

Assignment number 2: English Language Policy in Japan

Student ID Number:	EPS788
Module Number:	2
Title of Degree Program:	Applied Linguistics
Assessment Task Number:	SO/06/03
Submission:	First submission
Date Submitted:	November 30 th , 2008
Name of Tutor:	Jan Visscher

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	2
2.0 History of English Language Policy in Japan	2
3.0 Current English Language Policy	4
3.1 The JET Programme	4
3.1.1 Criticism of the JET Programme.....	5
3.2 MEXT Action Plan.....	6
3.2.1 Criticism of the MEXT Action Plan.....	7
4.0 Issues Affecting English Policy Planning Japan.....	8
4.1 Motivating Forces.....	9
4.2 Japan Language Policy Objectives.....	10
4.3 Drawbacks of Standardized Testing.....	10
4.4 Implementation, Feedback, Evaluation, and Adaptation.....	10
5.0 Conclusion.....	11
References	13

1.0 Introduction

For over 150 years, the Japanese people have considered English to be the key to communicating with the outside world, and great efforts have been undertaken by the government to encourage and promote the study of English as an international language. Still, in spite of earnest efforts to improve the number of English speakers in Japan, few of the policies have substantially impacted the adoption of English as a second language across the country. In spite of the fact that all those who graduate from high school have studied English for a minimum of 6 years, and some even longer, standardized test scores are low when compared with other countries (Gottlieb, 2003:32). Many have attributed this to the fact that Japan still relies on traditional methods of language instruction, which focus mainly on reading comprehension, as opposed to more modern methods, which emphasize interaction and communication (Kaplan, 1984:142). Others argue that the real reason why Japan has not substantially improved in English is because there is not sufficient motivation to require the Japanese people to do so, and that for policy planners, improvements in communicative English represent a threat to the preservation of Japanese culture (Reesor, 2002:42).

This paper will outline the history of Japan's English language policies, and examine barriers which have made the implementation of those policies problematic.

2.0 History of English Language Policy Planning in Japan

After Admiral Perry of the US Navy entered the Port of Kobe in 1853 and demanded, under the threat of violence, that Japan open its markets to trade, there began a fascination in Japan with Western culture. With the signing of the Kanagawa treaty in 1854, English became the focal point of foreign language study in Japan. In 1872, Arinori Mori, the first Japanese Ambassador to the United States, became so enthralled with English as an international language of communication that he sought to make it the national language of Japan, arguing that Japanese should be abandoned because its writing system had been complicated and corrupted by Chinese (Joseph, 2004). The proposal was rejected by the Ministry of Education, but it did serve to alert nationalists, who spurred a revolt against western ideology, even to the point of assassinating Mori in 1889 (Ike, 1996). Following Mori's assassination, there was a purge of western culture, and although English remained a part of the educational curriculum, its role was reduced.

Although anti-Western sentiment remained strong in Japan until the end of World War II, many government officials recognized the value of speaking English, and saw it as a necessary evil in order to communicate with the outside world. In 1922, the Japanese government invited Harold Palmer, a well-respected linguist, to Japan, and gave him funding to conduct research on the state of English teaching. Palmer's research revealed that one of the main drawbacks of English language education in Japan was its reliance on the traditional grammar-translation system. In this system,

English classes were conducted mostly in Japanese, vocabulary was taught out of context in the form of isolated lists, meaning was supplanted by grammatical form, and readings were based on difficult classical texts. Although Palmer's alternative teaching methodology was well received in middle schools, and was widely accepted as being effective, the Ministry of Education did not continue funding for Palmer's research, and no educational reform was undertaken (Scholefield, 1997:17).

Following World War II and America's seven-year occupation, Japan's postwar reconstruction efforts were heavily influenced by American interests. In 1956, the US provided funding for a panel of business and educational experts, called the English Language Exploration Committee (ELEC), which was established to offer "a radical change to English language teaching methods in Japan and the re-education of English teachers" (ibid.:16). The panel tried to introduce an oral component to English education, with an emphasis on practical usage and language in naturally occurring situations. Over the next twenty years, ELEC was responsible for more than 10,000 teachers receiving training, and 130 textbooks were published which reflected its teaching philosophy. However, many teachers and students resisted abandoning the grammar-translation method, the system to which they had become accustomed, and embracing the new system, which emphasized a more communicative approach. It has been postulated that ELEC's system did not receive acceptance because other areas of the education system outside of the scope of language policy intervention remained unchanged (Reesor, 2002:45). University entrance examinations, for example, were not altered to assess oral communication and remained heavily biased towards those who studied under the grammar-translation method. This was thought to have been a major contributing factor towards ELEC's new system not gaining wide acceptance (ibid.:45). By the late 1960's, ELEC was disbanded due to its failure to design an acceptable new system (Koike and Tanaka, 1995).

In 1984, the Ministry of Education assembled the Ad Hoc Committee on Education Reform, which carried out research on the state of language teaching in Japan in junior and senior high schools (Reesor, 2002). They came to the conclusion that crowded classrooms, a lack of adequate teacher training, and not enough contact with native speakers negatively impacted English education. The committee recommended that a communicative approach to English was necessary, and that more native English teachers should be hired. At the same time, Japan was experiencing an unprecedented economic boom, and as Japan began investing its surplus economic capital in buying overseas companies, anti-Japanese sentiment began to rise. The Japanese government attributed this sentiment to the fact that Japan was still a relatively closed society, whose intentions were not well understood by the world. It was thought, therefore, that the establishment of a programme to bring instructors from overseas to teach in Japanese classrooms would both improve English language education, and

expose many young foreigners to Japanese culture, effectively solving both problems.

3.0 Current English Language Policy

3.1. The Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme

The Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme (hereafter referred to as JET programme) began in 1987 as a bold plan to bring native English speakers from a variety of English speaking countries to Japan, to act as assistant language teachers (ALTs) in Japanese public junior and senior high schools. The programme involves a number of different government agencies. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) handles the hiring of teachers through local embassies, while the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) sets teaching guidelines and curricula for JET teachers. The Ministry of Home Affairs creates Councils of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR) to administer the programme at the local level, to provide support for teachers and host institutions, to oversee teacher placement, and to provide federally funded JET salaries for the local boards of education. (McConnell, 2000:1)

The JET Programme began with roughly 900 foreign teachers in its first year, but its overwhelming acceptance by the public led to steep yearly increases in teacher recruitment. (ibid: 230) Today there are more than five thousand JETs working across the country. It should be noted that the JET Programme is offered only through the public school system, but its popularity forced private schools to hire native speakers as well. At present, it is believed that most junior and public high schools across the country either have a foreign teacher on staff, or scheduled foreign teacher visits, and this is largely thanks to the JET Programme.

Although the main objective of the JET Programme has been to hire native teachers to assist in language teaching, the Ministry of Education has not hidden the fact that there is one other primary objective. It is hoped that those who came to Japan to live and work in the public school system will learn about Japanese culture and take back what they have learned to their home countries (McConnell, 2000:7). It was for this reason that the ALT's who have been hired (on one-year contracts) are young, usually fresh out of college, most with little teaching experience and rudimentary Japanese. It is believed that younger native speakers will be more adaptable to living in a foreign country, and be more likely to act as assistants to their Japanese counterparts, rather than assert their independence in the classroom, as experienced teachers might (ibid:42). MEXT has been well aware that it needs the support of Japanese English teachers, and, in this regard, it has been successful, as the JET Programme remains one of MEXT's only post-war initiatives not to have been rejected by the Japan Teacher's Union (ibid:4)

3.1.1 Criticism of the JET Programme

Since language teaching is not its only objective, it is difficult to evaluate the JET Programme. . In one sense, some of the qualities that make the Programme ideal as a grass-roots internationalization scheme may actually hinder it in terms of English language education. Teaching experience or skills in Japanese are not necessary for the former, but they are qualities that are invaluable for the latter. Philippon (1992:12) points out that native speakers do not necessarily possess an academic knowledge of their native language, or an understanding of how to teach it, yet it appears that those hiring for the JET Programme have assumed that they do. A discussion with a member from the Shizuoka Board of Education confirmed that hiring ALT's with teaching experience would greatly enhance the Programme in terms of English education (private conversation, November 18, 2008).

The fact that the JET Programme is now in its twenty-first year is evidence of its widespread approval. Foreign teachers are, for the most part, well-liked, and are thought to act as agents of internationalization. However, there is less evidence of its success as a policy for English education in Japan, as there have been no marked increases in TOEFL scores; in fact, there is some evidence that the overall English level in Japanese classrooms has actually decreased. (Reesor, 2003:58).

The main reason for this lack of success is that, in the beginning, the JET Programme was an interactive program inserted into an English education system that was not designed for it. Little thought was given as to how it would be incorporated into classrooms in which English language education had, until that time, relied on the grammar-translation method. Moreover, "At no time were discussions held with textbook oversight committees or other groups that shaped the larger structure of English in Japan." (McConnell, 2002:46)

Similarly, teachers trained in traditional approaches were asked to suddenly incorporate new team-teaching methods into the classroom, but without new textbooks and with little new training. Although training for Japanese teachers on how to effectively utilize team-teaching methods is now offered, the degree to which foreign teachers participate in the classroom still varies from school to school. In addition, a representative from CLAIR indicated that there have been no major new textbooks recommended by MEXT, which favors an interactive approach to teaching English, rather than the grammar-translation method (Personal communication, November 10, 2008).

Although it is unquestionably popular as an internationalization program (McConnell, 2002:46), the interactive approach that is promoted by the JET Programme is still only a complement to an English language education system which has remained largely unchanged. Without more training using the

interactive method, more textbooks developed and recommended (by MEXT) to take advantage of what foreign teachers can offer, and the institution of a national university entrance examination system which adequately rewards students for excelling in communicative skills, the JET Programme will remain underutilized.

3.2 MEXT Action Plan

In 2003, MEXT announced another major initiative to improve English education in Japan. The “Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities,” (hereafter referred to as the Plan) stated that, in a globalized world with English as the language of international communication, it was important to foster students with “communicative competence” in both English and Japanese. The Plan focuses on “cultivating students’ basic and practical communication abilities” (MEXT homepage, 2003). More specifically, Japanese students should be able to communicate in English using basic greetings by the end of junior high school, and demonstrate a functional English equivalent of level 3 of the Society for Testing English Proficiency (STEP) Test. By the end of high school, students should have the equivalent of level 2, or (level Pre-2), and students who graduate from university should be able to use English in their work. The validity of these objectives will be discussed in the next section.

Although the Plan outlines a wide range of support for English education, three areas are of particular concern (Kakimoto, 2002:66). The first area is the introduction of teaching in elementary schools; in 2006, it was reported that over 90 percent of elementary schools undertake “English Activities” (Takahashi 2006:5). The Plan advocates the teaching of at least one hour a week of English in the fifth and sixth year of elementary school. Furthermore, one-third of the English classes taught are expected to be held in the presence of a native speaker. Support for elementary schools teachers is to be offered through local boards of education.

The second area of the Plan involves increasing the quality of English used in the classroom. It advocates the use of standardized testing as a measure of English progress, specifically “objective” tests, such as the STEP, TOEIC and TOEFL. Students’ progress is monitored by their scores on these tests, and the Plan requires minimum scores for junior and senior high school teachers (550 TOEIC scores, or Pre-Level 1 for STEP).

The third area outlined by the Plan is that there should be an emphasis on English as a tool for communication. In response to the criticism that communicative English has not been adequately assessed, a listening component was added to the University Center Shiken, another standardized test used for entrance to public and most private universities in Japan. The listening test comprises

50 marks out of overall total of 300, or 1/6 of the overall score.

3.2 .1 Criticisms of the MEXT Action Plan (2003)

Criticisms of the Plan have been varied, although, to be fair, the Plan is still being implemented. While MEXT has not updated its webpage since 2003, not enough time has passed to know whether many of the changes to the English language curriculum have had an impact.

With regard to the introduction of English education in elementary schools, Takahashi (2006:5) states that curriculum for teaching at the elementary school level is left up to each school, and the extent to which English is taught varies greatly. In addition, as elementary school teachers teach many subjects other than English (unlike junior and senior high school teachers), the extent to which teachers are actually able to teach English depends upon their varying ability. Moreover, no textbooks or curriculums have been approved by MEXT for use in elementary schools, which basically means that curricula in elementary schools are dependent upon factors such as the English level of the elementary school instructor teaching the course, and the degree to which each school emphasizes English education. This lack of a standardized curriculum creates a wide gap in English language skills among students going into junior high schools, and prevents the streamlining of programs from elementary into junior high school (ibid:48).

Another criticism of the Plan has concerned minimum TOEIC scores. All Japanese Teachers of English will have to earn a minimum of 550 on TOEIC, or pre-1 STEP level. Kakimoto (2004), however, revealed that, in a survey of 150 junior and senior high school teachers, only slightly more than half had ever even taken the STEP test, and most of them had not taken it since college (p.54). More recently, a member of the Shizuoka Board of Education disclosed that, although all public junior and senior high school teachers were encouraged to take the TOEIC Test, their scores were not recorded by either MEXT or the board of education, which seems to indicate that the minimum standards for English level set by MEXT in the Plan will not be enforced (personal communication, November 18, 2008). In any case, trying to enforce minimum test scores for currently employed Japanese English teachers would likely be difficult to implement, but even if MEXT focused on restricting these standards solely on new teachers, it would take many years before the overall level of English among teachers showed any discernable increase. Finally, the assumption that higher teacher scores on standardized tests would contribute to their ability to raise students scores is tenuous.

One other major criticism of the Plan concerns the introduction of listening tests at entrance examinations to high schools and universities. Although these listening tests do encourage a greater

focus on spoken English, the Center Shiken is still primarily a test of reading comprehension, and even proponents of it, who state that the Center Shiken has undergone significant changes to accurately assess English ability, admit that it is not a test designed to measure communicative English (Guest, 2006).

An over-reliance on the Center Shiken as a measure of English proficiency is also one of the main reasons why English education in Japan is thought to have remained largely unchanged. Time and again, alternative teaching methodologies have been introduced, only to lose out to students preparing for university entrance examinations. Changing this test, or simply eliminating it as a measure of proficiency, would allow teachers in high schools to adopt a more comprehensive approach to teaching English, and would, in turn, allow policy makers the freedom to increase the number of textbooks which promote a more holistic approach to language learning (Gottlieb, 2005:38).

Possibly the most damning criticism of the MEXT Plan is that many of the key points outlined in it are very difficult to enforce and implement at the local level. It states that elementary schools should teach English, but little guidance is offered in terms of what should be taught; minimum teacher levels are outlined, but there are no incentives to enforce these minimums, or feedback to check if they are being met; general benchmarks are set for junior and senior high school students, but the system of assessing progress does not reward students for their communicative ability; Finally, the standard of English competency defined by the Plan — that a student is “able to use English in their work” — is so vague that it is impossible to assess.

With regards to language planning policy, this speaks to the need for policy makers to define clear macro-policy goals, and to establish an accurate system of recording progress. In order for policy planning to be successful, there is a strong need for objective evaluation, feedback, and adaptation, in order to ensure that standards and goals are being met. Concerning the most recent initiatives undertaken by MEXT, it is clear that the Plan promises more than it can deliver, because policy makers have been either unable or unwilling to ensure its implementation at the local level, and to objectively evaluate whether the Plan is having the desired effect.

4.0 Issues Affecting English Policy Planning in Japan

Over the last 150 years, all of the panels and committees that have been assembled to address English instruction in Japan have come to the conclusion that the education system has relied too heavily on a curriculum which over-emphasizes reading comprehension, and that a more interactive approach is necessary. Nonetheless, all previous attempts to reform the system through policy

planning have eventually been abandoned, and the two current major efforts, the JET Programme, and the MEXT 2003 Plan, have been criticized as being influenced by the same issues. The following are factors which have contributed to the historical failures of English Language Policy (ELP) in the past, and which should serve as areas of concern for current language policy initiatives.

4.1 Motivating Forces

Although many Japanese feel that it is important for Japanese people to speak English because it facilitates their ability to keep in contact with the world around them, domestically most Japanese have little contact with English outside the classroom setting. This lack of opportunity limits the practical application of the English learned in the classroom.

Japan is an island of approximately 130 million people, with 98.5 percent of the country ethnically Japanese (World Factbook, 2008). Of the remaining 1.5 percent, almost 1 percent are Koreans or Chinese. People from native English-speaking countries residing in Japan are among the remaining 0.6 percent. A greater number of English native speakers, or even the presence of minority groups who don't speak Japanese and use English to communicate, can provide opportunities for Japanese to practically apply their English skills. The presence of such communities can lead to the development of English as an additional language (EAL), whereby English can act as a lingua franca between foreign communities. Tollefson (1989) states that the lack of different language communities living in a country can have "a dramatic (negative) effect on second language acquisition" (p.26). Similarly, Matthew Reesor (2002) argues that Japan's historic isolation from other cultures has definitely contributed to its past failure to improve in English. He suggests that Japan is a country in conflict with itself, mindful of the perception that English education is a crucial factor in becoming more international, but also afraid that doing so might contribute to the loss of Japanese culture (p.50). This conflict has resulted in a history of English language policies that have been unsuccessful, either because they are second-guessed along the way, or because they are placed into a context within which they ultimately fail.

Reesor (2003) also points out that those Japanese who do learn to speak English well are "disadvantaged by discrimination and low paying jobs" (p.63). One reason why this may be so is that there are, in reality, not that many jobs that require English. Compared to other countries, for example, few foreign travelers visit Japan (35th in the world), and Japan has been criticized for its lack of an adequate tourism infrastructure for overseas travelers (Tamaru, 2003). Although efforts are being made to increase the number of foreign visitors, Japan is still well behind many other countries in the development of a tourism infrastructure that would create jobs for bilingual residents, expose local residents to foreign cultures, and generate an immediate need for practical communication in

English.

4.2 Japan Language Policy Objectives

Kennedy et al (2001) provides a list of some possible language planning objectives, based on what have historically been motivating factors in the ELP of countries around the world. However, many of the objectives which serve as the basis of ELP in other countries involve incendiary issues, often manipulated through the media by vocal minorities, such as the need to assimilate, the need to preserve a minority culture, or the need to provide a common language for competing minority groups (p.70).

However, the only language policy objective listed by Kennedy that applies to Japan is the role of English as an international language (EIL), and in the absence of an environment in which to apply newly acquired language skills, such as the presence of large foreign population or an advanced tourist infrastructure, the desire for internationalization alone may not serve as a sufficient motivating impetus for ELP planners. As John Rogers points out, the reality is that, although many people feel that English is an important for international communication, in many countries there is not sufficient need to justify the cost of mandatory English education (1989:149).

4.3 The Drawbacks of Standardized Testing

While standardized testing does provide a simple and inexpensive way of evaluating improvement, relying on these scores as the main measure of progress carries with it issues of concern. Popham (1999:8) states that there are three factors that can unfairly influence standardized test scores: innate intellectual ability; outside knowledge of the subject material; and what is taught in school. Moreover, reliance on standardized testing is subject to the “washback effect”, where educators are pressured to teach only what may appear on these tests, limiting diversity in the classroom, and eliminating areas of study which standardized tests do not or cannot evaluate.

In Japan, it has become obvious that an over-reliance on standardized testing has created precisely this environment. Although MEXT emphasizes a more communicative approach to English education, its policies are in conflict with the Center Shiken (whose construction MEXT also oversees), which forces teachers to follow a narrow curriculum emphasizing reading comprehension, and forces students to prepare for the test using traditional methods.

4.4. Implementation, Feedback, Evaluation, and Adaptation

The language policies and programs of every country are guided by a unique array of factors. Ricento et al (1996) writes that ELP is a complex interplay of government factions, whose motivations are more often preservation of power than they are improving their population's

linguistic abilities. At the macro-level, public perception and necessity determine the creation of policy. But it is the micro-level, or the level of the classroom, that is at the “heart of language policy,” and it is here where teachers can be agents of “social change”. (ibid:418). One of the main criticisms leveled by CLAIR and members of the Shizuoka Board of Education in private communications is that there needs to be better understanding between policy makers and classroom teachers, indicating that there is a gap between planning and implementation. Time and again, language experts and panels have all come to the same conclusion: that English in Japan has been too heavily based on the translation of difficult texts and that it lacked a communicative component. Policy planners, while understanding the need for adding this component, have not adequately considered other variables: specifically, the need for greater teacher training, the approval of textbooks designed to facilitate the instruction of the communicative method, and, most importantly, the creation of an adequate test that would accurately measure progress. This illustrates the need for policy planners not only to implement clear, attainable goals, but to develop an accurate system for assessing whether the goals are being reached.

5.0 Conclusion

Virtually all of the panels that have been assembled over the last century have advised a complete overhaul of the English education system, one which emphasizes a more communicative approach over the traditionally used grammar-translation method. For a variety of reasons, those recommendations were never fully realized. Foreign teachers hired to teach in classrooms are often young and inexperienced. Listening tests still do not carry enough weight in comparison with the traditional tests of reading comprehension. English education has been introduced at the elementary school level, but no curriculum has been set, and the ability of teachers to teach English still varies markedly. Lofty goals were set by the national government, but many of them were not pursued.

However, the failure to have reformed the English education system can also be attributed to a combination of social expectations, macro level planning, and micro level implementation. Policy makers and teachers were unable to completely abandon a system that had become entrenched, very likely because there wasn't sufficient motivation to require them to do so. Practically, most Japanese people do not need English, nor do they have the opportunity to use it in their daily lives, and even those who do attain a high level of proficiency are not rewarded for maintaining it. At the classroom level, Japanese teachers feel most comfortable teaching English the way they learned it and in the way it was taught to them, indicating that changes to the way the language is taught in Japan would contribute greatly to the current efforts to change the way English is being learned. One thing is for certain: without greater cooperation, feedback, and evaluation between policy planners and those who implement policy, no substantial improvement in the overall level of English language

education in Japan can be expected.

REFERENCES

- Gottlieb, N. (2005). *Language and Society in Japan*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Guest, M. (2006). 'Teaching progressively...for the Senta Shiken!' In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi & M. Swanson (Eds.), *JALT 2005 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London. Longman.
- Ike, M. (1995). 'A historical review of English in Japan.' *World Englishes*, 14(1), 3-11.
- Japan Ministry of Education Culture Sports Science and Technology Homepage
<http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm> Accessed November, 2008.
- JET Programme (2008), available at: <http://www.jetprogramme.org/e/introduction/stats.html>
Accessed November, 2008.
- Joseph, J.E. (2004.) 'The unilingual republic of the world: reactions to the 1872 proposal to make English the national language of Japan.' Paper presented to Presidential Forum of the North American Association for the History of the Language Sciences, Boston.
- Kakimoto, E. (2004). 'A Reform of English Education in Japan According to the Action Plan to Cultivate "Japanese with English abilities".' *Journal of the Faculty of International Studies of Culture. Kyushu Sangyo University*. 29, 53-67.
- Kaplan, R. (1987). 'English in the language policy of the Pacific Rim.' *World Englishes* 6(2),137-148.
- Kennedy, C. Knowles, M. Caldas Coulthard, C.R., Coulthard, M. (2001). *Sociolinguistics*. Unit 6-10: 54-112. Centre For English Language Studies, University of Birmingham.
- McConnell, D. (2000). *Importing Diversity: Inside Japan's JET Program*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McKenzie, R. (2008) 'The complex and rapidly changing sociolinguistic position of the English language in Japan: a summary of English language contact and use.' *Japan Forum*. 20(2),267-28.

- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (2003). 'Regarding the establishment of an action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities".' Accessed November, 2008 at <<http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm>>
- Phillipson, R. (1992). 'ELT: the native speaker's burden?' *ELTK*, 46(1),12-18.
- Popham, J. W. (1999). 'Why Standardized Test Scores Don't Measure Educational Quality.' *Educational Leadership*, 56,(6),8-15.
- Ricento, T. and Hornberger, N. (1996). 'Unpeeling the Onion: Language Policy and the ELT Professional.' *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, (3),401-428.
- Reesor, M. (2002). 'The Bear and the Honeycomb: A History of Japanese English Language Policy.' *NUCB Journal of language, Culture, and Communication*, 4 (1), 41-52.
- Reesor, M. (2003). 'Japanese Attitudes to English: Towards and Explanation of Poor Performance.' *NUCB Journal of language, Culture, and Communication*, 4 (1), 57-65.
- Rogers, J. (1982). 'The world for sick proper' (sic). *ELT Journal*, 36 (3), 144-151.
- Scholefield, W. (1997). 'An Overview of Teaching and Learning English in Japan Since 1945.' *Babel*, 32 (1), 16-21, 31-38.
- Takahashi,T. (2006). 'A Contrastive Study of English Language Textbooks Used in Compulsory Education in Korea and Japan: To Think of the Present Problems and the Future Design of Public English Language Education in Japan.' *Journal of Psychology and Education*, Kanegawa University, 26, 5-48.
- Tamaru, T. (2003). 'A Marketing Assessment and Proposal for the Increase of Inbound Foreign Visitors, Tourists and Non-Tourists, to Japan.'
<http://www.geocities.jp/inboundtourism/Inboundtourismjpn.html>.
- Tollefson, J. (1989). 'The role of language planning in second language acquisition.' In Kennedy et al, (1989), 23-31.

World Factbook (2008).

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ja.html>. Accessed
November 2008.