English pedagogy: Ms. Sato discussed English as an end in itself, or as a way of expanding individual horizons through greater awareness of other cultures, individuals, and worlds, developed most acutely through her extensive travel abroad experience. Ms. Watanabe discussed English as a tool to “get some knowledge,” or as a vehicle to expanding individual horizons through conceptual thinking, but that required discipline, structure, and evaluation. Finally, Ms. Nakamura discussed her motivation for pedagogy as a way to target the psychological and sensitive needs of her students, sharing more a personal and human set of interactions, as opposed to a dispassionate, unconcerned set of lecture notes or lessons. Though initially the observations were designed simply to observe their teaching practices in action, upon their analysis, it was interesting to see the ways in which the elements that came through as classroom Presence also corresponded to these very basic purposes, outlined earlier in the narrative. In this way, the operational definition of Presence has been supplemented and clarified, to include not only the *constitutive practices under which the content being instructed became intelligible to the instructor* originally, but also the very real, yet personal components of what lies at stake for each teacher in making that intelligibility possible and exactly how and why that intelligibility may occur.
We will see, however, that this translation was not always possible, or at least was inhibited by a number of other factors that will also be presented below. Through this, we will perhaps see how and why Presence was *not* used in many classroom situations (without having recourse to criticism of each individual teacher), and how various real, and observable factors made difficult the possibility of an anti-transcendental attitude. These factors, which will be described in the analysis and discussion of the actual data below, will be called “Presence Inhibitors” and will help to reify the site-specificity and dynamic continuum of factors affecting all pedagogical practice.

*Description of the Observation Lesson*

Nevertheless, given the infinite amount of data possible in looking at such multiple practices in real time, the difficulty of an examination and analysis such as this is to produce its categories and its procedures in a relatively straightforward, clear fashion. Given that it attempts to articulate and document the effects of multiple, organic processes, an equally multiple and organic discussion can quickly become unwieldy and abstruse. As such, in an effort to ground practically the analysis within an overall body of evolving practice that took place throughout the observations and interactions during the term spent with these teachers, the analysis of Presence in this Research Objective will center on a representative observation of all three teachers that took place on the same day in the middle of summer under relatively the same set of conditions. This data sampling will allow us to accomplish the goals set out above, namely expanding the discussion of Presence through examples observed in real time, not through lists or exhaustive descriptions (or through harsh criticisms of the teachers themselves during the times when Presence was not produced), but instead through relatively clear, direct application through the instruments and methodology described throughout the study.
By utilizing this observation as a representation of the elements of practice and classroom Presence, the analysis will also bring in as supplement the other series of observations and discussions arranged with the teachers as their schedule allowed (several of which were articulated in the second research objective). Thus, this analysis will give valuable data in both articulating the multiple situations present within each of the dynamic spaces, but will also seek to present a clearer and more controlled example for seeing the effects. For example, from the literature review onward, the study has taken into account not binary information, but instead a continuum of multiple practices. As such, elements beyond individual subjectivity and agency were also sought, meaning not only what individual participants “said” or “thought,” but also what they did, what larger social demographics said about the conditions and spaces, and also how other environmental factors affected practice and the construction of the pedagogical spaces. In this way, even seemingly uncontrollable or random factors like temperature, weather, other events happening at the school that day (for example, Sports Tournaments that take up the bulk of the students other time, resulting in more students not doing homework or appearing very sleepy in class from having stayed up until 11:00 or 12:00 the night before at practice, the Summer Festival for which multiple classes are cancelled in preparation, etc.) demonstrably can affect the ways in which the classroom spaces are structured, and the possible documentation of the practices happening in a real-time environment.

From the analysis of this data, the major themes and trends that developed in this research objective were multiple, and built upon the table of factors studied (see Table 4.3 and 4.3.b): first, the presence of English in the margins of practice, for example in unexpected and non-lesson oriented locations like in instructional language, classroom routines, or pre-and-post lesson dialogue that seemingly had little to do with the rest of the class, but that nevertheless produced
interesting intelligible effects. The second major theme of Presence was the location of direct
communication and activities that were anti-transcendental (as set up in the literature review),
focused on site-specificity and the concerns of the class, as opposed to an abstract set of
determinations set up by a worksheet, or the textbook (for example how the teachers negotiated
in class themselves, instead of by use of a pre-recorded CD or videotape). The final theme that
appeared in this objective was both the most surprising and perhaps the most important, that of
the existence of two elements that were called above “Presence Inhibitors,” which complicated
classroom Presence and required the types of “translation” articulated as the trend in objective
two. These two inhibitors were (1) the lack of basic skills on the part of students and (2) the
particular norms and expectations of teachers (especially women) particular to Japanese culture.
Nevertheless, the key for this objective and these inhibitors were the ways in which the
negotiations around and with these inhibitors were both the problem-solving strategies and
vehicles by which the three participants produced Presence, and the very real factors making it
impossible in certain situations. In turning next to the discussion of the data, we will see exactly
how Ms. Sato, Ms. Watanabe, and Ms. Nakamura prepared and executed their teaching lesson
within this very specific pedagogical space. Whereas the previous research objectives discussed
the three participants separately, in order to show their unique and diverse sets of independent
practices, for this objective, they will be discussed together to show how different approaches
produced different effects, with alternative strategies often enacted by their colleagues.

The representative lesson used in this research objective took place on a cloudy,
weltering Friday in mid-July (a few weeks before the end of the school term and the beginning
of the Summer Vacation) and took place over the course of the first three periods with each of
the three participants. Not having centralized heating or cooling, the school itself was the same
temperature as the outside environment, nearly 90 degrees with almost 100% humidity, with only oscillating fans placed at the front and the rear of the classroom to provide any comfort and open windows doing nothing but letting in the insects and the smells from the outside. Instead of cooling the temperature, however, the fans mostly only blew around the hot, stagnant air. The students entered after the bell rang and immediately began shedding as much of their school uniforms as they could; dark blue wool trousers and long-sleeved dress shirts for the boys were changed in favor of their gym-uniforms, nylon basketball shorts and a tee shirt with the school insignia and the characters of their last names on the front. Dark pleated skirts and a cotton blouse were for the girls were also changed into the gym-uniform, which was similar to the boys, only a slightly different color. Having no buses or public transport to the school, most of the students walked or rode their bicycles, and upon entering the school were hot, tired, and had to wipe the beads of sweat from their arms and faces with brightly colored and decorated handkerchiefs. In the classroom, after shedding their uniforms, they sprayed heavy amounts of cologne, perfume, and deodorant as well, thus adding to the sweltering environment the myriad smells of thirty teenagers literally doused in fragrance.

At the very beginning of the class, Ms. Sato used specific English language greetings with her students (“Good morning, Class,”) followed by a very simple Question and Answer session (which she called a “Q&A.”) Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Nakamura, however, utilized traditional Japanese greetings, a highly ritualized exchange that students initiated in all of their other classroom settings, consisting of “Stand up,” “Bow,” and “Sit down” in very classical, polite Japanese. Following the initial greetings and the Q&A session, Ms. Sato then went right into the lesson topic. Ms. Nakamura, on the other hand, immediately gave her students a vocabulary quiz, a routine which she also repeated during all of the other observed lessons.
During the interview, she described this process as simultaneously practical and personal; practical in that it helped teach the students “basic skills,” but also that it could give them a sense of “accomplishment” by being able to study for, and do well on, a series of simple quizzes. Ms. Watanabe, however, did not engage in banter with her students, as she did in other observations, but instead immediately instructed (in Japanese) for her students to open their textbooks to begin the lesson.

Continuing from this initial routine, the presentation of the lesson topic itself for each teacher was very different. For Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe, the classroom content that day for the second-year students was about Korean history and culture, with information about the Oppression that took place there during World War II. Students read from the textbook about a unique circumstance of elderly Korean citizens; many, if not most of them, can speak Japanese with a great degree of fluency. The textbook warned, however, that any students visiting Korea should not ask them why they speak it so well; the answer, the book said, inevitably was due to the forced learning and oppression from Japan’s colonial rule over Korea from the beginning of the century until the end of the World War II. Both Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe presented the lesson with few activities (reading in the textbook, asking questions about the reading, etc.) and with few transitions, a practice which was also repeated and described throughout the second research objective. For Ms. Nakamura, the lesson topic was a grammar and past-tense lesson about a Factory, in which the students learned grammatical forms related to process and continuation, though was also presented more or less as one long activity, with few transitions (though, interestingly, the lesson plan she prepared, and shared, showed more activities and more transitions than were ultimately executed). With Ms. Sato, the students practiced reading as a
group with her, while Ms. Nakamura and Ms. Watanabe utilized the CD, which accompanies the textbook and features a native speaker.

The language of instruction used during the lesson for all three teachers was a mixture of English and Japanese, with Ms. Sato using mostly English, supplemented by Japanese use, Ms. Watanabe using mostly Japanese, supplemented by occasional English use, and Ms. Nakamura using Japanese almost exclusively. It should be noted, however, as described in the first research objective, that each of the teachers desired consciously to use as much English as possible, but each felt hampered by the students lack of proficiency, called variously their lack of “basic skills,” their “motivation,” or their lack of “discipline.” These attitudes came through in the classroom in the amount of English used by each teacher as a practice. Conversations with the students as well (in the form of “Question Time,” Q&A, or bantering with the students), was also a mixture of each, though again mostly in Japanese, with the allowance of Japanese answers to English questions. Ms. Sato would ask most of the questions in simple, clear English, “Are you sleepy today?,” repeating several times if the student appeared not to understand and supplementing them with smiles, gestures, or friendly laughs. As well, sometimes they would respond in Japanese, and Ms. Sato would then move on to ask a question of another student. Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Nakamura, however, conversed with the students almost exclusively in Japanese, with Japanese answers allowed.

During the lessons themselves (the topics of which were described above), three students fell asleep within twenty minutes of the start of Ms. Sato’s class, with a few others growing sleepy through the duration (yawning, nodding off, eyes growing heavy, etc.) and others looking out the window or not paying attention altogether and looking at other pages in the textbook, hiding their cellular phones in their laps and sending emails to friends, or simply playing with
their electronic dictionaries. These students, especially those who were visibly sleeping, were not disturbed by Ms. Sato as she continued the lesson. Ms. Watanabe’s class found most of the students not listening or appearing to pay attention already about eight minutes into the class, with some staring out the window, and others reading non-appropriate materials (one even had a magazine hidden inside his textbook). Ms. Nakamura’s class finds one student falling asleep almost immediately (within five minutes of the start of class), with two female students talking almost incessantly. She quietly corrects them, but they continue throughout the class carrying on their conversation. As the class progresses, a second student falls asleep, but this student (like the first) is not woken up.

At the end of the lesson, all three teachers do a brief review of the material discussed, all using mostly Japanese for the questions, discussion, and answers. At the end of class with the ringing of the bell, all three performed closing rituals, with Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe giving closing greetings in English, with Ms. Nakamura giving a closing greeting in Japanese (with the students standing up, thanking the teacher very formally for the lesson, and bowing.)

*Category A: Authentic Interactions*

Having described briefly the overall classroom lesson with each of the three teachers, we can expand the discussion to include classroom pedagogical Presence. Given that each of these elements and factors described above occur simultaneously, in real-time, and are not broken down or apart except for the sake of discussion and analysis, they will be analyzed together as topics for discussion, though sometimes various exchanges or practices could fit into multiple categories, depending on the situation. These examples were analyzed and documented within the ethnography, through the representative observation, and supplemented with the other sets of field notes, interviews, discussions, and relevant discursive materials (for example, worksheets
given out to students, lesson plans created or shared by the teachers, etc.) As described in the literature review, authentic interactions are defined as *exchanges that produce real activities for real results, within real spaces, as opposed to transcendental applications of abstract systems.*

As described in the literature review, authentic interactions act as the “what” of presence, meaning the literal types of linguistic exchanges between the participants. The more detailed codings for analysis for this objective (see Appendix C) attempt to break down the categories according to the types of exchanges initiated and responded to by the teachers and the students, not simply as responses themselves, but also in how these responses helped to determine, construct, and deploy the English language classroom as a dynamic space, and as an autopoietic system (Maturana, 1984). As well, as discussed above, the codings were made in order to see the effects of observed behaviors, not necessarily to align them on a specific scale or hierarchy, or as tools for “correction” or “criticism” of the individual teacher’s practice. As such, the actual language or appropriateness of the exchange itself was less important than its effects observable in the classroom; as we will see in the narrative that follows, even sometimes exchanges that took place in Japanese, or that used incorrect English, were nevertheless useful for creating an exchange of authenticity between the participants in the classroom. As we will also see, and will be further examined in the conclusions and recommendations section of this dissertation, authentic interactions (as with the other two elements of Presence) often existed only in the margins of each teacher’s pedagogical practice, not as a central foci of the lesson or activity, but often in spite of it, or in ways that appeared unintentional or sometimes even completely spontaneous.

As described at the outset of this objective, the clearest examples of classroom Presence for Ms. Sato were exhibited when she was using English pedagogy in the recreation of a lived
world. In the initial research objective, we were introduced to this teacher and to her love of English teaching and the use of English as a skill in itself; having traveled abroad many times, Ms. Sato wanted to instill in her students the ability and the pleasure of being able to speak with people from around the world, to learn about others not through study, but through direct interaction. English, for her, was useful as such; she didn’t describe her interests in being a teacher through any sort of larger or theoretical discussion, but instead simply because “there was no way to use English in Niigata” except to become a teacher. Thus, for Ms. Sato, English is less a subject to be taught, than a real set of lived experiences residing within living beings all around the world.

In her classroom as well, whether intentionally or consciously or not, the analysis of the observations showed that she was also exhibiting classroom Presence at the exact times when these desires, motivations, and attitudes were most literally articulated (Coding ((A)).3.a.1.a). For example, at the beginning of each class (through each of the observed lessons, and then again during this representative observation), Ms. Sato enacted the ritual of English greetings and Q&A with her students in English. Using open gestures, a friendly smile, and American intonation (along with the same style of relatively casual dress she generally exhibited), she walked around the front of the room and asked three students at random, very simple questions about their day. This followed, too, an American style set of greetings, “Good morning, Class/Good Morning, Ms. Sato. Please Have a seat, etc.) immediately following the tardy bell.

This simple exchange, and especially in light of the reaction of the students to it (and, as we will see, in contrast to other sets or types of greetings or initiating activities possible in the classroom), is a clear example of classroom Presence. This initial exchange between Ms. Sato and her students took them out of their regular Japanese space, in which they lived and interacted
in other classes and in their regular lives, and were brought into an English space, with its own rules, constructions, and purposes (something that, in EFL studies, is especially important since the students do not encounter the target language in their daily lives outside the classroom (Chujo, 2011). In this way, the students were engaging authentically with Ms. Sato, as she was re-creating a native-English speaking set of routines and spaces, even within this non-native environment. Secondly, she was recreating her own desires and motivations for English teaching through this simple exchange, in that the types of spaces and environments in which native-speakers would communicate with each other (and with non-native speakers, alike) would take place according to different structural rules than that of a native Japanese language speaking classroom. In this way, the students were able almost immediately to attenuate themselves to the rules and structures present in this mutually created autopoietic system.

Contrast this exchange, on the other hand, with the greetings and initial routines of the other two teachers. Again, this comparison is not to hierarchize the exchanges along a continuum of “Presence Points,” but instead simply to highlight how different practices were received, and responded to, differently. Both Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Nakamura, as in the observed lessons described in the second research objective, started the representative lesson in July with the standard set of highly-ritualized, highly formalized Japanese greetings (Stand up/Bow/Sit down, etc.) The differences in the effect were demonstrable (Coding 3.d.2.a). Whereas the students in Ms. Sato’s classroom entered a new English space, and adapted themselves to the set of greetings and questions, the students in the other two classrooms were kept through the traditional Japanese routines in their regular classroom space, and did not place them within a new one in which English would be the core. In seeing the differences in reaction, even from the start of class, it is interesting to note the effects of these exchanges. Ms. Sato’s
students began thinking and using English (even the students who were not called upon were forced to think of possible responses, since she called them at random), while the students in the other two classrooms did not, but instead began the class as a continuation of the conceptual and cultural rules they encountered outside of it. In that way, most of the students did not appear even to be listening to Ms. Watanabe or Ms. Sato, but instead simply repeating through rote practice the greetings. Some immediately fell asleep, some did the greetings while playing on their cell phones or reading a book. While Ms. Sato, too, certainly did not have all the students’ attention, nevertheless the number of students looking in her direction (perhaps simply fearful of being called upon and looking foolish if they weren’t paying attention), was higher than in the other two classrooms.

This practice is an important clarification on the idea of authentic interactions, especially as they seemed to occur in the margins of practice, and one that came through very simply, not through Ms. Sato’s long and difficult planning of the lesson, or through her long study of English in undergraduate and in graduate school. Instead, it came through very naturally, as a process that she herself was probably not even consciously aware she was doing. Nevertheless, the effects of this interaction were quite palpable, especially if seen alongside alternative types of practice in other classrooms. First, in asking students simple questions (“How are you feeling?” “Are you sleepy?” “Did you eat breakfast? What did you eat?” etc), especially as a part of a morning routine, the students expected it, adapted to it, and provided simple answers to her queries, thus making the routine and generating very particular rules of intelligibility in the space. If students couldn’t answer, they were allowed to answer in Japanese, though again the response itself as a provocation by English created an outcome in which English was a tool for use, and an originally produced response and exchange of mutual intelligibility. The students were taken
from their regular Japanese space, in which they lived and interacted in other classes and in their regular lives, and were brought into an English space, with its own rules, constructions, and purposes (something that, in EFL studies, is especially important since the students do not encounter the target language in their daily lives outside the classroom (Chujo, 2011).

Ms. Watanabe, on the other hand and as described above, should tend to exhibit Presence when she was using English pedagogy in the structuring a conceptual tool. It is thus important to note that, for these specific reasons, her means of producing Presence will naturally be quite different from those of her two colleagues. As such, even if Ms. Watanabe had enacted the same series of morning routines as Ms. Sato, the effects would have been completely different, and may not have produced Presence in the form of authentic interactions. This is not only due to the obvious fact that Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe are different people, with different participants, but most specifically because the sets of attitudes articulated by each are very different, based upon different factors and backgrounds, and as such cannot be reproduced in the same ways by each, or to the same effects. Ms. Sato’s very real experiences, not necessarily always conscious in her mind, nevertheless find articulation in very real ways in the classroom; her experiences with American culture thus are not surprisingly reproduced in her sets of routines that create a seemingly real space; Ms. Watanabe, on the other hand, with a very different set of experiences, thus may not be able to reproduce them in the same way, both because they may not exist or because simply they may exist differently for her.

In the form of authentic interactions, her practice of structuring her pedagogy as a conceptual tool tended to produce fewer demonstrable examples, as she sought a balance between her desire to increase the lack of students’ basic skills, while also addressing their overall lack of discipline. Indeed, as described in both the interviews and the other sets of
observations, Ms. Watanabe was searching for that balance, but mentioned often that she did not believe that she had found it yet; whether because she actually had not found that balance, or simply because she thought she had not, this came through in the observations of her practice. Alternatively discussing this as a desire to make her lessons more “interesting,” and because she thought them “boring,” Ms. Watanabe articulated and deployed strategies throughout the lessons that nevertheless tended to remain rather abstract (grammatical discussions, sticking closely to the textbook in reading, few interactions with students or attempting to get them to produce original content, etc.). In this way, when she brought about elements that could have been authentic in and of themselves (for example, she also did her usual “Question Time” activity mid-way through the class), nevertheless she got almost no responses, and the students seemed unsure how to adapt themselves to this sudden change in format from a traditional grammar/translation format with notes written on the blackboard to the sudden need to produce or respond to original input. Hitherto, they had largely been spoken to in Japanese, with Japanese rituals, grammatical points, gestures, etc. Suddenly, they were asked “Question Time” in English. As such, they were unsure how to adapt themselves to this change, and therefore the activity largely produced no demonstrable outcome. Likewise, the students were largely passive in the lesson itself; they repeated with the teacher, or wrote notes form the board, or listened as she read to them while walking around the room. On occasion, if she would turn suddenly to ask one of the students, they almost immediately (within two seconds) responded “wakanai,” a very informal way of saying that they didn’t know, closest probably to “I dunno” in English (Coding 1.d.3). Going on to another student, they would repeat the same thing. Indeed, each student she asked would say this, almost immediately, until finally she just moved on and answered it herself
or just moved on and kept reading. Once, she even looked back to me, sitting in the back of the classroom, giving a slight shrug of the shoulders.

Ms. Nakamura, as described above and according to our framework, should therefore tend to exhibit Presence most when she was using English pedagogy as a sensitive means of creating fulfillment. Like Ms. Watanabe, this tended to create a search for balance between her personal feelings about pedagogy and the very real practical demands of a difficult pedagogical space. Nevertheless, as with Ms. Sato, one of the clearest examples of authentic interactions came in a very simple way, as she gave out her daily Quiz to students (a routine she repeated through each of the observations, Coding 3.a.3.a.) This quiz, a short vocabulary check, was given out at the beginning of each class, both because of her need to evaluate students (as described in the interview) and also her desire to give students an easy way to chart their own progress. As the students took the quiz and then checked the answers, they would mark in red and pass the papers to their neighbor for checking. Their neighbors would check, and often other students would glance over, curious about other students’ scores, lightly mocking them if they made simple mistakes, or remarking if they got all the answers correct. In this way, Ms. Nakamura was creating very simply a means of creating fulfillment in her students, which was palpable in the very simple routine of the daily quiz. Of course, not all the students did as well, but nevertheless even those that did not do well were not chided by her in class but instead were told that they would have another quiz the next class, and thus another chance to do better. In this way (and perhaps as some surprise to this researcher), evaluations themselves can be tools for classroom Presence, and an evaluation itself does not necessarily have to be transcendental or abstract. Even though the material required memorization, nevertheless it was done in such a way that it created a bridge between the teacher and the students, and produced a set of authentic
interactions between them in which her desire to see them find fulfillment was met with their need to develop a very basic English skill in order to receive it.

In the next section, these initial examples will be built upon to show both how they were articulated, and finally why. Following this, we will then be in a better position to discuss the various structures present in these spaces that were conducive to, or inhibitive of, classroom Presence. Indeed, as is obvious from the above, classroom Presence was a series of isolated moments, small examples, within an overall space of time. Much of the lesson itself was spent in clear transcendence, whether because the teacher was writing abstract grammatical rules on the board or because students were sleeping or playing with their cellular phones. In laying out these three sections, we will then be able to set up ways in which those moments of Presence can be intensified, reproduced, and deployed more often, and also explore some of the very real elements that prevented these teachers from exhibiting more examples than they did.

Category B: Presentification

Examples of classroom Presence through Presentification were documented through the same analytic procedures as Authentic Interactions. Defined as the literal and figurative presentation on the part of the teachers of past material through site-specific, attuned, relational techniques with their students and fellow participants (for example, the ways in which English language learning became intelligible for these teachers in their backgrounds), this category was further divided into the following two categories: (1) Techniques of presenting Content (i.e. task-related, attuned, or meaningful use and purposeful instruction related to the classroom lesson) and (2) Techniques of presenting Attitudes (i.e. attuned, meaningful use and purposeful instruction related to personal history, background, motivations, etc. not specifically related to the content of the lesson.) As defined in the literature review, presentification acts as the “how”
of presence, meaning the techniques used by the teachers to produce not only the linguistic outcomes but, more importantly the intelligibility that would give them meaning. As such, the two sub-categories give valuable information for isolating the techniques related first to classroom content (as above, related to the topic or target of the lesson) and second, to attitudes (which, for this category, could be the presentation or reproduction of the conditions under which English became intelligible for the teachers themselves.)

In Gumbrecht’s (2006) work, described throughout this study, Presentification is also sometimes described as the techniques used to “reproduce past worlds,” or for this analysis, the techniques by which the teacher reproduces the situations and the means by which English language learning became intelligible to them. These techniques can be both literal and figurative; literal in that the teachers can literally describe situations in which English was used by them (for example, Ms. Watanabe might describe to students, as she did in the interview, her time spent in southern Florida, or Ms. Sato might share pictures from one of her many trips to the United States), figurative in that they may be reproducing the types of pedagogical strategies that they used or learned before, consciously or unconsciously (for example, Ms. Sato may reproduce teaching styles she observed while team teaching with a native-English speaking instructor, or Ms. Nakamura may reproduce sensitivity techniques she observed or practiced with her advisors and mentors in her university program.) Nevertheless, what will be important to note for this section of the objective is how often the teachers did neither, whether intentionally or not. Thus, for this section, it will be important to isolate exactly how and why the teachers did (or, in fact, did not) Presenticate in ways that contributed to classroom Presence, except again in the very margins of their practice. As we will see, it is in Presentification as techniques that the two “Presence Inhibitors” mentioned above reify themselves mostly clearly.
In the interviews and discussions, all three teachers talked relatively candidly about their previous experiences teaching and learning English. Ms. Sato, accustomed most to interactions with Westerners, and especially Americans, shared a great deal of personal background about herself, her husband and children, family, and her travel experiences. Ms. Watanabe, too, shared certain interesting details, for example her travels in California, Southern Florida, and her past as a tour conductor. Ms. Nakamura shared the fewest details, but she also shared how and where she had traveled, and the very real motivations and purposes by which English pedagogy became real and important to her.

Interestingly, none of these elements came out in any of the observed sessions with these teachers, and especially in the representative lesson used for this objective. Whereas Ms. Watanabe described in the interview that sometimes she shared these details from her past with her students, there were no examples, whether originally or as references to past shared information. Likewise, Ms. Sato never made reference to her vacations in America, her time spent abroad, her major in college, or even to the trip she was going to take to America in August for nearly one month. Ms. Nakamura, too, never shared any of her information with students, nor did she discuss any of her previous places of pedagogy or of language study.

Though these would have been “literal” techniques of presenting those “past worlds” for their students, the teachers also tended not to produce them figuratively, either. Though Ms. Sato presented her lesson directly with her students, nevertheless large portions of the class were devoted to a single activity, a repeating and reading out loud of the textbook material, for such a long period of time that after a few minutes, many students had all but stopped repeating (using a monotone of barely audible groans and grunts for the sentences), and some were asleep (Coding 1.d.4) Ms. Nakamura and Ms. Watanabe also used a similar, very long activity, but used a radio
with the CD that accompanied the textbook, repeating with the students after a native-speaker read the passage out loud (A.1.d.3.a). As well, in the times when the teachers used the English language, they would often supplement or simply translate the sentence into Japanese if the student did not answer or appeared not to understand. This practice was repeated during all of the observation lessons, and as such during the representative lesson tended to produce a situation in which students appeared not even to listen to the English but instead simply to wait for the translations. Ms. Sato tended to repeat the English two or three times, before adding in a key word or two in Japanese for supplement. Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Nakamura, however, would often simply translate the sentence in Japanese almost immediately, even if it was on a sentence that the students most assuredly understood (at the beginning of the class, for example, this observer asked a student sitting nearby “how are you?,” a question they were asked on a nearly daily basis and had been for 3-4 years of English study, and immediately the student looked over to Ms. Watanabe for her to say to him, “Genki?” (“How are you?”) (Coding 1.d.3)

As well, interestingly, all three teachers, when speaking or reading English, adjusted their pronunciation, tone, rhythm, and speed greatly. When speaking during the interviews or with a native speaker, Ms. Sato speaks almost unaccented English, in an almost normal tone and speed. Ms. Watanabe chooses her words very carefully and articulates clearly but nevertheless speaks in a very intelligible and natural English speed and rhythm. Ms. Nakamura, youngest of the three and with the least experience speaking with native speakers, speaks with more of an accent, but she as well speaks very clearly and intelligibly, and supplements when she does not have the vocabulary with gestures that are very expressive.

In class, however, all three modify these linguistic practices as techniques of pedagogy in interesting ways. Ms. Sato speaks more slowly, but overall retains the intonation and rhythm of
American English (though, at times she will slow down and exaggerate the enunciation. Coding 1.a.2.a) Ms. Nakamura tends to speak more slowly, and also enunciates key words at times unnaturally to highlight their differences in English and in Japanese (1.a.2.a/1.a.3.a). Ms. Watanabe, however, actually modifies and alters her pronunciation entirely, modifying the English words and content to Japanese syllables (a practice that was described in more detail in the previous research objective, in describing her daily practices in the classroom, coding 1.b.4.a). Called colloquially “Katakana English,” this conforming to the Japanese alphabet (described in a previous section), distorts the length of words, removes most of the intonation, and largely renders words unintelligible to native English speakers unfamiliar with Japanese speech patterns (for example, the two syllable “textbook” becomes the six syllable “tekisutobuku.”) She does not do this in “everyday” speech, but only when teaching or reading sentences in English to her students.

Thus, how might we render these practices intelligible and thereby more clearly discuss what might be preventing the teachers (in the form of attitudes that make such practices seem useful or necessary) from Presentificating in ways that contribute to classroom Presence? In describing more clearly the two “Presence Inhibitors” described above, perhaps the answer can become clearer: these were described as (1) the lack of student basic skills and (2) the particular norms and expectations in Japanese culture. Both literally and figuratively, both of the above contributed to the lack of Presence through Presentification. First, as described in the first research objective, the sharing of personal information (thus, a literal Presentification of a “past world”) is inappropriate, thus making it difficult for the teachers to share those experiences traveling abroad, sharing pictures, or discussing an upcoming family trip. Secondly, the very real and very different roles of women in Japanese culture (and, again, all three of the teachers
are relatively young or middle aged females), also contribute to these expectations in ways
different from Americans, Westerners, or males even in Japan. Next, even if the teachers wished
to share this information, they all noted the lack of basic skills on the part of their students, thus
making the effectiveness of any such sharing limited. Ms. Sato, for example, might decide to
share such a story, or figuratively to reproduce a type of lesson she observed in the United States,
but her students may not be able to understand it in any way. As she mentioned in the interview,
when she first came to Matsuoka, she was amazed how her students couldn’t even read simple
words or even recognize letters. As such, though she came with lessons designed to increase
proficiency and linguistic outcomes, she was forced to go back and re-teach the students the
alphabet.

The key to these inhibitors is not in trying to fix their locus or meaning in the classroom,
as the “reason” why these elements occur. Instead, it is enough simply to describe the ways in
which these very real attitudes on the part of teachers (attitudes as their cultural and linguistic
backgrounds as Japanese women, and as their motivations, purposes, and expectations in the
pedagogical space) become articulated as practices. Nevertheless, realizing the extent to which
these attitudes find real translation and articulation as practice, it is therefore less surprising
perhaps why Ms. Watanabe, for example, modifies so greatly her pronunciation, even to the
point of rendering it unintelligible to a native speaker. She, perhaps more than her two
colleagues, noted and lamented the lack of basic skills in her students, and their need for
discipline in developing greater thinking skills. As such, her pronunciation, intentionally or not,
is a literally and figuratively produced technique attempting to increase linguistic proficiency,
based on the real translation of her attitudes. In this way, it conforms to the parameters of
Presentification as Presence, but lacks the critical component of *appropriateness* or
meaningfulness, which cannot be overlooked. Though she is presenting a real technique attempting to create a past world, or of a set of attitudes trying to produce greater basic skills, ultimately it only produces further practices of unintelligibility, for the students are simply producing Japanese syllables, warping the English letters and sounds often into unintelligible or completely different sounding words.

In the next section, we will turn from the techniques by which each teacher attempted to present the material, and towards the contextualizations that could literally render it both intelligible and reproducible in multiple situations. Though the previous two sections documented the “what” and the “how,” the next section will then move on to find the stakes and the subsequent use of language for the students and teachers at Matsuoka High School.

Category C: Deixis

Examples of classroom deixis were also analyzed and documented with the same procedures for Categories One and Two, and were defined as the “pointing out” or “staging” (Gumbrecht, 2006) of complex material through condensations that nevertheless require context, site-specificity, and that are constructed according to the rules dictated by the individual learning spaces (for example, “drawing our students’ attention towards complex phenomena and problems, rather than prescribing how they have to understand certain problems and, ultimately, how they must deal with them” [Gumbrecht, 2006, p. 128] This might include giving students an overall pattern for language learning to be applied in multiple ways as opposed to memorization of a set of word or sentence lists, contextualizing a problem or lesson topic for discussion, etc. and may occur in either the L1 or the L2) This category was further divided into the following two sub-categories: (1) Contextualization of Content (i.e. in which the teacher utilized the students’ knowledge, skills, or interests as a foundation for new knowledge related specifically to
the classroom lesson.) and (2) Contextualization of Attitudes (i.e. in which the teacher utilized the students’ knowledge, skills, and interests as a foundation for new knowledge or discovery related to non.lesson activities, or perhaps personal or social interest.) As described in the literature review, deixis acts as the “why” of Presence, meaning the production of further areas of inquiry to produce more Presence through an anti-transcendental attitude. This element is the most conceptually difficult, but also perhaps the most important, and requires some explanation: simply put, it is what is at stake in the pedagogy. Its purpose is not simply to produce a single lesson, or to produce Presence a single time, with authentic interactions and Presentification that are intelligible only once, but instead to make gestures for participants to produce consistently their own adaptations, spinning off new areas of thought and inquiry in new ways and new forms. These “spin-offs” are never hierarchal or charted along a smooth curve or progression, but instead are multi-dimensional, moving up and down, side to side, in every possible direction, as dictated by the factors described throughout the study (namely the attitudes of the participants, articulated by power, in concert with the overall larger spaces.) This deixis happens, however, not abstractly through theoretical constructs or abstract lessons of memorizing grammatical patterns, but instead more organically, as contextualizations that allow for “condensed complexity” (Gumbrecht, 2006). Connecting this to our earlier definitions of social systems, these elements would be the intelligible constructs usable by participants within larger environments of infinite complexity (for example, a student being able to “use” a certain English structure and reproduce it, even to a native speaker or in a native-language environment which would have an infinite number of such structures). We cannot, as researchers or teachers, necessarily “know” all of these constructs concretely, but nevertheless we can document and trace their effects, in much the same way we can document and trace the effects of power as the
translation of attitudes in real-time. As such, the two sub-categories here defined give valuable information in order to isolate those contextualizations as related first to the classroom content (meaning the lesson or target topic being taught), and second to attitudes (meaning more personal outcomes, interests, discussions, topics, etc. related to the categories of attitudes outlined in this study.)

The first component of the analysis of Presence, Authentic Interactions, as the “what” component described and documented the literal exchanges that took place in relation to the lesson content. The second component, Presentification, described “how” those exchanges took place as techniques within the pedagogical practices of all three teachers. The final component, Deixis, will look at why these exchanges occurred, most specifically for the ways in which the information was (or was not) contextualized in such a way that the information could be reproduced and expanded upon individually by the participants in future lessons or situations. Indeed, this “why” component sets up the overall purposes of the language instruction, and its stakes: the teachers were not simply trying to produce a singular usage of the language or a single production of a sentence; instead, they were trying to produce that all-important intelligibility, in which English could be used as a vehicle for thought, and thus accomplishing the motivations and purposes each teacher set up from the start (each of which will be examined in more detail in the conclusion of this objective.)

All three teachers discussed in both the interviews and in almost every conversation with this researcher the extent to which they wanted to produce Deixis with their students. Though they did not call it by this name, nevertheless each teacher was looking for the very specific, and very real, ways in which intelligibility could occur for students to produce additional communication from them following the lessons. The point was not simply to get them to
understand the lesson for that particular day but to be able to integrate that learning in real ways that could be reproduced or developed again later. For Ms. Sato, she hoped that a student in her classroom might meet an American on the street and ask him or her about his or her life. For Ms. Nakamura, she hoped that her students might learn to realize their own importance, increase their self-esteem, and build larger goals for themselves after having the “aha” moment related to English, finally “getting it.” Ms. Watanabe, too, hoped that her students could use English as a vehicle to produce greater conceptual thought, greater adaptability to multiple situations, in order to prepare and empower themselves for a dynamic and complex world. Did these desires and hopes translate themselves into their classroom situations?

Both Ms. Sato and Ms. Watanabe taught the same lesson during the representative observation, about Korean history and culture (A.1.a.3.a). Interestingly, the decision to teach this topic, on that day and in that way, was a clear example of Deixis in a number of ways. First, conceptually, the topic was related to something that they could adapt and use in their daily life (C.1.c.2.a.1.c); understanding about history and Korea through English created avenues for individual pursuit, as they could read other books about it, look online and read websites, etc. Nevertheless, literally, the lesson connected and produced avenues for further communication because that next month, these very students were going to take a trip to Korea. In Japan, all upcoming third year students go on a class trip; the location depends on the school and its budget, with smaller schools going somewhere in Japan from Hokkaido down to Okinawa or to nearby Korea, with larger schools sometimes going to Europe or the United States. At Matsuoka, the students would spend three days in Seoul and another day in Busan. As such, the lesson that day (and two more lessons subsequently) were about aspects of Korean history and culture that the
students might encounter, thus creating both a literal and figurative contextualization of the English language for students.

Within that lesson, each teacher approached the contextualizations quite differently. Ms. Sato, for example, further contextualized by discussing the appropriateness of certain words, ideas, and slang in English (for example, in Japanese, the words “shit” and “sit” sound identical, and Ms. Sato was discussing the inappropriateness of the former over the latter. C.1.c.4.a.2.a.3) These were done not as abstract elements for no real purpose, but were real discussions with real stakes: since the students did not speak Korean, and since ostensibly many of the people they would meet in Korea may not speak Japanese (or may not be willing to speak Japanese given historical oppression), they would only have English as a common tool of understanding. In this way, Ms. Sato produced Presence in helping the students inhabit “a lived world;” she not only helped them not to produce unintentional profanity, but also shared formal/informal greetings (not saying “hey!” instead of “hello” or “excuse me,” etc.) that they all might use on their trip.

Ms. Watanabe, on the other hand, used fewer contextualizations and examples, and handled the lesson along the lines of grammar instead of experience (A.1.c.4.b.). Students read from the textbook with the accompanying CD, and discussed the grammar points (that lesson used the Past Progressive when talking about Korean History) with a worksheet. Students did not interact, but instead used their electronic dictionaries to translate the materials and answer the questions.

Ms. Nakamura, though not teaching the same type of lesson, nevertheless structurally approached it similarly to Ms. Watanabe. Her lesson, about a factory, was not tied in with any real or lived experience or with any real “spaces.” The materials and discussion were handled with the textbook, a worksheet, and with the accompanying CD. As well, the students did not
learn about this factory as a lived set of possibilities, or as a site in which real conceptual thinking and language use took place, but instead as a vehicle by which to teach grammar (both process-oriented language and the past tense. As with Ms. Watanabe, many of the students used electronic dictionaries, while many others simply stared off into space.

Interestingly, though, one of the clearest examples of Deixis and a contextualization and a sharing of lived experience through language came with Ms. Nakamura, through a practice situated well in the margins of her instructional practice (2.a.1.a.1). Though for most of the lesson she used the CD that accompanied the textbook, on occasion she would switch and read the passage herself, with her students following after her. What was most interesting was that the students, each time she stopped the CD, were demonstrably louder (more seemingly “alive”) in their repetitions with her than with the CD, even though the CD was of a native-speaker and thus the pronunciation was more “correct” and natural. In looking back at the ways in which the teachers produced Presence, often in the margins, at the very times in which the translation of their attitudes as motivations were most literal, perhaps this seemingly random occurrence can become more intelligible. Ms. Nakamura discussed the extent to which she was concerned about her students’ feelings, and wanted them to feel fulfilled. Whether intentionally or not, these concerns came through in her voice tone, which though slowed and exaggerated in its pronunciation for her students, was nevertheless considerably softer than in her discussions outside of class. Her voice, as both a technique and as a contextualization to produce more communication, produced stronger linguistic outcomes from her students than did the native-speaking CD. In this way, she produced Deixis, perhaps completely unintentionally, by using a voice tone that nurtured her students, encouraging them to respond, perhaps without even realizing it. Indeed, none of the students seemed aware that they were speaking more clearly or
loudly with her than with the CD, and yet the effect was quite clear. Further, this effect did not seem pronounced with Ms. Watanabe when she would use the CD or would read aloud with her students. Nevertheless, in seeing that within her articulated attitudes was not the element of concern for her students psychological feelings, but a desire to see them fulfilled emotionally, perhaps we can see exactly how these motivations and attitudes become articulated in very real, yet not necessarily fixed, ways.

In moving next to the conclusion for this objective, the multiple threads started through the narrative of the data will be brought together. Through each of the three elements of this research objective, it was important to see how the teachers were articulating real and observable attitudes, consciously or unconsciously, but to demonstrable and intelligible effect. Elements of Presence came and went, were momentary or of limited duration, and often existed in the margins of each teacher’s pedagogical practice. In the following, we will begin to outline some of the complexities inherent in real, dynamic socialized systems to see how further Presence might be produced.

Conclusions and Discussion for the Third Research Objective

This research objective gave further support to the literature review and the methodology, lending further credence to the theoretical and practical aims of the study through observable data. As well, it provided a number of surprising elements that help to support even further the initial claim of evolving continuums of practice, articulated by power, in the construction of real, dynamic EFL systems. The following conclusion to this research objective will bring together the established themes and trends drawn out in the data, tying them into the larger theoretical implications of Presence for EFL studies. It will also show how the observed macro-and-micro factors (see Table 4.3) helped to illustrate these themes and trends.
As set up in the initial statement of the problem and the literature review, one aspect of the study was to show how the pedagogical spaces constructed themselves along the lines of socialized systems, an analysis of which should be able to account for the varied, dynamic, and multiple practices therein (Luhmann, 1984; 1990). Having completed the three research objectives, it should become clearer exactly how and why these spaces function so differently. As described in the initial chapter of the review, as a teacher myself, I often found myself unable to come to terms with the vast differences in outcome in different classroom lessons, despite similarities in terms of student demographic, individual differences, etc. As such, one of the key purposes of this study was to account for these differences, through the research objectives, instruments, and analysis of the data. In short, we are able to see now exactly how three classroom situations function so differently, because of their construction as autopoetic systems. It should now be clearer exactly what this means and how this functions in relation to the pedagogical setting: first, each teacher in the classroom enters that space with a very unique, and very different, set of cultural and linguistic backgrounds that define their attitudes (Baker, 1992; Motha, 2006), which will be the vehicles by which they interact in these real settings. Nevertheless, these attitudes must be articulated in order to be intelligible, and as such cannot simply remain within the individual teachers (indeed, if they remained unarticulated, it would be impossible to observe them or render them intelligible.) They are articulated in real spaces, in real ways, with real participants as others, in order to be understood and intelligible, or most simply to self-socialize within that environment with these others (Arnett, 1995.) In order to be mutually intelligible, participants construct the spaces together, and generate the rules by which intelligibility can and must occur, by means of power. For example, a native-speaker of English adapts his or her speech when in a classroom of non-native or beginning speakers; this is
something we do automatically in better effecting communication; though it seems obvious why one would use simplified grammar, slower speed, etc., nevertheless we can observe and articulate these patterns as literal applications and attunement to the needs and conditions of a real physical space, with real other participants (Lozar, 2009.) When these spaces have been constructed, the practices within them become articulated (and can be observed) as exchanges, techniques for presenting those exchanges, and finally the structures and stakes of those exchanges for producing additional (different) exchanges in other settings or at other times. It is in this way that this study looked first at those attitudes (Research Objective One), then at the general structuring of those practices in real classroom settings via power (Research Objective Two), and finally more specifically at the particular types of practices that can articulate and produce greater mutual intelligibility, as Presence (Research Objective Three.) It is in this way that the observed factors for this objective were related to those exchanges (as “authentic interactions” categorizing the authenticity, spontaneity, and purpose of the exchange), to those techniques (as “Presentification” categorizing the ways in which those attitudes and backgrounds were articulated), and to those real structures and stakes (as “deixis,” categorizing the ways in which the exchanges were contextualized in order to produce further exchanges, adapted to various and different situations.)(See table 4.3)

As defined in the literature review, and then followed through in each of the research objectives, the rules and means through which the above-discussed intelligibility could occur in these classroom spaces, between participants, took place because those rules were generated together given the site-specific and real-time demands (as “translations” and “adaptations”) (Gutierrez & Tajeda, 2000). Practically, this reiterates that the guiding element for pedagogical practice is not the textbook, or the lesson, the curriculum, the classroom space, or any other
single element; instead, the motivating factor is all of the complex, multiple elements together, negotiated with participants as an overall continuum, and articulated as practices. Further, the factor effecting and generating that continuum is power (hooks, 1994), as an articulation of the attitudes of the individual participants in real contexts and spaces.

Nevertheless, it was not enough simply to define and to articulate those varying factors contributing to the construction of the pedagogical space and to account for the practices therein. In an effort to contribute to the field of EFL studies, and also to teacher education in effecting transformative pedagogy for all teachers looking to increase outcomes in real classrooms, the Presence element of the third research objective was created. In tying this instrument in with the articulation of the multiple factors conditioning the construction of the pedagogical space, I believe we can begin to see the importance of the overall study for effecting transformations in teacher practice and a new way of analyzing and thinking (both practically and theoretically) about that practice that moves beyond dualisms, and yet respects each teacher’s unique and individually observable intelligibility within their practice.

Importance of the Instrument

As described at the beginning of this research objective, the purpose of the Presence instrument was not to hierarchize the teachers in the study, in order to show who was “more” or “most” Present, compared to others. In fact, the exact opposite was the purpose: to show instead that Presence is not a quantifiable value, not a static element that can be “held,” but instead (like power) an exercise or a relationship that can be observed for its effects in real-time. Without the Presence instrument showing how each of the teachers produced Presence at different times, in different ways, to different effect (and, indeed, at other times abstracted away from that Presence
in other ways and for drastically different effects), then we might be apt to come to very different conclusions for the types of practice being observed.

For example, without seeing how each teacher, regardless of attitude, background, training, or familiarity with native-speaking English teaching environments produced Presence in individual, multiple ways, we might be apt to conclude that Ms. Sato, given the ways in which she creates English “spaces” with her students, is therefore producing the most varied linguistic and attitudinal outcomes, and therefore is the most “effective” teacher. Indeed, comparing her background as a graduate-educated teacher who had traveled and lived abroad on numerous occasions, and who had been trained in one of the best teaching and language programs in Japan, and further had taught at two of the highest-level High Schools in the prefecture, to that of Ms. Nakamura, who was new to Matsuoka and had never lived abroad, we might be apt to draw varying conclusions about their teaching practice that the Presence instrument helps us to balance. For example, as illustrated, Ms. Nakamura was also producing classroom Presence, in a number of interesting ways, even though she had never lived abroad. Further, she was “presentificating” in a number of authentic, interesting ways, despite teaching grammar or translation, which in themselves were highly abstract.

As such, the key importance for the Presence instrument is in showing that the key is not training, as such, or familiarity with English and English culture; in and of themselves, these do not produce demonstrably greater amounts of classroom Presence. Instead, the key is in generating the rules under which English intelligibility can occur, or (more precisely) reproducing those generations in how they occurred for each of the individual participants. In short, it is in the anti-transcendental attitude of the individual participant, in allowing for and negotiating the multiple demands under which their classroom autopoietic systems were
constructed that produced the elements of classroom Presence, and not the lessons, pictures, activities, etc. of the content (Hagan, 2004; DaSilva-Iddings & Katz, 2007).

*Role of Presence Inhibitors*

The second key conclusion to this research objective is in the surprising presence and impact of the two “Presence Inhibitors,” which add a key dimension to understanding the concept of classroom Presence and its documentation in a real-time, dynamic pedagogical space. These Presence Inhibitors were the factors that contributed most clearly to the lack of Presence at key times in the lesson, or the seeming “necessity” (consciously or unconsciously, intentionally or unintentionally) on the part of participants to abstract away from attunement to the site-specific concerns in the pedagogical space. These Inhibitors were observed through the data analysis in the factors of exchanges, techniques, and contextualizations, most specifically for the ways in which authenticity was lost in favor of abstract or transcendent lessons, or in which each element of Presence was diminished in very observable, non-arbitrary ways. Again, this study is not looking for centralized “meanings” or a focus, not for a literal interpretation of the hidden workings of a pedagogical space, but instead is simply trying to show how attitudes are expressed for real reasons by means of power in creating, dictating, and articulating practice and forming spaces as socialized systems (Bloom & Egan Robertson, 1993; Ghani & Daud, 2006).

In this way, the Presence Inhibitors contribute to, and are constituted by, real attitudes on the part of participants. For example, Ms. Watanabe’s practice of modifying her pronunciation did not take place in a vacuum or for no reason whatsoever (she was not simply “in the mood” to change her pronunciation, or did it on a lark.) Instead, as described throughout our framework, this practice was an observable, real, intelligible practice that she articulated, to real effects. Though certainly it would be her goal, all things being equal, to produce a Present classroom, or a
classroom in which dynamic and varied linguistic outcomes occur, nevertheless these desires are “inhibited” by very real factors, themselves which contribute further to the development and articulation of her attitudes as practices. In short, her role as a Japanese female, and her very real experiences with students’ lack of basic skills, congeal themselves in multiple, complicated ways to forming the attitudes that are articulated as real practices in the pedagogical space; in short, nothing that these teachers do is accidental, nothing random. It may not be fully consciously realized (nor is that the goal), but the practices are real, they are observable, and they are therefore intelligible along a continuum of developing, hybrid practice.

Further, the Presence Inhibitors also performed an interesting function in relation to Presence beyond simply complicating and helping to explain the elements of, or lack of, Presence in specific classroom settings. They also act to reify, and to redeploy, the impossibility of generalizing or transcendentalizing teaching situations towards the creation of rigid frameworks or models. The Presence Inhibitors and their contributions to individual attitudes reify the importance of site-specificity, and the importance of an anti-transcendental set of attitudes. In short, one cannot define Presence, nor can one define its opposite, in any sort of generalized way, or apply “principles” to a classroom setting. Instead, again, one can look at effects, at results, and at attitudes and how they produce relationships in real settings. The Presence Inhibitors, thus, thwart any attempt at finding overarching “meaning” or interpretations to pedagogical practice; the inhibitors are there, and differently applied, formed, and deployed for each and every teaching situation. In this way, the very real Presence Inhibitors do not therefore justify a set of “proven” lesson plans to be applied to a classroom, because very real factors seem to inhibit Presence. Instead, just the opposite is the case: the Presence Inhibitors further justify that any such lesson, “Present” according to our working definitions or not, is
already, and from the start, anti-transcendental. If it becomes highly abstract, if the teacher
transcends away from the site-specific concerns of his or her classroom, this act it itself within
the confines of the generated pedagogical space, and is therefore a practice for real effects and
for real purposes. The Presence Inhibitors, as a category related to multiple, hybrid and existent
factors contributing to the make-up of classroom settings (Zuengler, 2003; Duff, 2004) are thus
real factors to be included in effecting and understanding Presence, and not elements to be
avoided, or to be diminished or overlooked. Or, as outlined in the factors designed for the study
(Figure 4.3), these inhibitors are not a separate category or factor, but instead play a part within
each of the observable culturally and socially based, observable factors (as exchanges,
techniques, and contextualizations based on interactions and relationships between participant
attitudes.) They are therefore further multiple elements contributing to the continuum of Practice,
as such, and not “roadblocks” to be overcome. In the next chapter, we will see how all of these
factors might be implemented towards producing more pedagogical Presence, and towards
resituating an understanding of teacher education more along these multiple, complex lines.
Table 4.3.b Summary of Conclusions for the Third Research Objective

Objective: Show, document, and analyze classroom Presence as the articulation of specific types of practices, situated within those dynamic pedagogical spaces and observable within individual lessons.

Conclusions reached to address above objective:

(1) **Presence is not hierarchally, but individually, produced in pedagogical spaces, not when teachers most clearly adhere to the prescribed lesson or curriculum, but instead when they reproduce or literally articulate their attitudes (as cultural and linguistic backgrounds and motivations and purposes for pedagogy) as exchanges with other participants.**
   *Sato- Produced Presence when creating spaces in which students could understand the world of English, as spoken and interacted with real native speakers.*
   *Watanabe- Had difficulty producing Presence, trying to utilize English as a conceptual tool, but continually concerned with student discipline and abstracted lessons.*
   *Nakamura- Produced Presence when addressing/adapting sensitively to students’ situations.*

(2) **Presence as exchange can be continually produced, but is inhibited by real factors in the pedagogical spaces: (1) Cultural issues and (2) Literal issues in the pedagogical space. These inhibitors, nevertheless, do not have to limit Presence, but instead reify the importance of site-specificity and attunement (not an anti-transcendental attitude.) As such, they can act to affirm Presence, not simply to inhibit it.**
   *Sato- Inhibited by lack of student skills and lack of resources, which did not allow her to bring in previous experiences and create that “world” of English (literal).*
   *Watanabe- Inhibited by inability (self-expressed) to find a balance between effective and “interesting” lessons, and also “inappropriateness” of sharing personal experiences (cultural).*
   *Nakamura- Inhibited by student psychological/mental problems (literal) and by expectations from other faculty, community, etc. (cultural)*
Chapter Five: Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Having articulated the three research objectives and the various conceptual, physical, and social aspects to the study of pedagogical spaces and relationships at Matsuoka High School, it is important to draw out the theoretical and practical conclusions, implications, and contributions of the multiplicity of data presented. Practically, the study documented the multiple factors present in dynamic classroom spaces in an effort to provide for teachers a means to render intelligible the elements affecting their practice. This practical contribution derived from my own experiences as a classroom teacher, frustrated and often confused by my inability to comprehend these multiple concerns affecting the pedagogical space, and why (for example) certain lessons “worked” while others did not, even though they should have, all things being equal. This study, in short, illustrated first exactly why such things are never equal.

Secondly, having analyzed the multiplicity of practice in pedagogical spaces articulated via power between the individual participants, I also showed the elements of practice that contributed to the types of classrooms that I, as a teacher, had hoped to create. Calling these elements Presence and building on a large body of theoretical research, this aspect showed teachers (such as myself) where and how they were articulating practices that were attuned to those very specific, multiple dimensions and rules generating the pedagogical spaces, and how to deploy them to better serve students’ diverse needs. Choosing a specific site of research to put these ideas into action, where such concerns could be documented, the ethnography of the spaces at Matsuoka High School contributed valuable evidence towards these intentions, supporting the objectives set up in the literature review and the methodology. From such an analysis of Presence, I offered an empirical research study that began to show teachers the degree to which they construct, in concert with their students and the literal spaces of that interaction, the rules by
which linguistic outcomes (of any kind) can occur and become intelligible for them. Having finished the analysis and discussion of each of the three research objectives, we can see the degree to which these multiple goals have been addressed in a way that in non-dualistic, egalitarian, and focused on helping the difficult situation of EFL pedagogy in a school like Matsuoka to become more diverse, empowered, and functional.

Theoretically, this study shows how pedagogical spaces formed as complex social systems (Larsen-Freeman, 2008; Luhmann, 1990), and how the outcomes and practices that happened therein were continually generated in real time by those individual participants, in concert with each other and with their social environments. As such, the single most important theoretical contribution of this study for EFL studies and teacher education is to move, both in the discussion and in the methodological instruments themselves, beyond dualistic or dialectical understandings of pedagogical practice, showing how a simple binary of “teacher/student,” “environment/school,” “self/other,” or anything else, can ever encompass fully the continuum of dynamic exchanges happening all the time. The key to this generation, this multiplicity, and this exchange is power, which throughout the study was the key instigator in all of these exchanges, producing them as articulations of real, multiple attitudes.

In order to make these theoretical and practical issues clear to the reader, and to other teachers and researchers documenting their intelligible practices, it was imperative to do more than simply outline or define types of pedagogical practice; instead it was critical to show the very real factors that construct it, its relationships and its interactions, and the means by which these articulations and practices occur. By showing the interaction of participant attitudes along the lines of power in generating those pedagogical spaces, and then the specific practices therein that contributed to classroom Presence, I articulated the ways in which intelligibility of practice
becomes possible in the classroom for teachers, and the specific ways in which it can best serve
our dynamic field of second-language studies and the many teachers therein. These practical and
theoretical contributions based on the analysis of the data lead to several unique and important
conclusions and implications, which will be outlined below.

**Conclusions and Implications**

The following conclusions will be drawn and adapted from the summaries of conclusions
for each of the research objectives (see Tables 4.1.b, 4.2.b, and 4.3.b), followed by implications
to be drawn from each, and a brief explanation/discussion of their application for the field of
EFL studies.

*Conclusion 1: Multiplicity as Facticity*

- **Conclusion:** The cultural and linguistic backgrounds and motivations and purposes for
  pedagogy for all three teachers (including all positive, negative, frustrating, helpful, etc.
  interactions within them) were translated into real, observable teacher attitudes.

- **Implication:** Hybridity, multiplicity, and complexity are basic, constitutive facts present
  in every pedagogical space.

The dynamic continuum of practices present in every classroom are not elements to be
sought out, or elements to be brought into specialized lessons, or elements to see as “strategies”
for any type of pedagogical practice. Instead, this shows clearly how such complexity and
multiplicity are basic constitutive factors in the fabric of the social space itself. These socialized
systems, even in the relatively small and homogeneous environment of a rural Japanese
classroom of thirty students with a single instructor, are infinitely complicated systems, with
power as the key process defining and articulating itself as a condensation and a
contextualization of that infinity (Dasilva & Katz, 2007; Maturana, 1984). This is a key
conceptual mindset change for pedagogy and cannot be overstated; it is not that we must seek out “diversity” in our classrooms, or try to create lessons that are more multiply oriented. Instead, we must see that such diversity and multiplicity are always there, from the start, and thus articulate our pedagogy in ways that allow that power, energy, and multiplicity to flow freely. The data of this study shows that the tool for allowing that “free flow” was classroom Presence, as an anti-transcendental attitude that focused its literal “whats” (linguistic exchanges), its “hows” (techniques for rendering those exchanges mutually intelligible) and its “whys” (the contextualization of those techniques to produce and spinoff further exchanges), on the sets of rules generated site-specifically by the participants with each other, as opposed to abstracted, transcendental applications like the memorization of vocabulary lists or grammar rules written on the chalkboard (Gumbrecht, 2006.)

The pedagogical spaces at Matsuoka High School act as an interesting microcosm for socialized systems and classrooms in many environments; though the individual concerns are certainly unique, nevertheless the larger structural factors should be intelligible to many teaching situations. As such, seeing how such complexity acts as a constitutive factor in forming the pedagogical space, with power as the instigating element, teachers can see how and why various outcomes (whether seemingly positive or negative in nature) occur as anything but accidents, and anything but mysteries never to be rendered intelligible.

**Conclusion 2: Beyond the “Power” Principle**

- Conclusion: Power is a process and an exchange; more specifically, it is a translation and negotiation of attitudes (in the form of talking, doing, and being in the pedagogical space) seeking intelligibility between participants (in this case, teachers and students)
• Implication: Power does not affect pedagogical practice, or is one component of that practice, but instead power is practice.

This implication is important for combining power and practice, in its most fundamental and perhaps most basic forms, and showing how power can be analyzed in real-time, site-specific circumstances where those articulations have real effects. Further, in this study, the analysis of classroom Presence shows also how power articulated those site-specific, attuned practices and anti-transcendental attitudes in real-time. As described in each of the research objectives, power played the role of articulating the teachers’ attitudes, translating and adapting them to the various unique concerns present in Matuoka High School. This evidence is key for showing not only the impact of power on attitudes and pedagogy, but also for showing its fundamentally multiple character as practice itself in producing and reproducing classroom Presence, taking into account that multiplicity as a constitutive factor and not as a by-product.

For example, in attempting to look at teacher attitudes and pedagogy, it is always impossible to look at them divorced from the real-time situations in which those practices occur. As such, it is important for researchers not to fall prey to a type of dynamic, hybrid “fundamental attribution error,” (Nisbett& Ross, 1991) by which researchers looking at power focus only on the dispositional factors related to pedagogy (for example, what the teachers say or “think” about their practice) and ignore the power of the situation in which it occurs.

This contribution of multiplicity and the practical component of power as practice is valuable, for it moves beyond the automatic assumption of power as “asymmetry” (Cherryholmes, 1981) or power as an automatic upheaval of the classroom space, inherently privileging certain ideas, individuals, or practices over others (Freeman &McElhinny, 2005.) Such dialectical examinations of the “inherent” roles of power have typified Critical Pedagogical,
poststructural, and postmodern analysis for much of the past thirty years (Bourdieu, 1978; deCerteau, 1984). Though such upheavals, asymmetries, or articulations may be one of many demonstrable effects of certain types of power relationships, this study shows how the practices of Ms. Watanabe, Ms. Nakamura, and Ms. Sato were not necessarily asymmetrical or dialectical components in which they were dominating the students because of their knowledge, training, or force. Instead, as we saw (especially in the second and third research objectives), power as articulation was more closely an exchange between dynamic individuals, not for the means of oppression or asymmetry, but for the means of intelligibility, through communication and articulation of their attitudes as individuals. In forming power along these lines, we thus see its fundamental creative and generative character, and the extent to which power as articulation and attitude relates to the individual needs, hopes, intelligible limits, and even desires (Deleuze, 1980) of participants, instead of only as vehicles and as tools of oppression or subjectification (Butler, 1998).

**Conclusion 3: Ubiquitous Presence**

- Conclusion: Presence is not produced as a hierarchy, but is instead produced individually, in dynamic pedagogical spaces.
- Implication: All teachers produce Presence.

It cannot be overstated: all teachers produce Presence. The frequency, duration, and circumstances under which it is produced are vastly different, and often take place regardless of their preparation, research, or the lessons they are presenting, and in sometimes surprising (or even contradictory) ways. Sometimes, teachers produce Presence even despite themselves, and very often it is completely unintentional, rendering a personal exchange of mutual intelligibility with their students while thinking that they are maintaining a purely detached, business-like
demeanor in which they are “sharing” nothing of themselves except their teacher training related to the content.

As such, this implication about the ubiquity of Presence as a constitutive fact (much like the implication related to multiplicity and hybridity) shows why the single most-important goal of this study is not simply to produce Presence, but to produce more of it. As outlined in social science theory, like the goal of communication “to produce more communication” (Luhmann, 1984) through greater attunement to the structures and factors contributing to intelligibility, the goal of Presence is to produce more Presence. More than simply to isolate a moment in time, or attempt to crystallize it and stop the dynamic process of pedagogical practice, instead, this conclusion shows the importance continually to produce Presence and to articulate the myriad factors defining the pedagogical space as often as possible, in concert with other participants, and in real time. Through the analysis of the data, we found that all three participants, despite differences in age, education, training, and stated purposes for teaching English, nevertheless produced Presence in different ways and at different times. Nevertheless, the key is that they all produced it at those times, in dynamic ways, and at other times abstracted away from that Presence. It was at the former times that, as we showed, outcomes and attitudes of students were articulated more clearly towards language learning or a mutual sharing of intelligibility, and at the latter times were less so (in some cases, resulting simply in the students falling asleep or staring at the window.)

This implication is key for it shows not only that all teachers produce Presence, but that also they can re-produce it, or produce more of it. Therefore, the goal for productive English language classrooms is not to make classrooms more “interesting” (as both Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Nakamura noted), or simply to “motivate” their students to “like” English (as Ms. Sato
noted). Instead, the goal must be to produce more Presence, a factor that allows students to exchange intelligibility towards language learning whether they are interested, motivated, or not. Indeed, given various factors (most obvious of which is that these teachers are dealing with teenagers, who in any situation are at a difficult time in their lives personally, physiologically, and socially [Adams & Berzonsky, 2005]), it is important not to reduce language learning simply to “interest” and “motivation.” Instead, Presence shows how linguistic outcomes and intelligibility can be produced regardless of, even despite, interest or motivation by students. Even if they articulate to their teachers, “I hate English!” they are doing it in English. Even if they say, “I hate you!” they are doing it in English, and in a real-time socialized environment. In connecting this example to one’s first language as a native English speaker, it is irrelevant and absurd to ask whether one “likes” or is “interested” in speaking it. Likewise, the situation is the same if one asks a Japanese student this question about Japanese. The difference, as explained in the initial chapter of this study, is that our L1 is always “present” to us; the goal, therefore, is to produce structurally the same types of attitudes, and their articulation through power as practices, in the L2 classroom. The teachers, individually, did this in unique ways: as described in the third research objective, Ms. Sato tended to present these “natural” reactions and relations to English through her creation of English as a space in the classroom (for example, her morning routines using American English), while Ms. Nakamura did this through the tone of her voice and her sensitivity to the situations and the feelings of her students. Neither of these elements were necessarily targeting the students’ “interest;” instead, they simply produced a real, dynamic exchange that produced real outcomes, not necessarily consciously (indeed, perhaps none of the participants, if asked, would even realize what had just occurred, nor is that conscious realization necessary.) Building on a body of research related to such authentic use of language (Gonzalez,
2006; Huang, 2004), the articulation of classroom Presence is yet another that shows us how and why such authenticity is important, though the contribution of this particular approach is in articulating a means that is fundamentally multiple and dynamic in character.

It is important to note, however, that this goal of “re-producing” Presence in the L2 classroom does not mean literally reproducing the same situations (which is fundamentally impossible), but instead reproducing the sets of strategies and practices by which it was produced, or being open to the multiple demands present at all times that allow it consistently to be produced. As stated very early in this study, this conclusion is important for it supports our initial assertion that teacher training workshops, or even direct experience with the L2 (in this case, having lived abroad in an English-speaking country) are not necessarily conducive to pedagogy or Presence as such. While of course they are hardly a detriment and no one would claim that teacher training and education is not important, nevertheless it is not enough simply to recommend to many Japanese teachers that they “live abroad” in order to be “effective” language teachers, or to draw the conclusion that because Ms. Sato lived abroad, and because she studied and completed an advanced graduate degree in English teaching, she therefore is the “model” teacher for the others to emulate. Indeed, as in the case of Ms. Nakamura, for instance, she had never lived abroad, and now as a teacher in Matsuoka would probably never be able to do so given budgetary constraints, time constraints, and a busy schedule and dozens of students each class-period requiring instruction. This inability and difference in preparation created an obvious tension in discussion when she noted that, for example, her colleague Ms. Sato had been abroad many times, and in fact was traveling abroad later that very summer to spend nearly a month in California, where she would be staying with native-English speakers.
The key for Presence, thus, is to show that any of these experiences do not necessarily “translate” into greater classroom Presence. Instead of experiences or teacher training workshops, it is the anti-transcendental attitude articulated early in the study that makes the key difference, and that must consistently be reproduced and deployed as a pedagogical practice and as a way of being. Ms. Nakamura had never lived or studied abroad, but nevertheless she produced classroom Presence (for example, when she was reading with her students and getting demonstrably better reactions than when she had the students read with the textbook-accompanied CD and its native speaker.) Ms. Watanabe, on the other hand, had lived abroad, and yet because of certain ideas she expressed about students’ lack of basic skills and need of discipline, wildly distorted her English pronunciation, creating for her students an English that was largely unintelligible even to a native speaker. As such, it is the attitude of the teacher, as articulated by power, that marks classroom Presence, not necessarily the preparation, lesson, or activity; teachers must first become attuned to the site-specific situations present in their classroom as a dynamic pedagogical space before training, experiences, or anything else can be adapted to those concerns. As in the example of their L1 usage, they must constantly reproduce the site-specific and attuned practices that make intelligibility continually possible; when speaking to a Japanese colleague, they do not suddenly reproduce a set of vocabulary lists, or canned sets of dialogue. Instead, they engage multiply at numerous times and in numerous, hybrid ways various attuned sets of practices and attitudes (Duff, 2004; Huang, 2004.) The key for classroom Presence is to show how and why this already occurs naturally in the L2 classroom, and how and why it should flow freely as often as possible in order to be produced constantly. These conclusions will continue to play a part in the following two sections, as they become translated into real implications and recommendations for future work in this area.
Recommendations

From these conclusions and implications, we now turn to look at several possible recommendations for future research and applications of this study into other educationally-applied situations. From the beginning, however, it is important to note that recommendations of this type of analysis cannot be made directly, or simply “translated” structurally or literally into a new situation. As discussed in both the literature review and the methodology, and followed through with the data display and analysis, this study and its results can only be directly connected to the site-specific, multiple, and dynamic concerns for which it was created. Nevertheless, there are general ideas and sets of practices that can be articulated as recommendations for future avenues of research and further application of these theoretical and practical ideas.

Recommendation 1: It takes a Village

- Conclusion: Cultural and linguistic backgrounds and motivations and purposes for pedagogy (including all positive, negative, frustrating, helpful, etc. interactions within them) were translated into real, observable teacher attitudes.
- Implication: Hybridity, multiplicity, and complexity are basic, constitutive facts present in every pedagogical space.
- Recommendation: Communities need to be more involved in realizing that their multiple, dynamic decisions have real, demonstrable effects on pedagogical practice and spaces.

As defined in the literature review, the English classes at Matsuoka High School acted as autopoietic systems that generated and deployed their own rules of intelligibility. Nevertheless, as systems these rules and structures were generated within a larger systemic environment of “infinite complexity” (Maturana, 1984) that influenced the ways and types of structures that
could be intelligible. More directly, in the data and discussion of the study, we also saw the various social and environmental concerns that impacted both the teachers and the students at Matsuoka High School: budgetary problems, psycho-social problems related to self-esteem (for students), problems related to achievement and proficiency (for teachers), and larger social problems related to demographics, infrastructure, and psychology. In short, the problems for the students in the English spaces at Matsuoka High School were not simply related to the effectiveness of their teacher’s instruction, or how well-funded or well-designed their classroom spaces and lessons were. There were also larger systemic problems outside the classroom that made teaching and English learning more difficult. Or, as related to the construction of these spaces as autopoietic systems, these larger social concerns also played a role in dictating the types of linguistic outcomes that would be possible in that space, or helped to condition the type of system that was ultimately generated.

Therefore, one recommendation would be for greater community involvement, both on the structural and systemic level, and also on the personal and parental levels. This includes literal changes in the types of opinions expressed verbally and non-verbally by system administrators about the “level” of Matsuoka High School, literal changes in the ways in which access to the school and its resources are distributed, and literal changes in the ways in which other teachers talk about their assignment as teachers at this school. This also includes figurative and conceptual changes in the way in which the teachers and administrators look at the overall English curriculum at Matsuoka High School. As discussed in the third research objective, simply motivation, “investment” in language pedagogy (Pierce, 1995), or even experience may not be enough to produce classroom Presence or increase any linguistic outcomes in the classroom. In the EFL environment specifically, even students who have motivation to learn
English are not necessarily in a better position to become more proficient; the community outside the classroom space is not conducive to using English at all. Indeed, Ms. Sato expressed this inability as one of her main reasons for deciding to become an English teacher in the first place. As such, the conceptual change that this study illustrates is the importance of creating alternative avenues of engaging students, such as Presence (as exchanges of real vitality between participants), instead of simply trying to increase student motivation or make English more “interesting” for students to study. In short, one of the key recommendations for this study is a recommendation made in many studies of education, in that it quite literally “takes a village” (to borrow a famous phrase from former First Lady Hillary Clinton) in order to produce both classroom Presence and the positive, empowered spaces that would satisfy the goals and methods laid out in school curricula.

**Recommendation 2: Revising Teacher Education**

- Conclusion (first component): Power is a process and an exchange; more specifically, it is a translation and negotiation of attitudes (in the form of talking, doing, and being in the pedagogical space) seeking intelligibility between participants.
- Conclusion (second component): Within that practice described above, individual articulations of anti-transcendental attitudes (as Presence) can be and are individually produced in unique, often surprising ways.
- Implication: Power does not affect pedagogical practice, or is one component of that practice, but instead power *is* practice. As an articulation of power, Presence is already produced by all teachers at different times; therefore, it can be continually produced more often as further attitudes and articulations are targeted for real change.
• Recommendation: The rethinking and redeploying of teacher education and teacher training workshops (and the attitudes shared by teachers and administrators within them) are both necessary and timely.

As found in the analysis of data, every teacher produces Presence, in different ways, individual to the particular and unique concerns set up by their pedagogical spaces, in concert with both their participants and with themselves as developing, dynamic individuals with real histories and attitudes. As such, the key component for the teachers was not in translating or bringing in the best textbook, or the most well-planned and researched activity or lesson plan, or in having travelled or studied English abroad for a long period of time. Of course, these materials did not necessarily detract from the lesson (although, in the cases of Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Nakamura, the use of the CD with the textbook produced considerably more unintelligible, quiet responses than when speaking with students in person), but nevertheless the component for teacher training is to get teachers to produce as practices consistently the situations and means by which English intelligibility occurred for them. This does not come through watching a video, or learning a new activity, or receiving a new set of worksheets. Instead, it is work that must be done from within, to show the teachers exactly how their pedagogical spaces function and how they work in unison with their students to produce the rules by which it forms and functions. In this way, this study recommends a type of “therapy” component (for lack of a better word) that would work with teachers on their practice, helping to produce and “Presentificate” in such a way that classroom Presence itself becomes a consistent practice, and not just a momentary fragment to be found in the margins of their difficult, but critically important, work.

Following from this, it is also necessary for teachers and administrators to rethink the types of attitudes expressed during teacher education, during meetings, and overall. As
described in the first and second literature review, schools like Matsuoka already face difficult
demographic situations even before the students and teachers enter the door. As such, it is
critically important not to taint or color their impressions and their attitudes towards their
practices therein before they can even start. Nevertheless, Matsuoka’s “reputation” preceded it
long before the teachers received their assignments, and though they came to work tirelessly,
nevertheless their attitudes and those expressed by others about their assignment did color their
attitudes about their work. In contrast, the students at the school also heard these rumors and
insinuations about Matsuoka, and knew the attitudes of the teachers and administrators towards
them, coupled with the community at large. These various attitudes were articulated in the
pedagogical spaces, thus being a constitutive part of how those spaces formed and functioned.

Avenues for Further Research

Future studies in this area will continue to lend support to these initial implications, along
with more methodologically precise instruments, techniques, and conclusions. Such studies will
show how participants negotiate meaning for themselves and articulate their developing, hybrid
attitudes in real ways through power in the classroom. Further, these studies will show how the
classroom spaces are shaped by power along these lines, in creating what the participants find
possible and necessary in structuring their practice, in order to produce three new kinds of
studies: (1) a set of studies used to validate the model and instruments constructed with a larger
population of teachers with similar characteristics (but in different settings and for different
purposes, for example in an ESL program in a K-12 district in the United States), (2) a practical
model for teacher training based on the elements of Presence here identified, attempting to create
and affect teacher training programs to become more focused on the “therapeutic” elements
described in this study and (3) a theoretical model for teacher Presence that articulates and
defines key types of practices and processes for real effects, in order to produce a more theoretically precise instrument and system of thought.

These two concerns, both practical and theoretical, will help shape the next several years of my teaching and research, and will move me further towards my goal of creating a useful, workable set of interactions and exchanges with real teachers, who like me found themselves in difficult, dynamic classrooms full of unknown practices, but which seemed fundamentally intelligible. This body of work will help them and, in turn, help me in my own practice as well.

In looking at the radically changing dynamics of pedagogy around the world, the changing cultural and linguistic backgrounds of our student populations, and the historically high rate of failure for large groups of non-mainstream students (or, like those in Matsuoka, those left to fend for themselves at the bottom), we can see that this type of research is not merely an academic exercise. In Japan, the stakes for EFL learning are very real, as a new generation of teachers and students attempt to compensate for, and deal with, a rapidly changing society; in ESL and studies outside Japan, the situation is critical as well, with the rapidly changing demographics of emerging students needing new approaches and new practices to help them succeed (Gonzalez, 2006; Maxwell, 2009.) Nevertheless, there is still a lot of work to be done. In seeing both the practical and theoretical applications under which specific factors can be documented for real and purposeful change, teachers can bridge the historic gaps and work together as partners, quite literally generating and creating their own future outcomes.
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Appendix A: Sample Semi-Structured Interview Guide

A. Categories of Analysis:

Category A: Cultural and Linguistic Background

Sub-Categories:
- Previous spaces/contexts of L2 Learning
- Previous spaces/contexts of L2 Pedagogy
- Previous individuals/relationships in L2 Learning
- Previous individuals/relationships in L2 Pedagogy
- Travel Abroad Experiences
- Individual Experiences and Family background

Category B: Motivations and Purposes for Pedagogy

Sub-Categories:
- Personal Motivations for Pedagogy
- Professional Motivations for Pedagogy
- Perceptions of Motivations for Students
- Perceptions of Motivations for Colleagues

B. Interview Questions


A. Focused Life History

1. Tell me about the significant events in your past that influenced your decision to learn English and become an English teacher. When did you become interested in this area, and what attracted you to it?
2. Who were the family members, teachers, or other people who most influenced you in your choice? What kinds of guidance, mentoring, or encouragement did they provide? Tell us about them.

B. The Details of Experience

3. Describe your learning experiences and background as an English learner. Tell me about the best, and also the most challenging, experiences you have had. To what extent do you feel your background helped you prepare for the realities of the classroom (as you now experience them.) (repeat for teaching)
4. Were you able to study abroad in a native-English setting during your education or training? (Possible follow-up/clarification: If yes, how do you compare those experiences to the EFL setting? If no, what strategies do you use to create “real” experiences, activities, etc.?)
5. Describe your relationships with peers and your teachers. Tell me about how they have helped you, and how they may be different than you experience now. Would any additional support or types of support have been helpful? If so, what kind?
6. How do your teaching experiences here compare with those you have had in other schools? What did the classroom “space” look like? What was the routine? Where have you taught prior to coming to Matsuoka?
C. Reflection on the Meaning and Opinions

7. What is your general impression of the role of English in the lives of Japanese students? (Follow up-clarification: What is “good” about compulsory English study? What is not good?)

8. What do you perceive as the best way to implement English study? What sort of classroom strategies do you use for instruction? (Follow-up: What is your main motivation or idea for using that strategy?

9. Given what you told me about your life, background, aspirations, etc, and what you have said about your actual experiences, are you satisfied with how you’ve blended these together with your own practice? Why or why not?

10. Do you feel the current modes or methods of instruction as you experience them are effective? What are the current challenges for Japanese education? Further, given the situation you now find yourself in, what would make your personal teaching life better?

11. What advice would you give someone from your home culture who aspires to become an English teacher?

12. Anything else?


A. Grand Tour

1. Take me through your daily teaching/work and tell me what it’s like here at Matsuoka High School. If you’d like, compare or contrast or describe other routines you’ve experienced at your previous schools.

B. Mini-tour

2. Tell me about the daily tasks you perform and the people with whom you interact. Where do these interactions take place? Describe what you did yesterday from the moment you arrived on campus to the time you left. Would you say this is a typical day for you? If not, how was it different? Follow-ups:

   3. Are you expected to follow particular standards, procedures, and rules? Tell me about them and how they affect the way you and other perform daily tasks.
   4. Are you supervised or observed in your teaching? Who oversees your work and how do they do it? Do they offer advising/advice or answer questions/complaints?

C. Experience

6. You’ve probably had some interesting work/study experiences in your time here and interacting at Matsuoka. Can you tell me about some of them? What was the best experience? What was the worst?

E. Native-language questions

7. Tell me about how you and your coworkers (peers) talk to one another, and how you talk with students. (based on previous answer) When you talk amongst yourselves, do you do so in ways, and with words, you would not normally use in the presence of administrators? Can you give me some examples?
Appendix B: Sample Classroom Observation Chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are the students responding/participating in classroom activity? (circle number):

1. Low/None (Students are working independently and/or in student groups or students and teacher are working together in communicative or situational activities (1-10 scale 1-3))
2. Medium (Some teacher direction of the entire class, but half or more of the time as above (4-6)
3. High (Teacher-directed instruction with minimal student interaction. Lecture, presentation, writing of grammatical points or notes on the board, students are taking notes of these, etc. (7-10)

Brief Description of Classroom Environment (style of the classroom, structure, decorations, arrangement of desks. How are student seats selected? Is there a daily “routine?” that is observable in the environment and how do students look as they enter the classroom?) Insert sketch/photograph at bottom of chart.
Activity/Lesson Type (target lesson, grammar point, what is being studied?):

If student groupings (single, small, large, etc.) are involved, describe them and Interactions:

Instructional Materials In Use (does the teacher use the textbook primarily, the blackboard, discussion examples, hand-outs, stories, etc.?):
Student interactions with Teacher (does the teacher ask questions? How do the students respond? Does the teacher use the target language or mostly native-language? How does teacher approach problems or problematic situations ((students sleeping, off-task)? How does the teacher provide feedback or correction?)

Other notes:

Sketch, photograph, or schematic of classroom space (below); attach any supplementary materials by staple to the next page (worksheets, lesson plans, etc.)
Appendix C: Categories for Coding Research Objectives and Summary of Findings Across Subjects

Categories for Coding First Research Objective
Instrument: Participant Semi-structured Interviews

Category A: Cultural and Linguistic Background
1: Previous spaces/contexts of L2 learning
   a. Teacher had studied English from middle school through graduate school
      1. Teacher had studied/used English language in Japan only
      2. Teacher had studied/used English language in Japan and abroad
   b. Teacher had studied English from middle school through undergraduate school.
      1. Teacher had studied/used English language in Japan only
      2. Teacher had studied/used English language in Japan and abroad
2: Previous spaces/contexts of L2 pedagogy
   a. Teacher had taught previously at top-tier High School
   b. Teacher had taught previously at mid-tier High School
   c. Teacher had taught previous at low-tier High School
   d. Teacher had not taught previously (new teacher)
3. Previous individuals/relationships in L2 Learning
   a. Teacher had former relationships who influenced their learning positively
   b. Teacher had former relationships who influenced their learning negatively
   c. Teacher did not have former relationships who influenced learning (self-interested)
4. Previous individuals/relationships in L2 Pedagogy
   a. Teacher had relationships with students/colleagues similar to current assignment
   b. Teacher had relationships with students/colleagues dissimilar to current assignment
   c. Teacher did not connect previous relationships to current assignment
5. Travel Abroad
   a. Teacher had travelled abroad for study for more than one month
   b. Teacher had travelled abroad for trips/home stays for more than one month
   c. Teacher had not travelled abroad or had travelled for less than one month
6. Individual Experiences and family background
   a. Teacher had family members/influences who were teachers.
   b. Teacher had family members/influences who were not teachers.
   c. Teacher had family members/influences who had lived/studied abroad
Category B: Motivations and Purposes for Pedagogy
1. Personal Motivations for Pedagogy
   a. Extrinsic Personal Motivations
      1. Teachers were motivated by practical concerns (i.e. utility of English for travel/work, inability to use English in daily Japanese life, etc.)
      2. Teachers were motivated by social concerns (i.e. Japanese education reforms, student inability to use English despite years of study, frustrations with their former English language learning, etc)
   b. Intrinsic Personal Motivations
      1. Teachers were motivated by concern for student feelings.
      2. Teachers were motivated by enjoyment of English itself (self-satisfaction).
      3. Teachers were motivated by a development of thinking skills through English.
2. Professional Motivations for Pedagogy
   a. Extrinsic Professional Motivations
      1. Teachers were motivated by need to use training/skills
      2. Teachers were motivated by need to change professions
      3. Teachers did not express extrinsic professional motivations for pedagogy.
   b. Intrinsic Professional Motivations
      1. Teachers were motivated by lack of student basic skills
      2. Teachers were motivated by desire to “do better” than their teachers had done
      3. Teachers were motivated by role of English as important “world language”
3. Perceptions of motivations for students
   a. Extrinsic
      1. Students are motivated to study for tests or college entrance
      2. Students are motivated to study because of career goals
      3. Students are not motivated to study
   b. Intrinsic
      1. Students enjoy/want to talk to foreigners and learn about foreign culture
      2. Students enjoy/want to talk to teachers
      3. Students do not enjoy/want to talk or learn English
4. Perceptions of motivations for colleagues
   a. Extrinsic
      1. Teachers are motivated to prepare students for tests.
2. Teachers are motivated to overcome student lack of basic skills
3. Teachers are pressured to conform to cultural/social norms

b. Intrinsic
   1. Teachers understand/show concern for student extrinsic motivations.
   2. Teachers do not understand/do not show concern for student extrinsic motivations.
   3. Teachers understand/show concern for student intrinsic motivations (i.e. feelings)
   4. Teachers do not understand/do not show concern for student intrinsic motivations (i.e. feelings)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Sato</th>
<th>Ms. Watanabe</th>
<th>Ms. Nakamura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studied at Dokkyo University, a private university noted for its excellent language education programs. Studied English (especially American Racial History). Also studied Master’s Degree in English at Niigata University after traveling abroad. A.1.a.2</td>
<td>Studied at Niigata University, a large national university on the Sea of Japan Coast. Majored in English Literature. A.1.b.2</td>
<td>Studied at Saitama University, a Japanese national university known for its undergraduate education programs and large international student population. Major was English Education with a focus on linguistics. A.1.b.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are not teachers, but encouraged travel and study of English. Has aunt and uncle who are living abroad (one in business in NYC, and another in public service in Germany.) A.6.b and A.6.c</td>
<td>Previously worked as a Tour Conductor, and took the English Teacher Evaluation/License exam when a friend suggested to her that she might be good at it. A.4.b. and A.6.b</td>
<td>Didn’t like English at first, when studying it in school (she is the youngest, age-wise, of the teachers), because “most focused on grammar” and she doesn’t like grammar by itself. A.3.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveled to America and abroad several times, beginning in teenage years and continuing through college to the present. A.5.a</td>
<td>Traveled to America for one year during college, but not for study: four months in San Francisco, then down to Miami Liked warm places because she “hates snow.” A.5.b.</td>
<td>Traveled abroad for vacation only; has never studied or lived in another country. A.5.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister is also an English Teacher. A.6.a</td>
<td>Brother is a teacher, but not English (instead Biology) A.6.a.</td>
<td>Aunt and her husband are teachers, but not English (high school PE teachers) A.6.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught previously at (1) Tokamachi High School (regular “midlevel” high school), (2) Honae High School (higher level “English centered” high school, with two ALTs all the time, (3) Southern Niigata High School (high level general high school with almost all students attending/preparing for college and entrance examinations). A.2.a, A.2.b., A.4.b</td>
<td>Taught previously at (1) Tochui High School (lower level high school similar to MHS), (2) Shibata Minami High School (mid-range High School, closer to level of Senba High School in the next town.) A.2.b and A.2.c</td>
<td>Just came to MHS in April of 2010. Taught previously at (1) Sanjo Higashi High School (mid-range High School, closer to level of Senba High School in the next town.) and (2) Yoshida Commercial High School (specialty school that focused on vocational studies, and as such had lower-level English interest/programming.) A.2.b and A.2.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sato</td>
<td>Ms. Watanabe</td>
<td>Ms. Nakamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No way to keep up with or use English in Niigata, unless by working as a teacher. B.1.a.1 and B.2.a.1</td>
<td>Felt that she could not/did not want to continue working as a Tour Conductor. B.1.a.1 and B.2.a.2</td>
<td>Felt that her teachers in her early school life understood English, but not student feelings. She felt like this made her dislike English and not feel accommodated. Wanted to become an English teacher to be sensitive to their personal feelings. B.1.b.1, B.2.b.2, B.4.b.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal motivation (not parental or social) because SHE wanted to study abroad. B.1.b.2 and A.1.3.c</td>
<td>Feels that English is a “thinking skill,” not just a language skill. English is a means to “get some knowledge,” but not necessarily English itself (could be other languages; she also studied Russian, but no longer “remembers anything”) B.1.b.3</td>
<td>Interested in studying behavioral and psychological problems of students, to help them (counseling.) B.1.b.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonality of English as a “world language” gave her a “good feeling,” as though she were connected to others around the world. Wants her students to “build that same feeling.” B.3.b.1</td>
<td>Evaluations are necessary parts; if they don’t have a product/outcome/evaluation, they don’t study. B.3.a.1 and B.4.a.1</td>
<td>Quizzes/evaluations can help students target their own goals/fulfillment. B.3.a.1 …but they don’t like to study/aren’t motivated. B.3.a.3 and B.3.b.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categories for Coding Second Research Objective
Instruments: Participant Semi-structured Interviews and Classroom Observations

Category A: Verbal Practices (i.e. Power as Talking)

1. Initiations
   a. Teacher initiates classroom discussion to students using English as a standard classroom routine (Greetings, Q&A, etc.).
      1. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using English
         a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
         b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
         c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
         d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using Japanese
         e. Produces no response at all
      2. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using Japanese
         a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
         b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
         c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
         d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using Japanese
         e. Produces no response at all
      3. Teacher initiation does not expect/assume a response
   b. Teacher initiates classroom discussion to students using English spontaneously (unrelated to classroom routine.)
      1. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using English
         a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
         b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
         c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
         d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
         e. Produces no response at all
      2. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using Japanese
         a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
         b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
         c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
         d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
         e. Produces no response at all
      3. Teacher initiation does not expect/assume a response
c. Teacher initiates classroom discussion to students using English related specifically to lesson content.
   1. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using English
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   2. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using Japanese
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   3. Teacher initiation does not expect/assume a response

 d. Teacher initiates classroom discussion to students using Japanese as a standard classroom routine.
   1. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using English
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   2. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using Japanese
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   3. Teacher initiation does not expect/assume a response
e. Teacher initiates classroom discussion to students using Japanese spontaneously (unrelated to classroom routine.)
   1. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using English
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   2. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using Japanese
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   3. Teacher initiation does not expect/assume a response
f. Teacher initiates classroom discussion to students using Japanese related specifically to lesson content.
   1. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using English
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   2. Teacher initiation expects/assumes a response from students using Japanese
      a. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using English
      b. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible response from student using English
      c. Produces meaningful/intelligible response from student using Japanese
      d. Produces not meaningful/unintelligible responses from student using Japanese
      e. Produces no response at all
   3. Teacher initiation does not expect/assume a response

2. Responses
   a. Teacher responds to student initiation using English only related to lesson content (i.e. using the target grammar, vocab, etc.)
      1. Teacher response is to student question in English
         a. Teacher response answers student question
1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not answer student question
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

2. Teacher response is to student question in Japanese
   a. Teacher response answers student question
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not answer student question
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

3. Teacher response is to student comment in English
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

4. Teacher response is to student comment in Japanese
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher responds to student initiation using English only unrelated to lesson content
      1. Teacher response is to student question in English
         a. Teacher response answers student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
               2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
         b. Teacher response does not answer student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

2. Teacher response is to student question in Japanese
   a. Teacher response answers student question
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not answer student question
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

3. Teacher response is to student comment in English
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

4. Teacher response is to student comment in Japanese
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   c. Teacher responds to student initiation using Japanese only related to lesson content (i.e. target vocab, etc.)
      1. Teacher response is to student question in English
         a. Teacher response answers student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
         b. Teacher response does not answer student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response is to student question in Japanese
         a. Teacher response answers student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not answer student question
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

3. Teacher response is to student comment in English
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

4. Teacher response is to student comment in Japanese
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional response/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional response/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   d. Teacher responds to student initiation using Japanese only unrelated to lesson content
      1. Teacher response is to student question in English
         a. Teacher response answers student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
         b. Teacher response does not answer student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response is to student question in Japanese
         a. Teacher response answers student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
         b. Teacher response does not answer student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
3. Teacher response is to student comment in English
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

4. Teacher response is to student comment in Japanese
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

   e. Teacher responds to student initiation using a mixture of English and Japanese related to lesson content
      1. Teacher response is to student question in English
         a. Teacher response answers student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
         b. Teacher response does not answer student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response is to student question in Japanese
         a. Teacher response answers student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
         b. Teacher response does not answer student question
            1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
            2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

3. Teacher response is to student comment in English
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
b. Teacher response does not address student comment
   1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
   2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

4. Teacher response is to student comment in Japanese
   a. Teacher response addresses student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   b. Teacher response does not address student comment
      1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
      2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

f. Teacher responds to student initiation using a mixture of English and Japanese unrelated to lesson content
   1. Teacher response is to student question in English
      a. Teacher response answers student question
         1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
      b. Teacher response does not answer student question
         1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   2. Teacher response is to student question in Japanese
      a. Teacher response answers student question
         1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
      b. Teacher response does not answer student question
         1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
   3. Teacher response is to student comment in English
      a. Teacher response addresses student comment
         1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
      b. Teacher response does not address student comment
         1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
         2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student

4. Teacher response is to student comment in Japanese
a. Teacher response addresses student comment
   1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
   2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
b. Teacher response does not address student comment
   1. Teacher response produces additional question/initiation from student
   2. Teacher response does not produce additional question/initiation from student
g. Teacher does not respond to student initiation
   1. Student re-attempts initiation in English
   2. Student re-attempts initiation in Japanese
   2. Student does not re-attempt initiation

3. Transitions
   a. Teacher transitions between multiple activities related to classroom content using mostly English (after ~10 minutes)
      1. Activities are related to same content (i.e. reading the passage, then listening to the passage, then speaking, etc.)
      2. Activities are related to different content (i.e. quiz, then reading the passage, then writing, etc.)
   b. Teacher transitions between multiple activities related to classroom content using mostly Japanese (after ~10 minutes)
      1. Activities are related to same content (i.e. reading the passage, then listening to the passage, then speaking, etc.)
      2. Activities are related to different content (i.e. quiz, then reading the passage, then writing, etc.)
   c. Teacher transitions between few activities related to classroom content using mostly English (after ~20 minutes)
      1. Activities are related to same content (i.e. reading the passage, then listening to the passage, then speaking, etc.)
      2. Activities are related to different content (i.e. quiz, then reading the passage, then writing, etc.)
   d. Teacher transitions between few activities related to classroom content using mostly Japanese (after ~20 minutes)
      1. Activities are related to same content (i.e. reading the passage, then listening to the passage, then speaking, etc.)
      2. Activities are related to different content (i.e. quiz, then reading the passage, then writing, etc.)
   c. Teacher does not transition between activities or only has a single activity (~40-50 minutes of classtime)

Category B: Non-Verbal Practices (i.e. Power as Doing)
1. Non-Verbal Practices Accompanying Verbal Practices
   a. Non Verbal accompanies verbal initiation
      1. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility of verbal initiation (for example, voice tone, exaggeration, etc.) related to standard classroom routines (Greetings, Q&A, etc.)
         a. Verbal initiation is in English
         b. Verbal initiation is in Japanese
         c. Verbal initiation is in a mixture of English/Japanese
2. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility of spontaneous verbal initiation (unrelated to classroom routine.)
   a. Verbal initiation is in English
   b. Verbal initiation is in Japanese
   c. Verbal initiation is in a mixture of English/Japanese

3. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility of verbal initiation related specifically to lesson content.
   a. Verbal initiation is in English
   b. Verbal initiation is in Japanese
   c. Verbal initiation is in a mixture of English/Japanese

4. Practice is not meaningful towards intelligibility of verbal initiation (for example, non-specific gestures)
   b. Non Verbal accompanies verbal response
      1. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility of verbal response related to lesson content
         a. Verbal response is in English
         b. Verbal response is in Japanese
         c. Verbal response is in a mixture of English/Japanese
      2. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility of verbal response unrelated to lesson content
         a. Verbal response is in English
         b. Verbal response is in Japanese
         c. Verbal response is in a mixture of English/Japanese
      3. Practice is not meaningful towards intelligibility of verbal response

2. Non Verbal Practices as such
   a. Non verbal as such is in response to student verbal initiation in English
      1. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility/clarification of initiation
      2. Practice is not meaningful towards intelligibility/clarification of initiation
   b. Non verbal as such is in response to student verbal in Japanese
      1. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility/clarification of initiation
      2. Practice is not meaningful towards intelligibility/clarification of initiation
   c. Non verbal as such is in response to student non-verbal
      1. Practice is meaningful towards intelligibility/clarification of non-verbal (for example, student points at home work, and then points to the “turn-in” basket on the table, to which the teacher nods “yes” or “no.”)
      2. Practice is not meaningful towards intelligibility/clarification of non-verbal
   d. Non verbal as such is spontaneous
      1. Spontaneity is related to classroom content/activity
      2. Spontaneity is not related to classroom content/activity
e. Non-verbal as such is a habit/routine (for example, twitch, swaying from side to side, tapping fingers, etc.)
   1. Habit/routine is gestural (i.e. twitch, swaying)
   2. Habit/routine is related to appearance (i.e. dress, style of hair, make-up)
      a. Appearance-related routine is traditional/formal (slacks, blouse, black/white, etc.)
      b. Appearance-related routine is relaxed/casual (sweater, shorts, sportswear, etc.)

Category C: Spaces of Interaction (i.e. Power as Being)
1. Physical Spaces
   a. Physical Space is the English Classroom
      1. Conducibility to English learning
         a. Classroom population
            1. Classroom does not appear crowded for its size
            2. Classroom appears crowded for its size
         b. Classroom shape/layout
            1. Classroom shape/layout focuses student attention (i.e. no student can “hide”, blackboard at front, etc)
            2. Classroom shape/layout does not focus student attention
            3. Classroom shape/layout allows for movement
               a. Teacher moves around classroom space with ease
               b. Teacher moves around classroom space with difficulty (i.e. not enough space between rows)
               c. Teacher does not move around classroom space (i.e. stays by the chalkboard)
               d. Students move around classroom space with ease
               e. Students move around the classroom space with difficulty
               f. Students do not move around the classroom space (i.e. remain at their desks)
         c. Classroom Resources
            1. Classroom has appropriate materials/preparation (enough desks, books, chalk, etc.)
            2. Classroom does not have appropriate materials/preparation (not enough desks, etc.)
            3. Classroom has technology to enhance/supplement learning (computers, CD player, DVD, etc.)
            4. Classroom does not have technology to enhance/supplement learning
   b. Physical Space is not the English Classroom
      1. Space is room of instructional activity (i.e. other classroom)
         a. Space is relevant to English learning (i.e. room used to practice speeches for contests, study room, etc.)
         b. Space is not relevant to English learning (i.e. Music room, science lab)
      2. Space is transitional area (hallway, restroom, etc.)
a. Space is used by teacher for relevant English interactions (i.e. chatting, passing out papers, etc.)
b. Space is not used by teacher for relevant English interactions
c. Space is used by students for relevant English interactions
d. Space is not used by students for relevant English interactions

3. Space is room of instructional planning (i.e. Teacher’s room, principal’s office, etc.)
a. Students are allowed freely within the space
   1. Freely-entered spaces are relevant for English interaction
   2. Freely-entered spaces are not relevant for English interaction
b. Students are not allowed freely/regulated in the space
   1. English interactions take place in regulated space (i.e. make-up tests, making copies for class)
   2. English interactions do not take place in regulated space (i.e. teacher’s lounge, smoking room, etc.)

2. Conceptual Spaces
   a. Conceptual Space includes an individual with other participants
      1. Participants are only students
         a. Students are attuned to classroom topic/content
            1. Attenuation is disruptive (i.e. talking while the teacher is talking)
            2. Attenuation is non-disruptive (i.e. taking notes, following directions, looking at others’ notes, etc.)
         b. Students are not attuned to classroom topic/content (i.e. passing notes, talking, etc.)
            1. Non-attenuation is disruptive (i.e. talking, making noise, etc.)
            2. Non-attenuation is non-disruptive
      2. Participant is only teacher
         a. Teacher is targeted on lesson topic/content (i.e. teaching directly/writing on the board)
         b. Teacher is not targeted on lesson topic/content (i.e. stacking papers, leaves classroom, etc)
      3. Participant is mixture of teacher and students
         a. Practices in the space are related to classroom content
            1. Language used in the space is primarily English
            2. Language used in the space is primarily Japanese
            3. Language used in the space is a mixture of both English and Japanese
         b. Practices in the space are unrelated to classroom content
            1. Language used in the space is primarily English
            2. Language used in the space is primarily Japanese
            3. Language used in the space is a mixture of both English and Japanese
   b. Conceptual Space includes an individual without other participants
1. Individual is “in his/her own space” (i.e. looking out the window, staring off into space)
   a. Behavior in space is disruptive (i.e. making bodily noises, playing with the window latch)
      1. Disruptive behavior is recognized by teacher.
      2. Disruptive behavior is not recognized by teacher.
   b. Behavior in the space is non-disruptive (i.e. staring quietly out window)
      1. Non-disruptive behavior is recognized by teacher (i.e. “Tomoki, pay attention.”)
      2. Non-disruptive behavior is not recognized by teacher.

2. Individual is reading/studying materials related to classroom content (i.e. textbook, notebooks, dictionary, etc.)
   a. Behavior in space is disruptive (i.e. loudly shuffling papers, electronic dictionary sound “on”)
      1. Disruptive behavior is recognized by teacher.
      2. Disruptive behavior is not recognized by teacher.
   b. Behavior in the space is non-disruptive (i.e. reading in the book )
      1. Non-disruptive behavior is directly related to relevant target lesson
      2. Non-disruptive behavior is not directly related to relevant target lesson (i.e. reading the next chapter)
         a. Behavior is recognized by teacher (i.e. “Tomoki, we’re on page 7, not 15.”)
         b. Behavior is not recognized by teacher.

3. Individual is reading/studying materials unrelated to classroom content (i.e. comic book, novel, cell phone etc.)
   a. Behavior in space is disruptive (i.e. loudly shuffling papers, watching cell phone videos)
      1. Disruptive behavior is recognized by teacher.
      2. Disruptive behavior is not recognized by teacher.
   b. Behavior in the space is non-disruptive (i.e. reading a novel quietly)
      a. Behavior is recognized by teacher (i.e. “Tomoki, put that comic away and study.”)
      b. Behavior is not recognized by teacher.

4. Individual is sleeping
   a. Behavior is recognized by teacher (i.e. Tomoki, wake up!)
      1. Student responds and stays awake
      2. Student responds but soon falls back asleep
         a. Teacher repeats recognition behavior
         b. Teacher does not repeat recognition behavior
   3. Student does not respond at all (stays asleep)
      a. Teacher repeats recognition behavior
      b. Teacher does not repeat recognition behavior
   b. Behavior is not recognized by teacher
# Summary of Findings Across Subjects: Category A: Verbal Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Sato</th>
<th>Ms. Watanabe</th>
<th>Ms. Nakamura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greetings in English/following “American” style. Instructions, too, are in English (if ALT is present, ALT uses completely English and reads at slower pacing) Students Respond. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.A.1.a/ c/ e</td>
<td>Greetings in Japanese (including standard “Stand Up. Bow” also in Japanese.) Students respond in ritual way. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.D.2.c (and d)</td>
<td>Greetings in Japanese (including standard “Stand Up. Bow” also in Japanese.) Students respond in ritual way. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.D.2.c (and d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A with students, called upon at random. Obs: June 1, 2, 3 1.B.1.a/c/e</td>
<td>Few post-greeting routines (gets straight to lesson content) Obs: June 1,2,3 July 1 1.C.1/2/3; 1.F.1/2/3</td>
<td>“Banter” with students, called at random Obs: June 1,3 1.B.1.d/e; 1.E.1.c/e; 1.E.2.c/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions in English, with Japanese supplements Obs: June 1,2,3 July1 1.C.3, 1.F.3</td>
<td>Instructions in Japanese, with occasional English supplement Obs: June 1,2,3, July1 1.F.3</td>
<td>Instructions in Japanese (uses Japanese almost exclusively) Obs: June 1,2,3, July 2 1.F.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks the meaning using Japanese, “supplementing” with English A1 Obs: June 1,2,3 July 1 1.F.1.a, 1.F.2.c/e</td>
<td>Checks the meaning using Japanese, “supplementing” with English only occasionally. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.F.1.a</td>
<td>Checks the meaning using Japanese, “supplementing” with English occasionally, but infrequently (90% or more Japanese) Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.F.2.c/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Reading/writing/textbook lesson (Does not use CD) Reading (June 2,3, July 1): 1.C.1.a/b/e; 1.F.1.a/b/c/e</td>
<td>Activities: Reading/writing/textbook lesson (uses CD) Reading (June 1,3): 1.C.1.a/b/e; 1.F.1.a/b/c/e Writing: (June 1,2,3, July 1)</td>
<td>Activity: studying from the book; translation and explanations in Japanese (grammatical). Vocab: Repeating after the CD. Reading: 1.C.1.a/b/e; 1.F.1.a/b/c/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few transition activities (activity is one, long activity) Obs: June 1,2,3 July 1 1.A.3.c.1/2; 3.C.2</td>
<td>Few transition activities (activity is one, long activity) Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.A.3.c.1/2; 3.D.2</td>
<td>More transition activities, but less than written on lesson plans 1.A./F.3/a.c.e; 3.d.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to use English, but forced to use Japanese (low level of students in both L1)</td>
<td>Desire to make lessons more “interesting,” but inhibited by student lack of basic skills</td>
<td>Desire to help students feel better about themselves, become more motivated, (even in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and L2) (From Interview)  
Checks the meaning often (mostly in Japanese)  
Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1  
2.A.1.a.1/2; 2.A.2  

and “discipline.” (From Interview)  
Asks if students have any questions (“Question Time”). Initiates, however seldom gets responses. Utilizes a CD/radio.  
Obs: June 1,2, July 1 1.C.1; 1.F.1.a; 1.F.2.c/e  

L1), but no skills. (From interview)  
Gives Vocab Quizzes at beginning of class  
Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.C.1; 1.F.1.a; 1.F.2.c/e  

| Checks the meaning often (mostly in Japanese)  
Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1  
2.A.1.a.1/2; 2.A.2 | Asks if students have any questions (“Question Time”). Initiates, however seldom gets responses. Utilizes a CD/radio.  
Obs: June 1,2, July 1 1.C.1; 1.F.1.a; 1.F.2.c/e | Gives Vocab Quizzes at beginning of class  
Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.C.1; 1.F.1.a; 1.F.2.c/e |
|---|---|---|
| More interaction, students give responses, or “I don’t know,” but are given chances to respond again.  
Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.C.1.b/d | Students respond “I don’t know” almost immediately upon being asked a question  
Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.C.1.d | Not much student interaction, responds “I don’t know” quickly  
Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.C.1.d |
| Notes from discussions:  
Connections between interview, discussing background at other schools, lack of motivation in students at MHS, and inability to directly “translate” activities from prior experience. | Notes from discussions:  
Inability to bring prior experience into classroom; no discussion of background, activities have to be targeted to lack of basic skills. | Notes from discussions:  
Greater focus on student “psychology” added to English lessons; students don’t feel motivated due to various factors (social, personal, etc.) |

Examples of Coding “values.”

1.A.1.a/ c/ e as a coding in this example, compared to the above categories, means “Teacher initiates classroom to students using English as a standard classroom routine that expects a response from students using English, and that produces a meaningful, not meaningful response, or no response from students using English (in individual cases).”

1.D.2.c/d as a coding means, “Teacher initiates classroom discussion to students using Japanese as a standard classroom routine that expects a response from students using Japanese that were both meaningful and not meaningful, in individual cases.”
### Summary of Findings Across Subjects Category B: Non-Verbal Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ms. Sato</th>
<th>Ms. Watanabe</th>
<th>Ms. Nakamura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages students in joking/greetings gestures (smiling/laughing/pointing)</td>
<td>Occasionally asks students questions/banter, but mostly begins lesson immediately. Fewer gestures/no “joking.”</td>
<td>Occasionally asks students a few simple questions, not much banter, usually goes right into passing out daily quiz. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.1.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs: June 1,2, July 1</td>
<td>1.a.2.c</td>
<td>1.a.3.c</td>
<td>1.a.1.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiles, uses slightly slower/exaggerated tone of voice. A1</td>
<td>Uses much slower/exaggerated tone of voice; even mispronounces words to correspond to Japanese syllables (does NOT do this in normal conversation in English, however.) Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.3.a.</td>
<td>Smiles, uses slow, exaggerated tone of voice, but very rarely uses English. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.3.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1</td>
<td>1.a.3.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When working with ALT, looks back and forth from ALT to students when ALT is reading. A2</td>
<td>Typically does not work with ALT (Did not team-teach during obs) Obs: n/a</td>
<td>Typically does not work with ALT (Did not team-teach during obs) Obs: n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs: July 2</td>
<td>2.d.1/2.e.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages students directly using both English/Japanese (with gestures and movements)</td>
<td>Does not engage students directly or gesturally often. Uses “filter” of the CD/textbook. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.4</td>
<td>Engages students directly, but in Japanese. Chats/asks questions of them (unrelated to lesson). Obs: June 1,3 2.e.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1</td>
<td>1.b.1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively casual style of dress/demeanor (usually slacks, no skirt. Shirt or sweater, not blouse) A2</td>
<td>Slightly more formal style of dress; dress slacks or skirt; blouse or dark sweater. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 2.e.2.a</td>
<td>Relatively casual style of dress (usually slacks, no skirt. Shirt or sweater, not blouse) Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 2.e.2.b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1</td>
<td>2.e.2.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Summary of Findings Across Subjects Category C: Spaces of Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Sato</th>
<th>Ms. Watanabe</th>
<th>Ms. Nakamura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom space has raised dais at the front, with blackboards in front and behind. Desks arranged in rows with everybody facing front.</td>
<td>Classroom space has raised dais at the front, with blackboards in front and behind. Desks arranged in rows with everybody facing front.</td>
<td>Classroom space has raised dais at the front, with blackboards in front and behind. Desks arranged in rows with everybody facing front.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) 1.a.1.b.1</td>
<td>1.a.1.b.1</td>
<td>1.a.1.b.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class size (30-35 students). No empty chairs unless particular student is absent from class. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.1.a.2</td>
<td>Large class size (30-35 students). No empty chairs unless particular student is absent from class. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.1.a.2</td>
<td>Generally has smaller class sizes (works primarily with first-year students. Class is divided in half and the others given to another teacher.) Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.1.a.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When solo-teaching, stands on the dais and writes on the board. During activities, will walk from the dais and around the room. Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 1.a.1.b.3.b/ 1.a.1.c.4</td>
<td>Moves around the room, only stands on the dais and writes on the board when writing grammatical point. Obs: June 1,2,3 1.a.1.b.3.b</td>
<td>Stays near the front of the room; does not move around much. Writes often on board explaining grammatical points. Obs: June 1,2 July 1 1.a.1.b.3.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When ALT is present, stands to the side and watches the ALT, with occasional interjections. ALT (white American male) stands off to the side of the dais and does not use the chalkboard. Obs: July 2 2.b.1.b</td>
<td>Did not team-teach with ALT during observation period Obs: n/a</td>
<td>Did not team-teach with ALT during observation period. Obs. n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some students continually fall asleep, others look out the window. Electronic dictionaries. (At least two per class) Obs: June 1,2,3, July 1 2.b.4.a</td>
<td>Some students continually fall asleep; others read the book and use electronic dictionaries (around ½, consistently.) Several look out the window during lesson. Obs: June 1,2,3 July 1 2.b.4.b</td>
<td>Some students continually fall asleep (at least three per class). Obs. June 1,2,3, July 1 2.b.4.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categories for Coding Third Research Objective
Instruments: Presence Instrument (Analysis of Both Participant Semi-structured Interviews and Classroom Observations)

Category A: Authentic Interactions
1. Linguistic Exchanges related to Content
   a. Exchange is authentic and appropriate (i.e. lesson about past tense, teacher asks “What did you eat yesterday?” to which student replies “I ate Sushi yesterday”)
      1. Authentic exchange uses English
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
   b. Exchange is authentic and not appropriate (i.e. student says “I eat Sushi yesterday.”)
      1. Authentic exchange uses English
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
            1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
            2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
            1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
            2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
            1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
            2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
c. Exchange is authentic and spontaneous (i.e. not related to direct initiation/response, “Ms. Sato, it’s hot in here.”)
   1. Authentic exchange uses English
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   d. Exchange is not authentic (i.e. rote memorization, repetition, etc.)
      1. Exchange uses English
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      2. Exchange uses Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      3. Exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student

2. Linguistic Exchanges related to attitudes
   a. Exchange is authentic and appropriate (i.e. Teacher says, “What movie do you like?” student responds “I like Matrix.”)
      1. Authentic exchange uses English
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
   b. Exchange is authentic and not appropriate (i.e. student says “I… Matrix.”)
      1. Authentic exchange uses English
a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
   1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
   2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
b. Exchange is initiated by student

2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
   a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
      2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
   b. Exchange is initiated by student

3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
   a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
      2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
   b. Exchange is initiated by student

c. Exchange is authentic and spontaneous
   1. Authentic exchange uses English
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student

d. Exchange is not authentic (i.e. rote memorization, repetition, etc.)
   1. Exchange uses English
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   2. Exchange uses Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   3. Exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
b. Exchange is initiated by student
3. Linguistic Exchanges related to routines (Greetings, Q&A, etc.)
   a. Exchange is authentic and appropriate (i.e. “Hello, Tomoki. How are you?” “Hello, Ms. Sato. I am sleepy”)
      1. Authentic exchange uses English
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      3. Authentic exchange uses a mixtures of English and Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
   b. Exchange is authentic and not appropriate (i.e. student says “Sato, I sleepy.”)
      1. Authentic exchange uses English
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
            1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
            2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
            1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
            2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
            1. Further feedback/correction of error is provided by teacher
            2. Further feedback/correction of error is not provided by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
   c. Exchange is authentic and spontaneous (i.e. “English is too hard!”)
      1. Authentic exchange uses English
         a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
         b. Exchange is initiated by student
      2. Authentic exchange uses Japanese
a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
b. Exchange is initiated by student

3. Authentic exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
   a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
   b. Exchange is initiated by student
d. Exchange is not authentic (i.e. rote memorization, repetition, automatic response, etc.)
   1. Exchange uses English
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   2. Exchange uses Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student
   3. Exchange uses a mixture of English and Japanese
      a. Exchange is initiated by teacher
      b. Exchange is initiated by student

**Category B: Presentification**

1. Techniques of presenting content
   a. Technique presents element of teacher cultural and linguistic background as supplement of lesson content
      1. Presentation involves teacher previous spaces/contexts of L2 learning related to lesson content (i.e. where he/she learned the particular lesson content for themselves)
         a. Presentation is in English
         b. Presentation is in Japanese
         c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
      2. Presentation involves previous spaces/contexts of L2 pedagogy related to lesson content (i.e. where he/she taught the particular lesson content before, “When I was at XXY High School, we…”)
         a. Presentation is in English
         b. Presentation is in Japanese
         c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
      3. Presentation involves previous individuals/relationships in L2 Learning related to lesson content
         a. Presentation is in English
         b. Presentation is in Japanese
         c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
4. Presentation involves previous individuals/relationships in L2 Pedagogy related to lesson content
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

5. Presentation involves experiences related to travelling abroad related to lesson content
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

6. Presentation involves individual experiences and family background related to lesson content
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

b. Technique presents motivation and purpose for pedagogy related to lesson content
   1. Presentation involves extrinsic personal motivations for pedagogy (i.e. practical concerns of desire to continue
      Japanese speaking, social concerns of education reforms, etc.)
      a. Presentation is in English
      b. Presentation is in Japanese
      c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
      d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

   2. Presentation involves intrinsic personal motivation for pedagogy (i.e. concern for student feelings, self-satisfaction,
      development of thinking skills)
      a. Presentation is in English
      b. Presentation is in Japanese
      c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
      d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

   3. Presentation involves extrinsic professional motivation for pedagogy (i.e. English skill as ability to translate into job
      skills, etc.)
      a. Presentation is in English
      b. Presentation is in Japanese
      c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
      d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

   4. Presentation involves intrinsic professional motivations for pedagogy (i.e. lack of student basic skills, role of English
      as “world language”)
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a. Presentation is in English  
b. Presentation is in Japanese  
c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese  
d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

5. Presentation involves extrinsic perception of motivation for students (i.e. need to study for tests, career goals)  
a. Presentation is in English  
b. Presentation is in Japanese  
c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese  
d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

6. Presentation involves intrinsic perception of motivation for students (i.e. enjoyment of foreign culture, desire to talk to/become friends with foreigners, etc.)  
a. Presentation is in English  
b. Presentation is in Japanese  
c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese  
d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

7. Presentation involves extrinsic perception of motivation for colleagues (i.e. need to prepare students for tests, lack of basic skills in students, etc.)  
a. Presentation is in English  
b. Presentation is in Japanese  
c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese  
d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

8. Presentation involves intrinsic perception of motivation of colleagues (i.e. lack of concern for student feelings, etc.)  
a. Presentation is in English  
b. Presentation is in Japanese  
c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese  
d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

2. Techniques of presenting attitudes (non-content related, general discussions, sharing of “personality”, etc.)  
a. Technique presents element of teacher cultural and linguistic background not related to lesson content (i.e. sharing a story, “free talking,” etc.)
   1. Presentation involves teacher previous spaces/contexts of L2  
a. Presentation is in English  
b. Presentation is in Japanese  
c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
2. Presentation involves previous spaces/contexts of L2 pedagogy
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

3. Presentation involves previous individuals/relationships in L2 Learning
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

4. Presentation involves previous individuals/relationships in L2 Pedagogy
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

5. Presentation involves experiences related to travelling abroad
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

6. Presentation involves individual experiences and family background
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese

b. Technique presents motivation and purpose for pedagogy not related to lesson content
1. Presentation involves extrinsic personal motivations for pedagogy (i.e. practical concerns of desire to continue
   Japanese speaking, social concerns of education reforms, etc.)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

2. Presentation involves intrinsic personal motivation for pedagogy (i.e. concern for student feelings, self-satisfaction,
   development of thinking skills)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)
3. Presentation involves extrinsic professional motivation for pedagogy (i.e. English skill as ability to translate into job skills, etc.)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)
4. Presentation involves intrinsic professional motivations for pedagogy (i.e. lack of student basic skills, role of English as “world language”)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)
5. Presentation involves extrinsic perception of motivation for students (i.e. need to study for tests, career goals)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)
6. Presentation involves intrinsic perception of motivation for students (i.e. enjoyment of foreign culture, desire to talk to/become friends with foreigners, etc.)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)
7. Presentation involves extrinsic perception of motivation for colleagues (i.e. need to prepare students for tests, lack of basic skills in students, etc.)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)
8. Presentation involves intrinsic perception of motivation of colleagues (i.e. lack of concern for student feelings, etc.)
   a. Presentation is in English
   b. Presentation is in Japanese
   c. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
d. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)
c. Technique presents spontaneous adaptation unrelated to lesson content or attitudes
   1. Presentation is in English
   2. Presentation is in Japanese
   3. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   4. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

d. Technique presents transcendental, non-spontaneous, or non-productive adaptations (i.e. non-Presence)
   1. Presentation is in English
   2. Presentation is in Japanese
   3. Presentation is in a mixture of English and Japanese
   4. Presentation is not linguistic (i.e. non-verbal, gestural, etc.)

Category C: Deixis

1. Contextualizations of Content
   a. Contextualization is literal (i.e. “You can use this pattern to XYZ.”)
      1. Contextualization produces immediate response from students
         a. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
         b. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
            1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
               c. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
               d. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
                  1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
                     a. Occurs in English
                     b. Occurs in Japanese
                     c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
                     d. Occurs non-verbally
                  2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
   2. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
b. Contextualization is conceptual (i.e. explaining pattern using activity, such as content-based instruction)
   1. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
      a. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
         1. Occurs in English
         2. Occurs in Japanese
         3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      b. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
         1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            a. Occurs in English
            b. Occurs in Japanese
            c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
         2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
      c. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
      d. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
         1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            a. Occurs in English
            b. Occurs in Japanese
            c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
            d. Occurs non-verbally
         2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
   2. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
      c. Contextualization produces avenues of further inquiry
         1. Contextualization is activity using pattern to be carried over into another class
            a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
               1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
                  a. Occurs in English
                  b. Occurs in Japanese
                  c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
               2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
                  a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
                     1. Occurs in English
                     2. Occurs in Japanese
                     3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
4. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
   a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
      1. Occurs in English
      2. Occurs in Japanese
      3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      4. Occurs non-verbally
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
2. Contextualization is activity to be utilized at home/outside of school
   a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
      1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
      2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
         b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
      3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
      4. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
            4. Occurs non-verbally
         b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
3. Contextualization is activity provoking critical thinking/questions (i.e. “What do you think?” “Why?, etc.”)
   a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
      1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
         a. Occurs in English
b. Occurs in Japanese
c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
   a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
      1. Occurs in English
      2. Occurs in Japanese
      3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
4. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
   a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
      1. Occurs in English
      2. Occurs in Japanese
      3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      4. Occurs non-verbally
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
4. Contextualization produces patterns of adaptability
   a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
      1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
         a. Occurs in English
         b. Occurs in Japanese
         c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
         b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
      3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
      4. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            1. Occurs in English
2. Occurs in Japanese
3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
4. Occurs non-verbally
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
   b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
2. Contextualization of Attitudes
   a. Contextualization is literal (i.e. “You can use this pattern to XYZ.”)
      1. Contextualization produces immediate response from students
         a. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
         b. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
            1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
               a. Occurs in English
               b. Occurs in Japanese
               c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
            2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
            c. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
            d. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
               1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
                  a. Occurs in English
                  b. Occurs in Japanese
                  c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
                  d. Occurs non-verbally
            2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
   b. Contextualization is conceptual (i.e. explaining pattern using activity, such as content-based instruction)
      1. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
         a. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
b. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
   1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
      a. Occurs in English
      b. Occurs in Japanese
      c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
   2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
      c. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
d. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
   1. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
      a. Occurs in English
      b. Occurs in Japanese
      c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
d. Occurs non-verbally
   2. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
2. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
c. Contextualization produces avenues of further inquiry
   1. Contextualization is activity using pattern to be carried over into another class
      a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
         1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
            a. Occurs in English
            b. Occurs in Japanese
            c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
         2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
            a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
               1. Occurs in English
               2. Occurs in Japanese
               3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
            b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
            3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
            4. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
               a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
                  1. Occurs in English
                  2. Occurs in Japanese
3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
4. Occurs non-verbally
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
2. Contextualization is activity to be utilized at home/outside of school
   a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
      1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
         a. Occurs in English
         b. Occurs in Japanese
         c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
         b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
      3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
5. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
   a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
      1. Occurs in English
      2. Occurs in Japanese
      3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      4. Occurs non-verbally
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
   b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
3. Contextualization is activity provoking critical thinking/questions (i.e. “What do you think?” “Why?, etc.”)
   a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
      1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
         a. Occurs in English
         b. Occurs in Japanese
         c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher

1. Occurs in English
2. Occurs in Japanese
3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
4. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
   a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
      1. Occurs in English
      2. Occurs in Japanese
      3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      4. Occurs non-verbally
   b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
   b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
4. Contextualization produces patterns of adaptability
   a. Contextualization produces immediate response from students.
      1. Contextualization is verbal and appropriate to situation
         a. Occurs in English
         b. Occurs in Japanese
         c. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
      2. Contextualization is verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            1. Occurs in English  2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
            b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
      3. Contextualization is non-verbal and appropriate to situation
      4. Contextualization is non-verbal and inappropriate to situation
         a. Provokes feedback/correction by teacher
            1. Occurs in English
            2. Occurs in Japanese
            3. Occurs in a mixture of English and Japanese
            4. Occurs non-verbally
         b. Does not provoke feedback/correction by teacher
         b. Contextualization does not produce immediate response from students
### Summary of Findings Across Subjects: Category A: Authentic Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Sato</th>
<th>Ms. Watanabe</th>
<th>Ms. Nakamura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 2-3; 2nd Period (9:50-10:40)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Number of Students: 32</strong></td>
<td><strong>Class 2-1; 1st Period (8:50-9:40)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Number of Students: 33</strong></td>
<td><strong>Class 1-2; 3rd Period (10:50-11:40)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Number of Students: 18</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic for “example” class: About Korean history and culture, with information about oppression during WWII.&lt;br&gt;1.a.3.a</td>
<td>Lesson Topic for “example” class: About Korean history and culture, with information about oppression during WWII&lt;br&gt;1.b.3.a.2</td>
<td>Lesson topic for example class: Grammar and past tense: Talking about building of a Factory (process oriented, A leads to B, with tenses for the steps of building)&lt;br&gt;1.b.3.a.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One long activity with few transitions (reading, questions about the reading, discussing, etc.) Students practice reading as a group with the teacher as she moves around&lt;br&gt;1.d.3.a</td>
<td>One long activity with few transitions (read/repeat from the textbook, answer comprehension questions about the reading) Midway through class does “Question Time:” No substantive responses produced. Asks questions from textbook as she moves around the classroom&lt;br&gt;1.d.3.a</td>
<td>One long activity with few transitions (reading, questions about the reading, repeating after the teacher, etc.) Second activity (through end) reading in the book; minimal individual instruction. Stays toward the front of the classroom as she teaches&lt;br&gt;1.d.3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are asked questions, if they do not respond, given second/multiple chances before moving on.&lt;br&gt;1.a.3.b/1.b.1.a.2</td>
<td>Asks other questions, student almost immediately (less than 1-2 seconds) respond “wakanai” (informal/”I dunno.”) Moves on to next student. 1.d.3</td>
<td>Repeating after the CD (3/4 repeat in quiet voices). Some students not repeating&lt;br&gt;1.d.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Findings Across Subjects Category B: Presentification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Sato</th>
<th>Ms. Watanabe</th>
<th>Ms. Nakamura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language of instruction:</strong> English w/ occasional Japanese use. NOTE (from interview/discussion): Students lack basic skills in Japanese AND English, preventing “total” English usage. (B).1.a.1.c</td>
<td>Language of Instruction: Japanese. Students wait for directions in Japanese. NOTE (from interview/discussion): Students lack skills and discipline to understand English, but wants to be “more interesting.” 1.d.3</td>
<td>Language of Instruction: Japanese almost exclusively. NOTE (from interview/discussion): Students lack of skills even in L1. 1.d.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversation:</strong> English and Japanese (as supplement) 1.a.4.c</td>
<td>Conversation: Japanese. Students wait for the “translations,” even on items that they know. Don’t “listen” to English. 1.a.4. b/1.d.3</td>
<td>Conversation: Japanese. Students ask no questions/responses. 1.a.4.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Component/NOTE:</strong> No discussion of personal background. Individual experiences not shared during any instructional activities (Presence Inhibitor 2: Japanese cultural inhibitors and “inappropriateness” of sharing personal information)</td>
<td>Mentions in interview that she “shares” information, but does not during unit. (cultural component, in interview; Presence Inhibitor no. 2)</td>
<td>Cultural Component: No discussion of personal background. Individual experiences not shared during any instructional activities (or during example unit.). Stays closely related to the text/lesson, but is active in explaining grammar and language explanations. (Presence Inhibitor 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts pronunciation for students, but intelligibility is still high. NOTE: Presence Inhibitor 1: lack of student basic skills to understand “natural” rhythm/speed of English 1.a.2.a</td>
<td>Continues to adapt her pronunciation in English for students (i.e. pronouncing incorrectly, exaggerated elongations, even though this is NOT done normally.). NOTE: “Presence Inhibitor 1: lack of basic skills) 1.b.4.a</td>
<td>Adapts pronunciation for students, but intelligibility is medium/still intelligible. NOTE: Presence Inhibitor 1: lack of student basic skills to understand “natural” rhythm/speed of English 1.a.2.a/1.a.3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three students sleeping within twenty minutes of start of class. Others grow sleepy and stop paying attention. (students allowed to sleep) 1.d.4</strong></td>
<td>¼ students aren’t listening (8 mins. in), some reading (not-related to topic). Others look out window. 1.d.4</td>
<td>Almost immediately (within 5 mins) one student asleep, two (female) students begin talking incessantly.. Second student falls asleep as class progresses; not woken up/noticed. 1.d.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sato</td>
<td>Ms. Watanabe</td>
<td>Ms. Nakamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic of unit is related to their School Trip (to be taken in August.) (C). 1.c.2.a.1.c</td>
<td>Topic of unit, like Sato, is related to their School Trip (to be taken in August.) Materials/reading handled with CD accompanying text. 1.c.2.a.1.c</td>
<td>Topic of Unit is very vague/abstract. Not tied in with “spaces.” Materials handled with textbooks, worksheet, and CD accompanying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of certain words/ideas/slang (‘hey, sit/shit, etc.’) 1.c.4.a.2.a.3</td>
<td>“Past Progressive” and “Past Perfect” teaching: students using electronic dictionaries (not asking/receiving questions.) 1.c.4.b</td>
<td>“Past Tense:” Approx. ½ use dictionaries (elec. or regular) others just stare into space. 1.c.4.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not use CD of native speaker: students respond quietly/monotone after her. Students will sometimes respond, but often “wait for the translation” as she sometimes will use Japanese. 1.b.2</td>
<td>Uses CD of Native Speaker: students respond quietly/monotone When using English/not with the CD, students “wait for the translation.” Usually given immediately following. 1.b.2</td>
<td>*Uses CD of Native Speaker: students respond almost inaudibly. *Uses Voice for reading same passage: students demonstrably louder 2.a.1.a.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualization/routine (English greetings at beginning and end) 2.c.4.a.1.c</td>
<td>Contextualization/lack-of with routines? (Bowing/stand-up, etc.) 2.c.4.b</td>
<td>Contextualization/lack-of with routines? (Bowing/stand-up, etc.) 2.c.4.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Samples of Data (Example Transcripts/Excerpts)

Interview: Ms. Sato (pseudonym)
Time: Summer 2010, 10:00 AM-10:30
Location: Matsuoka High School Teacher’s Supplemental Room

Interviewer Notes: Sato-sensei is mid 30’s, hair fixed simply and falls just above her shoulders. She has one small daughter, and is pregnant again at time of interview with a due date near New Year’s. Lives in Niigata City, about one hour from Matsuoka, and drives each day both ways to Matsuoka. Husband is executive/manager in a bank (upper SES, she doesn’t really have to work and will take maternity leave.) “Liberal” demeanor and friendly atmosphere. Smiles, jokes, dresses relatively informally in comparison to other teachers.

A: It’s a little after 10:00 and I’m here with Ms. Sato, and we’re going to talk about your background and your ideas about English teaching. Okay? So, my research is about English spaces, so the type of spaces that we create at Matsuoka high School, so not just the classroom, but the mental space, or how we think about English. Okay? So, I’m going to ask you some questions about that space.
B: Right.
So, what specific events or what inspired you to become an English teacher in Japan.
To tell the truth, there is no way using English in niigata, so as an English teacher, I can use English as a… occupation. So, I decided to be a teacher.
Why did you like English, that you wanted to use it?
Because when I was… when I started learning English, since I was four, and I had the chance to visit United States several times in my teenage, and after that, I learned English at my University, too. So, it’s easiest way to choose the occupation.
So, to keep up with your English skills? Use it or lose it! What university did you attend?
I went to Dokyo University in Saitama University. ¹

¹ NOTE: Dokko University (獨協大学 Dokkyō Daigaku) is a private university in Sōka, Saitama, Japan, which is a fairly liberal, ideally mixed (co-educational) institution noted for its language education programmes and international exchanges.
What was your actual major?
My major was English, but I mainly learned American history and American racial history.
Interesting. So, you mentioned you started learning English from four years old. So, who influenced you, or how were you able to learn?
My parents wanted me to be an English speaker, because my, two of my uncles… was living in NY and Germany, when I was young, so my parents wanted me to be like them. I guess. They were there for their jobs. Were they teachers?
No, one of my aunts in NY is export/import kind of job, and the other job, uncle, in Germany, he worked as a civil servant, yeah, he worked for some public office.
Okay. Interesting. So, is anyone else in your family teachers?
No, not at all. But, now my sister, older sister, became a teacher.
An English teacher?
Yes.
So, Matsuoka High School is not the first school you ever taught at, so tell me about the other schools before…
The first school I taught at Tokamachi High School, about five years ago, and it was just after my graduation of graduate school at Niigata University and it was kind of coincident, so the office prefectural office got me as a Service Teacher, so I accepted the job, and started to teach.
And after Tokamachi?
After Tokamachi I went to Bandai High School in Niigata, and Bandai High School is kind of English Centered High School, many teachers want the students to be good English speaker, so the system, like computer system, or facilities, will occupy.
So, good resources.
Yes, it’s nice, and there were two ALTs all the time there.
Wow, were you also at Niigata Minami…
Yes, Minami, after Bandai.
That’s also a High Level school, right?
Yes, it’s a high level school, but Niigata Minami’s English Education is not for English speaking, but for the entrance examination for the university, so they taught grammatical thing, and they taught how to read the English papers, or English writings.
They taught for the tests?
Yes.
Okay, one other thing I’m interested in learning, is that I found that their ideas about teaching and purposes affect learning spaces, for example students often ask you “why should I study English if I’m going to work at Super Saito”
…oh, yes…
And so, often teachers give an answer, but I’m curious to know your own idea when you are teaching class, for you, what is the purpose?
Nowadays, English is such a common language all over the world, so for me personally, I so greatful that my parents taught me, my parents gave me a chance to study English and thiw is so useful for me to speak English for me, so I hope some of my student can build the same feeling.
So, the other schools you mentioned you taught, I’m curious, the classroom space itself, was the design and the layout always the same, same as Matsuoka? Blackboard at the front, etc.
Yeah, usually the same, but Bandai HS has special room, like computer as the center of the student, and they can all the students can see the same screen, so teachers can send the one information to all students, so, which is useful for Flash Cards, or, (Japanese), practicing the same expression.
Did you find that different kind of format useful, or distracting, than the normal classroom.
But, the budget is limited, so… Sho ga nai. (It can’t be helped)
Also, many students in a small space.
Yes.
One other thing I’m interested in, so, when you first came to Matsuoka HS, what were some of the challenges that affected your teaching style? Because, you were at Niigata Minami, so you couldn’t really bring all of the work… what were those challenges when you first came?
I tried to have students read by themselves, but some of the students couldn’t read ANY words, ANY English words, so I started to teach them how to pronounce, so that’s the first trial, and I didn’t help them at all, or, no, students ask me “I don’t know how to read,” but I told them HOW do you pronounce “Re”, like “ree,” so like reborn, or something, so I divided the words into small blocks, and have them read.
Try to teach them the literacy…
Yes.
Have you also found that their first language, their Japanese ability, is low?
Yeah, sure, it is.
So, in your classes, do you also try sometimes to help their second language learning by helping in Japanese, as well?
Yes, it is. If I explain in, kind of, (Japanese), “adult Japanese,” they don’t understand the meaning. So, I ask other students, if they know the meaning in Japanese, and many students try to think about, and they try to understand the meaning of the ThAT Japanese.
Yeah, one thing we know through research is that poor L1 skills leads to poor L2 skills.
Yes, exactly.
So, many times I think they forget that when we say, “Oh, they can’t speak English!” maybe they don’t have the (Japanese) literacy in Japanese. So, we have to try to blend them together. I’m interested in, if I were a Japanese teacher, maybe do team teaching with a Japanese Koku-go teacher, team teaching, for particularly low level class. I wonder if that would be useful.
Yeah, right.
…to become Bilingual, advance both their Japanese and English, but it’s difficult to arrange. So, what other challenges did you find here, not just levels, but what else surprised you?
They are… such… SHY students, so they hesitate to express themselves. So, I try to have them express their, for example, first step is reading, reading textbook, second is express their own writing. It’s okay to be really short sentences, or really easy way, easy words, but there mental, nantoiu, mental trying, is a second thing.
Why do you think they are so shy?
Because… I think… from the young days, from elementary school, they didn’t get much chance to express themselves, and I guess more intellectual students did the part, like express or to be reader, so they were always like, um, nantoiu darouna, hiding… behind these intellectual students, I guess. That’s why.
One thing I’ve found about japan, too, that’s different from the USA, is that students like that are ALLOWED to hide, like a cultural thing, like the teacher is afraid..
…of touching, making contact…
Yeah, so they let them “disappear,” so that surprised me, so over time…
Yeah, yeah…
…that leads them… that’s different from America, I think. One other thing you mentioned, a few years ago, we talked and you told me about one classroom who graduated, this year, I think, that, Ito-kun and that group, that many of the students in that group had low self-esteem.

Yes.

What do you think caused that, and how did that affect their learning, do you think?

Family background, the main reason is family background, and parents are too busy to take care of their kids, so they are always alone, with TV…

So… what… I guess… I was also going to ask, at the end, is there any kind of … we call it demographic information, like information about the school, like how many students, or average test scores, things like that. For example, why is it that Matsuoka has the reputation now, of being one of the lower-level schools. (1) How did that happen and (2) why is it that, it seems, we have such a high level of LOW self-esteem students, very shy, etc. It seems like they all have become… “accumulated” here. I’m curious, is it because of tests, or because of something else, do you think?

One reason is logistic one; because here we don’t have any railways, we don’t have useful bus system, so many good schools built in more useful place.

Aaaah, I see. So the level…

Easy access, easy to come here.

Because, I remember many of the people, like older people, always told me how High, how good MHS used to be.

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

So, I was curious what caused the changes. So, right now, MHS is the entrance test and level, has it become lowered?

No, I mean, entrance examination always the same in the prefecture, but the SCORE is so high.

So, Matsuoka has a certain score that is different than Niigata…

Sure. Niigata HS can be almost perfect, and the students can get a perfect score, but here, I guess, one of the scores our students can enter…

Okay.

So, then often the students who CAN go elsewhere, choose to go elsewhere.

Yeah.

So, the students who have no other choice, often…
Yeah, often come here.
So, that causes them to be accumulated. What are the biggest problems, other than self-esteem, and shyness, in your English classrooms?
Because in the Junior High School days, they were BEATEN by English, I guess, that’s why… they… HATE because I was BEATEN by English, so English is not fun, English is not helpful, and I HATE it, I HATE it, that’s the main reason, and idea.
It’s hard to counteract that, right? Also, then with family background, etc. they’ve been beaten with so many things, it’s hard to change them, their thinking…
Yeah… (sigh)
So, you mentioned that you have been in the US before. Did you study there as well?
No, not at all.
Just as trips?
Trips, like homestays…
Okay. And was that in HS, or through school, or because of your parents being interested and helped you find homestays… how were you able to do that?
I found it (emphatic “I”) because I always wanted to go to study in abroad, so…
You had the motivation to go. How do you try to teach… one problem I’ve seen is that students have no goals/motivations… how do you try to get students to have some kind of goal, like you did…
Yeah, I try to have them have, like, what do you like best? I always ask them, what do you like to do, and they believe they have… but, in the end, they say, “Dousei muri,” “It’s too difficult for me,” they say this all the time. So, why do you think so? And why don’t you try? And they don’t even try, but they say, or they give up…
Give up too quickly..
Yeah, too quickly.
How many students are here at MHS?
About four hundred students…
It’s interesting how many of the students… so, do you find then that things that you did, or learned, or used at the other schools, have you been able to use those here, or have you had to create a whole new set of teaching routines?
Basic teaching routine is the same, but the level is different, so I have to come down to their level, for the first time, but gradually, I get used to it, so I have no problem right now. So, I know that you are pregnant, so you are planning on spending time with your baby, what is your, do you plan on returning here, or will you go to another school, later? I think… working due… is four year, is limited. So, I HAVE to move to another school, I guess. After my maternity leave is finished. So, this is your… Third year. So, I remember when you first came, was one of the first times when I was here. When we talked about teaching. Interesting! So, are you looking forward to going to a new school. Hmmm, sou da ne. Maybe it’s better to work at the closest school to my house. Where do you live? Niigata. Same as Ms. Watanabe. Yes, (sou sou). If you could live closer to Niigata, so location is the biggest thing, or do you feel sometimes that students here, that you’re not able to use all of your… activities… I don’t think so; each school has each good point, so this school, like Matsuda-san, we can share a lot of time, for English work, working, so it’s such a good point. For Ei-ken, we can teach them for a long time, but at Niigata Minami HS, many students will take Ei-ken, so they only have five minutes, or ten minutes for studying together. Also, I think, my opinion, having worked in very high level schools, and others, is I feel like schools like Matsuoka are important for teachers who have done lots of studying/research, because the highest students will always be high, they are self-starters. They don’t really need you. Yeah, that’s so true. Maybe they enjoy talking, but they have many resources, many outlets… but here… I feel like you can really affect, you can see the change in their faces sometimes. Yes, yes.
…because many people, they could just disappear, and nobody gives them attention, so here, even though there are many challenges, I think that they are more open, sometimes, to having, you can have more of an impact.

Right.

Very high level students often think, they don’t need you (laugh!)

Yeah, I heard some of the students in Niigata Minami, they told me like that. “We don’t actually need teachers; we can have textbook, we can have some materials.” By themselves.

But here… they need the help, and if you don’t give them the help, they’re, it’s hard for them to do it on their own.

Right.

BUT, it’s still challenging.

It is… (CONTINUED; sample ends)

Interview: Ms. Watanabe (pseudonym)
Time: Summer, 2010, 9:30-10:00 Am
Location: Matsuoka High School Teacher’s Room

Interviewer Notes: Watanabe-sensei is mid 40’s, slightly colored hair, well dressed, attractive. She does not share many personal details, but she mentions that she lives in Niigata City and commutes each way. More conservative than Ms. Sato, but her attitude and demeanor betray a hint of flare/rebellion. She appears much more fun-loving than she lets herself appear while at work, though slightly nervous at the beginning of the interview. Speaks very slowly, carefully, pausing to choose her words very carefully, or hesitantly.

NOTE: Parenthetical (XXX) notes translations when interviewee switches into Japanese.

Okay, so today is July 10th, and it’s about 8:45.

No, August.

Oh, that’s right! I’m a month behind (laugh). So, I’m going to ask you some questions about your ideas… (same set-up as other interviews, with explanation of project, “cover story,” etc.). So, why did you decide to become an English teacher?
Why? (pause) My friend recommended me to be a teacher. (smiled)
In high school?
No, when I was a tour conductor, and you know, I was thinking about, that I should change my job, because I felt I couldn’t continue to be a tour conductor forever. It takes too much energy…
Yes, a lot of energy…
Yes, my friend recommended me to take the examination…
So, at university, what did you study? English?
I took Humanities, and I learned (pause) English literature. Like Shakespeare… and, Wolfgang… something… I can’t remember…
Goethe?
No, British… Wolfgang… (laugh)… something, I can’t remember (laugh)
So, where did you go to school? What college?
Niigata University. ²
Did you have any family members who were English teachers, or teachers?
My brother is a teacher, but he doesn’t teach English.
What does he teach?
Seibutsu…
Biology?
Yes, biology…
So, before you taught at MHS, where did you teach…
I taught at Tochui HS, and Shibata Minami…
So, can you tell me, in Japan, students take tests and HS have different levels. In USA, you go to HS wherever you live, so all Matsuoka people would go to MHS, but can you describe how each school was a little different, like the level of students or English ability…
What do you mean? From Matsuoka?
Like, all the schools, like, for example, if you taught at Niigata HS, then came here, it’s a different experience. But, about the schools where You taught.

² Niigata University (新潟大学 Niigata daigaku) is a national university in Niigata, Niigata Prefecture, Japan. It was established in 1949 and has its major origins in Niigata Medical College (established in 1922) and in Niigata Higher School (established in 1919). It is one of the largest Japanese national universities on the Sea of Japan. (OC: HIGH LEVEL, requires high scores.)
Tochui, their English ability is almost same as MHS students. But, Shibata Minami, there are two different courses; one is regular and one is Kogyo-ka. So, the ability is different. Ordinary course students can try to enter good university, so they learn… they want to study… a little bit. (laugh) More than other Kogyo-ka no seito.

So, when you came to MHS, what were some of the challenges when you first came here?

Challenge? (sigh) Oh….

What surprised you?

A lot of things surprised me (laugh). But, about English teaching?

Anything.

Anything?

Yes, my study is not just about English, but about how our thinking affects our teaching… I see. Nantoiu kana… I didn’t see any… motivation, from studying something. So, I, you know, put a lot of energy to make them have more interests, learning English, and, but they didn’t have basic skills, so I have to (?)…

Were you surprised that they didn’t have those basic skills, maybe even in Japanese? Did you find that, too, not just in English?

Yes, Japanese ability is Low, it’s so low, I think.

(L1 ability impacts L2)

Yes, I think so.

So, what were some of the strategies you used to try to motivate them?

Ah, I tried to talk about a lot of things, outside Japan. Like, for example, if you open the textbook, finding some interesting pictures, maps, so I tried to make them think about other countries, other contexts.

Do you bring in your experiences from being a tour conductor?

Sometimes, yes (laugh)

I think it’s good…

But, one thing that made me surprised was when I asked them… where to find England… and they answer… it’s in America. So, they don’t have basic knowledge. It’s tough!

So, does that make it more difficult to plan activities…
English activities? Um, I don’t think so. But, since they don’t have motivation and they don’t have any purpose to learn English, I have to, you know, find out strategies to make them excited, or… I don’t know how to explain… but to get them to speak.

So, that’s what we’ll talk about next. Maybe we can talk about some strategies… But, one question I’m interested in, is that every teacher has different ideas about the purposes of English in Japan. Like, when students ask, “Why do I have to learn English…” etc.

My first purpose, kore ha ne, I want them to know something new through English, so if they can read English, they can get some knowledge from books, so I want them to use English as a skill. I mean, too.

So, it’s a thinking skill, not just a language skill?

Not just language, I think English is one tool to get some knowledge. Desyou?

So, the purposes…

Purpose is not English itself, but to get some knowledge.

A tool for learning?

Yes, sou da toomou.

I think so, too. I agree, but what about a lot of the requirements that you have as a teacher, for example, tests; how do you balance that purpose with that you have to teach grammar…

Sore ha, because I have to evaluate them, desyou, if I don’t have to evaluate students, I would need for examination, but I have to first evaluate them, and second, if they don’t have any exam, they don’t study, desyou?

That’s true.

I want them to be able to write English also, just not speak.

Do you feel pressures from, for example, MHS students, not so many go to college…

College, yes…

Shibata, though, maybe they did.

Yes, sou sou.

Did you feel pressure to prepare them…

OF course.

How did that match with your purpose of English as a tool, did they fit or compete?
Are desyou, ano, if student goes to college, they can get higher knowledge, so in that case, English is one tool to get into college. Ne? So, I didn’t feel any gap between my belief and… the system.

When you made activities or evaluations or plans for your classes for those students, did you make them think or did you make them similar to the types of entrance examinations, for example, if you knew that they were going to teach something, did your classes fit that, or just your ideas?

My own idea (smile). Because, knowledge and their abilities is different.

I agree; if you have the skills, you can do any test.

Sou ne.

Like, if I give you a Japanese test, you can do it since you know Japanese. But, if you just teach questions, if the questions change, then maybe you can’t… anyway, that’s a good strategy. So, let’s see, what do you think, this is kind of personal question, but what do you think could make your teaching, or your life as a teacher, or “student” life, what do you think would make it better at MHS. What could improve? You know, when we’re in class together, like you said, students don’t have motivation. What could…

Maybe, I think, I should nanto iu na, I always feel I need to make my class more interesting. I know my class is a little bit… boring… I believe so myself, maybe a little bit boring, so I have to think, you know… a lot about the class.

So, if it was more interesting, do you think that they would have more motivation? Would it make a difference?

Motivation, ne… one time I asked some questionnaire about learning English; they, I found out they didn’t like studying English, but they don’t know the words, and nandarou ne, and the grammar, that’s why they are a little bit, behind. You know? So, nandarou na? And, also I ask them if I do the class in English, only in English, what do you think? And they say, it’s okay, but I don’t want everything in English. A little bit is okay, so I, in my head, I’m planning changing my class to try and speak English a little bit more, to ask them questions a little bit more, in English.

Did you ever study abroad, or live in an English speaking country?

Yes. Hai.

Where and when?
When I was 21 years old, I stayed in the US for one year.

Where did you stay?

Four months in San Francisco, then I got go out and change, and I took a plane and bus and went down to Miami.

Oh, wow!

Actually, Fort Lauderdale.

So, you were in very warm places, nice.

Sou, sou. Because I hate snow. (laugh)

But, now you live in Niigata, in the Snow Country.

I came back day o.

One other thing I’m interested in is classroom space; how the classroom space affects types of teaching. Here, we have 37 students, so it’s very hard to change the space, so it’s the teacher in front, but at the other schools, how were the spaces? Or where you studied, were they always the same? Or different?

Space? I think MHS classroom is a little bit… narrow. Smaller than other kinds. But students are so many.

Were the teachers always in the front?

Oh, yes. Because blackboard is in front. Also, in the back.

Do you do much team-teaching?

Once in a while, with Maiko…

What do you think of it?

I think the students got excited; I think it’s okay. (laugh)

Do you find it easier to have a team teacher, or more different, because you both have different ideas.

Nandarou na; not difficult, I think I like team teaching, because they have more, students get more excited, and they can speak, you know, fluently…

If you had the opportunity, would you teamteach more often, or do you like solo teaching?

Once a week would be best, is the best I think.

Outside of school, outside of class, do you have interactions with students?

In clubs?

Anything… for example, do you have…
You mean, I hang around with them? (laugh)
No, no… like club activities, or, I forget what students mentioned, there was an overnight camp, or something in Niigata.
No, nai… de mo, once a year in July, doko desyou, for example, this year we went to Tai Nai, ano, Interact Club.
And what sorts of activities do you do there? Speaking? Get to know each other?
Just get to know each other.
Students and teachers?
Students only. Teachers, doushite…
How long do you plan to stay at MHS, will you transfer, or do you want to stay here?
Who knows? I have no plan. Yotei ha arimasen. I don’t dislike this school, but it takes a long time to commute, it’s tough, especially in the winter, that’s especially why I want to transfer.
Where do you live now?
Niigata city, by the beach. 40 kilometers.
Also, you mentioned, it’s difficult here, as students don’t have motivation, so it makes you tired…
Also, they need more discipline.
Tell me about that, what do you think they need?
They need? To be disciplined (large laugh). Some of them, I think, are sort of illness, have some sort of, how to say in English…
Nihongo de ii yo.
Ii? They can’t understand, or can’t stay in a classroom. They can’t keep seated.
We say ADHD.
Watashi mo kenkyuu ha… (my research is also about this kind of sickness) Special kind of care. Because maybe at home they have no discipline?
America ni oi desyou? (Very common in America. Really, ) we need to divide class into three. (English). One for high level, one for low level, one for middle… (Now, we just have two, but we need three.)
Maybe more responsibility, and discipline?
(Yes, I think so.)
Maybe they have no motivation, and also no purpose.
They have no dream. (When I was a little girl,) I want to go abroad. I tried to learn abroad. (But, these students don’t’ want to abroad, they don’t want even to go to Tokyo. They want to stay in their small world) Small world.
Did you study other languages other than English?
Yes, Russian. (laugh) It’s too tough for me; I don’t remember anything. (It’s difficult.)

Interview: Ms. Nakamura
Time: Summer, 2010, 1:15 pm
Location: Matsuoka High School Teacher’s Room

Interviewer Notes: Continually checks (hm, hai, etc.)
NOTE: Parentheses (XXX) note when interviewee switches into Japanese (translation.)

A: So, I’m going to speak to you in English, but you can answer in English or in Japanese. So, (COVER STORY). So, first I want you to tell me about the significant events in your past…
B: Actually, I didn’t like English at first, at my school age, because English teachers focused on grammar, most, I hate grammar (laugh), so I didn’t like English… But, I thought all English teachers like English, so they didn’t understand students feelings about English classes, so I wanted to be teacher… who… knows students feelings about English.
So, not just about English, but about their personal feelings, treating them as human beings.
Yes.
Did you have any family members, teachers, etc. who encouraged you to be an English teacher? Hmmm, none of my family, but my aunt and her husband are teachers, but not English teachers.
What level do they teach?
High school, taiku teachers.
So, where did you grow up? Are you from Niigata?
In Joetsu City, south part of Niigata.
Where did you go to College?
Saitama. Saitama University. ³
What was your major?
English Education. Actually I ...(Eigo-gogaku) Grammar. I hated grammar, but linguistics, but
my homeroom teacher, professor, is a linguistic… teacher, and he influenced me, so…
I’m interested in these things as well…
So, you study Chomsky?
Sausurre, and Barthes…
(laugh)
I enjoy these. Chomsky, too.
Sou, sou.
Interesting! So, in Saitama. So, after that you came back here?
Yeah.
Alright, I’m interested in hearing, when did you come to MHS?
This April. This year.
Were you at another school before this one?
Two schools, eto, before this school, Sanjo Higashi, and before Sanjo Higashi, Yoshida
Commercial High School.
So, were they very different?
Yeah, very different.
How so? As a teacher, how did you adapt everyday…
Hmmm, sou, Sanjo… Sanjou higashi, second level high school in Sanjo area. So, half of students
go to college, and, so… it’s easy to motivate them (laugh) to study English. Because they have to
take entrance examination, but then other school, Yoshida commercial school and this Matsuoka,
I think, it’s difficult to motivate them.

³ Saitama University (埼玉大学 Saitama Daigaku abbreviated 埼大 Saidai) is a Japanese national university located in a suburban area of Sakura-ku, Saitama City capital of Saitama Prefecture in Tokyo Metropolitan Area.
The University has five faculties (schools) for undergraduate education -Liberal Arts, Education, Economics, Science, and Engineering- and four graduate schools -Cultural Science, Education, Economic Science, and Science and Engineering-, all offering programs leading to doctorates as well as master’s degrees. The total enrollment in the university is more than 8,500 with more than 500 overseas students pursuing undergraduate and postgraduate studies.
Why do you think it’s difficult? Each has said the same thing… why do you think there is no motivation?
Because Japanese high school students don’t have situation that they have to use English in their daily life, so they… it’s not… yeah… not situation.
So, how do you try and motivate them? Or, what do you think, going into the classroom knowing this, how do you try to change that situation?
So, I don’t like to… take… interactive activities in my class, to have more interactive activities, to make it more real.

When you came to MHS, what surprised you? Other than motivation, did you find it to be surprising, or similar to other situations? You can be honest! I’ve been coming here for almost five years, so I know this school, but I’m curious what surprised you when you came here…
I was surprised some students have some trouble in studying, even in Japanese. So, not so many, but I give them some instruction in Japanese, but some of them didn’t understand.
Even in Japanese?
Yeah. It’s a little surprising.
Why do you think they have trouble? Is it… another motivation problem? Different kind of motivation?
It depends, hmmm, but some of them, some of them have motivation, but some of them, ando, others have a real trouble, problem, even in…
Expressing themselves?
Expressing? Maybe like mind? (Depression)
What do you think causes that? Problems at home, city, school?
If it’s (Depression), it’s not… it’s… more than motivation. Family or community have influenced them much.

You mentioned earlier about motivation about students, not having a chance to speak English, so I’m curious to know, so what is the purpose of requiring English teaching in Japan? For you? For example (gives examples from other teachers…)
Ah, yeah. For me? Purpose of teaching English for me? Nandarou na. Communciation kana?
Because, I think studying English means studying the way of thinking, the way of thinking of people who speak English, so it related to they know many things in the world.
Not just their own…
Yeah.
If you had to give advice to a new teacher coming to MHS, based on what you’ve learned and your own teaching, what would you give them?
Eh? New Teachers?
Yes, for example…
I think it’s important for students to… feel… for students to… understand ja nai na… pass…
Manzoku! Ah, wakatta. I got it.
Fulfilled?
Yes, fulfilled! So, it’s important to give them some task to feel… those feelings.
That’s good, yeah, because there’s lots of pressure to pass tests, so they think fulfillment is about a test, but maybe not…
Yeah.
Have you studied abroad?
No.
Been to America?
Only for traveling. Three weeks travel, and I went to Washington DC, and to London, and Paris, Rome…
But, when you were a student at saitama, you didn’t study abroad?
No.
(continued)

Sample Field Note:

FN: Sato

Time/Location: Matsuoka High School English Class 2-3
2nd Period, 9:50-10:40, Friday, DATE

Students: 32
Classroom 2-3, hot and muggy; writing on back blackboard, oscillating fans, windows open. Students look tired, many use uchiwa.
-Greetings are in English, follow American style; Good Morning; How Are You? Etc. Two students respond in English. Three don’t respond; two others in Japanese.
-Instructions are in English; reads at slower than normal pacing. Reads a sentence, then repeats, reads and repeats. Sometimes stops to translate the sentence or ask students what it means in Japanese. Uses word bank at the bottom of the textbook page.

-Moves back and forth around the room. Stays on the left side, near the windows (Note: perhaps because I’m sitting on the opposite side?)

Q&A: random selections (in English); Interaction (1-10 scale): 7; goes back and forth with students, asks them questions.

LESSON TOPIC: About Korea for their upcoming trip (school trip for 3rd year students that summer), with information about WWII oppression, though described less for historical accuracy than to prevent possible mistakes/cultural transgressions (for example, if they meet an old person who speaks Japanese to them, they shouldn’t ask them HOW or WHY they speak it so well.) Checking the meanings in Japanese, with occasional English usage.

. Provides easy, clear explanations of words or material, also in English.

Students appear to grow sleepy over class.

10:15- 3 students are asleep (lack of transition activities? One long activity. Should change every 7-8 minutes?)

Classroom “space” raised dais in front of blackboard (SKETCH BELOW)

Ideas from class:

HOW behaviors are deployed, tolerated, and perpetuated to become habits, practices, and learning and teaching strategies in the classroom. These lead to the learning outcomes in Ms. Sato’s class.

Notes for follow-up discussion: ask her what kind of instruction did you receive? What is your idea of English for THIS class (1/2)?

How to better take advantage of the smaller class size? More activities, 1-1 practice.

NOTES FOR STUDY: What is the “character” of each class? Each grade? Scores higher/lower than usual, or others?

Instructions: active teacher;

ACTIVITIES: Vocab: Repeat after the teacher (instruction)

¾ all repeating, though in very quiet voices, barely audible, sounds almost like a “hum”

1. Sentences: reading in the book (pages 32-33) repeating after CD again, with no individual instruction. ½-3/4 taking part. How to increase to 4/5 or all?
Appendix E: Glossary of Key Terms

Anti-transcendental attitude: As a component of classroom practice and Presence, this is the focusing on site-specificity instead of generalization, immediacy instead of deferment, practices instead of abstractions, in language classroom practice.

Attitudes: the core sets of experiences and interactions that become articulated in the classroom as practice. These are defined for this study into two observable categories: (1) cultural and linguistic background of participants and (2) motivations and purposes for learning.

Authentic Interactions: Relationships and situations between participants that produce real activities for real results, as opposed to transcendental applications of abstract systems (for example a language speaking activity as opposed to writing down grammatical rules from the chalkboard).

Autopoietic System: the self-determined, self-generated enclosures (such as language classroom spaces) produced conceptually and physically by participants together within much larger environments of infinite complexity (such as schools, towns, nations, or the undesignated physical environment outside the classroom.)

Deixis: the “pointing out” (Gumbrecht, 2006) of complex material through condensations that nevertheless require context, site-specificity, and that are constructed according to the rules dictated by the individual learning spaces (for example, “drawing our students’ attention towards complex phenomena and problems, rather than prescribing how they have to understand certain problems and, ultimately, how they must deal with them”
**Pedagogy**: not only as the practice of teaching, or the strategies therein designed to produce learning from students, but also fundamentally as a relationship between dynamic participants in a specific learning space that is without clearly pre-defined or generalizable parameters. As such, this definition incorporates, but also expands upon, a large body of critical pedagogy research (Freire, 1970; McLaren, 1986), and seeks to move beyond a dualism of teacher/student (or pedagogue/learner), instead creating a fluid continuum in which teachers are also sometimes learners from other participants, and learners also sometimes teachers to other participants. These multiple roles take place dynamically in real time, in concert with those other participants, and in and of themselves are not necessarily parsed out into defined “roles” as the classroom practice continues.

**Power**: the practice or exercise in real-time and space by which participants in the learning space articulate those attitudes and give them meaning, composed of two observable categories: (1) verbal articulations (for example, *what* participants said when, to whom, and how), and (2) non-verbal articulations (for example, *how* students voiced their verbal articulations, including gestures, facial expressions, movements, etc., or the gestures or movements themselves in absence of verbal articulation.)

**Practice**: the entire ways in which participants in the learning process affect and instigate learning and teaching in a real, material and situated space: for example, the uses of classroom space and time, daily instructional routines, and the fluid, dynamic, and interactive sets of exchanges that make them intelligible.

**Presence**: Exchanges between individuals that are less based on transcendental interpretations, meanings, abstract formulas, translations, or rules, and instead create a sense of being,
immediacy, reality, site-specificity that generates its own rules and needs, and an attunement within a situated space, as a system, to the rules, formations, and generated practices that conditioned the production of that space.

**Presentification:** This was defined as the literal and figurative presentation on the part of the teachers of past material in site-specific, attuned, relational ways with their students and fellow participants (for example, the ways in which English language learning became intelligible for these teachers in their backgrounds).

**Reflexive Ethnography:** a type of qualitative methodology that, in contrast to traditional ethnography or scientific research, always takes into account and allows for the individuality and humanity of the researcher and observer as an integral part of the research. Instead of searching for some contrived sense of “objectivity,” instead a reflexive ethnography realizes that the researcher himself or herself changes, chooses, adapts, and responds to the research and observations in ways that should be taken into account, and included as a part of the research process itself.
Appendix E: Photographs of Matsuoka High School

(See attached photographs)