Nihonjin Kyoushi Dake?:
The Perceptions and Beliefs of a Non-Native Speaking Teacher in a High-intermediate Japanese Language Class

by

Matthew Somerville
BA, University of Lethbridge, 2021

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In the Department of Linguistics

Nihonjin Kyoushi Dake?:
The Perceptions and Beliefs of a Non-Native Speaking Teacher in a High-intermediate Japanese Language Class

by

Matthew Somerville
BA, University of Lethbridge, 2021

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Li-Shih Huang (Department of Linguistics)
Supervisor

Dr. Mamoru Hatakeyama (Department of Pacific and Asian Studies)
Outside Member

Abstract

Within non-native speaking teacher (NNST) research, literature concerning NNSTs within the Canadian Japanese-as-a-foreign language (JFL) context is limited. Previous research has shown that prevailing preferences for NSTs due to perceived linguistic and pedagogical capabilities creates negative implications for NNSTs, such as teaching anxiety, confidence issues, and workplace challenges (i.e., hiring and discrimination) (Holliday, 2006; Phillipson, 1992; Kickzokiak & Wu, 2018; Faez & Karas, 2017; Park, 2012; Tsuchiya, 2020). By using Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) and qualitative and quantitative methods (i.e., reflexive journal entries, pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, follow-up interviews, and Likert-scale questions), this study addresses the gap of scarce literature on NNSTs in the Canadian JFL field by investigating the instructional practices used by a NNST and students' and the instructor's perceptions and beliefs of the NNSTs' capabilities in a high-intermediate Japanese class. Key findings of this study are that tasks benefit students' learning of professional Japanese communication, NNSTs have the capabilities to teach high-level and pragmatic-focused speaking courses, and, students' preferences for their instructor are based on their instructors' individual skills and teaching attitudes rather than their nativeness. These insights provide valuable implications for academic and practical fields, offering novel findings about NNST capabilities. Administrators can use this information for more informed hiring decisions and establish collaborative models based on the unique strengths of both NSTs and NNSTs. These recommendations foster hope for NNSTs by advocating for equity, diversity, and inclusion, thereby transforming student learning within higher education.

Keywords: Non-native speaking teachers; native speakerism; Japanese-as-a-foreign language; equity, diversity, and inclusion; scholarship of teaching and learning

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acknowledgements

I would first like to acknowledge and respect the lək̓ʷəŋən, Songhees, Esquimalt, and W̱SÁNEĆ peoples on whose traditional territory I was able to research on, and may the historical relationships with the land continue to this day.

Thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Li-Shih Huang, for your incredible patience, wisdom, and dedication to academic rigour during this process. I hope to be as enthusiastic as you are towards teaching and research someday. As well, thank you to my second committee member, Hatakeyama-*sensei,* and external member, Dr. Ben Pin-Yun Wang, for your insightful questions and comments which helped improve my thesis.

Thank you to my professors who deepened my interest in all things language. I have had the utmost pleasure learning under you all, whether that be in or outside the classroom.

Thank you to Nancy and staff from the Centre for Academic Communication. I met many of you during the summer when you helped me edit my thesis. I always left my appointments feeling reinvigorated because you cheered me on. I am so grateful.

Thank you to my family for listening to me with open ears regardless if I was ecstatic or sorrowful, for dropping everything to help me when I was at my lowest, and for your tremendous encouragement. You have been my biggest supporters. I love you all so much.

Thank you to my friends near and far. My time as a Master's student would be mundane without you. You made me smile when times were tough and kept me accountable.

Thank you to my research assistants, Alena and Mina, for taking the time to interview the participants despite your busy schedules.

Lastly, I would like to thank the students who gave their time for this research. You made each day rewarding. Whatever you may do in the future, I wish you all success.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to students who turn language learning from a hobby into a passion. May you turn your dreams into reality. Never give up.

Chapter 1: Introduction

A rich debate exists within the research of non-native speaking teachers (NNSTs) and native speaking teachers (NSTs), specifically regarding the dichotomy of these two labels (e.g., Selvi et al., 2023). Throughout history, native speakers have been seen as an ideal figure in comparison to non-native speakers (Rivers, 2018). These deep-rooted perceptions have created a language ideology known as native speakerism that causes negative implications for NNSTs (Holliday, 2006; Phillipson, 2009; Tsuchiya, 2020; Zhang & Zhang, 2021). These negative beliefs impact students' learning experiences, and are connected to NNSTs' negative affective domains (e.g., anxiety, confidence, self-efficacy, and inferiority) (Colmenero & Lasagabaster, 2020; Faez & Karas, 2017; Freeman, 2017; Park, 2012; Zacharias, 2018). Furthermore, studies have indicated that NNSTs experience problems in the workplace, such as hiring and inopportunity to teach beyond beginner classes (Kamhi-Stein, 2018; Kickzowiak & Wu, 2018; Ruecker, 2018). Rather than basing hiring decisions on nativeness alone, awareness of NSTs' and NNSTs' strengths and weaknesses merit thoughtful considerations (e.g., Eslami & Harper, 2018; Houghton et al., 2018; Mahboob, 2018; Nakagawa, 2020; Rajagopalan, 2018, Uzum, 2018). Following this idea, previous research suggests for instructional training and collaboration between NSTs and NNSTs to understand each other's individual strengths and utilize these strengths to benefit learning (Kadowaki, 2018; Kickzowiak & Wu, 2018; Ruecker, 2018; Tsuchiya, 2020; Uzum, 2018). Current NNST research predominately focuses on NNSTs in the English-as-a-foreign language (EFL) field and while studies on NNSTs in the Japanese-as-a-foreign language (JFL) field exist (Sakurai, 2012; Takeuchi, 2023; Tsuchiya, 2020), research on NNSTs of Japanese within Canada is limited. I address this gap by investigating students' and

my own perceptions and beliefs surrounding a NNST within a high-intermediate Japanese class in a Canadian post-secondary context.

Specifically, I implemented Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) which allowed me to directly observe and critically examine issues within the classroom by being the instructor and researcher (Gayle et al., 2013). The course I taught was a class on professional communication in Japanese, which focused on speaking and pragmatic knowledge. This course was taught to two groups of students over a five-week period. To gather students' and my own perceptions and beliefs connected to the NNST, I incorporated various data collection tools that were mainly qualitative. First, I used pre- and post-course surveys, which consisted of open-ended and Likert-scale questions. Students also completed weekly language logs and had the choice of completing a follow-up interview after instruction was finished. Lastly, I used a reflexive journal to document my own perceptions and beliefs of my instructional practices and capabilities.

1.1 Research Positionality

I am aware that my identity can potentially impact the research I do, especially since I was both a researcher and an instructor. First, I am a white male who grew up in a small town in the Albertan prairies. In the JFL field I believe that my race makes me an "outsider," which may have affected how the participants perceived me. In addition, the way I have studied Japanese may not be as typical compared to other Japanese-as-an-additional language learners in the sense that I have learned Japanese in various contexts. I began to study Japanese after becoming interested in the language and culture during middle school. Learning the language quickly became a passion for me, but I experienced difficulties in that I had no resources or access to Japanese language lessons because of where I lived. Thus, I studied independently for two years

before going to university where I majored in English literature, Japanese, and Linguistics, and minored in Asian studies.

During my undergraduate studies, I enrolled in various Japanese and Asian studies courses to improve my knowledge of the language and culture. I mainly experienced learning Japanese from a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher, but I also had the opportunity to go to Nagoya, Japan for an eleven-month exchange, where I took courses from native Japanese-speaking teachers that aided my speaking, writing, and reading skills. In addition, I used Japanese daily and experienced the culture first hand, which improved my Japanese language proficiency and knowledge. I also became acquainted with many non-native Japanese speakers, who, I believed, to be very skilled in the language.

Having an interest in the Japanese language and culture has also allowed me to experience Japanese in a teaching context as well. I had many opportunities to teach grammar and cultural lessons, create lesson materials and language assessments, and tutor students both individually and in groups during my time as an undergraduate student. However, prior to this study, I have never instructed a course independently, especially a class that focuses on professional communication. In addition, while I have taken classes on language teaching methods, I have not received formal training.

As a prospective NNST of higher-level Japanese university courses, I aim to contribute to the research landscape of the NNST field by critically examining the perspectives of both the learners and myself in the context of a high-intermediate Japanese class within Canada.

This thesis has two goals. I examine the instructional practices used by the NNST in an high-intermediate JFL classroom, as well as the students' and my own perceptions and beliefs. The literature review in Chapter 2 provides context of native speakerism as a language ideology

by discussing the emergence of "native speaker" term and the negative implications that this idea has caused NNSTs not only in the EFL field, but other languages as well. Moreover, this chapter reviews previous literature on NNSTs' and students' attitudes, building awareness through teacher training and collaboration, and, lastly, approaches used to teach professional Japanese communication. Chapter 3 describes the course, the teaching methods, and the research methods, including the instruments and procedures used for data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 provides the results of the study, and Chapter 5 contains the discussion as well as a conclusion.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter examines extant research in the native speakerism field. Section 2.1 introduces key terms: language ideology, native-speakerism, perceptions and beliefs, pragmatics, and *keigo* (Japanese polite language). Section 2.2 briefly explores the term "native speaker," and the bias behind this term. Following this exploration, I define the "native speaker fallacy," which is a term that describes the hegemonic view of native speakerism within language education programs (Phillipson, 1992). Section 2.3 describes the attitudes of both NNSTs and students as presented in previous research (Colmnero & Lasagabaster, 2020; Park, 2012; Zacharias, 2018; Zhang & Zhang, 2021). To address the native speaker fallacy and improve language teaching practices, it is crucial that the perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of both NSTs and NNSTs are critically examined, and research is shared with language programs and classroom. This line of research is covered in Section 2.4. Section 2.5 provides a brief explanation of teaching practices for professional Japanese communication (Kitagaki, 2002; Mukoyama, 2018). The chapter ends with Section 2.6, which presents the research questions.

2.1 Key Concepts

2.1.1 Language Ideology

Within the context of NNST research, scholars describe "native speakerism" as a form of language ideology (Bouchard, 2020; Holliday, 2006; Houghton, 2018; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). An ideology refers to "a manner or the content of thinking characteristic of an individual, group, or culture" (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). According to Bouchard (2020), there are four general perspectives of ideology: (1) a belief, idea, or conceptual phenomenon, (2) ideology as reflective of the interests of particular social groups, (3) ideology as both discourse and practice

aimed at acquiring and/or maintain power, and (4) ideology as strayed epistemologies or mistaken rationalizations.

Silverstein (1979) defines "language ideologies" as "any sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification' for language use" (p. 193). Irvine and Gal (2000) proposes three semiotic processes that are used to construct linguistic differences: *iconization*, *fractal recurivitiy*, and *erasure* (pp. 37-38). *Iconization* refers to an entity that represents the whole society (Doerr, 2015; Irvine & Gal, 2000). For example, in Japan, the Tokyo dialect represents the "standard" language of Japan (Doerr, 2015; Sanada, 2019; Tsuchiya, 2020). *Fractal recrusivity* is defined as "the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship onto some other level" (Irvine & Gal, 2000, p. 38). For instance, native and non-native speakers' linguistic and pedagogical capabilities are based on their appearance and ethnicities. Particularly, native speakers are deemed to have more linguistic skills, such as pronunciation and "perfect" grammatical knowledge, along with the capability to teach the second language in comparison to non-native speakers. Finally, *erasure* is defined as "the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible" (Irvine & Gal, 2000, p. 38). In the Japanese context, attempts to ban the *Ainu* language during the Edo period is an example of *erasure* (Doerr, 2015; Rudolph, 2023).

2.1.2 Perceptions and Beliefs

It is important to know what "perceptions" and "beliefs" mean in the context of this thesis since I am examining students' and my own perceptions and beliefs of the NNST. First, "perceptions" is defined as the "...mode of apprehending reality and experience through the senses, thus enabling discernment of figure, form, language, behaviour, and action" (Given,

2008, p. 606). In this study, perceptions include how students and the instructor view themselves (i.e., how they feel about their instruction or learning, what they understand, what they can improve, etc.…) and the learning situation (i.e., the performance and behaviour of the student or instructor) (Wesley, 2012). Here, "belief" is defined as "…the mental state a person is in when [they] take something to be true" (Tsugita & Miyazono, 2018, p.2). In previous literature, student and instructor "beliefs" include self-efficacy, confidence, motivation, and anxiety. (Faez & Karas, 2017; Wesley, 2012).

2.1.3 Native-Speakerism

"Native-speakerism" is defined by Holliday (2006) as: "an established belief that 'native-speaker' teachers represent a 'Western culture' from which spring the ideals both of the English language and language teaching methodology" (p. 385). This definition emphasizes an example of *fractal recursivity* in that native speakers, due to their appearance, are thought to possess superior linguistic and pedagogical capabilities (Irvine & Gal, 2000). The opposite is true for NNSTs because they are stereotyped as ineffective speakers and instructors due to their physical differences (Kamhi-Stein, 2018; Kickzkowiak & Wu, 2018; Ruecker, 2018; Selvi et al., 2023; Tsuchiya, 2020).

2.1.4 Pragmatics

The professional Japanese course that I taught focused on speaking and pragmatics. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that refers to the "meanings that arise from the use of communicative resources in context, and in particular, the meanings implied by speakers, inferred by listeners and negotiated between them in interaction (Culpeper et al., 2018). Within pragmatics, *speech acts* are an important concept. This term refers to the functions performed through language (Yule, 1996). Some examples of speech acts include greetings, inviting,

requesting, and refusing, which are prevalent in professional communication (Fiorito, 2005; Ishihara & Cohen, 2022). Context affects communication depending on when, where, and whom one is talking to and what the circumstances are (Ishihara & Cohen, 2022; Yule, 1996). For example, one might say "give me the pen" to their close friend at school, but they would not say that to a teacher. Instead, they may say "I was wondering if I would be able to borrow your pen?"

2.1.5 Keigo (Polite Language)

The course I taught was a high-intermediate Japanese class that focused on professional Japanese communication. The course was designed to increase students' understanding of *keigo,* (polite language) that is used within Japanese professional contexts. Unlike in English, where one shows politeness by using a higher pitch or adding auxiliaries to soften requests (Hasegawa, 2006), politeness in Japanese is much more intricate because it is grammatically encoded within the language (Barešova, 2015). Furthermore, when using honourifics, one must consider the listeners' status or the grammatical object (Barešova, 2015).Within *keigo*, there are three language styles: *teineigo* (polite language), *sonkeigo* (honourific language), and *kenjougo* (humble language) (Pizziconi, 2011). *Teineigo* is used when talking with others who are "socially distant or in status" (Takeuchi, 2023, p. 40). Second-language learners of Japanese are often introduced to this style first because it is the safest to use when talking with strangers (Wetzel, 2004). *Sonkeigo*, or honourific language, is used to honour the grammatical subject by raising its position. In contrast, one uses *kenjougo* to lower their position, effectively honouring the subject (Barešova, 2015). Both *sonkeigo* and *kenjougo* have unique verb sets for certain verbs, in addition to morphological inflections (Barešova, 2015). For example, the polite form of the verb "to eat" ('*tabemasu'*) has an honourific verb and humble version: '*meshiagarimasu*' (to

honourifically eat) and '*itadakimasu'* (to humbly receive (food)). The *teineigo* verb '*tsukurimasu'* ('to make') does not have a honourific or humble equivalent, so specific grammatical constructions are used instead. For the honourific structure, an honourific marker "*o"* attaches to the verb stem (i.e. the verb without '*masu'*) as a prefix, followed by the suffix *'ni-narimasu*.' Thus, '*tsukurimasu*' would become '*o-tsukuri-ni-narimasu*' (to honourifically make) (Barešova, 2015, p. 2). In addition to this construction, the passive form of the verb can also be used (V-(*ra)reru*)) '*tsukuraremasu*' (Barešova, 2015, p. 2). The process is similar for humble verb constructions in that the prefix is the same. However, the suffix attached to the verb is "*itashimasu*." So, '*tsukurimasu'* would become *'o-tsukuri-itashimasu*' (to humbly make) (Barešova, 2015, p. 2). Learners of Japanese must not only remember the grammatical rules to use *keigo* effectively, but also consider the various contextual factors, such as who the speaker is talking to or what they are talking about, the status, and the setting, that determine usage. For this reason, *keigo* is challenging to acquire, even for first-language (L1) Japanese speakers (Maruki, 2022).

2.2 Native Speaker Fallacy

In this section, I discuss the origin of the term "native speaker." Studies have indicated that problems (i.e., hiring and workplace) for NNSTs are due to the native speaker fallacy. Previous literature examines this concept in English and other language teaching contexts, such as French, Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, and Japanese.

2.2.1 Emergence of the Concept of "Native Speaker"

Dictionaries define native speakers as those who learned to speak a language as a child (McArthur et al., 2018). The term "native speaker" was first used starting in the 18th century (Rivers, 2018) with the first notions demonstrating a relation between linguistic capability and

language ownership as seen in the introduction to the *New Dictionary of the Language* (Kenrick, 1773). Commenting on this introduction, Rivers (2018), notes that "dominant 18th-century discussions concerning pronunciation and the authenticity of language speakers derived exclusively from their native origins came to prominence" (p. 15). These notions were found in dictionaries, poetry, and speeches throughout the 18th to the 20th century, which aided in solidifying the idea that native speakers are owners of their language. In the linguistic field, this concept of a native speaker became concrete when Chomsky (1957) argued that the native speaker is seen as a figure of perfect authority over their language. Native speakers indeed have knowledge of their language, which can be used to explain the deeper aspects of language, such as grammar. However, it does not mean that native speakers are superior to non-native speakers in inherent language or pedagogical ability. Bloomfield (1927) argues this point in earlier work, stating that native speakers are not perfect in their language production, as these speakers make mistakes frequently after acquisition. While attempts to dismantle the notions of native speaker have been made by linguists such as Bloomfield (1927), Chomsky's (1957) work reinforced the idea that native speakers have absolute command over their first language, creating misconceptions for NNSTs in teaching English and other language-teaching fields.

2.2.2 Native Speaker Fallacy

As native speakerism is an example of an ideological perspective, native-speaker fallacy is an example of hegemony within second-language teaching (Phillipson, 2009). For example, the administration favours NSTs due to their perceived language capabilities, and, as a result, NNSTs experience othering in the hiring process and in the workplace (Kiczkowiak & Wu, 2018; Ruecker, 2018). Phillipson (1992) discusses the "native speaker fallacy" as the view that native speakers are the ideal second language teachers due to their linguistic and cultural

knowledge. The current notion of "native speaker" affects NNSTs negatively as their physical attributes are used by others to determine their linguistic and pedagogical capabilities (Liu, 2018; Kamhi-Stein, 2018; Moussu, 2018a, 2018b; Ruecker, 2018; Tsuchiya, 2020). NSTs and NNSTs are judged based on their place of birth, accent, race/ethnicity, age, sex, or gender to determine their linguistic skills in the target language (Kamhi-Stein, 2018; Liu, 2018; Ruecker, 2018). An example found in Tsuchiya (2020) is that students determined the nativeness of their teacher using their last name (i.e., does it sound Japanese), as well as their pronunciation (i.e., was it nativelike). These judgments affect NSTs positively but NNSTs negatively (Ruecker, 2018; Tsuchiya, 2020). When hiring, Kiczkowiak and Wu (2018) noted that administrations favour NSTs more than NNSTs; moreover, even when hired, NNSTs receive less pay. While NNSTs can teach advanced language classes due to their linguistic knowledge and ability to speak in the language of the students, they are typically hired to only teach beginner and low-intermediate classes because of their perceived skills (Liu, 2018; Moussu, 2018a; Xiong & Eamorphan, 2020). Illustrating that NSTs are hired based on their accent and place of origin, Ruecker (2018) discusses how race, in particular, reduces NNSTs' chance of being hired, even though NNSTs may be more qualified than NSTs. Due to the native speaker fallacy, NNSTs' teaching and language capabilities are defined by their physical characteristics rather than their skills. As such, they face obstacles within the workplace, such as hiring issues and the opportunity to teach different language domains or advanced language classes.

Within the context of native speakerism, many scholars focus on NNSTs within the EFL field (Faez & Karas, 2017; Kahmi-Stein, 2018; Kickzkowiak & Wu, 2018, Liu, 2018; Moussu, 2018a, 2018b; Ruecker, 2018; Selvi et al., 2023; Uzum, 2018). However, the implications caused

by the “native” and “non-native” labels exist within other additional language learning contexts as well (Wernicke, 2017; Takeuchi, 2023; Tsuchiya, 2020; Xiong & Eamoraphan, 2020).

2.2.3 Native Speakerism within Other Languages

I explore research from Thompson and Fioramonte (2013), Wernicke (2017), and Xiong and Eamoraphan (2020) who examined native speakerism in Spanish, French, and Mandarin Chinese language teaching contexts. Next, I discuss previous research from Tsuchiya (2020) and Takeuchi (2023) since their research deals with native speakerism in the JFL field, which aligns with this thesis.

Thompson and Fioramonte (2013) aimed to demonstrate the native speaker fallacy in the Spanish-as-a-foreign language (SFL) field by examining novice NNSTs of Spanish in a post-secondary context. Furthermore, they wanted to use purely qualitative data instruments because prior research only used quantitative methods to gather participants’ perceptions. Thompson and Fioramonte (2013) implemented semi-structured interviews with three teaching assistants and identified themes such as “everyone making mistakes,” “pronunciation,” and “self-perception of advanced teaching abilities.” For the first theme, results showed that participants noted that in addition to students making mistakes, the NNSTs, as the experts, also made mistakes. However, all participants mentioned that making mistakes was “acceptable” (Thomspon & Fioramonte, 2013, p. 571). One participant mentioned that they were compassionate towards their students’ linguistic errors, and, at the same time, they expected their students to give them leeway. Another participant mentioned that native speakers also speak imperfectly.

For “pronunciation,” Thompson and Fioramonte (2013) highlighted participants differing perceptions of their own pronunciation. One participant viewed their pronunciation as a weakness and wanted their students to experience instruction from NSTs. One participant was

satisfied with their pronunciation because they were sometimes mistaken to be a native speaker of Spanish. Another teacher-assistant focused on perfecting their Spanish pronunciation and also stressed the importance of speaking with correct pronunciation in order to communicate properly in their classroom. The perceptions of the teacher assistants' pronunciation also affected how they viewed other NNSTs. One participant stated that they would prefer learning from a native speaker, and noted that learning from an instructor without an accent was easier. In contrast, one participant viewed that having native pronunciation was beneficial because of their own experiences with instructors that had non-native accents. This participant expressed difficulties taking the NNSTs seriously.

Finally, participants shared their thoughts on teaching in advanced classes in that they did not feel comfortable teaching these courses. One participant noted that the differences between NSTs and NNSTs did not make a difference in lower-level classes but did make a difference in advanced level classes. For example, the participants felt uncomfortable teaching literature at a high level. Another participant also noted the lack of opportunity to teach upper-level classes due to public administration hiring native speakers to teach advanced classes. This same participant was also hesitant about teaching higher-level classes because they believed that students should be able to interact with NSTs at a higher level despite having the capabilities to teach at that level.

Overall, Thompson and Fioramonte's (2013) study contributed to the NNST field by examining the perceptions of teaching assistants in the SFL context in order to discover implications that connect to NNSTs' linguistic and pedagogical capabilities. However, one limitation of this study is that it did not collect the perceptions of students. I address this limitation by examining the perceptions and beliefs of myself as the instructor and students.

Native speaker fallacy affects not just NNSTs' perceptions of themselves or others around them, but also how they view their teaching identities. Wernicke (2013) brings up the notion of "authenticity," which is linked to NSTs, impacting the identities of French-as-a-Second-Language (FSL) instructors in British Columbia. While the study was not situated in the JFL context, the results are still important because the study sheds light on the negative implications related to NNSTs in the Canadian context experience.

An issue that Wernicke (2017) highlighted in their research is the conflict of NNSTs' identities because they are both an instructor *and* a learner of the target language. As they noted, the research also examined how these instructors come to terms with their status as non-native speakers and teachers. In order to understand the discursive construction of FSL instructors' (both francophone and non-francophone) teaching identities, Wernicke (2017) aimed to examine: (a) how the experiences and knowledge from abroad were represented by teacher-participants as authentic resources; (b) how participants used conceptions of authenticity to construct an identity as FSL teacher both abroad and in their local professional contexts; and (c) how authenticity in prevailing ideologies about French language learning and teaching can be connected to FSL teacher identity construction.

The research was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, NNSTs of French ($N = 82$) were recruited after arriving in France. These teachers came from different areas of British Columbia and the majority taught in French immersion, while others taught in secondary core French programs. All non-native French-speaking instructors had intermediate to advanced proficiency. Wernicke (2017) stated that data was collected via "questionnaires, travel journal submissions, audio/video recordings of classroom sessions and extracurricular activities, and extensive field notes" (p. 217). In the second phase, they followed up with seven participants

after one year and collected data via semi-structured interviews, email correspondences, and follow-up discussions.

The results from the first phase of Wernicke's (2017) study showed the impact that native speakerism has on how FSL instructors view themselves, especially regarding their language proficiency. Wernicke noted, "francophone teachers explicitly identified as native speakers of French to explain that questions about language did not apply to them;" however, they did acknowledge the importance of French language development for the non-francophone instructors (p. 217). NNSTs experienced tension due to their ongoing development of French, which conflicts with their identity as "legitimate" French language instructors. Wernicke (2017), referring to one participant who struggled with maintaining their bilingual self, stated, "…being legitimate as an FSL teacher was seen to hinge on this teacher's ability to demonstrate native language use in her teaching and use of French" (p. 218). Due to the native speaker fallacy, FSL instructors question their teaching identity because they are both a learner and teachers of French.

Wernicke (2017) also presented ways in which FSL teachers invalidate or validate their identities, specifically through avoidance of the FSL identity and making use of authenticating resources and other identities to identify their own self. In one case study, they explained that a Quebec FSL teacher avoided identifying themselves as a French instructor, and even when asked directly about how they identified as a teacher, the teacher used broad terms in an attempt to evade from their identity. Other case studies demonstrated how instructors authenticated their own identities. One way of embracing their identity as FSL teachers was using different resources identified during interviews. For example, instructors alluded to French literature, French cuisine, artifacts, and their interaction with (native) French speakers (Wernicke, 2017).

By mentioning these aspects in their narratives, FSL instructors "[bestowed them] the authority to act and speak as a legitimate teacher of French" (Wernicke, 2017, p. 222). Another way that instructors established their own identities was by using different terms, which Wernicke (2017) calls "portable identities" (p. 222). One instructor, in their narrative, likened themselves to a "mother" and students as their "children" (p. 223).

Wernicke (2017) illustrated the influence of native speaker fallacy on non-native speaker French instructors' identity in Canada. Through the use of multiple qualitative data collection instruments, the study illustrated the conflicting learner-teacher identity characterizing NNSTs, causing issues in authenticating their teaching identities. As shown in the research, some teachers avoided directly calling themselves "FSL" teachers altogether. These findings are often found in NNST literature due to the bifurcated labels that cause NNSTs to question their linguistic and teaching identities (e.g., Aoyama, 2021; Kiczkowiak & Wu, 2018; Rajagopalan, 2018). However, some FSL instructors embraced their teaching identity by using resources or different terms. These findings offer strategies that NNSTs could use to authenticate their teaching identity, which aids in counteracting the native speaker fallacy.

The previous two papers have examined the perceptions and identities of NNSTs. While examining instructors' perspectives are important to understand the negative effects of the native speaker fallacy, it is also necessary to examine students' perceptions of their instructors since they are directly impacted. Mirroring findings from previous research (e.g., Liu, 2018; Moussu, 2018a), Xiong and Earmoraphan (2020) highlighted a contradiction in that NNSTs are put into lower-level classes because they can speak the language of the students; meanwhile NSTs, who do not speak the language of the students, teach advanced classes. Thus, while these institutions acknowledge that NNSTs possess certain skills (e.g., the ability to communicate with students)

that enable them to teach the target language effectively, opportunities to teach higher-level classes are limited. This contradiction exemplifies the negative implications of the native speaker fallacy since NNSTs may have the necessary skills to teach higher-level courses but cannot due to administrative constraints.

In order to address these negative implications, Xiong and Eamoraphan (2020) investigated students' perceptions of native and non-native instructors that teach Mandarin Chinese in Thailand. The objectives of this study were to determine the adult students' attitudes toward native and non-native Chinese-speaking teachers within a Chinese language academy. Specifically, they conducted a study that analyzed the attitudes of adult learners at beginner, intermediate, and advanced proficiency levels. In addition, they wanted to determine if there were any significant differences in the students' attitudes. Xiong and Earmoraphan (2020) implemented a comparative quantitative study that employed descriptive and inferential statistics to realize these objectives. The survey, completed by 124 respondents, featured thirty-one 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire items. These survey questions were divided into three categories: "motivation," "communication," and "teaching/learning" (Xiong and Earmoraphan, 2020, p. 238).

The results from Xiong and Earmoraphan's (2020) study revealed that adult learners have no preference for the nativeness of the instructor in terms of "motivation," "communication," and "teaching and learning" (p. 240). This same finding was seen in adult learners' preferences for teachers who instruct beginner and intermediate-level classes, but Xiong and Earmoraphan (2020) found that adult learners have a slight preference towards native instructors teaching advanced level courses because of their motivation and teaching and learning. Using ANOVA, students' attitudes in all three categories were calculated and Xiong and Earmoraphan (2020)

determined that there was no significant difference in the adult learners' attitudes of native and non-native Chinese-speaking teachers.

Although these results from Xiong and Earmoraphan (2020) are intriguing, the choice of using purely quantitative tools to gather students' perceptions raises questions. As Thompson and Fioramonte (2013) noted, quantitative instruments do not fully capture students' perceptions. If Xiong and Earmoraphan (2020) also employed qualitative methods to gather students' thoughts about NNSTs and NSTs, the results might provide a fuller understanding of their preferences towards NNSTs and NSTs.

The three studies reviewed here explored native speakerism within different foreign language contexts, such as Spanish, French, and Mandarin. These studies contributed new knowledge to the NNST field by exploring NNSTs of other languages. Such studies hold significance in research as they are more relevant to NNSTs in the JFL field than the EFL field. However, the findings from these studies may not reflect students and NNS instructors within the JFL field in Canada. Canada is a multilingual country with many minority languages, and out of these languages, Japanese is popular among Canadians, with 18,293 students learning this language (Japan Foundation, 2021). Moreover, according to Japan Foundation (2021), there are 1,437 non-native Japanese instructors in North America, yet, to my knowledge, research on NNSTs within the Canadian JFL field is limited.

2.2.4 Native Speaker Fallacy in Japanese

Although there is scarce literature on NNSTs in the Canadian JFL context, recent studies have examined native speakerism within Japan (Takeuchi, 2023) and the United States (Tsuchiya, 2020).

First, Takeuchi (2023) presented findings for second language (L2) speaker legitimacy and native speaker bias by examining the perceptions and beliefs of L2 Japanese speakers who work in Japan using an ethnographic approach. Takeuchi (2023) also included first-language (L1) Japanese speakers. "Legitimate language," as defined by Grenfell (2011), refers to "the language or language variety that is valued in a particular context and thus is 'socially dominant linguistic form'" (p. 51). Legitimate language relates to language ideologies in that it is used by those who are in places of power. Moreover, there is a sense of ownership regarding *who* can use the language, as examined in Takeuchi (2023). This notion of ownership emphasizes native speakerism within the Japanese context, causing negative implications for non-native speakers, such as discrimination and hiring and workplace problems, which Takeuchi (2023) described using the term "native speaker bias" (p. 11).

I review Takeuchi's (2023) research on L2 Japanese speakers' (N = 12) and L1 Japanese speakers' (N = 3) perceptions of *keigo*. In order to determine perceptions about *keigo*, Takeuchi (2023) interviewed L1 and L2 speakers. For L2 speakers, Takeuchi (2023) asked: (1) "How would you describe your Japanese language ability," (2)" Is there anything you're careful about when you speak Japanese," and (3)" What is difficult about Japanese?" (Takeuchi, 2023, p. 46). L1 speakers were asked what Japanese language skills they thought foreigners in Japan needed. First, many participants (both L1 and L2) stated that they struggled with *keigo*, even those who have spent extensive time learning Japanese. L2 Japanese speakers' struggle with *keigo* centred around their perceived lack of knowledge, and confidence, and a lack of correction because of their ethnic status. Takeuchi (2023) noted that L1 Japanese speakers also agreed that *keigo* is difficult and, thus, for foreigners, it is "optional" (p. 48). According to L1 and L2 speakers, the difficulties mainly stemmed from knowing the context of when to use *keigo* (i.e., who and

where) and which language style to use. Some L1 participants also stated that L2 speakers are not able to use *keigo,* while others noted that the L2 speakers' use of *keigo* was a sign of progress.

According to Takeuchi (2023), L2 participants disliked using *keigo* due to their individual goals or the paradoxicality of *keigo.* The researcher reported that one L2 participant used *keigo* at work, but used the plain form (i.e., verb forms without polite inflections) outside of the workplace because they wanted to be friendly. *Keigo*, while used for politeness, can also be seen as rude depending on how it is used (Takeuchi, 2023). Another L2 participant in Takeuchi's (2023) study acknowledged the contradiction of *keigo* in their answers but also noted that it is important to learn *keigo* as an L2 speaker. Takeuchi (2023) reported that L1 speakers did not have negative comments about *keigo*, except for one participant who remarked their dislike for *keigo* because it creates barriers.

In contrast, some L2 participants liked *keigo*, seeing it as a "professional resource" (Takeuchi, 2023, p. 51). In addition, one L2 participant was interested in *keigo* because of how it shapes one's identity, and they liked the complexities of the *keigo* system. Relating to identity, Takeuchi (2023) noted that through learning formal expressions, one participant was able to "…[match the conceptions of their identity as a speaker of Japanese]" (p. 51). This notion was emphasized by one L2 participant, who enjoyed *keigo* because of its many intricacies.

To summarize the essential points from this section concerning my research, Takeuchi (2023) determined that three differing beliefs about *keigo* existed among L2 and L1 speakers. Namely, they struggled, rejected, or embraced *keigo*. However, all participants noted the importance of *keigo* in showing respect in a professional communication setting. Specifically for L2 speakers, *keigo* is an indicator of their proficiency in Japanese and, by some, a tool for self-

expression. However, based on the perceptions of L1 and L2 speakers, a leniency exists that allows L2 speakers to not use *keigo*, and in some cases, be discouraged from using it (Takeuchi, 2023). As Takeuchi (2023) stated, at a surface-level, it was L1 speakers' desire to be kind since they understand the difficulties of *keigo.* However, looking deeper, Takeuchi (2023) determined a perception that *keigo* must be used by native speakers of Japanese and not L2 speakers, which emphasizes speaker legitimacy and creates negative implications for L2 speakers because they are restricted from accomplishing professional tasks.

Takeuchi's (2023) study illustrated L2 speaker legitimacy and native speaker bias within the Japanese language context by looking at L2 and L1 speakers' perceptions of *keigo*. Takeuchi's (2023) methodological choice of interviewing both L2 and L1 speakers provided a better representation of the perceptions of *keigo*. However, this study is limited in that it may not reflect native speaker bias in a Canadian post-secondary context.

The next study (Tsuchiya, 2020) is closely related to my thesis since it explores native speaker fallacy within the post-secondary JFL field within a North American context. Tsuchiya (2020) examined students' (n = 564) and instructors' (n = 29) preferences within post-secondary Japanese and Chinese language programs in the United States. Tsuchiya (2020) drew from a larger research project conducted in 2016, which used qualitative and quantitative methods. First, a survey was used to collect students' and instructors' preferences by having them select one of three choices: (a) native speakers, (b) non-native speakers, or (c) no preference. This was done in response to opinion statements about linguistic and pedagogical capabilities. The findings from the survey answers showed that students and teachers prefer NSTs. Participants mainly preferred NSTs due to their linguistic capabilities, with pronunciation being the highest (92%), followed by advanced-level speaking/listening (73%), colloquial expressions (72%), the linguistic

standard (69%), and target culture knowledge (64%), among others (Tsuchiya, 2020). Across these same factors, NNSTs were preferred because of their compassion (41%), grammar teaching (36%), and lenient grading (24%). In addition, students preferred NNSTs to teach beginner-level classes (17%).

Through the analysis of data gathered from the open-ended questions, Tsuchiya (2020) noted that students and instructors use racial and ethnic characteristics and linguistic and pedagogical capabilities as judgements to determine their teachers' nativeness. Students considered NSTs to be native based on if their last name and appearance were from the target culture. Furthermore, students deemed teachers as native if they were fluent in the target language, had target pronunciation and accented English, were good at teaching the target language, and had a high position in the program. In contrast, students believed instructors to be "non-native" based on their non-target last name and appearance, pronunciation, unaccented English, and discomfort when teaching. Further, if students did not have enough information on the teacher's background or if the instructor had characteristics of NSTs and NNSTs, then they could not determine whether a teacher was a native speaker of the target language or not. Teachers also shared the same judgements when determining the nativeness of instructors, such as the instructor's background, proficiency in English, and teaching ability.

Tsuchiya's (2020) study greatly contributed to the NNST field by examining native speaker fallacy within Japanese and Chinese language teaching through the use of qualitative and quantitative methods to gather students' and instructors' perceptions of NNSTs. The participants' preferences for NSTs versus NNSTs highlighted different strengths of NSTs (e.g., pronunciation) and NNSTs (e.g., compassion). These strengths have been reported in previous research (e.g., Chun, 2014; Moussu, 2018a). Worth noting is how highly rated the preferences for NSTs are

compared to those for NNSTs. For example, the top-rated preference for NSTs was 91% (as a model for pronunciation), while the top-rated preference for NNSTs was 41% (considered a more compassionate teacher). The division in results could be due to the design of the survey, which asked participants to choose between native speakers and non-native speakers, or no preference, rather than having students use Likert-scales to rate their opinions as seen in Colmenero and Lasagabaster (2020), Xiong and Earmoraphan (2020), and Zhang and Zhang (2021).

2.3 Attitudes

Research has shown that native speakerism influences students' and NNSTs' attitudes leading to a division between NSTs and NNSTs (Freeman, 2017; Kickzowiak & Wu, 2018). Furthermore, it is connected to the affective domains (e.g., anxiety, confidence, self-efficacy, and inferiority) (Dassa, 2018; Eslami & Harper, 2018; Faez & Karas, 2017). Oskamp and Schultz (2005) define "attitudes" as the "disposition to respond *in a favourable or unfavourable manner* to given objects" (p. 9, italics in original). In this section, I examine previous research that looks at the attitudes of NNSTs and students.

2.3.1 Non-Native Speaking Teacher Attitudes

Within the context of attitudes of NNSTs, scholars tend to comment on self-efficacy, or the "…belief they can be successful when carrying out a particular task" (Cambridge Dictionaries, 2023). In NNST research, self-efficacy issues are often seen through NNSTs' perceived target language skills and their teaching (Faez & Karas, 2018; Park, 2012; Zacharias, 2018).

Park (2012) looked at the experiences of five East Asian women in Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESOL) programs who are non-native English speaking teachers

(NNESTs) through a qualitative study. The data collection instruments included: electronic autobiographical narratives (responses to structured questions via email), electronic journal entries (semi-structured), and interviews (unstructured).

In this study, Park (2012) shared findings from one NNEST named Xia, who experienced self-efficacy-related problems as an immigrant in the United States. They reported that Xia's confidence lowered because she did not speak the American standard English but "Chinglish" (p. 139). Xia also reported feeling the need to perfect her English in order to appear more credible to her students. However, observing her MA TESOL supervisor, Xia came to appreciate her own non-native status, saying, "I am kind of proud… I speak two languages… I want to improve my English but not to be identified as an NES" (p. 141). To conclude, Park (2012), based on Xia's narratives, offered implications, such as a greater understanding of how ideologies affect NNSTs and provide insight for TESOL programs in changing their curricula.

Park's (2012) work illustrated how the native speaker fallacy can negatively affect NNSTs' attitudes. The findings corroborated with those from Wernicke (2017) in that the NNST instructor doubted their non-native identity at first but later embraced their non-native identify by being inspired by their TESOL mentor. However, a limitation of this study is that it only presented the narrative of one participant, despite Park (2012) involving five NNESTs, which diminishes the overall persuasiveness of the study.

Next, Zacharias (2018) investigated how NNSTs' perceptions of themselves are linked to their proficiency in the second language, especially pronunciation, by exploring previous non-NNEST research. They stated that the native speaker fallacy pressures NNSTs because "non-standard" language is considered not good enough. Moreover NNSTs' perceptions of themselves are affected by students' expectations. Additionally, NNSTs are rejected because students did not

see them as authentic teachers. However, as Zacharias (2018) reported, students did not have any judgements towards their non-native instructor's ethnicity, yet the NNSTs "imaged the students as having negative attitudes…" which affected their own self-perceptions (p. 3). NNSTs' perceptions of themselves are also linked to their image of an ideal English teacher, which was often a NST. Finally, the 'non-native' label affected NNST's perceptions because it erased their bilingual identity.

Zacharias (2018) suggested various pedagogical implications that will positively impact NNSTs. One implication relates to the re-examination of the NNEST label that is used to define non-native instructors. Zacharias (2018) also recommended that instructors, regardless of their employment status, should "critically reflect upon and engage in conversations around [labeling practices] and their consequences for language users and teachers" (p. 4). Moreover, they suggested having teachers use "consciousness-raising tasks" that go beyond the nativeness of the instructor (p. 4). Examples include asking students what makes an effective English teacher and reading NNESTs' narratives to "explore factors leading to an empowering sense of self" (Zacharias, 2018, p. 4). The use of narratives was explored in Park's (2018) study and was shown to be effective in illustrating how a non-native instructor can gain confidence in their own identity. Related to identities, Zacharias also recommended that teacher training use NNESTs' narratives, allowing instructors to "critically explore how NNESTs fashion manageable identity options and identify strategies contributing to positive self-perceptions" (p. 5). Compared to Park (2018), Zacharias's (2018) study did not provide new knowledge since it was an exploration of previous research. However, the study was still effective in demonstrating how the native speaker fallacy negatively affected NNSTs' perceptions of themselves and their linguistic and teaching capabilities.

2.3.2 Student Attitudes

It is important to understand students' perceptions of NNSTs and NSTs since they are "at the heart of the teaching and learning process" (Uzum, 2018, p. 1). Recent publications within the NNST field have commented on students' preferences towards their instructors, satisfaction and motivation (e.g., Colmenero & Lagabaster, 2020; Zhang & Zhang, 2021).

Using mixed methods, Colmenero and Lasagabaster (2020) aimed to examine the preferences of students ($N = 355$), teachers ($N = 51$), and parents ($N = 101$), whose perspectives have been neglected in previous research regarding language teachers. Their research questions looked at the three groups of participants' (students, parents, and teachers) preferences towards NSTs or NNSTs, whether these preferences change based on the language level of the course (i.e. beginner, intermediate, or advanced), and their perceived advantages and disadvantages in having NNSTs and NSTs. A questionnaire and focus groups were used to collect answers to these foci. The questionnaire consisted of 5-point Likert-scale questions from strongly agree to strongly disagree. These Likert-scale questions were divided into four categories: (1) assessment and support, (2) attitudes and motivation, (3) culture, and (4) perceived linguistic abilities.

The results showed that students prefer NNSTs at the beginner level, both NNSTs and NSTs at the intermediate level, and NSTs at the advanced level. When looking at the assessment and support subcategories, students and teachers did not consider the nativeness factor relevant. However, looking at the individual items, students, parents, and teachers preferred NNSTs for grading students' knowledge of grammar and listening comprehension due to their experience as second-language learners. Students and parents believed that NSTs and NNSTs were equal in their impacting students' attitudes and motivation. However, based on the focus group answers,

students stated that NNSTs are more positive and motivating because they have been in the same situation as them. For culture, all three groups did not believe that nativeness was an important factor related to the instruction of cultural aspects linked to language. However, based on the Mann-Whitney U tests, students preferred NSTs as the "best-option" to teach culture (Colmenero & Lasagabaster, 2020, p. 9), while parents were neutral, and teachers preferred NNSTs. However, when asked about which instructor provides more learning opportunities, students were neutral, while both parents and instructors preferred NSTs. Finally, for the perceived linguistic abilities section, students preferred NSTs. Analysis of individual items showed that participants agreed that NNSTs serve as prime examples of English learners. Regarding the NNSTs' accents, all three groups did not believe that having an American or British accent was important. However, in the focus group, students voiced their worries about the NNSTs' first language affecting their English pronunciation, while others thought it beneficial to experience various accents.

More recently, Zhang and Zhang (2021) examined learners' ($N = 218$) satisfaction and motivation with NESTs and NNESTs using a path-analytic approach. They aimed to determine if EFL learners' satisfaction changed based on their NESTs and NNESTs' teaching competence and how the EFL learners' satisfaction with both teachers affected their motivation. In order to achieve these aims, the researchers used two questionnaires for determining the learners' (a) motivation and (b) their satisfaction. Questions for the learner motivation questionnaire were divided into three classifications: instrumental motivation (i.e., to learn an additional language because of specific goals, such as working in the target country), integrative motivation (i.e., the desire to learn an additional language for personal growth and communicating with target community) (Gardner, 1983), and learning situational motivation (i.e., desire to learn an

additional language because of the course and instructor) (Gardner, 1985). For the survey, twenty-seven questionnaire items containing 5-point Likert-scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree were used.

The results for the first aim showed that there is a statistical difference in learners' satisfaction which are connected to their instructors' teaching communication skills and English proficiency and knowledge, and pedagogical skills. For the second aim, learners' satisfaction with their instructor's skills had a slight impact on their learning motivation based on the path models' latent variable. However, based on the path coefficients, learners' satisfaction with their instructors' teaching competence did influence their English learning motivation. Furthermore, based their analysis, there is a direct causal relationship between four pairs of variables regarding EFL learners' satisfaction with their instructor's skills and motivation. Specifically, learners' satisfaction with NESTs' pedagogical skills influenced students' instrumental motivation, while learners' satisfaction of NESTs' English proficiency impacted English learning motivation. Similarly, learner's satisfaction of NNESTs' communication skills affected instrumental motivation, and EFL learners' integrative motivation was casually linked to NNESTs' English proficiency. An indirect link existed between instructors' pedagogical skills and students' learning motivation, both instrumental and integrative.

Zhang and Zhang's (2021) research illustrated that the nativeness of the instructor influences students' motivation and satisfaction. The quantitative methods were suitable for the participant sample; however, because both of their questionnaires used Likert-scale questions without a N/A option, there is greater potential for their data to be skewed. Rather than relying on only qualitative data, my study incorporated qualitative data collection methods to gain a rich and in-depth picture of perceptions of an NNS instructor.

2.4 Building Awareness through Teacher Training and Collaboration

Native speakerism is a long-standing construction of monolingual biases, but through awareness this linguistic ideology can be taken apart. Rather than hiring NSTs and NNSTs on nativeness alone, acknowledgment on their strengths and weaknesses, and their specific capabilities of what they know and how they teach their knowledge to students merit thoughtful considerations (Aoyama, 2021; Eslami & Harper, 2018; Mahboob, 2018; Nakagawa, 2020; Rajagopalan, 2018; Sakurai, 2012; Uzum, 2018). In order to address the native speaker fallacy, understanding the perceptions that cause obstacles for NNSTs are crucial. As Uzum (2018) noted, "Any attempt at improving teaching quality starts with awareness. In order to provide high-quality teaching, regardless of their nativeness or non-nativeness, teachers need to be aware of their strengths and weaknesses" (p. 5).

Previous research has demonstrated that NSTs and NNSTs possess different skills that can be used to benefit language teaching and learning as a whole. While NNSTs have shortcomings (e.g., they may lack culturally specific language, such as idioms or cultural references), they have a strong understanding of the linguistic intricacies of the target language and can explain their understanding to students (Moussu, 2018a; Rajagopalan, 2018). In addition, because of their experience learning the target language, NNSTs are empathetic toward students and can serve as role models (Eslami & Harper, 2018; Rajagopalan, 2018; Uzum, 2018). Recognizing the diverse attributes of both NNSTs and NSTs can enhance language teaching, enabling administration to harness the unique potentials inherent in NNSTs. While previous NNST research has highlighted the implications that NNSTs face, future research needs to be shared in teaching education courses so that instructors can become aware of the perceptions that may

potentially create obstacles in for NNSTs (Kiczkowiak & Wu, 2018; Mahboob, 2018; Ruecker, 2018).

To address the native speaker fallacy, previous research has suggested teacher training, which benefits language instructors by bringing awareness on perceptions (Boecher, 2005; Faez, 2018; Kiczkowiak & Wu, 2018; Ruecker, 2018; Tsuchiya, 2020; Wernicke, 2017). Since these perceptions go beyond how the instructor teaches their classes, Kickzkowiak and Wu (2018) state that "training programs…should also attempt to create 'transformative' intellectuals who will base their practice on moral, professional, and ethical considerations…" pp. 3-4). Through reflection and discussion, language instructors can increase their confidence and strengthen equity, diversity, and inclusion by building awareness on the "discriminatory factors" that can cause negative implications (Kiczkowiak & Wu, 2018; Ruecker, 2018; Tsuchiya, 2020). Furthermore, it is necessary to showcase that *both* NTSs and NNSTs have individual strengths that can contribute to their "local teaching environment" (Kiczkowiak & Wu, 2018, p. 4).

Previous research also recommended that NNSTs and NSTs work together to empower both groups, which in turn would address native speaker fallacy (Liu, 2018; Kadowaki, 2018; Kahmi-Stein, 2018; Oda, 2018; Wang & Fang, 2020). Kadowaki (2018) investigated team teaching (TT) between South Korean and Thailand high school native Japanese-speaking teachers (NJSTs) and non-native Japanese-speaking teachers (NNJSTs) and noted that NJSTs were identified as role-models by NNJSTs because of their linguistic strengths and cultural knowledge. Moreover, NJSTs are valued because they offer genuine conversation with students. Related to collaborative activities, NJSTs were able to assist NNJSTs in South Korean in preparing teaching materials. Finally, Kadowaki (2018) illustrated the importance of the NNJSTs' proficiency when working with NJSTs since NNJSTs in South Korea were more

effective in collaborating with NJSTs because of the high proficiency in the language in comparison to the Taiwanese NNJSTs.

Other researchers indicated the benefits of collaboration. For example, Wang and Fang (2020) noted that native and non-native instructors' collaboration would allow for shared responsibility and new perspectives as they learn from each other. Collaboration can also occur between NNSTs and administration, which Kahmi-Stein (2018) stated would "contribute to educating and creating awareness among those that make hiring decisions" (p. 4). However, for collaboration to benefit instructors or institutions, native and non-native instructors must have opportunities to validate their individual strengths, state their concerns, and negotiate their "linguistic and personal identities" (Kiczkowiak & Wu, 2018, p. 5).

2.5 Approaches in Teaching Professional Japanese Communication

During my exploration of existing research, I had difficulties finding research on instructional practices used to teach professional Japanese communication within the North American context. Thus, I examined two approaches employed by Japanese researchers: Pattern Practice (Kitagaki, 2002) and TBLT (Mukoyama, 2018).

Kitagaki (2002) implemented an audio-lingual approach coined "pattern practice" to instruct *keigo*. Based on Fries' (1945) *oral approach*, the pattern practice approach focuses on the repetition of structure patterns to allow for the automatic use of the target language. The researcher stated some limitations of pattern practice in teaching a foreign language to English speakers. The main limitation of pattern practice is that this method only focused on the repetition of sound (i.e., words or phrases) but not meaning within the English language curriculum. As such, the method was unsuitable to capture context or settings (where meaning is important) and as a result was not used in the Japanese language setting. However, the researcher

conjectured that the Japanese L1 learners can apply meaning from experience and contexts when hearing the sounds. Therefore, the problems that existed when using pattern practice in an English education setting were eliminated in the Japanese language setting. Kitagaki (2002) presents three reasons as to why this approach works in a Japanese language setting: 1) despite *keigo* being Japanese it is like a second language; 2) *keigo* has rules and formal practice of forms which make it suitable for the pattern practice approach; and 3) learners have a solid understanding of Japanese so they are able to learn the differences more readily.

The researcher instructed a professional Japanese language class which was targeted for students ($N = 30$) becoming secretaries. Using mimicry-memorization practice, the instructor provided a basic sentence (i.e., "(*watashi-ga*) *yonda"*, (I) read…)) and then students provided the *keigo* version of this sentence "(*watashi-ga*) *haidokuitashimashita,* (I) humbly read…")). After, individual cues are given by the teacher which expand the basic sentence. For example, the instructor gives the cue "*kimi-no-tegami-o*" ("your letter (direct object)) to which students say "*otegami-o-haidokuitashimashita"* ((I) humbly read your letter.)

Kitagaki (2002) compared students' writing of *keigo* expressions during different times and observed changes that occurred after starting the pattern practice approach. Findings suggested that students, once used to the approach, began to speak loudly and without worry. Furthermore, students gained confidence and could use *keigo* fluently because they got used to using *keigo* via spoken word. Moreover, when participating in brief written examinations, students made fewer errors, resulting in improved grades. In addition, students actively answered the instructor's questions; thus, the classroom had a positive atmosphere.

Kitagaki's (2002) study demonstrated an instructional practice that can be used to instruct *keigo.* However, previous research (Butler, 2011; Lightbown & Spada, 2013) has commented on

needing more effective language teaching approaches in comparison to audio-lingual approaches, such as pattern practice. Pattern practice fits within the *behaviourist perspective*, which is the language acquisition view that one can learn language by forming habits through imitation and practice (Skinner, 1957; Xia, 2014). However, this perspective was challenged by Chomsky (1966), who argued that humans acquire language naturally without being explicitly taught. This notion of how language is acquired is known as the *innatist perspective* and led to the creation of various new approaches (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Some of these approaches focused on communicative instruction, such as TBLT, which focuses less on grammar and more on communication (Long, 2015).

Mukoyama (2018) examined Taiwanese universities that used TBLT to instruct business Japanese. Specifically, they aimed to see if any differences in effectiveness of TBLT existed between students that had different Japanese proficiency levels. In this study, which lasted one week (six hours for six days), the lectures focused on business Japanese, and 52 undergraduate students who ranged from N3 to N2 proficiency[1] partook in these classes immediately after their second year. For data collection, the researcher administered a test on the final day of the experimental project, and students completed a survey that featured self-evaluation and course evaluation questions. The test focused on concepts that students learned in the class. In addition, the survey used a 5-point Likert-scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree.

A total of 51 students completed the test and surveys. Based on the professor's evaluation, students were separated into three groups based on their proficiency levels; thus, 18 were in the high-rank group, 19 were in the mid-rank group, and 14 were in the low-rank group.

[1] N3 and N2 refer to proficiency levels from the Japanese language proficiency test (JLPT). N3 is equal to intermediate and N2 equals to upper intermediate.

For the test, Mukoyama (2018) reported an average score of 79.9 for all students, indicating the overall effectiveness of the class because students acquired knowledge from doing the tasks. However, the mid-rank and low-ranked scored below the average (77.4 points and 71.9 points, respectively). Using Tukey multiple comparisons, Mukoyama (2018) determined that as students gained proficiency, they learned more through task-based language instruction.

For the self-evaluation, students' ratings averaged of four, indicating "agreement" with each statement. Three out of ten questions ranged from a score of 3.75 to 3.98, which, as Mukoyama (2018) indicated, students believed their Japanese proficiency to increase after taking the course. Using Tukey multiple comparisons, Mukoyama (2018) determined the significance of five questions, showing that students felt that they improved their proficiency of service expressions within a business setting (#2), could do a self-introduction (#3), take appointments (#5), reject invitations (#6), and get permission (#7). For these five questions, Mukoyama (2018) determined a significant difference in self-evaluation ratings between students in the high-rank group and students in the low-rank group. In addition, there was a difference between the evaluation ratings from students in the high-rank group and mid-rank group related to question 6 (rejecting invitations).

The course evaluations consisted of five statements and employed the same 5-point Likert-scale. The statements focused on what students felt was appropriate (i.e., "The amount of work was appropriate") and their perceptions, such as the "I feel that my interest in business Japanese strengthened after taking this course" and "I improved my usage of specific expressions within a business setting" (Mukoyama, 2018, p. 57). The averages from all five questions ranged from 3.76 to 3.92, indicating that students found the course to be helpful. Tukey multiple comparisons showed no significant difference among the three groups, however.

Using a final test, course evaluations, and self-evaluations, Mukoyama (2018) determined that using TBLT was effective in improving students' understanding of business Japanese, but this effectiveness differs depending on the proficiency level of the student. However, these findings may not reflect what students in a Canadian post-secondary institution perceive.

2.6 Research Questions

Current NNST research predominately focuses on non-native teachers in the English language field. While some studies on NNSTs in the JFL field exist, research on NNSTs of Japanese within Canada is limited. I intend to address this gap by investigating the beliefs and perceptions surrounding a NNST within the Canadian JFL context by answering the following questions:

1) What are the instructional practices that are used by a NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese course?

2) What are the students and instructor's perceptions and beliefs towards the NNSTs' capabilities within a high-intermediate Japanese class?

Chapter 3: Methods

In this section, I will outline the essential principles and characteristics of SoTL research, my criteria for selecting participants, and my data collection instruments and procedures and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

SoTL is defined as a "systematic study of teaching and learning" that uses "established or validated criteria of scholarship" to improve learning or develop an understanding of learning (Potter & Krustra, 2011, p. 2). Through the implementation of SoTL, I was the instructor and researcher of a high-intermediate Japanese class. By doing so, I gained an understanding of obstacles related to NNSTs in my own instructional context through reflection and by using my "research lens" to critically analyze teaching and learning (Gayle et al., 2013, p. 83).

The present research followed Felten's (2013) five principles of good SoTL research, which are inquiry focused on student learning, grounded in context, methodologically sound, conducted in partnership with students, and appropriately published. I first critically explored student learning through observing what students learned and their attitudes linked to their learning. Second, I examined how my non-native status and instruction affected their learning. Third, I grounded the practice in scholarly and local contexts through familiarization with established research and awareness of my classroom, the number of students I taught, and my workload. In addition, with the assistance of my supervisor, I carefully chose tools based on research objectives and questions to achieve methodological soundness. Fourth, I undertook an ethical review to protect the participants. I also acknowledged that my students are not just research participants but collaborators. Similarly, the data I gained through this project is a personal cumulation of *my* reflections, observations, and experiences, as well as that of students.

The feedback I received from the student participants while teaching the course has aided in improving my instruction and their learning. Furthermore, students' perceptions of NNSTs and NSTs has aided my understanding of what they think about the nativeness of their instructor and their individual strengths and weaknesses. Considering the final principle of good SoTL practice, I intend to make these findings public. This process involves sharing the results with teachers and administrators and presenting the research at conferences and in scholarly journals.

The analysis of my research is mainly qualitative since I aimed to understand students and the instructor's perceptions of the instructional practices and the NNST's capabilities through students' and my perceptions and beliefs. Furthermore, I used pre- and post-course surveys to collect students' perceptions of NNSTs and NSTs, which includes the NNSTs' pedagogical and linguistic capabilities, NNSTs in beginner and intermediate courses, students' general preferences for NNSTs and NSTs, and NNSTs' and NSTs' teaching qualifications and training.

3.2 Research Context

Data were gathered from a Japanese language program at a post-secondary university in Canada. The program at this university has nine courses related to the Japanese language and three Japanese-language instructors. Seven of these language courses target intermediate learners, focusing on speaking, reading, and writing.

For the research project, I taught a high-intermediate Japanese professional communication course focused on speaking and pragmatics (see Appendix B for the course syllabus and Appendix C for a course outline). The duration of the class was one hour and 30 minutes and occurred weekly for five-weeks.[2] My instruction was primarily in Japanese. I

[2] The classes did not occur consecutively due to scheduling conflicts.

implemented the TBLT approach, described in Chapter 2. Using Long's (2015) TBLT approach, I completed a needs-based analysis of the target demographic, which consisted of high-intermediate undergraduate students, to "…identify *target tasks*" (p. 6, emphasis in the original). According to Long (2015), tasks are any activity, whether simple or complex, situated in the real world. I selected tasks from professional settings and modified them to be pedagogically scaffolded.

The TBLT approach incorporates a cycle consisting of a pre-task, main-task, and post-task (Willis, 2021). Follow-up tasks may also be used. The pre-task prepares learners for the main task. In the lessons I taught, I gave students instructions and a pragmatic situation to prepare them for the lesson. Next, the students practiced a real-world activity as the main task. In the post-task, the students were asked questions that focused on the form or reflection of the task. Then, I taught students forms, in other words, specific grammatical or conversational points, to ensure that they 'get it right in the end' (Willis & Willis, 2007, pp.30–32).

I adapted pragmatic teaching practices from Roever (2021) for task-based teaching. Specifically, I used Discourse Completion (DC) tasks, role-play tasks, and elicited conversation tasks. Discourse completion tasks contain a scenario and "a gap for respondents to [fill in] their [responses]." DC tasks are not used to test students' performance in the real-world but instead can be used to determine "what kind of pragmalinguistic tools learners have at their disposal and whether they know how different sociopragmatic context settings affect pragmalinguistcs" (Roever, 2021, p. 48). The DC tasks contained multiple blanks which students filled in the by saying the appropriate phrase or grammar. By doing so, I was able to gauge their pragmatic knowledge. For role-plays, I provided students with a real-world situation and interacted with

each other or, in some cases, created a script by their selves. While role-plays are great tools because they allow students to use their "interactional abilities," they are not the same as natural language (Roever, 2021, p. 55). Elicited conversation tasks address this problem by allowing students to practice language but not under a specific role. Content for the class was mainly from a *keigo* textbook called "*Shokyū ga owattara hajimeyō*: *Shin Nihongo Keigo* Torēningu" (Let's start when finished beginner level: Japanese polite language training) by Kaneko (2014). I also adapted script tasks from this textbook by having students read a script aloud together, and then we discussed how the script could be improved. After, I showed them a corrected version of the script.

As a NNST, I have studied Japanese as a second language and used my experiences to teach high-intermediate Japanese. I understand Japanese grammar; more importantly, however, I can teach students how to use the proper grammar because I have had the opportunity to learn that language myself (see also Moussu, 2018b; Rajagopalan, 2018; Uzum, 2018). In addition, I can provide a positive atmosphere for learning and empathize well with students since I know the difficulties of learning Japanese as a second language (Moussu, 2018b; Sakurai, 2012; Uzum, 2018). Lastly, because I speak English, the primary language of students in Canada, I can explain complex Japanese concepts to students (Xiong & Eamoraphan, 2020).

3.3 Participants

The research project involved two groups of participants: (1) four[3] undergraduate students at a post-secondary institution in Western Canada and (2) an instructor-researcher. Student participants were recruited based on their self-reported intermediate proficiency level

[3] Fifteen participants were originally recruited; however only four completed the five-week course and all data collection tools.

and signing an implied informed consent form (see Appendix A). I asked participants to complete a background questionnaire that asked about their proficiency in Japanese and personal information (sex, gender, age, race/ethnicity, first language[s], etc.), which was used to construct the profiles of each participant (Table 1).

Table 1

Participant Demographics

	Lauren	Lily	Conrad	Candice
Gender	Female	Female	Male	Female
Age Range	18-24	18-24	18-24	18-24
Ethnicity	Other	Asian	Caucasian	Asian
First Language(s)	English, Japanese	English, Japanese	English	Chinese
Proficiency	Advanced	Low advanced	Mid-intermediate	Low intermediate

Note. The names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

3.3.1 Defining High-Intermediate

I used the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines (2012) to define "high-intermediate" proficiency.[4] Compared to other standardized proficiency guidelines, such as the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT), ACTFL's guidelines include writing, reading, listening, *and* speaking. Within the ACTFL guidelines are five proficiencies: distinguished, superior, advanced, intermediate, and novice. The latter three have sub-levels of

[4] The ACTFL guidelines list the main proficiency level followed by the sub-level (i.e., intermediate-high). However, I use the sub-level (i.e., "high," "mid," or "low") before the primary proficiency for better clarity. In this thesis, both high-intermediate and intermediate-high refer to the same level.

proficiency, which are low, mid, and high (ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, 2012). To define high-intermediate proficiency, I will also consider low-advanced and mid-intermediate levels. By doing so, I identify what high-intermediate speakers can do effectively and, at the same time, where they may struggle.

Additionally, the ACTFL guidelines have five categories that define each fluency: tasks, content, context, accuracy, and discourse (ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, 2012). Tasks describe how language speakers at each level can achieve different communicative tasks. Regarding tasks, speakers with mid-intermediate proficiency can easily communicate in various tasks and social situations. In contrast, high-intermediate speakers are more confident in communicating in these tasks. Low-advanced speakers can deal with a variety of communicative tasks. For context, mid-intermediate speakers can talk about immediate physically related topics, such as personal information, family, and daily activities. High-intermediate speakers also communicate topics that are physical but not immediate (i.e., school, work, and particular interests). In addition, when discussing work or school, low-advanced speakers can communicate abstractly related topics, such as current events or employment.

Discourse criteria includes using different tenses, length of speech, and linking meaning, varies among proficiencies. Low-intermediate speakers communicate one sentence at a time and need help linking their ideas and using different tenses. On the other hand, high-intermediate speakers can successfully communicate in all verb tenses and aspects and can link ideas within a paragraph length. However, these speakers can only maintain this performance for a duration of time compared to a low-advanced speaker. Furthermore, low-advanced speakers can connect multiple sentences to form a coherent discourse, but their descriptions and narrations are frequently separate rather than “interwoven” (ACTFL, 2012, p. 6).

Content criteria evaluates the level of vocabulary among speakers. Low-intermediate speakers have a more straightforward vocabulary compared to high-intermediate speakers. High-intermediate and low-advanced speakers can use complex vocabulary, but high-intermediate speakers struggle to maintain their vocabulary breadth. In addition, these speakers may use vocabulary that does not fit the context in which they find themselves. Low-advanced speakers have less difficulty retaining an extensive vocabulary but sometimes need help using a specific lexicon. Moreover, low-advanced speakers can generally be understood by native speakers not typically used to non-native speakers' speech –although there may be instances in which these speakers have to restate what they have said. High-intermediate speakers can also be understood by native speakers not usually accustomed to non-native speaking; however, there may be interferences in their communication that negatively influence their comprehensibility. As for mid-intermediate speakers, they are understood by native speakers who *are* accustomed to non-native speech.

To summarize, speakers with a high-intermediate proficiency can confidently communicate in various tasks and social situations and discuss topics unrelated to their physical surroundings. They can narrate in all verb tenses and link ideas within the length of a paragraph. However, unlike low-advanced speakers, they can only sustain this length sometimes. In addition, high-intermediate speakers can use complex vocabulary but cannot maintain the same range of vocabulary as low-advanced speakers. Finally, high-intermediate speakers can be understood by native speakers who are not used to non-native speaking. However, high-intermediate speakers may have some breakdown in their communication that affects their comprehensibility.

3.4 Data Collection and Analysis

3.4.1 Data Collection Instruments

The data collection instruments are described in the following sub-sections.

a. Pre-course Survey (Appendix E.I)

Pre-course surveys were used to understand students' initial perceptions and attitudes of NNSTs and NSTs. The surveys were administered online using Survey Monkey. Participants took approximately 30 minutes to complete the survey. Questions from Tsuchiya (2020) were modified to fit the purpose and context of the research. Students responded to twenty one statements that asked them about their perceptions and preferences towards NNSTs and NSTs and selected an answer from a 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree.[5] In addition, each Likert-scale question also featured an N/A option. The survey also had questions asking the students' thoughts about the course. At the end of the survey, open-ended questions (e.g., "which instructor do you prefer? Native or non-native Japanese-speaking instructor? Why?") were used to understand further students' thoughts and preferences of NSTs and NNSTs.

b. Post-Course Survey (Appendix E.II)

Post-surveys were used to understand the perceptions and beliefs of the NNST after the teaching period was finished. Post-course surveys were created similarly to the pre-course survey; however, questions that asked for students' information were omitted in the background section. In addition, I modified questions to ask students about their thoughts after taking the

[5] Out of the 21 statements, there is one duplicate question, which was aa oversight on my part. I decided to use the responses to cross-validate the participants' responses when the responses did not match.

course (e.g., “what goals did you achieve during this five-weeks?”). Participants took approximately 37 minutes to complete the survey.

c. Language Logs (Appendix E.II)

Each week during the instructional period, participants were asked to complete weekly language logs (Appendix E.II). These language logs provided students with guiding questions based on Bloom’s taxonomy (Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, and Evaluating) to facilitate critical reflection (Anderson et al., 2013). Specifically, these questions focused on the participants’ learning and the instruction of the NNST. The participants’ answers to these questions gave more insight into their perceptions and beliefs of the NNST. I followed the steps in Huang (2017) to enable students to reflect effectively. For example, during Unit 1, I briefly discussed the purpose of the language logs and clarified my expectations of learners as they reflected. I also encouraged students to use any modality (writing, video, or voice recording) to document their reflections (Huang, 2017).

d. Reflexive Journal

I wrote in a reflexive journal to ponder on my instruction. After each session, I documented what occurred in the class, recorded observations of the participants’ performance and understanding, and noted my instruction. Specifically, I considered what went well and what could be improved. Through these considerations, I implemented changes in future sessions.

e. Follow-up Interviews (Appendix E.V)

After the students submitted their post-course survey, they were invited to complete a 20 to 30 minute follow-up interview. These interviews were used to expand on the participants’ perceptions and beliefs stated in the pre- and post-course surveys and language logs. The interview contained eleven questions, with five personalized questions for each participant.

Sample questions include: “Reflecting on your experiences with the course, do you believe that the instructor helped you achieve those goals? How?;” “What is something you improved upon during this course?;” and “After taking the course, what did you think about the non-native Japanese-speaking teacher’s target language (Japanese) knowledge?” To allow them to answer as freely as possible, I did not interview the participants myself but instead hired research assistants to conduct the interviews. I provided a script (Appendix E. IV) and guiding questions (Appendix E.V) for the research assistants to use while interviewing participants and instructed them to record the interview sessions via Zoom and a cellular device as a backup.

3.4.2 Data Collection Procedures

The procedures involved in data collection are set out below.

a. Recruitment

With the department chair’s permission from a post-secondary language department, I began recruiting participants by posting recruitment material at the post-secondary institution and on social media (Facebook and Instagram). In addition, with permission from Japanese language and linguistics instructors, I visited courses that consisted of intermediate Japanese students to describe my research. After, I handed a sign-up sheet where students could put their email. I then contacted interested participants by sending a letter of invitation for them to access the implied informed consent form and online pre-course survey.

Participants who completed the pre-course survey confirmed their consent through the implied informed consent page at the start of the survey, following the approved ethical guidelines (protocol number: 22-0530). After participants completed the pre-course survey, I sent them a pre-test that assessed their grammatical and pragmatic knowledge of Japanese

honourifics (Appendix D). Once student participants were recruited, I sent a link to schedule possible class times for students to complete.

Data collection took place from February 21 to May 12, 2023. During this time, I taught participants for five-weeks. I instructed all four participants for the first unit, but due to scheduling conflicts, I had to divide the participants into two separate groups for the following four units. The content of each unit was not changed in any way; however, the instruction was modified based on students' feedback and my own reflections. All participants were asked to complete five language logs during the instructional period. Once participants completed their final language log, I sent them a link to the post-course survey, which they completed online. Then, I distributed a follow-up interview sign-up link to participants and set up interviews between the research assistants and the participants who indicated their willingness to do the follow-up interview. Interviews were held online via Zoom.

3.4.3 Data Analysis

a. Preparation: Transcription, Translation, and Verification

After each unit, I uploaded language logs to NVivo. Some language logs were sent to me as image files, so I typed out these entries into NVivo using the file function. In addition, some language logs were written in Japanese. In those cases, I translated these entries into English and had these translations verified by an L2 Japanese-speaking colleague. For interviews, I manually transcribed the two audio-interview recordings and used otter.ai, a transcription website, to transcribe the third interview. I verified all interviews for accuracy before coding.

b. Coding

The data gathered from the open-ended questions in the pre- and post-course survey, language logs, reflexive journal entries, and follow-up interviews were coded using content

analysis. I implemented steps from Huang (2019) to code the data. Firstly, I read all of the data multiple times in order to gain an understanding of the transcripts. Based on my initial readings of the reflexive journal entries, pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, and follow-up interviews, I completed the open-coding of all qualitative data sources by coding "meaning units" through labeling sections ranging from a single word to a paragraph length to describe a particular meaning (Huang, 2019, p. 6). I repeated this process a second time and then had a fellow Applied Linguistics graduate student at the University of Victoria code a randomly selected 30% of the data to establish inter-coder reliability. Using NVivo 12's coding comparison query function, I calculated coder agreement by sentence, which yielded various kappa coefficients, a statistical measure that indicates agreement that occurs by chance (Belur et al., 2021). During the first coding comparison, the kappa coefficient for reflexive journals was 0.25, 0.62 for pre-course surveys, 0.33 for post-course surveys, 0.8 for language logs, and 0.33 for follow-up interviews. Kappa scores below 0.4 are considered poor agreement, kappa scores from 0.40 to 0.75 indicate fair to good agreement, and kappa scores above 0.75 are considered excellent agreement (Belur et al., 2021). I met with the second coder to discuss coding that we disagreed on in order to establish stronger agreement. Through discussion, we realized that coding disagreements were mainly due to different interpretations of codes and inconsistencies in coding. For example, when coding data from the post-course survey, the second coder coded one participant's response "…I personally had a great experience especially because I found that a non-native instructor understands the difficulty of learning the language and had better insight that a native instructor" as *empathy* because the NNST understands the trouble that the student goes through, but I coded it as *learning a target language* because the NNST understands the difficulties because they themselves have learned the target language. After agreeing that these

interpretations were understandable, they were assigned to both codes. We also realized that the way we selected codes caused disagreements in the coding comparison. For example, when coding the interviews, the second coder accidentally included the interviewer's question along with the student's answer. Additionally, I selected all of one participant's answer while the second coder only selected the phrases that had meaning. We addressed these inconsistencies in coding, and, after reaching a consensus for all data sources, the kappa coefficients from the reflexive journal, post-course survey, and follow-up interviews were raised to 0.43, 0.42, and 0.48, respectively, indicating fair to good agreement. Additionally, I used NVivo's agreement percentages, calculated by comparing the coding agreement between two or more researchers on the same data (at sentence level) (Roaché, 2017). The percentages ranged from 92% to 98% for these sources, further confirming agreement. After completing this process, I reorganized themes or sub-themes by combining similar themes or deleting themes with no references and putting them in alphabetical order (see Appendix F).

Reflexive Journals: The main theme and sub-theme structure for the reflexive journal entries is presented in Figure 1. A total of 37 themes emerged, with 599 references.

Figure 1

Theme Structure for Coding Reflexive Journal Entries

Theme 1: Attitudes (n = 11)
- Sub-theme 1: Dissatisfaction (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 2: Embarrassment (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 3: Self-efficacy (n = 2)

Theme 2: Improvement (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic improvements(n = 1)
- Sub-theme 2: Task improvements (n = 4)

Theme 3: Improvement Suggestions (n = 7)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic suggestions (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 2: Task suggestions (n = 4)

Theme 4: Instruction (n = 10)
- Sub-theme 1: Culture instruction (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 2: Examples (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 3: Explanations (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 4: Focus on form (n = 42)
- Sub-theme 5: Pragmatic teaching (n = 8)

Theme 5: NNSTs' Strengths and Weaknesses (n = 184)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 51)
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic weaknesses (n = 25)
- Sub-theme 3: Other strengths and weaknesses (n = 8)
- Sub-theme 4: Pedagogical strengths (n = 78)
- Sub-theme 5: Pedagogical strengths (n = 22)

Theme 6: Students (n = 97)
- Sub-theme 1: Student backgrounds (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 2 Student challenges (n = 94)

Theme 8: Tasks (n = *252*)
- Sub-theme 1: Main-task (n = 57)
- Sub-theme 2: Post-task (n = 22)
- Sub-theme 4: Task processes (n = 47)
- Sub-theme 5: Task scenarios (*n* = 13)
- Sub-theme 6: Task strengths (n = 87)
- Sub-theme 7: Task weaknesses (n = 17)
- Sub-theme 8: Warm-ups (n = 21)

Theme 9: Topics (n = 33)
- Sub-theme 1: Topic choice (n = 27)
- Sub-theme 2: Topic strengths(n = 6)

Note. n = Number of references

Pre- Course Survey: The main and sub-theme structure for the pre-course survey is presented in Figure 2. A total of 33 themes emerged, with 168 references. (See Appendix F.II for the codebook.)

Figure 2

Theme Structure for Coding Pre-Course Survey

Theme 1: Asking Questions (n = 9)
- Sub-theme 1: NNSTs (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 2: Both (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 3: NSTs (n = 1)

Theme 2: Aspects of Communication (n = 7)
- Sub-theme 1: Both (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 2: NNSTs (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 3: NSTs (n = 3)

Theme 3: Course Participation (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 1: Both (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 2: NNSTs (n = 1)

Theme 4: Instructor Preference (n = 17)
- Sub-theme 1: Prefer both (n = 7)
- Sub-theme 2: Prefer NSTs (n = 7)
- Sub-theme 3: Prefer NNSTs (n = 3)

Theme 5: NNST Perceptions (n = 27)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 9)
- Sub-theme 2: Pedagogical strengths (n = 18)

Theme 6: NST Perceptions (n = 33)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 12)
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic weaknesses (n = 13)
- Sub-theme 3: Other strengths (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 4: Pedagogical strengths (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 5: Pedagogical weaknesses (n = 4)

Theme 7: Overcoming Challenges (n = 24)
- Sub-theme 1: Enthusiasm (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 2: Explanations (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 3: Keigo (n = 17)

Theme 8: Student Challenges (n = 9)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic challenges (n = 9)

Theme 9: Students (n = 38)
- Sub-theme 1: Learner goals (n = 9)
- Sub-theme 2: Student Background (n = 29)

Note. n = Number of references

Language Logs: The main theme and sub-theme structure for the language logs is presented in Figure 3. A total of 25 themes emerged, with 216 references. (See Appendix F.III for the codebook.)

Figure 3

Theme Structure for Coding Language Logs

Theme 1: Applicability (n = 44)
- Sub-theme 1: In Japan (n = 43)
- Sub-theme 2: Outside of Japan (n = 1)

Theme 2: Course Instructor (n = 29)
- Sub-theme 1: Instructor performance (n = 7)
- Sub-theme 2: Pedagogic strengths (n = 17)
- Sub-theme 3: Pedagogical weaknesses (*n* = 5)

Theme 3: Pedagogy (*n* = 50)
- Sub-theme 1: Instruction (*n* = 13)
- Sub-theme 2: Teaching materials (*n* = 37)

Theme 4: Student Challenges (n = 43)
- Sub-theme 1: Culture (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic challenges (n = 36)
- Sub-theme 3: No challenges (*n* = 2)
- Sub-theme 4: Other factors (*n* = 4)

Theme 5: Student Strengths (n = 33)
- Sub-theme 1: Learning strengths (n = 8)
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic strengths (n = 21)
- Sub-theme 3: Task strengths (*n* = 2)
- Sub-theme 4: Warm-ups strengths (*n* = 2)

Theme 6: Tasks (n = 13)
- Sub-theme 1: Task strengths (n = 11)
- Sub-theme 2: Task weaknesses (n = 2)

Theme 7: Warm-up Activities (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 1: Warm-up activity strengths (*n* = 4)

Note. n = Number of references

Post-Course Survey: The main theme and sub-theme structure for the post-course survey is presented in Figure 4. A total of 37 themes emerged, with 115 references. (See Appendix F.IV for the codebook.)

Figure 4

Theme Structure for Coding Post-Course Survey

Theme 1: Asking Questions (n = 7)
- Sub-theme 1: Both (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 2: NNSTs (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 3: Self-efficacy (n = 4)

Theme 2: Aspects of Communication (n = 8)
- Sub-theme 1: Both NNSTs and NSTs (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 2: NNSTs (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 3: NSTs (n = 3)

Theme 3: Course Participation (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 1: Both (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 2: NSTs (n = 1)

Theme 4: Course Recommendation (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 1: Do not recommend (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 2: Would recommend (n = 4)

Theme 5: Instructor Preferences (n = 18)
- Sub-theme 1: Both (n = 6)
- Sub-theme 2: NNST preference (*n* = 4)
- Sub-theme 3: No preference (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 4: NST preference (n = 7)

Theme 6: NNST Perceptions (n = 17)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 9
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic weaknesses (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 3: Pedagogical strengths (n = 6)
- Sub-theme 4: Pedagogical weaknesses (n = 1)

Theme 7: NST Perceptions (n = 23)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 10)
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic weaknesses (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 3: Other strengths (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 4: Pedagogical strengths (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 5: Pedagogical weaknesses (n = 3)

Theme 9: Students (n = 36)
- Sub-theme 1: Achievements (n = 11)
- Sub-theme 2: Influences on motivation (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 3: Progress in high-intermediate Japanese (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 4: Reasons to take the course (n = 9)
- Sub-theme 5: Learner background (n = 5)

Note. *n* = Number of references

Follow-up Interviews: The main theme and sub-theme structure for the follow-up interview is presented in Figure 5. A total of 41 themes emerged, with 154 references. (See Appendix F.V for codebook.)

Figure 5

Theme Structure for Coding Follow-Up Interviews

Theme 1: Applicability (n = 12)
- Sub-theme 1: In Japan (n = 9)
- Sub-theme 2: Outside of Japan (n = 3)

Theme 2: Changes in Learning (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 1: Changes (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 2: No changes (n = 2)

Theme 3: Course Instructor (n = 39)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 11)
- Sub-theme 2: Other strengths (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 3: Pedagogical strengths (n = 23)

Theme 4: Course Participation (n = 6)
- Sub-theme 1: Beyond nativeness (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 2: NNSTs (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 3: NSTs (n = 1)

Theme 5 Instruction Support (n = *8)*
- Sub-theme 1: Helpful (n = 6)
- Sub-theme 2 Neutral (n = 2)

Theme 6: NNST Strengths and Weaknesses (n = 23)
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic weaknesses *(n* = 4)
- Sub-theme 3: Other strengths (n = 1)
- Sub-theme 4: Other weaknesses (n = 4)
- Sub-theme 5: Pedagogical strengths *(n* = 8)
- Sub-theme 6 Pedagogical weaknesses (n = 1)

Theme 7: NST Strengths and Weakness (n = 26*)*
- Sub-theme 1: Linguistic strengths (n = 15)
- Sub-theme 2: Linguistic weaknesses *(n* = 1)
- Sub-theme 3: Other strengths (n = 7)
- Sub-theme 4 Pedagogical weaknesses (n = 3)

Theme 8: Students (n = 25)
- Sub-theme 1: Achieving goals (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 3: Improvement (n = 13)
- Sub-theme 4: Learner background (n = 5)
- Sub-theme 5: Learner motivation (n = 2)
- Sub-theme 6: Student challenges (n = 2*)*

Theme 9: Tasks (n = 3)
- Sub-theme 1: Strengths *(n* = 3)

Theme 10: Teaching Materials (n = 8)
- Sub-theme 1: Amount *(n* = 8)
- Sub-theme 2: General strengths *(n* = 2)
- Sub-theme 3:Variety of materials *(n* = 4)

Note. n= Number of references.

c. Quantitative Data Analysis

Using Excel, I analyzed the data gathered from the pre- and post-surveys by tallying and comparing participants' perceptions and beliefs from their responses to the Likert-scale questions in order to determine if (any) changes in their perceptions and beliefs were present after the five-week course.

Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter, I list key findings from all data collection sources. I share qualitative data from reflexive journal entries, pre- and post-course survey open-ended questions, weekly language logs, and follow-up interviews to determine what instructional practices were used by the NNST and what perceptions students and the instructor had in relation to these instructional practices. Next, I report the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data from the Likert-scale questions and reflexive journal entries, pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, and follow-up interviews to identify students' and instructors' perceptions and beliefs towards the NNST's capabilities in a high-intermediate Japanese class.

4.1 Instructional Practices

This section is set-up based on the themes and subthemes determined from the content analysis. First, I report findings from students' and my own reflections related to the strengths and weaknesses of tasks. Next, I state findings for improvements that I made to improve students' learning. Lastly, I elaborate on the types of instruction observed throughout the course, including instances of pragmatic aspects of verbal communication in the professional Japanese context instruction.

4.1.1 Task Strengths and Weaknesses

This section highlights the sub-themes *task strengths* and *task weaknesses* which emerged through the analysis of the reflexive journal entries, language logs, and follow-up interviews. Under the language logs and follow-up interviews, codes, such as pedagogical effectiveness, variety, and engagement, were determined. My perceptions of the tasks' strengths were identified through my reflections of specific tasks in my reflexive journal. Specifically, I commented on the strengths of DC tasks, elicited conversation tasks, role-plays, and post-tasks.

Starting with students' responses, Lauren, in the follow-up interview, highlighted that she was able to use her skills in "practice problems," which I "continually gave," indicating pedagogical effectiveness. Also in the follow-up interview, Conrad noted the variety of activities, saying there was a "good variety of activities throughout each class." When describing DC and role-play tasks, Lily used positive descriptors such as "fun" or "helpful" in the language logs, indicating engagement and usefulness of these tasks. As the instructor, I mentioned in my journal the pragmatic functionality of the DC tasks which was "to test [the students'] pragmatic knowledge" (Unit 4). To complete the DC tasks, students read aloud roles and filled in blanks with what grammar, words, or phrases they thought was the best based on the pragmatic clues they were provided. For example, when I taught Unit 2 to Group 2, the DC task had them visiting a colleague's house. One student used *'konnichiha'* (hello) rather than '*sumimasen'* (excuse me), which is a more polite phrase used when entering one's house. Regarding elicited conversation tasks, I reflected on this task's pedagogical effectiveness when Group 1 was completing an interview task in Unit 5, and they had to state their strengths and weaknesses: "Students did not seem to have trouble to come up with strengths and weaknesses, but had difficulties conveying their answers through an episode." In this task, I wanted students to communicate their strengths and weaknesses through a narrative which students had difficulty with. However, later on in my reflection, I stated "…I loved their answers regardless. They weren't perfect, which I told them was okay. It got them thinking." The strengths of role-plays were their pedagogical effectiveness in making students use the learned concepts. For example, in Unit 4, I taught students about service *keigo* (a type of *keigo* that is commonly used in retail) and rather than creating a scenario for students to use, I asked them to create a role-play script. I reflected in my journal, writing "I was very happy because [students] combined aspects from all

three [topics from that lesson].” Lastly, through post-tasks, students reflected on linguistic, pragmatic, and cultural aspects, which I considered a strength. For example, after a role-play on opinion sharing in Unit 3, I asked students what they thought about how one gives their opinion in Japan and Canada. Candice answered “*ukemi*” (passive), which reflected how Japanese people present their opinions in comparison to Canadians, who tend to be more direct.

Neither the students nor I explicitly commented on the weaknesses of the tasks themselves. Instead, students and I provided task design weaknesses in the language logs and reflexive journal entries, respectively. These are under the sub-themes *task design* and *tasks* in Figures 1 and 3. Within these sub-themes, six codes were generated from content analysis: poor task clarity, task difficulty weakness, limited task variety, and poor time management.

For poor task clarity, there were instances where I felt some tasks, including instructions or situations, were vague. For example, during a role-play task in Unit 3 where students had to provide an opinion to their team that quality should matter more than speed when releasing a new product. I reflected after teaching that “The situation was not clear enough… and caused students to do the activity differently [than what I intended].” Conrad also mentioned the issue of task clarity when discussing a DC task in the Unit 3 language log: “…I feel that filling in blanks in the example dialogues seemed quite long, and I wasn’t always sure what to say to fill them in.”

I also reflected on the weakness regarding task difficulty. Specifically, I coded instances where I thought tasks were above or below the students’ current level. Examples include: “I wonder if my task activities were difficult enough for the students’ level” (Unit 1) and “I think the tasks were a bit easy for this group” (Unit 2). Students finished tasks earlier than expected, which led me to believe that they were easy for students. I also conjectured that tasks might have

been easy for students in Group 1 because of their fluency in Japanese. Additionally, I reflected on the limited task variety after teaching Unit 5 to Group 1. I stated, "making tasks was quite difficult. I wanted to make creative and engaging activities that aided students' learning, but due to time, I ended up doing the same tasks with some variation." Lastly, for poor time management weakness, I noticed the extra time I had left in class and thought it was due to the number of activities: "We had a lot of time left over, unlike the other group. I don't know exactly why, but maybe I need to make more tasks in case they finish early" (Unit 2).

4.1.2 Linguistic and Task Improvements

During the five-week instruction, I made improvements to certain aspects to better students' learning in the following lessons for both groups. I created the main-theme for improvements, which consisted of two sub-themes: *linguistic improvements* and *task improvements*.

For *linguistic improvements*, I stated that I wanted to assist students with their *kanji* reading by including *furigana*, phonetic characters that represent the reading, next to difficult *kanji* (Chinese characters) in my reflexive journal. However, these modifications were not entirely successful because I observed that a student still struggled with reading the *kanji.* In my own reflection, there were many instances where I noted that my *kanji* reading was not how I wanted it to be. For example, I expressed that, "…I wasn't always 100% on the *kanji* reading, even though I put them on there! So embarrassing." (Unit 2) Thus, as a suggestion, I reflected that I should use simpler *kanji* to improve my own reading in Unit 5.

As for *task improvements*, I coded suggestions for DC tasks, role-play tasks, elicited conversation tasks, and post-tasks, and in general. For DC tasks, I offered the suggestion to include hints or to take out unnecessary sections to minimize student confusion (Unit 2). As for

role-plays, I wrote that I need to make clearer instructions after noticing that students created a conversation for both characters individually rather than working together to create a two-way conversation (Unit 3). The particular role-play activity was offering to help one's boss who is searching for someone who can speak French. The students created conversations for both themselves as the subordinate and the boss, instead of choosing roles. For elicited conversation tasks, I stated that I should provide more preparation time to lower task difficulty (Unit 5). Additionally, I also made improvements to post-tasks because I noticed that I did not explicitly incorporate these tasks. Thus, starting from Unit 4, I focused on implementing post-tasks by providing questions that prompted students to reflect on linguistic, pragmatic, and cultural aspects. For instance, after the lesson about service *keigo* (polite Japanese that is used within retail) was completed, I asked students what the strengths and weaknesses of service *keigo* and general *keigo*. As a general suggestion for all tasks, I noted that I should provide more time for students to plan before the main task commenced.

4.1.3 Types of Instruction

I also highlighted different forms of instructions which I developed as the main-theme when coding. The sub-themes under this main theme are *pragmatic instruction*, encompassing verbal and non-verbal communication within Japanese professional settings, *cultural instruction*, and *focus on form*.

As the course focused on pragmatics and speaking, there were aspects of verbal and non-verbal communication in a professional Japanese context that were taught to students. For instance, during Unit 5, I taught students about how to do an interview, which composed of job interview introductions, methods to show one's strengths and weaknesses, most common job interview questions, and how to answer these questions in an appropriate manner. In addition, I

also taught students non-verbal communication seen in interviews, such as bowing and body posture. For *cultural* instruction, I incorporated cultural notions into my pragmatic teaching. For example, in Unit 4 I taught students how to talk on the phone in a business setting which involved cultural notions that categorize social circles, *uchi* (inside) and *soto* (outside). Furthermore, I explicitly taught grammar, phrases, or steps, such as in Unit 3 when I provided steps on how to offer an opinion. Another example is in Unit 2 when I covered how to make a request, I went over a specific verb construction *~teitadakemasenka* ('would you please do [verb]?') and compared this form with a less polite form, such as V-*tekurenai* ('hey would you [verb] for me?'). I also went over the protocol on how to properly answer the phone in a Japanese professional context in Unit 4.

4.2 Students' Responses to Instructional Practices

From analyzing the pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, and follow-up interviews, I devised sub-themes connected to *students' goals*, *applicability of learned concepts*, *students' progression* after the five-weeks, *challenges*, and the *learning strategies* they used to overcome these challenges, as well as *recommendations* for myself to improve their learning. While not directly related to the course, students' goals indicated what they expected to gain from the NNST's instruction and the challenges are what students faced during their learning in the course.

4.2.1 Students' Goals

Students were asked goals they wanted to achieve in the pre-course survey and what goals they thought they achieved in the post-course survey. Lauren, Lily, and Conrad also stated how they improved in follow-up interviews.

In the pre-course survey, Lauren, Lily, and Conrad wanted to improve their knowledge of *keigo*. Conrad, for example, said "I hope that my understanding of *keigo* (when to use and general vocabulary)… will improve." Conrad also stated that they would like to improve their understanding of "Japanese business settings." On the other hand, Candice wanted to increase their confidence when using honourific forms. In the post-course survey and interviews, students reported having improved in their knowledge of and confidence in *keigo* or pragmatic situations. For example, Conrad stated: "I know in which situations using *keigo* would be appropriate, and I feel like I am able to overall understand *keigo* much better. As in, I can hear it and understand it, and respond in the correct manner." Lauren also expressed increased understanding of *keigo* and pragmatics in the post-course survey, "I was able to familiarize myself with honourifics as well as practice using it." Candice also noted in the post-course survey that she gained a "better understanding" of when to use *keigo* in various professional contexts. In the follow-up interview, Lily expressed improvement in pragmatic functions due to the examples, stating that "[the instructor] had very concrete examples, like with the interview. One lesson being dedicated towards interviews and not just… being able to speak politely but.. situationally how to speak correctly. And those were things I've never really learned."

4.2.2 Applicability of Learned Concepts

In weekly language logs, one of the questions students were prompted to consider was the applicability of the concepts they had learned. Students stated that they could use learned concepts both in professional and other settings within Japan and their home country. In Unit 2, Candice said, "If I work in Japan or work with Japanese I may need to use it." This unit focused on visiting a colleague's house and how to make and reject requests in a formal way. Conrad also highlighted using concepts from Unit 3, but not in a professional way. He expressed, "[I'm

planning on studying abroad, so when I first arrive at my host family's house, I will definitely remember to bring a gift, and be especially polite the first time I meet them." Both Lauren and Lily stated that they could use what they learned from Unit 4 if they were to make a reservation or work in the service industry. Furthermore, Lily commented on learning how to give opinions in Unit 3 and reflected on the differences in culture: "I can use [what I have learned] when I'm speaking to my Japanese friends, as I typically find myself being quite opinionated which is normal in English, but my speaking manner is probably thought as intimidating or confrontational among my friends." For Unit 5, which focused on interviews, Conrad said, "If I were to work in Japan, I think that this week will be a very good, solid case to work off of."

4.2.3 Progress in High-Intermediate Japanese

In the post-course survey, students were asked if they felt that they had progressed in high-intermediate Japanese during the five-weeks. Lauren, Lily, and Conrad agreed that they progressed, while Candice did not. Specifically, Lauren expressed improvement even though she had previous experience with the Japanese language: "I started with a good foundation and background which really helped, but I overall felt like I improved a lot." Lily acknowledged that they learned *keigo* before taking this course; however, they forgot most of it because they never had to use it while in Canada: "While *keigo* was taught to me while studying in Japan, [I definitely lost what I learned once I returned to Canada because I had no reason to remember it]." Conrad agreed that he progressed because he improved in *keigo,* stating that "I feel that after these five-weeks, I have gotten a lot more comfortable using *keigo* in conversations, and knowing when it would be appropriate to use *keigo* in the first place." Unlike other students, Candice did not agree that they progressed, but did not provide a reason.

4.2.4 Students' Challenges

Participants identified various language-learning challenges in pre-course surveys and language logs, which are represented by the main theme *student challenges.* Through the analysis of the pre-course survey, I identified instances where students had challenges regarding using *keigo* and maintaining their Japanese language proficiency. I put these codes under the sub-theme *linguistic challenges*. Lily stated that "speaking in *keigo*" was an obstacle, while Candice noted that the grammar used in *keigo*, specifically the "honourific form" and "[particles]," posed a challenge. Students also experienced trouble with switching between language styles or knowing when to use them. Conrad, Lily, and Candice were not sure when to use it. Conrad commented that "the other thing I should practice more is when to use *sonkeigo* [honourific language] versus when to use *kenjougo* [humble language]. I know generally, but when in conversation, sometimes it takes some time to remember which one to use." Candice stated that switching between language styles, such as *sonkeigo* to *teineigo* (polite language), was difficult. Similarly, students expressed challenge is speaking politely, while other students reflected on *keigo* grammar. During Unit 1, Lauren shared that they forgot some of the *keigo*-related rules. Lily shared this same sentiment, saying "I know what to include when introducing myself in a professional manner…but cannot speak *keigo* very well without stopping to think."

I also identified students' challenges related to reading *kanji*, vocabulary knowledge, and *keigo* in their weekly language logs under the same sub-theme. Conrad and Lily had difficulties with *kanji.* For example, during Unit 1, Lily stated that she had difficulty with *kanji* and had to use Google translate to get the readings. Conrad also was unable to understand the meanings of certain *kanji* and to read them in Unit 2. Furthermore, Conrad mentioned having difficulty with vocabulary, especially during the interview task in Unit 5: "The biggest thing for me was the

mock-interview at the end of class. I feel like I couldn't express myself as freely as I usually do because I don't know enough vocabulary related to the topic." The vocabulary issue that Conrad was referring to was connected to specific phrases used to showcase one's strengths and weaknesses during an interview process.

4.2.5 Strategies to Overcome Challenges

While reading the weekly language logs, I came across strategies that students used to overcome their learning challenges. These strategies are related to reading *kanji*, mitigating embarrassment, preparation, revision, and applying they learned. When overcoming challenges related to *kanji,* Lily and Conrad stated that they needed to prepare. Lily did so by noting down the readings of *kanji*. She expressed, "I think I faced less obstacles with *kanji* learning this week, as I was able to prep *furigana*" (Unit 3). In Unit 2, Conrad stated, "I looked up the meaning and practiced writing the *kanji* I didn't know." Furthermore, Lily mentioned in Unit 4 that they do not need to be embarrassed about asking what the readings for *kanji* were since she was "able to grasp and use situationally use" what she was learning.

Students also noted preparation beyond learning *kanji.* Conrad reflected on preparing before class, stating that, "I'll be sure to read ahead so that I can better read and comprehend the material" (Unit 3). Lauren also shared a sentiment about preparation in Unit 5: "I think I can improve even more by practicing more and preparing… so then I won't struggle when having to think of things to say when I am placed in a situation where I need to introduce myself." In addition to learning before class, Conrad and Candice also stated that it was important to revise. In Unit 1, Conrad mentioned "[taking] note of *kanji* or vocabulary" to study later would help overcome their challenges, while Candice stated that revision aided their improvement.

There were also many strategies related to applying what they learned, whether that be using *keigo* more as Candice reflected in Unit 1, or more generally. For example, Lauren expressed, "I think that one thing I can try doing is to practice using what I [learned] in real life to make sure I understand everything and that I don't forget" (Unit 1). Similarly, Conrad mentioned that they did not want to forget concepts that they learned, thus they mentioned "I think the best thing I can do to maintain the information that I've learned from this class is to make a weekly, or semi-regular routine of practice."

4.2.6 Learner Recommendations

In weekly language logs, students offered suggestions as to how I could improve their learning. The codes that were most prevalent were "early access to teaching materials" and "*kanji* learning." Other codes that I identified were related to pedagogy, such as "time management," "examples," and "explanations." I put these codes under the sub-theme *learner recommendations*.

Lily and Conrad requested for early access of materials to prepare *kanji* readings, familiarize themselves with the material, or to revise. Lily reflected, "I think it would help if I could have access to the PowerPoint before class so that I can just [add] *furigana* on my own time…" (Unit 2). In Unit 5, Conrad reflected on having resources earlier, saying "…having some additional resources provided to prepare for the class such as the slides… were really helpful in my aiding my comprehension, which in turn allowed me to get so much more out of the class."

Students also suggested adding *furigana* for difficult or unknown *kanji*. In addition, one student requested that I am more careful on what *kanji* I use on the slide. For example, in Unit 1, Lily stated, "If there were some more *furigana* for some of the harder *kanji* I would really appreciate it." Conrad also shared this sentiment saying to put *furigana* on "…*kanji* that are more

rare, or perhaps yet unseen by students of my approximate level." Furthermore, Candice expressed that I should be more cautious of what *kanji* I put on slides.

Students had other suggestions related to pedagogy. In Unit 1, Conrad noted "I do feel that sometimes we were given a bit too much time to do the practice dialogues. Unless it's very long, I'd say anywhere from 2-5 minutes should be plenty." I coded this code under "time management." During Unit 5, Lauren and Candice had suggestions related to "examples" and "explanations," respectively. Lauren, mentioned in their Unit 5 language log wanting to have more examples so that, "we can practice introducing ourselves and how we would do it differently depending on who we are talking to," whereas Candice wanted more detailed explanations.

4.3 Instructor's Perceptions

Through the analysis of my reflections, I developed a main-theme for NNSTs' strengths and weaknesses based on my self-perceived strengths and weaknesses as the NNS course instructor. The sub-themes under this main include *linguistic, pedagogical,* and *other strengths and weaknesses.* Additionally, I also created a main-theme which I titled "attitudes," which includes the sub-themes *embarrassed, dissatisfaction,* and *self-efficacy.*

4.3.1 Linguistic Strengths and Weaknesses

First, I report the linguistic weaknesses, which included codes for dissatisfaction of L2 use, poor reading of *kanji*, and lack of grammar knowledge. For dissatisfaction of L2 use, I coded any instance where I felt my usage of Japanese was not satisfactory. For example, in Unit 1, I reflected that, "I think I wasn't as fluent as I wanted to be. I stumbled and mispronounced things that I don't usually do." There were also instances where I had difficulties with reading *kanji* included in my instruction. For example, in Unit 2, I mentioned, "…while I was able to

read most *kanji*, there was one *kanji* that I couldn't read." Lastly, for lack of grammatical knowledge, there was an instance in Unit 3 where I could not explain a concept due to my grammatical knowledge. I stated, "…at one point I wanted to give an example to illustrate a step, but I couldn't [think of a good example]. The reason was because I didn't know the concept myself…."

Next, linguistic strengths were based on codes related to satisfaction of Japanese use, pragmatic knowledge, and adept *kanji* reading. Any positive aspect related to my L2 usage was coded under Japanese use. To give an example, at the end of the Unit 2, I reflected in my journal, "I think I spoke more Japanese than last time. So, I think that was good." Next, for pragmatic knowledge, I coded any instance where I used my understanding of Japanese honourifics and practical communication to provide explicit instruction and corrective feedback. For instance, during Unit 5, I noticed that one student did not use "*hai"* ('yes') nor "*ijyou*" ('done'), which are used at the beginning or end of an answer, respectively. I addressed these pragmatic failures because using these words when answering an interview question is polite and aids the flow of interviews.

4.3.2 Pedagogical Strengths and Weaknesses

There were many instances in my reflexive journal where I wrote about my pedagogical strengths and weaknesses. For pedagogical strengths, I noted codes for adept corrective feedback, enthusiasm, responses to learner feedback, provision of guidance, and skilled explanations. First, for corrective feedback, there were many times where I corrected students, specifically regarding appropriate usage of certain phrases. For example, in Unit 4, students were doing a DC task that focused on service *keigo.* During this task, one student said "*nannishimasuka*" ('what would you like to have?') instead of the polite counterpart

"*nanninasaimasuka*" ('what would you honourifically like to have?'), so I corrected them. For enthusiasm, I coded instances where I felt I was positive. For Unit 2, I wrote, "I was positive and engaging. At least, I felt I [was]." There were also times where I was excited about teaching a class. As an example, I wrote in my Unit 5 entry, "overall, I felt that I was engaging. I was quite excited to go over this lesson since I think it is the most practical." In Unit 5, the focus was on job interviews, which I felt was the most beneficial topic for students because they can use the concepts to get a job in Japan. For responses to learner feedback (Unit 4). I wrote, "I read the question, and found out that I used the wrong word for 'my own company' thanks to a student's feedback. After reviewing this feedback, I corrected the mistake." The word that I had used was "*tousha,*" which refers to "this company" rather than *"wagasha"* ('our company' or 'my company'). Relating to the provision of guidance, I wrote many accounts of prompting students, such as asking questions that encouraged students to reflect on form, pragmatics, or culture. For example, during a task in Unit 2 where students from had to request a professor to look at their mistakes, I prompted students to use previously learned concepts by saying "You have knocked on the door. What do you say?" and "Oh, you're leaving [their office]. What do you say?" There were also instances where I felt my explanations were strengths. For example, I noted, "I shared my thoughts about the difference. I discussed how *~mashōka* ("shall we~"?) is passive while ~(*sa)setekudasai* ("please let me do~") is more direct. These aspects are linked to politeness." (Unit 2). On the other hand, there were also cases where I felt that I had poor explanations, under the sub-theme *pedagogical weaknesses*. For example, during Unit 1, one student gave an answer which I wanted to clarify, but I failed. I stated, "I was trying to explain why the introduction wouldn't be 'short' per se because [the employee] moved to a new department. I could have explained it much better, but perhaps I didn't fully know why myself."

4.3.3 Other Strengths

I also listed strengths that were not linguistic or pedagogical in my reflexive journal. Particularly, I identified strengths in my cultural knowledge, research skills, and NNST capability. I included these codes in the sub-theme *other strengths.* First, regarding cultural knowledge, I wrote about using *uchi* (inside) and *soto* (outside) –cultural concepts which I knew before—to instruct business phone etiquette. These concepts are used to describe social circles; thus, an employee's language use may be different depending on who they are talking to. For example, if an employee was to introduce themselves to an employee from another company, they would use something like "[company name] *degozaimasu*" ('This is (honourifically) [company name]') in contrast to "[company department] *desu*," ('This is [company department]) which an employee could use when talking to a co-worker within the same company. Furthermore, I used my research skills to get information that was beyond the textbook I was using, such as when I used websites to learn about the processes of job interviews in Japan. Additionally, I collected common questions that are asked within a Japanese professional context and learned how to answer these questions. In addition, I found interesting material during research to supplement students' learning. For instance, I found a ranking of common misses, which I showed the students in Unit 3 after we went over how to apologize. This ranking of common misses refers to the most prevalent mistakes that are seen in Japanese professional contexts, such as "inputting errors" (i.e., typing errors) and "forgetting to do something that that needs to be done." Lastly, after I taught the last unit, I reflected on the class and noted my capabilities as a NNST. I wrote, "I proved to myself that as a NNST I can teach a high-level class, and not only that, I can teach a [class creatively]."

Table 2 summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the course instructor perceived by the instructor.

Table 2

Strengths and Weaknesses Determined by the Instructor

Strengths	Weaknesses
Linguistic	
Satisfaction of L2 use Pragmatic knowledge Adept *kanji* reading	Poor *kanji* reading Lack of grammatical knowledge
Pedagogical	
Adept corrective feedback Enthusiasm Response to learner feedback Provision of guidance Skilled explanations	Poor explanations
Other	
Cultural knowledge Research skills NNST capability	

4.3.4 Instructor Attitudes

As mentioned in the introductory paragraph of this section, I created three sub-themes related to attitudes: *embarrassed, dissatisfaction,* and *self-efficacy* were identified. These sub-themes reflected codes that I documented for three aspects: reading, speaking, and instruction. I felt embarrassed because of my poor reading of *kanji,* lack of preparation, and poor speaking skills. One example was when I instructed Unit 2. I stated, "in regards to *kanji*, I wasn't always 100% on the readings because I forgot, even though I put them on there! So embarrassing." I also expressed embarrassment because of my lack of preparation: "If I looked through the slides/documents that I made before the class started, I would have noticed the mistakes I made. The class turned out fine, but it was a bit embarrassing" (Unit 5). As for my lack of speaking

skills, I reflected on my Japanese: "my Japanese was awful. I slipped so many times with my pronunciation. At one point I purposefully read slower than I normally do. That was embarrassing" (Unit 2). For dissatisfaction, I commented on my lack of vocabulary breadth. I stated that "I think I used Japanese well enough, but my speaking wasn't varied. I need to improve more" (Unit 5). For self-efficacy, there were times where I felt my skills in Japanese affected my teaching. For example, I wrote "…because of my Japanese, I did not give the best explanations today" (Unit 4).

4.4 Observations of Students

Based on my own observations of the students, I wrote down in my reflexive journal my perceptions of the challenges that students seemed to have during the instructional period. I created a main theme for students, which includes the sub-theme *student challenges*.

4.5 Quantitative Results of Students' Perceptions

In this section, I report the quantitative data from the Likert-scale questions in the pre- and post-surveys, which all participants completed.[6] Key findings for participant responses are shown in Table 3. For raw data gathered from student rankings of pre- and post-course Likert-scale questions, refer to Appendix G.

Out of the 21 Likert-scale items about students' perceptions of NNSTs, responses to twelve items (i.e., 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 20) changed in a positive direction (i.e., a change from "disagree" to "agree" or from "neutral" to "agree"), responses to six items (i.e., 1, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 19) changed in a negative direction (i.e., a change from agree to disagree or from agree to neutral), and three items (i.e., 2, 11, and 21) remained the same. Thus, students' perceptions did change after the instructional period. However, these changes were small

[6] The number of respondents differ in the pre- and post-course survey due to the selection of N/A as a response by some participants.

because most perceptions changed from “disagree” to “neutral” or from “neutral” to “agree.” In the following section, I present the results obtained from specific categories within the Likert-scale questions. These categories include preferences towards NSTs or NNSTs, including NNSTs’ linguistic and pedagogical capabilities; NNSTs in beginner and intermediate courses; and lastly, training and qualifications of NNSTs and NSTs.

Items #1 (grammar instruction), #4 (use of formal expressions), and #6 (pronunciation) referred to NNSTs’ linguistic capabilities. In the pre-course survey, for item #1, 75% of students chose “neutral” while one student responded with “agree.” However, these perceptions seemed to change as revealed by the responses to the post-course survey with all students responding “neutral.” These results suggest that after the instructional period, students were impartial to NNSTs teaching grammar. For item #4 (formal expressions), all students chose “neutral” in the pre-course survey, but these perceptions changed with one student responding “disagree” and three quarters of students choosing “neutral.” From this, most of the respondents seem to be impartial about learning formal expressions from NNSTs, but there is also some disagreement. Regarding item #6 (pronunciation), all students chose “neutral,” but, in the post-course survey, students responded with either “disagree,” “neutral,” or “agree” regarding NNSTs’ pronunciation skills. These results suggest that students have mixed perceptions on whether to develop pronunciation skills from a NNST or not. The total averages of these items in the pre-course survey and post-course survey were 3.2 and 2.9, respectively. These mean ratings indicate that students were impartial towards NNSTs’ linguistic capabilities before the instructional period, but did not prefer NNSTs’ linguistic capabilities after the instructional period.

Next, items #3 (cultural instruction), #5 (lenient grading), and #7 (engagement) were pedagogically-related items. For item #3, which focuses on cultural instruction, half of

respondents chose “disagree,” while the other half chose “neutral.” On the other hand, in the post-course survey, three quarters of students chose “neutral,” indicating that after the instructional period, students seemed more indifferent towards the NNSTs’ cultural instruction. Next, for item #5, in the pre-course survey, half of respondents selected “disagree,” while the other half chose “neutral.” which indicates that students either were indifferent or agreed that NNSTs are lenient graders. In the post-course survey, students each selected “disagree,” “neutral,” or “agree.” From this, students had mixed perceptions on NNSTs’ grading. Finally, for item #7, all students responded with “neutral,” indicating that they are undecided on whether NNSTs are more engaging compared to NSTs. These perceptions changed in the post-course survey with one student responding “agree.” Thus, the majority of students’ perceptions towards NNSTs as engaging instructors are indifferent, but there is also some agreement as well. The total average for these items in the pre-course survey were 2.7, while in the post-course survey the total average was 3. These averages indicate that students did not prefer NNSTs’ pedagogical capabilities, but were indifferent towards NNSTs’ pedagogical capabilities after the instructional period.

Students were also asked about their general preference for NNSTs (item #16) and NSTs (item #17). In the pre-course survey, the majority of students (75%) chose “neutral” regarding NSTs, while 67% of students had neutral preference towards NNSTs. In the post-course survey, half of students were either indifferent or preferred NSTs after the instructional period. For NNSTs, half of the respondents chose “neutral,” while one student responded with “disagree,” and another student chose “agree.” Thus, after the instructional period, the majority of students’ preferences towards NNSTs and NSTs are impartial; yet, there is more preference for NSTs than NNSTs. The averages for students’ general preference towards NNSTs changed from 3.7 to 3.5

after the instructional period, while the averages for students' general preferences towards NSTs changed from 2.7 to 3. These averages suggest that students did prefer NNSTs before and after the instructional period. Contrastively, students did not prefer NSTs before the instructional period, but were neutral towards NSTs at the end of the instructional period.

Next, students were asked to respond to statements about their preferences for NNSTs teaching beginner speaking (#8), listening (#9), reading (#10), and writing classes (#11). For item #8, all of the respondents chose "neutral," which indicates that their preferences towards NNSTs in beginner speaking classes were indifferent. However, these preferences changed in the post-course survey with 67% of respondents choosing "neutral" and 33% of respondents choosing "disagree." Thus, while there is some disagreement, students seemed to be indifferent towards NNSTs teaching beginner speaking classes after the instructional period. For item #9, in the pre-course survey, 67% of respondents selected "neutral," while one respondent chose "agree." In the post-course survey, the majority of students (67%) were still neutral; however, one student responded with "disagree." Thus, after the instructional period, the majority of students were indifferent towards NNSTs teaching beginner listening classes, but there was also slightly less preferences as well. In item #10, which asked students' preferences for NNSTs in beginner writing classes, 100% of respondents chose "neutral" in the pre-course survey, but only 67% of respondents chose "neutral" in the post-course survey. The remaining 33% responded with "disagree." These results show that most respondents seemed to be indifferent towards NNSTs in writing classes, but there is also some who do not prefer NNSTs. Finally, for item #11 (beginner reading classes), 67% of respondents chose "neutral," while the remaining 33% chose "disagree." These perceptions did not change in the post-course survey, indicating that students were indifferent towards NNSTs that teach beginner reading courses; however, one student

seemed to not prefer NNSTs to teach beginner reading courses. The total averages of these items (i.e., #8, #9, #10, and #11) in the pre- and post-course survey were 3 and 2, respectively, which suggests that students were impartial toward NNSTs in beginner speaking courses before the instructional period but did not prefer NNSTs in beginner speaking courses at the end of the instructional period.

Additionally, students reported their preferences for NNSTs in intermediate speaking classes (#12), intermediate listening courses (2 and 13), intermediate writing classes (#14), and intermediate reading courses (#15). For item #12, the majority of students (67%) chose "disagree," while one student selected "neutral." These perceptions changed in the post-course survey with the majority of students responding with "neutral" and one student choosing "disagree." From this, students did not prefer NNSTs in intermediate speaking classes before the instructional period, but their preferences changed to impartial after the instructional period. Items #2 and #13 contained the same statement (NNSTs in intermediate listening classes); yet the perceptions are different. For item #2, in the pre-course survey, 67% of students selected "neutral," while one student chose "disagree." In item #13, the opposite was found. 67% of respondents chose "disagree," while one student chose "neutral." The post-course survey, the perceptions in item #2 remain the same, but for item #13, respondents chose either "disagree," "neutral," or "agree." Overall, these results indicate students' mixed perceptions of NNSTs in intermediate listening classes in that students are indifferent, but at the same time, unsure whether they prefer or do not prefer NNSTs in intermediate listening courses. Next, for item #14 (intermediate writing classes), 67% of respondents chose neutral while one student selected "disagree." Therefore, the majority of respondents were indifferent in learning intermediate writing from NNSTs. These perceptions change in the post-course with all students choosing

"neutral," which shows that students seem to be indifferent towards NNSTs in intermediate writing classes after the instructional period. For item #15 (intermediate reading classes), most students selected "neutral," while one student chose "disagree" in the pre-course survey; however, these perceptions changed in the post-course survey with all respondents choosing "neutral." Thus, while there was some disagreement about NNSTs teaching intermediate reading classes, participants seemed to be mainly impartial about their preferences. The total averages for these items are 1.9 in the pre-course survey and 2.2 in the post-course survey. These averages suggest that, overall, students did not prefer NNSTs in intermediate courses.

Item #18 and #19 deals with the language-teaching related training of NNSTs and NSTs, respectively. In the pre-course survey, all students responded with "disagree" for item #18. In contrast, for item #19, most students (67%) had neutral preference towards NSTs. The remaining student responded with "agree." These results indicate that some students are impartial towards NSTs despite them not having training, while one student prefers NSTs that do not have training. In the post-course survey, students' perceptions changed for NNSTs and NSTs that do not have training. Individual students responded with "disagree," "neutral," or "agree" for NNSTs, indicating mixed preferences. In contrast, the majority of students (67%) preferred NSTs that do not have training in language teaching, while one student did not prefer NSTs without training in language teaching. In the pre-course survey, preference for NNSTs who do not have language training was 2.3, and 1.5 in the post-course survey. In comparison, preference for NSTs who do not have language training was 2.5 in the pre-course survey, but 2.3 in the post-course survey. Based on these means, students did not prefer NNSTs who did not have any language-teaching related training before or after the instructional period. Similarly, students did not prefer NSTs who did not have any language-teaching training before or after the instructional period.

Finally, items #20 (NNSTs are qualified Japanese instructors) and #21 (NSTs are qualified Japanese instructors) probed students' perceptions of qualified instructors. For item #20 67% of students disagreed that NNSTs are qualified Japanese instructors, while one student chose "neutral" in the pre-course survey. In the post-course survey, these perceptions changed with students choosing either "disagree," "neutral," or "agree." For item #21, all students perceived NSTs as qualified instructors, and this perception did not change in the post-course survey. Students' responses to item #20 averaged 2.5 in the pre-course survey and 2.3 in the post-course survey. For item #21, students' responses to item #21 was 4 in the pre-course survey and 3 in the post-course survey. These averages suggest that students did not think that NNSTs as qualified instructors before or after the instructional period. In comparison, students did agree that NSTs were qualified instructors before the instructional period but, after the instructional period, were indifferent towards NSTs as qualified instructors.

Table 3

Students' Perceptions towards NNSTs and NSTs

	Pre-course Survey					Post-course Survey				
Item	*N*	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	***M***	*N*	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	***M***
1.When it comes to studying grammar, I prefer a non-native Japanese teacher.	4	0%	75%	25%	**3.5**	3	0%	100%	0%	**3**
2. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate listening classes.	3	33%	67%	0%	**2.7**	3	33%	67%	0%	**2.3**
3. When it comes to learning about the culture of the foreign language, I prefer a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher.	4	50%	50%	0%	**2.5**	4	25%	75%	0%	**2.8**
4. When it comes to learning formal expressions, I prefer a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher.	3	0%	100%	0%	**3**	4	25%	75%	0%	**2.5**

5. When it comes to grading, I think a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher is more lenient.	4	50%	50%	0%	**2.5**	3	33%	33%	34%	**2.8**
6. I want to develop pronunciation skills like a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher.	3	0%	100%	0%	**3**	3	33%	33%	34%	**3**
7. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers for their engaging language teaching.	3	0%	100%	0%	**3**	4	0%	75%	25%	**3.3**
8. I prefer non-native Japanese speaking teachers in beginner speaking classes.	2	0%	100%	0%	**3**	3	33%	67%	0%	**2**
9. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in beginner listening classes.	3	0%	67%	33%	**3.3**	3	33%	67%	0%	**2**
10. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in beginner writing classes.	3	0%	100%	0%	**3**	3	33%	67%	0%	**2**
11. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in beginner reading classes.	3	33%	67%	0%	**2.7**	3	33%	67%	0%	**2**
12. I prefer non-native Japanese speaking teachers in intermediate speaking classes.	3	67%	33%	0%	**2.3**	3	33%	67%	0%	**2**
*13. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate listening classes.	3	67%	33%	0%	**2**	3	33%	33%	34%	**2.3**
14. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate writing classes.	3	33%	67%	0%	**2.7**	3	0%	100%	0%	**2.3**

15. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate reading classes.	3	33%	67%	0%	**2.5**	3	0%	100%	0%	**2.3**
16. In general, I prefer native Japanese-speaking teachers.	4	25%	75%	0%	**3.7**	4	0%	50%	50%	**3.5**
17. In general, I prefer non-native Japanese speaking teachers.	3	33%	67%	0%	**2.7**	4	25%	50%	25%	**3**
18. If my teacher is not trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers.	3	100%	0%	0%	**2.3**	3	33%	33%	34%	**1.5**
19. If my teacher is not trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer native Japanese-speaking teachers.	3	0%	67%	33%	**2.5**	3	33%	0%	67%	**2.3**
20. When I think of a qualified Japanese teacher, I think of a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher.	3	67%	33%	0%	**2.5**	3	33%	33%	34%	**2.3**
21. When I think of a qualified Japanese teacher, I think of a native Japanese-speaking teacher.	4	0%	0%	100%	**4**	3	0%	0%	100%	**3**

Note. N = Respondents who answered "disagree," "neutral," or "agree*";* * = duplicate question of item #2; M = mean

4.6 Qualitative Results of Students' Perceptions of NSTs and NNSTs

In the next section, I report the qualitative findings of students' perceptions derived from open-ended questions in pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, and follow-up interviews. This section is divided by the strengths and weaknesses of both the NSTs and NNSTs and the

NNS course instructor, followed by what students perceive NSTs and NNSTs can teach. Furthermore, I report students' preferences of NSTs and NNSTs and which instructor they favour for asking Japanese language questions.

4.6.1 NST and NNST Strengths and Weaknesses

Through coding the open-ended questions in pre- and post-course surveys and the follow-up interviews, I developed main themes for NNST, NST, and course instructor strengths and weaknesses. The sub-themes under these main themes include *linguistic, pedagogical,* and *other strengths and weaknesses*.

Linguistic Strengths and Weaknesses. In the pre- and post-course surveys and follow-up interviews, students highlighted various strengths and weaknesses that NNSTs and NSTs. Conrad, Lauren, and Lily stated that NNSTs have experience learning Japanese-as-an-additional language. In the pre-course survey, Conrad mentioned, "I do think that non-native instructors could have the edge in terms of grammar… as the non-native instructor has most likely been down the path that their students are on." Similarly, in the post-course survey Lauren expressed that NNSTs can offer "better insight" than NSTs because they "understand the difficulty of learning [a second] language." Lily commented on the NNSTs' understanding of specific struggles that second language learners experience: "I definitely thought having a non-native speaker was more helpful, as they know the struggle of learning *keigo* and *kanji*…." Additionally, Lily noted the NNSTs' strength of speaking the native language of students which is beneficial if she were to ask NNSTs language learning questions. Candice expressed in the post-course survey: "[NSTs] may not understand the difficulties that non-native [speakers] will face when learning Japanese" which indicates their weakness in lacking experience learning Japanese-as-an-additional language. However, students reported positive aspects of NSTs'

speaking skills and noting NSTs' native proficiency as a strength. For example, Conrad used "innate" and "natural" when describing the course instructor's speaking skills. Furthermore, pronunciation was also noted to be a strength of NSTs. For example, when asked about their thoughts about NSTs and NNSTs in the post-course survey, Conrad stated, "I still have to give a slight bias towards native Japanese-speaking instructors, as their Japanese pronunciation will most likely be better…." Additionally, NNSTs' proficiency and pronunciation were deemed as weaknesses because they are "not fully native," as stated by Lauren. Furthermore, Conrad mentioned that "native speakers just have that advantage [of pronunciation]…. I don't think that's something that can really be overcome for most non-native speakers."

Pedagogical Strengths and Weaknesses. In both the pre- and post-course survey, Lily considered NNSTs to have lenient corrective feedback and, NSTs to have harsh feedback. In the pre-course survey, Conrad highlighted NNSTs' strength in providing learning advice because of their experience as a second language learning: "…I feel like I would get a better answer from the NNST as they have most likely been in my position as a student at one point in their life, and therefore would be able to give me better advice." Also in the pre-course survey, Candice expressed NNSTs' strength in empathy as they "understand the difficulties non-native speakers may face when learning the language." Both NNSTs and NSTs shared explanations as a strength. For NNSTs, Lily and Conrad reported that NNSTs can explain how communication worked for them while in Japan and can give in-depth explanations of complex grammar. For NSTs, Lily reported in the pre-course survey that they are able navigate questions with more ease.

For pedagogical weaknesses, Lily highlighted that NNSTs put more focus on non-native speaking students rather than ethnically Japanese students. For NSTs, Lily stated that they may skip over concepts that they deem as "common knowledge." Additionally, Conrad noted NSTs'

weakness in explaining grammar points, whereas Candice highlighted this weakness in their post-course survey, stating that "[NSTs may not understand the difficulties that non-native speakers face learning Japanese]."

Other Strengths and Weaknesses. Strengths and weaknesses that did not directly relate to linguistics or pedagogy were also reported by students. First, students positively described NNSTs' and NSTs' cultural understanding. However, students' perceptions differed regarding NNSTs' and NSTs' experiences within Japan. When discussing NNSTs' weaknesses, Lily noted that NNSTs may not have authentic experiences in comparison to NSTs, especially if the NNST's appearance is non-Japanese. NSTs, on the other hand, having lived in Japan have many experiences that are genuine. Conrad noted this as well, saying that NSTs have been educated in Japan. Furthermore, in the follow-up interview, Lauren emphasized that instructors should know both the Japanese language and culture regardless of their native or non-native background, stating that: "…I think it's important to learn a language from someone who not only knows the language but is very much immersed and understand the culture as well."

Tables 4 and 5 summarize students' perceptions of NNSTs' and NSTs' strengths and weaknesses.

Table 4

NNST Strengths and Weaknesses as Perceived by Students

Strengths	Weaknesses
Linguistic	
Experience learning a second language Strong grammatical knowledge Speak the native language	Poor speaking skills Poor pronunciation
Pedagogical	
Lenient corrective feedback Detailed explanations Empathetic Provide learner strategies	Focus on non-native speaking students
Other	
Cultural knowledge	Lack of authentic experience

Table 5

NST Strengths and Weaknesses as Perceived by Students

Strengths	Weaknesses
Linguistic	
Natural speaking Native pronunciation	Inexperience learning a second language
Pedagogical	
Efficient explanations Natural examples	Harsh corrective feedback Skip concepts that are "common knowledge"
Other	
Cultural knowledge Lived experiences	

4.6.2 Course Instructor's Strengths and Weaknesses

Students also expressed specific strengths and weaknesses of the course instructor in the language logs and/or follow-up interviews.

Linguistic Strengths of the Course Instructor. During the follow-up interviews, students were asked questions about my second language knowledge, and communication skills or language proficiency. For linguistic knowledge, Lauren commented on my L2 understanding

and stated that they were impressed with my knowledge. As for communication skills and language proficiency, Lily stated that it was “fluent.” Conrad described my skill in explaining, stating that it was “clear.”

Pedagogical Strengths and Weaknesses of the Course Instructor. When asked about my pedagogical capabilities, students commented on aspects related to corrective feedback, concrete examples, activity variety, skilled explanations, encouragement, and effective instruction. In addition, students also commented on my pedagogical weaknesses during weekly language logs, which included lack of detailed explanations and difficult examples.

Lily described my corrective feedback as “firm but gentle” in the follow-up interview. For examples, Lily mentioned the effectiveness of my examples due to their “concrete” nature. As for activities, Conrad appreciated the activity variety and also stated that they had a “smooth learning process” when discussing my explanations in the follow-up interview. Lauren also shared that they appreciated my “encouragement” in the Unit 3 language log. Lauren, Lily, and Conrad also expressed that they learned many things through each class, indicating the effectiveness of the instruction.

Students also shared some weaknesses in weekly language logs; particularly, the lack of detailed explanations and difficult examples. For explanations, Candice stated in the Unit 5 that they wanted more detailed explanations when asked if the teaching of materials helped or hindered their learning. As for difficult examples, Lauren noted in Unit 4. “some of the examples were a bit tricky…,” but they did not explain why.

Other Strengths and Weaknesses of the Course Instructor. Students expressed in the follow-up interviews my strength in cultural knowledge, which did not fall under pedagogical or linguistic category. Particularly, students seemed to be satisfied with my Japanese cultural knowledge. Lauren commented on the amount of cultural information I offered, while Lily noted the specificity of my cultural knowledge, stating that "… a lot of it was things you would only know had you been there and studied there…."

Table 6

Course Instructor's Strengths and Weaknesses Perceived by Students

Couse Instructor	
Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Linguistic	
Second language knowledge Fluent proficiency Clear communication	
Pedagogical	
Firm and gentle corrective feedback Concrete examples Activity variety Encouragement Effective instruction	Lack of detailed explanations Difficult examples
Other	
Cultural knowledge	

4.6.3 Aspects of Communication

In the pre- and post-course survey open-ended questions, students were asked what aspects of communication (i.e., job interviews, requesting information, stating an opinion, etc.) they think native or non-native Japanese-speaking teachers are qualified to teach, which developed as a main theme. Under this main theme, I identified three sub-themes related to both NNSTs and NSTs, NNSTs, and NSTs for both surveys. In the pre-course survey, Candice stated

that both instructors can teach pragmatic aspects, such as interviews or stating an opinion. Conrad stated that as long as the instructor has experiences related to aspects of communication, NNSTs and NSTs can teach or offer their opinion on these activities (e.g., job interviews, requesting information, stating an opinion, etc.). Lauren also expressed that both instructors are qualified to teach any aspect of communication. Lily commented that NSTs can teach communication styles. In the post-course survey, some students' answers changed. Lauren agreed that NNSTs can teach any aspect, but for NSTs, they stated, "I think that a native teacher would have experience in Japan and so they would have insight on personal interaction that would be helpful when teaching communication." Lily noted that NSTs can teach "unspoken dialogue," such as body language. As for NNSTs, Lily stated that they can teach pragmatic aspects (i.e., interviews, or how to introduce one's self). Candice disagreed that NNSTs are qualified to teach aspects of communication, while NSTs are. Conrad did not change their perception in that both instructors are qualified to teach if they have the experiences or proficiency: "I think that any Japanese instructor who has had those types of experiences or is an extremely proficient in Japanese would be qualified to teach the aspects of communication mentioned [(e.g., job interviews, requesting information, stating an opinion, etc.]."

4.6.4 Instructor Preferences

Students indicated their preferences for NNSTs or NSTs in pre- and post-course surveys and follow-up interviews. In the pre-course survey, all participants stated that they would prefer NSTs. However, their perceptions changed in the post-course survey. At first, Lily stated that they would be interested in having a NNST to teach them grammar. In the post-course survey, they stated that they would be fine with both native and non-native instructors because of their differing strengths. However, Lily would be more willing to learn from NNSTs because of their

lenient corrective feedback. Other students preferred NSTs or NNSTs because of their specific strengths. For example, in the post course survey, Candice reported a preference towards NSTs because of their cultural knowledge, while Lauren preferred NNSTs because of their experience learning Japanese as an additional language. However, it is important to note that Lauren stated in the post-course survey and the follow-up interview that rather than the nativeness of instructor, the teacher's attitude influences their learning. As for Conrad, he noted in the pre-course survey that he would be willing to have a NNST as well because of their experience learning Japanese-as-an-additional language, grammatical knowledge, and language-learning advice. Later, however, Conrad noted in the follow-up interview a slight preference towards NSTs if the focus is on speaking:

> I do think that as I get to a higher level that perhaps a native speaking teacher might be a bit more advantageous for me as a student because I'd just be listening to more natural, native Japanese as I'm taking the class that just implicitly improves my pronunciation. But, if that's not the focus of the classes that I'm taking, then I don't see an issue with whether the instructor would be a native speaker or not.

Based on these findings, students' preferences for NNSTs and NSTs are shaped by individual instructor's individual strengths and weaknesses, or in some cases, their attitudes.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In this chapter, I synthesize the results in the previous chapter to discuss key patterns from my data. Section 5.1 discusses how my results answer the two research questions. Section 5.2 presents the empirical, methodological, and practical implications of this research. Section 5.3 lists the study's limitations and proposes potential directions for future research. Lastly, Section 5.4, I conclude the thesis.

5.1. The Research Questions

The primary aim of my study was to investigate two fundamental questions within the context of a high-intermediate Japanese class. First, I investigated the instructional practices used by a NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese class. Second, I examined the perceptions and beliefs held by both students and the instructor regarding the capabilities of a NNST within the same high-intermediate Japanese class. This section discusses these questions in light of my findings.

5.1.1 Research Question 1: What are the instructional practices used by the NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese class?

a. Task strengths and weaknesses. The various tasks used to instruct professional Japanese have strengths. Students highlighted the variety and engagement of tasks in language logs and follow-up interviews, while I reported the tasks' capability to test students' pragmatic knowledge, as well as allow students to reflect on linguistic and cultural aspects of Japanese, in the reflexive journal entries.

The strengths of the tasks relate to some of Ellis' (2005) principles of instructed language learning. According to Ellis (2005), pragmatic meaning is vital for language learning. The tasks implemented in the course allowed students to primarily focus on pragmatic meaning (i.e., "…meanings that arise in acts of communication" (Ellis, 2005, p. 211) rather than grammatical

forms. Related to what students deemed as strengths, the variety of tasks allowed them many opportunities to use and develop their pragmatic knowledge, which, in turn, motivates them intrinsically (Ellis, 2005). Students also had opportunities to learn specific forms (i.e., lexical or grammatical) implicitly through tasks and explicitly through instruction. Furthermore, Ellis (2005) states that learners require L2 input and output, as well as opportunities to interact with one another in the target language. I provided students with input by using Japanese in the instruction and reading out task scenarios before they commenced the main task. Students were provided many opportunities to use Japanese, either by stating the answers to DC tasks, performing script tasks aloud, or by acting out a role-play or elicited conversation task. Specifically, through role-play and elicited conversation tasks, students interacted with each other or myself to negotiate meaning.

5.1.2 Research Question 2: What are the perceptions and beliefs of students and an instructor towards a NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese class?

a. Students' preferences for NNSTs. The quantitative data suggests that students, on average, did prefer NNSTs after the instructional period. However, students did not prefer NNSTs in beginner speaking, listening, reading, and writing courses. These results could be influenced by the NNSTs' linguistic weaknesses, which students highlighted in the qualitative data collection instruments (i.e., pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, and follow-up interviews), such as poor pronunciation and poor speaking. However, the qualitative data stated otherwise. Students preferred both NNSTs and NSTs because of their differing strengths. In addition, students went beyond nativeness by basing their preferences on the instructor's teaching attitudes. These findings are similarly expressed in Uzum (2018) who discusses the attitudes of students toward NESTs and NNESTs, stating that "...it is clear that students do not

have a preference for one group over another. They reflect on their teachers' linguistic, personal, pedagogical, and professional skills, alluding to what they think good teaching is" (p. 5). Quantitative data collection methods might not effectively capture these perceptions because students cannot fully express their thoughts (Thompson & Fioramonte, 2013). Consequently, the utilization of both the quantitative and qualitative approaches allowed me to gather students' perceptions regarding NNSTs and NSTs.

b. Strengths and weaknesses of NNSTs. The results from this study suggest key NNST strengths and weaknesses which were identified by myself and students. First, NNSTs can offer an empathetic approach of teaching additional languages. The journey of NNSTs as L2 learners provides them with a unique perspective. Their empathy and specific explanations, rooted in personal experience, often resonate with many students. NNSTs' shared journey of learning Japanese as an additional language adds a layer of relatability to their teaching. For example, Lily commented on the NNST strength in their lenient corrective feedback, contrasting with the harsh feedback from NSTs. This leniency often stems from NNSTs' own experiences with learning the language. Furthermore, their ability to provide in-depth explanations, especially on complex grammar topics, resonated with many students. As students in this study reported, such detailed explanations are often accompanied by relevant learning strategies, making the learning experience more relatable and compelling. These results are supported by previous research, which suggests that NNSTs have more pedagogical strengths than NSTs, such as leniency, empathy, and ability to give detailed explanations because of their knowledge of L2 grammar (e.g., Moussu, 2018a, 2018b; Tsuo & Chen, 2019; Sakurai, 2012).

However, NNSTs may face perceptions by others for not having authentic experiences compared to NSTs. Lily's feedback, for instance, touched on the idea that NNSTs might have

fewer genuine experiences, especially if their physical appearance does not fall into the target culture. Such concerns suggest that while NNSTs might excel in explaining the mechanics of the L2 because of their grammatical knowledge, they might sometimes fall short in imparting cultural nuances and pragmatic experiences because of limited exposure in the target language. This finding could be linked to L2 speaker legitimacy (Takeuchi, 2023) because L1 speakers effectively determine who can speak the language and who cannot. These authentic experiences, as students believe, can be pivotal in truly understanding and learning a language. There is also the perception that NNSTs have shortcomings in their speaking skills and pronunciation, which Conrad highlighted in the post-course survey and follow-up interview. Moreover, some students noted some potential areas of improvement related to instruction. For example, Lily suggested that I add *furigana* to *kanji* to improve text readability.

c. Strengths and weaknesses of NSTs. Students also shared their perceptions of NSTs. In contrast to NNSTs, students value NSTs' native linguistic proficiency. This perceived proficiency in the language manifests in more than just the NSTs' ability to communicate fluently. For instance, Conrad commented on the" innate" and "natural" speaking skills of NSTs. Beyond fluency, this perceived ability encompasses a deep-rooted understanding of the subtle nuances in pronunciation, intonation, and rhythm that usually only native speakers have.

NSTs' pronunciation and innate speaking are heavily noted by students as advantages because the NS instructors give students' an example of what to achieve (e.g., Cheng, 2019; Medgyes, 1994; Sung, 2011; Tsuchiya, 2020; Xiong & Earmoraphan, 2020). However, these perceived strengths need to be questioned because they are problematic for NNSTs who, because of these perceptions, lack confidence in their L2 pronunciation. A study from Levis et al. (2016) showed that the instructor's linguistic background did not affect students' overall improvement

in their comprehensibility (i.e., “the amount of work it takes listeners to process speech”) and accentedness (i.e., “the amount of difference from the accent in a given locale”) (Levis et al., 2016, p. 900). Thus, while students perceive NNSTs to be less proficient instructors in pronunciation, this perception may not be entirely accurate.

Furthermore, students discussed NSTs’ authentic experiences as a strength, which is supported by extant research who suggest that NSTs are perceived to have a stronger understanding of the target culture (Huang, 2019; Tsuo & Chen, 2019). Lily's comment emphasized the distinct advantage that NSTs have in teaching pragmatics through their firsthand experiences. The ability of NSTs to incorporate their teachings with real-world examples drawn from their personal encounters and cultural immersion can contribute to students’ learning. These perceptions again align with Takeuchi’s (2023), findings. However, unlike being constrained by their physical appearance, NSTs are able to use the target language without restriction, gaining a deeper understanding of its practical usage.

5.2 Empirical, Methodological, Practical, and Pedagogical Implications

5.2.1 Empirical Implications

In the following section, I highlight findings that are not reported in previous studies, namely: the potential for NNSTs to be useful in teaching high-intermediate language courses; NNSTs teaching pragmatic focused classes; students’ indifferences towards NNSTs and NSTs; notable strengths of NNSTs; a link between perfectionism and dissatisfaction among NNSTs; and potential influence of NSTs’ implicit knowledge on L2 students’ learning.

a. The potential for NNSTs in teaching high-intermediate language courses. First, my study is one of the only studies to explore NNSTs in a high-intermediate class (as opposed to other proficiency levels). Research on NNSTs teaching high-intermediate classes is limited due

to the native speaker fallacy, resulting in NNSTs to be assigned to lower-level classes (Kickozwiak & Wu, 2018; Thompson & Fioramonte, 2013; Xiong & Earomorphan, 2020). To my knowledge, only one study has examined a NNST within an EFL high-intermediate to low-advanced course (Subtirelu, 2011); yet the study did not examine the perceptions of the instructor or students. Through the examination of students' perceptions and beliefs, my findings suggest that students can succeed in achieving their goals when learning from a NNST. Furthermore, my reflection after teaching the course revealed that NNSTs can teach high-intermediate courses. These findings give promise to future NNST research since it provides empirical evidence that NNSTs can teach high-level courses.

b. NNSTs teaching pragmatic speaking-focused classes. The results from this study demonstrate that NNSTs are able to teach pragmatic classes that focus on speaking which, to my knowledge, is a notable finding that has not been explored by previous research. One study from Savvidou and Economidou-Kogetsdis (2019) examined EFL NNSTs' knowledge of pragmatics, specifically in writing emails. They lacked theoretical knowledge of pragmatics, but these teachers were able to use their experiences which were "based on their own experiences as people, learners and teachers" to identify pragmatic issues. For example, one instructor commented on greetings and conclusions while another talked about intercultural importance. These findings showed that NNSTs possess pragmatic knowledge, but they do not provide evidence that NNSTs are able to instruct pragmatic-focused speaking classes. In comparison, my findings illustrated that I was able to teach a class that focused on pragmatic aspects related to professional Japanese communication, such as self-introductions, requesting and rejecting, and interviewing. The research findings contribute to the NNST field by providing new knowledge about NNSTs and spoken pragmatic instruction; however, more research on this area is required

in order to determine the full extent of NNSTs' skills in this linguistic area. Future research may consider comparing NSTs' and NNSTs' pragmatic instruction within the classroom to determine their individual strengths and weaknesses.

c. Students' indifference towards NNSTs and NSTs. The quantitative results suggested that students did not prefer NNSTs in the beginner class after the instructional period, a finding that challenges existing research (e.g., Alseweek, 2012; Colmenero & Lasagabaster, 2020; Xiong & Earomorphan, 2020). Previous research shows that students preferred NNSTs at beginner levels because of their strengths, such as their grammatical knowledge, experience with learning the target language, and ability to speak the native language of the students (e.g., Cheng, 2019; Colmenero & Lasagabaster, 2020; Xiong & Earomorphan, 2020). The qualitative findings indicated that students' preferences toward NNSTs and NSTs go beyond their nativeness. The students listed differing strengths of both instructors, such as the NNSTs' grammatical knowledge and NSTs' perceived advantage in pronunciation and speaking. For instance, Conrad stated that he preferred NSTs because as he progressed in Japanese, learning from NSTs was more advantageous. However, if the focus of the class was not on speaking, then having a NST was less critical. In contrast, Lauren thought that the teacher's attitude in the classroom was more of a factor in their preference rather than the nativeness of the instructor, which is echoed in Uzum's (2018) study of students' attitudes towards NNSTs and NSTs.

d. Notable strengths of NNSTs. My findings showed that I have linguistic strengths that have not been mentioned in previous literature, such as pragmatic knowledge and L2 use. Throughout the course, I was able to provide explicit instruction and corrective feedback because I had prior knowledge of *keigo* and of professional communication. I also used my cultural knowledge of Japanese, specifically the use of *uchi* (inside) and *soto* (outside), to instruct

pragmatic aspects. Previous research also did not mention NNSTs perceiving their reading of the L2 script as a strength, but I positively reflected on my ability to read *kanji*. However, I also noted my weakness in reading as reported in the results chapter. These findings differ from those found in the literature, focusing on mainly linguistic strengths, such as grammatical knowledge and experience learning a second language (e.g., Chun, 2014; Medgyes, 1994; Murphy-O'Dwyer, 1996; Tsuo & Chen, 2019). Studies that have examined NNSTs in other languages, such as in Wernicke (2017), Thompson and Fioramonte (2013), and Xiong and Earomorphan (2020), do not highlight the specific strengths that NNSTs in the specific language fields have. Thus, rather than generalizing NNSTs' strengths, it is crucial to acknowledge and appreciate their distinct and individual strengths. The finding from this study contributes to this thought by highlighting the unique strengths that the NNST in a JFL field.

e. A link between perfectionism and dissatisfaction among NNSTs. Additionally, my findings provide a new potential connection of NNSTs' perfectionism and dissatisfaction. Previous research (e.g., Kunt & Tüm, 2010) examined perfectionism within the NNST context which is often linked with "foreign language anxiety," a situation-specific anxiety that can be seen through communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation (Horwitz, et al., 1986). However, my reflections did not note any form of anxiety, but rather dissatisfaction. Specifically, while I felt satisfied with my overall Japanese speaking ability, I was unhappy with my vocabulary breadth. NNSTs may strive for perfection in their language learning, and thus, be critical towards their own target language skills because of their dual identity as a second language learner and teacher (Kunt & Tüm, 2010; Wernicke, 2017). As such, future research may consider exploring the relationship between NNSTs' need to be perfect

and their dissatisfaction toward their linguistic skills. Furthermore, future research should investigate if and how NNSTs' perfectionism may affect students' learning.

f. Potential influence of NSTs' implicit knowledge on L2 students' learning. Another finding shown by students is that NSTs may have a tendency to sometimes skip over what they perceive as "common knowledge," a potential pitfall for learners new to the language. Lily's comment highlighted this challenge, stating that NSTs may sometimes overlook or bypass concepts they consider students are already familiar with. Such practice can create knowledge gaps, especially for learners with a different cultural or linguistic background than the NSTs. What might seem obvious to a native speaker, due to their lifetime of immersion in the language and culture, might be new or even perplexing to someone just starting their language learning. Perhaps the skimming of important information is due to the NSTs' implicit knowledge of rules (Villalbos-Ulate, 2011) paired with their lack of experience learning a second language (e.g., Ma, 2012; Moussu, 2018a).

5.2.2 Methodological Implications

The use of qualitative methods in my research helps to uncover new insights on instructional practices that are used by a NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese class. My research expands beyond research by Mukoyama (2018), who did not implement qualitative methods to address what students thought about the instructional practices used within the class. As such, they were unable to examine any underlying reasons why students were not able to improve their knowledge of *keigo*. In contrast, students in my study could express their perceptions more freely because of the data collection methods I used.

To my knowledge, my study is the first to use a reflexive journal, pre- and post-course surveys, weekly language logs, and follow-up interviews within the specialized NNST research

area. The reflexive journal allowed me to reflect on my perceptions and beliefs as the instructor, such as my linguistic and pedagogic strengths and weaknesses. I also identified areas for improvements in my instruction. Moreover, the pre- and post-course surveys and weekly language logs were helpful in collecting students' perceptions and beliefs before, during, and after the instructional period. I was also able to use follow-up interviews to gain a deeper understanding of students' perceptions and beliefs of the course and NSTs' and NNSTs' linguistic and pedagogical capabilities.

5.2.3 Practical Implications

Beyond nativeness in hiring: Using NNSTs' strengths in the decision-making process. In this study, students' preferences towards teachers were not based on the appearance or race of the instructor but on their individual strengths and teacher attitudes. Students noted various pedagogical and linguistic strengths of both NNSTs and NSTs. NNSTs, as reported in this thesis possessed more pedagogical strengths, while NSTs had more linguistic strengths. This is not to say that one should be hired over the other. Instead, hiring decisions can be made by factoring instructors' individual strengths. Further, my findings are supported by Uzum (2018), who highlighted the various strengths and weaknesses of both instructors and urged the administration to "diversify" what NNSTs and NSTs teach (p. 5). Previous research has not expressed pragmatic knowledge as a strength of NNSTs; yet, I was able to teach a high-level professional Japanese language course successfully by using my prior knowledge of keigo and business settings. By considering the characteristics of each teacher, administration can directly address the native speaker fallacy within their establishments by using the strengths and weaknesses presented in the literature in their decision making. By doing so, administration can

create positive implications for equity, diversity, and inclusion in post-secondary institutions by acknowledging the strengths that individual instructors have.

5.2.4 Pedagogical Implications

Teacher training and collaboration between NNSTs and NSTs. This thesis illustrates that NNSTs and NSTs have differing strengths and that the NNST had negative feelings toward their linguistic and pedagogical skills through students and my own perceptions, respectively. Administration can use these findings to better second language learning and teaching by implementing teacher training programs and encouraging collaborative opportunities between NNSTs and NSTs. Through teacher training programs, NNSTs and NSTs can enhance their teaching skills by strategizing how to balance their differing strengths and weaknesses. For example, students' perceptions showed that NNSTs had *lenient* corrective feedback and NSTs had *harsh* corrective feedback. There may be times during instruction that instructors need to be more strict or more tolerant of students' mistakes. Thus, through discussion, NNSTs and NSTs can learn from each other to draw on their strengths and navigate their weaknesses within the classroom. Moreover, teacher training programs can assist in mitigating the negative feelings (i.e., lack of confidence, issues in self-efficacy, and teaching anxiety) that NNSTs and NSTs may have through discussion and exposure to current research. For instance, in this thesis, I experienced dissatisfaction with my L2, which I linked to perfectionism. Perhaps I could lessen this negative feeling by speaking with other NNSTs and NSTs who have been in the field longer or seeking professional development opportunities that prepare novice NNSTs. By doing so, I could improve my confidence and lessen my linguistically and pedagogically related anxieties.

Next, administration can draw from NNSTs' and NSTs' individual strengths to create a partnership model to benefit students' learning (e.g., Liu, 2018; Kadowaki, 2018; Kahmi-Stein,

2018; Wang & Fang, 2020). This thesis shows that a NNST possesses many pedagogical strengths, such as enthusiasm, engagement, and corrective feedback. They also have grammatical knowledge of the L2 and can empathize with students because of their experience learning the second language. However, NNSTs may not be as fluent in L2 as NSTs (e.g., Chun, 2014; Sakurai, 2012; Tsuchiya, 2020). In addition, they may lack the authentic experiences that a NST have. A pedagogical approach that integrates the strengths of both NSTs and NNSTs could be highly beneficial for students. However, it is also important not to divide NNSTs and NSTs in what they can teach. Rather, as Oda (2018) notes, NNSTs and NSTs should be "assigned the same roles" (p. 6). Thus, instead of the current model where NSTs teach speaking courses and NNSTs teach grammar (Uzum, 2018), NSTs and NNSTs could collaborate within the same classroom, offering their own skills and knowledge. For example, in a pragmatic course, the NNSTs and NSTs can teach grammatical aspects related to professional communication and share their individual experiences and cultural backgrounds. Keeping the strengths of both NNSTs and NSTs in mind, administration can create courses focusing on collaboration between NNSTs and NSTs to enhance student learning.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research Directions

First, I would like to acknowledge potential bias due to the self-reported nature of all data sources (Bergen & Labonté, 2020; Krumpal, 2018). Specifically, for students, the social desirability bias could be a factor to consider. As defined by Bergen and Labonté (2018), social desirability bias refers to the "tendency to present oneself and one's social context in a way that is perceived to be socially acceptable, but not wholly reflective of one's reality" (p. 783). Furthermore, Krumpal (2018) notes that social desirability bias occurs when questions that target "sensitive topics," such as racism are asked (p. 1535). While the questions in data collection

instruments (i.e., pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, and follow-up interviews) did not directly ask participants sensitive questions, there might be instances where students did not want to mention the race or ethnicity of instructors as criteria to determine their capabilities. Furthermore, students may have provided only positive aspects of the course instructor's pedagogical and linguistic abilities during the follow-up interviews because of this bias.

Another limitation of this study was the size of the participants. Initially, the intended number of participants was between five and ten students. However, because recruitment began in January due to administrative factors outside of my control, recruiting undergraduate students for this study was difficult. A larger sample size may contribute to a fuller understanding the perceptions and beliefs of students within a Canadian JFL context.

Also, the short time-frame was also a limitation. Students' perceptions and beliefs may not have changed within the five weeks of data collection. Studies with a longer timeframe could provide a fuller understanding of students' perceptions towards NNSTs and NSTs.

Additionally, a limitation of this study is that I did not integrate the codes from all sources (i.e., reflexive journal entries, pre- and post-course surveys, language logs, and follow-up interviews) during the final stage of the data analysis. The results may differ had I properly integrated all codes from all sources.

Finally, this study relied on students to report their language proficiency on the pre-course survey. Afterwards, I used a pre-test to gather information on students' knowledge of *keigo*, which might not have accurately reflected their Japanese proficiency. SoTL practitioners could analyze the oral production generated through task performance over time or in Unit 1 and Unit 4, to measure students' learning outcomes. Alternatively, an oral proficiency interview could have been implemented to determine their participants' proficiency level(s).

Despite these limitations, this research has collected quantitative and qualitative data to examine the instructional practices used within a high-intermediate Japanese class and what perceptions and beliefs of the instructor and students towards NNSTs' capabilities. To benefit future research, replicating the study with more student participants across different proficiency levels, teachers (both NSTs and NNSTs), and administrators would be beneficial for future research. Furthermore, building on the current study to examine other post-secondary JFL programs within British Columbia or Canada would provide a fuller picture of students' and instructors' perceptions and beliefs towards of NNSTs.

5.4 Conclusion

The present study aimed to address the gap of limited research on NNSTs within the Canadian JFL field by examining the instructional practices used by a NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese class and the perceptions and beliefs students and the instructor have surrounding the NNST's linguistic and pedagogical capabilities. Using SoTL and multiple sources of data, I directly observed students' learning and gained insights into the perceptions surrounding a NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese class.

Reflections from both students and the instructor on the instructional practices used by the NNST reveals that tasks, such as DC tasks, script tasks, elicited conversation tasks, and role-play tasks, benefitted students' learning of professional Japanese communication by being engaging and allowing students to communicate in differently depending on the task they were engaged in. These tasks also tested students' pragmatic knowledge and allowed them to reflect on different aspects of language (i.e., linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic).

For perceptions and beliefs of the NNST in a high-intermediate Japanese class, key findings are that students' perceptions of their instructor are not based on the ethnic or linguistic

background of the instructor, but their individual strengths and teaching attitudes; and NNSTs have the capabilities to teach higher level courses. Moreover, NNSTs have the ability to instruct a pragmatic-focused speaking class.

To my knowledge, this study is the first of its kind to examine a high-intermediate Japanese class in a Canadian context, thereby greatly contributing to the specialized NNST field by offering novel findings that have not been investigated in previous research before. The results from this study also offer implications for academic and practical fields by increasing awareness of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of both NNSTs and NSTs within a post-secondary JFL context. This awareness creates hope for NNSTs by empowering administration to make better informed hiring decisions, which can improve equity, diversity, and inclusion within the post-secondary field. Furthermore, recognizing that both NNSTs and NSTs possess unique strengths, administration can implement collaborative models within post-secondary institutions, benefitting students' learning.

References

ACTFL. (2012). *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.* (2012). Retrieved January 1st, 2023, from https://www.actfl.org/educator-resources/actfl-proficiency-guidelines

Alseweed, M. A. (2012). University students' perceptions of the influence of native and non-native teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 5(12), 42–53. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n12p42

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2013). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives* (Complete ed.). Longman.

Aoyama, R. (2021). Language teacher identity and English education policy in Japan: Competing discourses surrounding "non-native" English-speaking teachers. *RELC Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211032999

Barešova, I. (2015). On the categorization of the Japanese honourific system *Keigo*. *Topics in Linguistics*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2015-0001

Belur, J., Tompson, L., Thornton, A., & Simon, M. (2021). Interrater reliability in systematic review methodology: Exploring variation in coder decision-making. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *50*(2), 837–865. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124118799372

Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In *Non-Native Language Teachers* (pp. 195–215). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24565-0_11

Bergen, N., & Labonté, R. (2020). "Everything is perfect, and we have no problems": detecting and limiting social desirability bias in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 30(5), 783–792. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732319889354

Bloomfield, L. (1927). Literate and illiterate speech. *American Speech*, *2*(10), 432–439. https://doi.org/10.2307/451863

Boecher, Y. (2005). Native and nonnative English-speaking teacher distinctions: From dichotomy to collaboration. *CATESOL*, 17(1), 67–75.

Bouchard, J. (2020). The resilience of native-speakerism: A realist perspective. In Houghton, S.H.& Bouchard, J. (Eds.), *Native-speakerism its resilience and undoing*. (pp. 17-46). Springer

Brindley, G. (1987). Factors affecting task difficulty. In Nunan, (Ed.), *Guidelines for the development of curriculum resources*, (pp. 45-56). National Curriculum Resource Center.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The Implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the asia-pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 36–57. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000122

Cheng, CY. (2019). EFL students' in-class motivation toward non-native English speaker teacher and native English speaker teacher. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)*, *7*(1), 382–393.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structure*s. Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112316009

Chun, S. Y. (2014). EFL learners' beliefs about native and non-native English-speaking teachers: perceived strengths, weaknesses, and preferences. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *35*(6), 563–579. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.889141

Colmenero, K, & Lasagabaster, D. (2020). Enclosing native speakerism: students', parents' and teachers' perceptions of language teachers, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1865384

Culpeper, J. V., Mackey, A., & Taguchi, N. (2018). *Second language pragmatics: From theory to research*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315692388

Dassa, L. (2018). Continuous teacher training. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0275

Doerr, N. M. (2015). Standardization and paradoxical highlighting of linguistic diversity in Japan. Japanese Language and Literature, 49(2), 389-403.

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System (Linköping)*, 33(2), 209–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006

Eslami, Z. R., & Harper, K. (2018). Language proficiency and NNESTs. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0022

Faez, F., & Karas, M. (2017). Connecting language proficiency to (self-reported) teaching ability: A review and analysis of research. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 135–151.

Faez, F. (2018). Empowerment of NNESTs. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1–7). In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.) John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0016

Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, *1*(1), 121–125. https://doi.org/10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.121

Fiorito, L. (2005). Speech acts and languages for special purposes: a speech act approach to ESP. *Metalogicon (2005) XVIII*, *1*, 43-60 https://doi.org/10.3406/xvii.2005.2019

Freeman, D. (2017). The case for teachers' classroom English proficiency. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 31–52. https://doi.org/10.3406/xvii.2005.2019

Fries, C. C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. University of Michigan Press.

Gardner, R. C. (1983). Learning another language: A true social psychological experiment. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *2*(2-3-4), 219–239. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X8300200209

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation.* Edward Arnold.

Gayle, B. M., Randall, M., Langley, L., & Preiss. (2013). Faculty learning processes: a model for moving from scholarly teaching to the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The IISOTL Journal, 1*(1), 81-93.

Given, L. M. (2008). Perception. In *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 607-607). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909

Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 562-570.

Grenfell, M. (2011). *Bourdieue, Language and Linguistics.* Contimuum.

Griffiths, C. (Ed.). (2008). *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511497667

Hagiwara, A. (2016). The role of phonology and phonetics in L2 kanji learning. *The Modern Language Journal* (Boulder, Colo.), 100(4), 880–897. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12350

Harris, J. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about task-based language teaching in Japan. *The Journal of ASIAL TEFL*, 13(2), 102-116.

Hasegawa, N. (2006). Honourifics. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* (pp. 493–543). Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591.ch32

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism, *ELT Journal*, *60*(4), 385-387. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030

Houghton, S. A. (2018). Shifts needed in teacher attribute*s*. In Houghton, S. H., Rivers, D. J., & Hashimoto, K. (Eds.), *Beyond native-speakerism*: *current explorations and future visions*. (pp. 15-37) Routledge.

Houghton, S. A., Rivers, D. J., & Hashimoto, K. (2018). *Beyond native speakerism: Current explorations and future visions*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315643601

Huang, I.-C. (2014). Contextualizing teacher identity of non-native-English speakers in U.S. secondary ESL classrooms: A Bakhtinian perspective. Linguistics and Education, 25, 119–128. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2013.09.011

Huang, L.-S. (2017). Three ideas for implementing learner reflection. *Faculty Focus*. https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-and-learning/three-ideas-implementing-learner-reflection/

Huang, L.-S. (2019). Analysing open-ended questions and semi-structured interviews on language-learning needs of Syrian refugees. *SAGE Publications.* https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526483843

Huang, L.-S. (2021). *Improving learner reflection for TESOL: Pedagogical strategies to support reflective learning.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429352836

Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity, (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities. School of American Research Press*, 35-84.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2022). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (Second edition.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003168188

Japan Foundation. (2021). *Survey report on Japanese-language education abroad 2021*. https://www.jpf.go.jp/e/project/japanese/survey/result/survey21.html

Kadowaki, K. (2018). Japanese native speaker teachers at high schools in South Korea and Thailand. In Houghton, S.H. & Hashimoto, K. (Eds.), *Towards Post-Native-Speakerism dynamics and shifts.* (pp. 97-112). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-7162-1_6

Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (2018). Challenges faced by NNESTs. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0010

Kaneko, H. (2014). *Shokyū ga owattara hajimeyō: Shin nihongo keigo torēningu. Tōkyō:*Kabushiki Gaisha Asuku Shuppan.

Kano, C., Shimizu, Y., Takenaka, H., Ishii, E., & Akutsu, S. (1993). *Intermediate kanji book: Vol. 1*. Tokyo: Bonjinsha.

Kenrick, W. (1773). *New Dictionary of the English language*. John & Francis Rivington.

Kiczkowiak, M., & Wu, A. (2018). Discrimination and discriminatory practices against NNESTs. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0014

Kitagaki, H. (2002). Teaching method (pattern practice) of honourific expressions in secretarial case studies. *Nihonbashi Gakkan University Bulletin, 1,* 93-108.

Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: a literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(4), 2025–2047. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9.

Kunt, N., & Tüm, D. Ö. (2010). Non-native student teachers' feelings of foreign language anxiety. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4672–4676. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.748

Levis, J. M., Sonsaat, S., Link, S., & Barriuso, T. A. (2016). Native and nonnative teachers of L2 pronunciation: Effects on learner performance. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(4), 894–931. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.272

Li, Y. (2016). Intercultural awareness in foreign language teaching: A Chinese perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7*(4), 768-772. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0704.18

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. M. (2013). How languages are learned. (4th edition.). Oxford University Press.

Liu, J. (2018). NNESTS. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Loewen, S. (2018). Focus on form versus focus on forms. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0062

Long, M. H. (2015). Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Ma, L. P. (2012). Advantages and disadvantages of native- and nonnative-English-speaking teachers: ttudent perceptions in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*(2), 280–305. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.21

Mahboob, A. (2018). NNEST lens: implications and directions. In J. I. Liontas, T., & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Maruki, Y. (2022). Keigo to use and to be used: reevaluation of keigo learning in Japanese language classes. *Journal of Japanese Language Education and Linguistics*, *6*(2), 142–153. https://doi.org/10.18196/jjlel.v6i2.14874

Matsunaga, S. (Matsunaga). Teaching and learning to read kanji as L2: Why are they difficult? In Xing, J., and Ng, P-S, (Eds.), *Indigenous Culture, Education and Globalization* (pp. 245–262). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48159-2_13

McArthur, T., Lam-McArthur, J. & Fontaine, L. (Eds.). (2018). *Native speaker*. The Oxford Companion to the English Language: Oxford University Press. Retrieved 4 Feb. 2023, from https://www.oxfordreference.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/view/10.1093/acref/9780199661282.001.0001/acref-9780199661282-e-822.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). *Ideology.* In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved March 26, 2023, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ideology

Mori, Y., Sato, K., & Shimizu, H. (2007). Japanese language students' perceptions on Kanji learning and their relationship to novel Kanji word learning ability. *Language Learning*, *57*(1), 57–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00399.x

Moussu, L. (2018a). Shortcomings of NESTs and NNESTs. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0044

Moussu, L. (2018b). Strengths of NESTs and NNESTs. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0813

Mukoyama, Y. (2018). Gaikokugo kankyouni okeru tasku chuushin no bijinesu nihongo kyouiku no kouka [Effects of employing task-based language teaching in a foreign language learning environment to teach japanese as used in business settings]. Global studie*s*, 2, 49-62.

Murphy-O'Dwyer, L. M. (1996). Putting the T in TESOL. TESOL Matters, 6(2), 21.

Nakagawa, Y. (2020). Kaigai de motomerareru neiteibu/nonneiteibu nihongokyouiku no shishitsu/nouryoku to "sugureru" nihongojyugyou. *Musa, 27, 17-36.*

Nunan, D. (2004). Task-based language teaching. Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667336

Oda, M. (2018). Collaboration and collaborative practices. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0011

Oskamp, S., & Schultz, P. W. (2005). Attitudes and opinions (3rd ed.). L. Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0813

Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(1), 127 151. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.4

Park, M. S. (2021). Effects of different sources of pre-task planning on second language oral performance: A Study of Korean EFL Learners. *TESL-EJ*, *25*(2)

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: new theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 1–33). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596483-003

Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2009). Linguistic imperialism continued. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203857175

Pizziconi, B. (2011). Honourifics: The cultural specificity of a universal mechanism in Japanese. In D. Kádár & S. Mills (Eds.), *Politeness in East Asia* (pp. 45-70). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511977886.005

Potter, M. K., & Kustra, E. D. H. (2011). The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, dis- tinctions, and clarifications. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 5*(1), 1–18. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol5/iss1/23

Rajagopalan, K. (2018). Divide between NESTs and NNESTs: dichotomy and continuum perspectives. In J. I. Liontas, T.& M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd edition.). Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, D. J. (2018). The Idea of the Native Speaker. In Houghton, S. H., Rivers, D. J., & Hashimoto, K. (Eds.), *Beyond native-speakerism*: *current explorations and future visions*. (pp. 15-37) Routledge.

Roaché, D. (Ed.) (2017). Intercoder reliability techniques: Percent agreement. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communicative Research Methods*. (Vols. 1-4). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411

Roever, C. (2021). Teaching and testing second language pragmatics and interaction : a practical guide. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429260766

Rothstein, D., & Santana, L. (2011). *Make just one change : teach students to ask their own questions*. Harvard Education Press.

Rudolph, N. (2023). Narratives and negotiations of identity in Japan and criticality in (English) language education: (dis)connections and implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, *57*(2), 375–401. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3150

Ruecker, T. (2018). Employment landscape for NESTs and NNESTs. In J. I. Liontas, T. & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0015

Sakurai, Y. (2012). Learners' perceptions of "good" foreign language teachers: A quantitative analysis between native and non-native teachers. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *9*(1), 46–60.

Sanada. (2019). Japanese Dialects. In P. Heinrich & Y. Ohara (Eds), *Routledge handbook of Japanese sociolinguistics.* (pp. 63-77). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315213378-4

Savvidou, C., & Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2019). Teaching pragmatics: nonnative-speaker teachers' knowledge, beliefs and reported practices. *Intercultural Communication Education, 2*(1), 39–58. https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v2n1.124

Self-efficacy. (2023, May 31). Retrieved from Cambridge Dictionary: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/self-efficacy

Selvi, A., Yazan, B., & Mahboob, A. (2023). Research on "native" and "non-native" English-speaking teachers: Past developments, current status, and future directions. *Language Teaching,* 1-41. doi:10.1017/S0261444823000137

Silverstein, M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic Iideology. In *e Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels,* edited by Paul R. Clyne, William Hanks, and Carol L. Ho auer, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Skinner, B.F. (1957). *Verbal behaviour.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. https://doi.org/10.1037/11256-000

Subtirelu, N. (2011). Juggling identity and authority: a case study of one non-native instructor of English. *TESL-EJ, 15*(3), 1-30.

Sung, C. C. M. (2011). Race and native speakers in ELT: Parents' perspectives in Hong Kong. English today, 27(3), 25–29. doi:10.1017/s0266078411000344

Takeuchi, J. (2023). Language ideologies and L2 speaker legitimacy: native speaker bias in Japan. *Multilingual Matters.*

Thompson, A. S., & Fioramonte, A. (2013). Nonnative speaker teachers of Spanish: Insights from novice teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*(4), 564–579. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2013.01210.x

Toyoda, E. (1995). Kanji gakushü ni tai-suru gakushü-sha no ish perception about kanji learning). *Nihongo kyõiku (Journal of language teaching)* (85), 101-113.

Tsuchiya, S. (2020). The native speaker fallacy in a U.S. university Japanese and Chinese program. *Foreign Language Annals*, *53(3),* 527-549. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12475

Tsugita, S., & Miyazono, K. (2018). Beliefs. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of lifespan human development* (pp. 232-234). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Tsou, S.-Y., & Chen, Y. (2019). Taiwanese university students' perceptions toward native and non-native English-speaking teachers in EFL contexts. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 176–183.

Uzum, B. (2018). Attitudes of students toward NESTs and NNESTs. In J. I. Liontas, T.& M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0008

Villalobos Ulate, N. (2011). Insights towards native and non-native ELT edducators. *Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 4(1), 56–79. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.325

Walkinshaw, I., & Oanh, D. H. (2014). Native and non-native English language teachers: student perceptions in Vietnam and Japan. *SAGE Open*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014534451

Wang, L. (Evelyn), & Fang, F. (Gabriel). (2020). Native-speakerism policy in English language teaching revisited: Chinese university teachers' and students' attitudes towards native and non-native English-speaking teachers. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1778374

Wernicke, M. (2017). Navigating native-speaker ideologies as FSL teacher. *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La revue canadienne des langues vivantes 73*(2), 208-236. https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/662370.

Wesley, P. M. (2012). Learner attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs in language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*(s1), s98–s117. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01181.x

Wetzel, P. J. (2004). Keigo in modern Japan : polite language from Meiji to the present. University of Hawaii Press.

Willis. (2021). An evolution of a framework for TBLT: what trainers and teachers need to know to help learners succeed in task-based learning. In N. P. Sudharshana & L. Mukhopadhyay (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching and assessment: Contemporary reflections from across the world*. Springer Singapore.

Xia, Y. (2014). "Language theories and language teaching – from traditional grammar to functionalism."Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(3) 559-565.

Xiong, S., & Eamoraphan, S. (2020). A study of adult learners' attitudes towards native and non-native Chinese speaking teachers according to their learning levels in a Chinese language academy in Bangkok, Thailand. *Human Sciences Scholar*, *12*(1), 232-234.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Zacharias, N.T. (2018). Attitudes of NNESTs toward themselves. In the *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (eds J.I. Liontas, T. International Association and M. DelliCarpini). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0007

Zhang, J. & Lawrence Jun Zhang (2021) Learners' satisfaction with native and non-native English-speaking teachers' teaching competence and their learning motivation: a path-analytic approach, Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 41:3, 558-573, https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1833834

Appendix A: Letter of Information for Implied Consent

You are invited to participate in a study entitled *Nihonjin Kyoushi Dake*?: The Perceptions Non-Native Speaking Teacher in a High-Intermediate Japanese Language Class that is conducted by Matthew Somerville.

Matthew is a Graduate student in Applied Linguistics at the University of Victoria and you may contact him if you have further questions by email [email].

As a Graduate student, I am required to conduct research as part of the requirements for a degree in Masters of Arts. It is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Li-Shih Huang. You may contact my supervisor at [phone number].

Information
As part of my research, I will be teaching a five-week course that focuses on high-intermediate professional communication within Japanese business and academic contexts. This course will act as the site for my research. In addition, this course is non-credit and is outside the academic auspices of the university.

Purpose and Objectives
The objectives of this research are a) to gain an understanding of what instructional practices the non-native speaking teacher uses in their language instruction; and b) to examine the students' and the instructor's perceptions and beliefs of a non-native Japanese-speaking instructor's teaching practices and linguistic capabilities within a high-intermediate Japanese language class.

Importance of this Research
This research of this type is important because non-native speaking teachers are rarely hired to teach high-intermediate language classes due to deep-rooted perceptions of their linguistic and teaching ability. The proposed research will thereby address gaps in literature by examining student and instructor beliefs and perceptions of the non-native speaking teacher in a high-intermediate Japanese class.

The proposed research will benefit both the academic and professional fields, including language teaching, language learning, teacher education, and professional development with the goal of increasing the awareness of non-native speaking teachers' instructional and linguistic capabilities within a high-intermediate Japanese language class in a post-secondary context. In addition, the research will offer insight on the challenges that non-native speaking teachers experience and relevant instructional practices that both native speaking teachers and non-native speaking teachers can use within the Japanese as a Foreign language field. Lastly, the strengths and weaknesses of the non-native speaking teacher in the high-intermediate Japanese language class will inform post-secondary institutions' hiring of both native speaking teachers and non-native speaking teachers.

Participants Selection
Participants for this research must be undergraduate students and have intermediate proficiency in Japanese. A standardized pre-test will be used to determine your eligibility to participate in the study.

What is Involved
If you consent to voluntarily participate in this research, your participation will include:

• Taking a pre-test that focuses on speaking in practical contexts (20 minutes)
• Answering a pre-course survey (20 minutes)
• Taking a free five-week course that focuses on high-intermediate Japanese communication in professional contexts (one hour and thirty minutes/week). This course will be in-person or remote based on majority preference.
• Completing five language logs that will allow you to reflect on your learning and the teacher's instruction (20 minutes/week)
• Answering a post-course survey (20 minutes)
• Doing an optional interview at the end of the course (20-30 minutes). Interviews can be done online or in-person based on your preference. You will explicitly be asked if the interview can be recorded, and you can decline to answer any questions that the interviewer may ask.

Please note: I am using SurveyMonkey for this research project. In addition, if participants prefer a remote course, I will be using Zoom. Please be advised that information about you that is gathered for this research study, including identifiable information, uses an online program located in the U.S. or a program that can be accessed from the US (SurveyMonkey and Zoom). As such, there is a possibility that information about you may be accessed without your knowledge or consent by the US government in compliance with the US Freedom Act.

Inconvenience
Participation in this study may cause some inconvenience to you, including the total participation time of approximately 10 hours and 40 minutes.

Risks
There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.

Benefits
The potential benefits to your participation in this research is that you will have free opportunities to take a five-week course to work on your Japanese and prepare for professional contexts within business and academia.

Compensation
As a way to compensate you for any inconvenience related to your participation, in addition to the free course, you will also be given a $10 Starbucks gift card.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this research must be completely voluntary. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw at any time without any consequences or any explanation. If you withdraw from the study your data will be used only if you give permission. You will also receive full compensation.

Researcher's Relationship with Participants
The principal researcher has a dual-role relationship as I am both the researcher and instructor of the course. However, as this course is a free learning opportunity, your participation in this study will have no impact on your academic standing.

On-going Consent
To make sure that you continue to consent to participate in this research, I will obtain your on-going consent at the beginning of every class.

Anonymity and Confidentiality
Your anonymity will be protected in the dissemination of results through the use of pseudonyms.

All of the data collected will remain strictly confidential; only me and my supervisor will have access to the data. If you choose to participate in the follow-up interview, the page with your personal contact information and the rest of the questionnaire responses will be linked to the interview data, but your identity will be concealed through the use of a number code. Only code numbers will be used for storing the data. Access to the computer used for research will be kept secure through the use of passwords known only by me, the researcher, and any printouts of data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet.

Dissemination of Results
The results of this study may be shared with others at scholarly conferences and through publications, and that only pseudonyms or codes for participants will be used in publications and presentations. None of the audio recordings will be used for presentations.

Disposal of Data
Five years after this study has been completed and the results have been disseminated, all data (electronic and paper-based) will be deleted, shredded, or otherwise destroyed.

Contacts
Individuals you may contact regarding this study include Dr. Li-Shih Huang (email: [email], phone: [phone number] In addition, you may verify the ethical approval of this study, or raise any concerns you might have, by contacting the Human Research Ethics Office at the University of Victoria ([email and phone number]).

By completing and submitting the survey, YOUR FREE AND INFORMED CONSENT IS IMPLIED and indicates that you understand the above conditions of participation in this study and that you have had the opportunity to have your questions answered by the researchers.

Appendix B: Sample Course Syllabus

Unit #	Topic
Unit 1	• Information about Research Project and Class • Basic *Keigo* • Academic and Professional Self-Introduction
Unit 2	• Visiting a Colleague's House • Making and Rejecting Requests
Unit 3	• Offering to help • Giving an opinion • Apologizing
Unit 4	• Talking on the phone in a business manner • Receiving a Reservation • Service *Keigo*
Unit 5	• Interview Self-Introduction • How to Answer Interview Questions • Non-Verbal Communication • Things to Watch Out For

Appendix C: Sample Course Outline

Professional Communication in Japanese: Unit 3

Suggested Timeframe: 120 minutes

Task	Time (min.)	Steps
Introduction	3	1. Ongoing consent 2. Introduce lesson plan
Warm-up		***Mystery Word***
	10	1. Explain warm-up activity to students. 2. Start warm-up activity
1. 申し出る（*Moshi deru*）(Offering help)		
Pre-Task	1	1. Provide instructions and read scenario. 2. Check students' understanding before starting activity.
Main-task #1 (DC Task)	5	1. Have students fill in the blanks individually. 2. Show answers to students.
Main-task #2 (DC Task)	5	1. Have students fill in the blanks individually. 2. Show answers to students.
Post-task	2	1. Ask students about their thoughts on *~mashou*, *~(sa) seteitadakimasu,* and *~(sa)setekudasai*.
Explicit teaching	10	1. Teach grammar and show examples to students. 2. Go over pragmatic differences in grammar.
Pre-task	2	1. Provide instructions and read scenario. 2. Check students' understanding before starting activity. 3. Provide preparation time for students
Main-task #3 (Role-play)	10	1. Have students create a script based on scenario. 2. Provide corrective feedback to students if necessary.
2. 意見を言う（*Iken wo iu*）(Giving an opinion)		
Pre-Task	1	1. Provide instructions and read scenario. 2. Check students' understanding before starting activity.
Main-task #1 (Script reading)	10	1. Delegate roles for students. 2. Have them read the script. 3. Switch roles 4. Ask students how B-*san*'s conversation could be fixed
Explicit teaching	10	1. Present steps in giving an opinion 2. Go over *ga* and *yo* particles and explain how to use *~shi* in professional communication
Pre-task	1	1. Provide instructions and read scenario. 2. Check students' understanding before starting activity. 3. Provide preparation time for students
Main-task #2 (Role play)	10	1. Have students create a script based on scenario. 2. Provide corrective feedback to students if necessary.
Post-task	2	1. Ask students what they think about sharing opinions. What are the differences?
3. おわびする（*Owabisuru*）(Apologizing)		
Pre-Task	1	1. Provide instructions and read scenario. 2. Check students' understanding before starting activity.
Main-task #1 (DC Task)	10	1. Have students fill in the blanks individually. 2. Show answers to students.
Post-task	2	1. Ask students what the differences in apologizing in Canada and Japan.
Explicit teaching	10	1. Introduce steps on how to apologize 2. Present most common misses in Japan.
Pre-task	1	1. Provide instructions and read scenario. 2. Check students' understanding before starting activity. 3. Provide preparation time for students
Main-task #2 (Role play)	10	1. Have students create a script based on scenario. 2. Provide corrective feedback to students if necessary.
Post-task	2	1. Ask students what they think about apologizing in Japanese
Ending	2	1. Remind students when language logs are due.

Appendix D: Pre-Test

Section 1: 「お」or「ご」?

Directions: You will be given a noun. Please choose whether that noun has the prefix 「お」or「ご」?

1. 話 (はなし) A. **お話** B. ご話	2. 都合 (つこう) A お都合 B. **ご都合**	3. 住所 (じゅうしょ) A. お住所 B. **ご住所**
4. 仕事 (しこと) A. **お仕事** B. ご仕事	5. 家族 (かそく) A. お家族 B. **ご家族**	6. 意見 (いけん) A. お意見 B. **ご意見**
7. 注意 (ちゅうい) A. お注意 B. **ご注意**	8. 手紙 (てかみ) A. **お手紙** B. ご手紙	9. 友達 (ともたち) A. **お友達** B. ご友達
10. 時間 (しかん) A. **お時間** B. ご時間		

Section 2: Honourific vs. Extra-modest/Humble expressions

Directions: You will be given a verb and asked what the honourific/extra-modest/humble is. Please select the correct answer.

11. What is the honourific version of「食へる」? A. いらっしゃいます B. おっしゃいます C. いただきます D. **召(め)し上(あ)がります**	12. What is the honourific version of「見る」? A. **ご覧(らん)になります** B. お越(こ)しになります C. 伺(うかが)います D. 拝見(はいけん)します	13. What is the extra-modest version of「会う」? A. お目(め)にかかります B. お会(あ)いになります C. **拝見(はいけん)します** D. ご覧(らん)になります
14. What is the humble version of「コピーする」? A. コピーします B **コピーいたします** C. コピーなさいます D. おコピーなさいます	15. What is the extra-modest version of「ある」 A. でいらっしゃいます B. でございます C. **ございます** D. いらっしゃいます	

Section 3: Scenarios

Directions: Read each scenario and pick the best answer.

16. You are about to leave your boss's office. What do you say to them as you leave? A. おじゃましました。 B. ありがとうございました。 C. **失礼(しつれい)いたします。** D. では、行きます 。	17. Your co-worker is leaving the office. What do you say? A. お世話(せわ)になっております。 B. 行ってらっしゃい。 C. ありがとうございます。 D. **お疲(つか)れ様(さま)です。**	18. A customer is calling you. They want to talk to Mr. Tanaka (your boss), but he is not there. What do you say? A. 田中部長(ぶちょう)はいません。 B. 田中さんは会社(かいしゃ)を出(で)ました。 C. **田中は席(せき)を外(はず)しております。** D. 田中は席(せき)を外(はず)しています。
19. An employee from a different office within the same company is calling you. They want to meet Mr. Tanaka, but he is not in the office right now. What do you say? A. すみませんが、田中はいません。 B. **あいにく、田中さんは席(せき)を外(はず)しております。** C. 申(もう)し訳(わけ)ありませんが、田中はいらっしゃいません。 D. あいにく、田中さんは会社(かいしゃ)から出(で)ました。	20. You apologize to your boss for being late. What do you say? A. 遅(おく)れて恐(おそ)れ入(い)ります。 B. **遅(おく)れて申(もう)し訳(わけ)ありませんでした。** C. あいにく遅(おく)れてすみませんでした。 D. 遅(おく)れて悪(わる)かったです。	21. You cannot meet a co-worker because you have an appointment . What do you say? A. 申(もう)し訳(わけ)ありませんが、都合(つごう)が゛悪い(わるい)ですので、会えません。 B. 申(もう)し訳(わけ)ありませんが、都合(つごう)が゛悪い(わるい)でございますのてで、お会えいたしません。 C. 申(もう)し訳(わけ)ありませんが、都合(つごう)が゛悪い(わるい)ですので、会い(あい)かねません。 D. **申(もう)し訳(わけ)ありませんが、都合(つごう)が゛悪い(わるい)ですので、お会い(あい)できません。**

Appendix E: Data Collection Materials

E.I Pre-Course Survey

Contact information	First and Last name [University] Email Address
Demographic information	**2. To which gender do you identify?** • Female • Male • Non-binary • Prefer to self- describe
	3. What age range do you fall in to? • 18-24 • 25-30 • 31 and older
	4. Ethnic background? • Caucasian • African American • Asian • Hispanic • Other
	5. Native language (s) • English • Japanese • Chinese • Korean • Other (please specify) **6.What is your Japanese proficiency (i.e., low-beginner, mid-beginner, high-beginner)?**
	7.What is your preferred class format? • In-person • Remote
A. Background questions Answer the questions based on your initial thoughts about the course. **Please read all of the questions carefully. There is no right or wrong answer, so please indicate your honest feelings. Your response will be kept anonymous.**	
8. Why did you decide to take this course?	
9. What goals do you hope to achieve during the five-weeks?	
10. What challenges do you have learning Japanese at an advanced level?	
11. What can your instructor do to help you achieve your goals?	
12. What are your thoughts about native versus non-native Japanese-speaking instructors?	

B. Beliefs and Perceptions of a Non-Native Japanese-Speaking Instructor

This section contains agreement statements about non-native Japanese-speaking instructors. Please choose **one** answer for each statement.

Please read all of the questions carefully. There is no right or wrong answer, so please indicate your honest feelings. Your response will be kept anonymous.

Questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
13. When it comes to studying **grammar**, I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers.					
14. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate listening** classes.					
15. When it comes to learning about the **culture** of the foreign language, I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers.					
16. When it comes to learning **formal expressions**, I prefer a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher.					
17. When it comes to **grading**, I think a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher is more lenient.					
18. I want to develop **pronunciation** skills like a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher.					
19. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers for their **engaging language teaching**					
21. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner speaking** classes.					
22. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner listening** classes.					
23. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner writing** classes.					
24. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner reading** classes.					
25. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate speaking** classes.					

26. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate listening** classes.
27. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate writing** classes.
28. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate reading** classes.
29. In general, I prefer **native** Japanese-speaking teachers.
30. In general, I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers.
31. If my teacher is **not** trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers.
32. If my teacher is **not** trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer **native** Japanese-speaking teachers.
33. When I think of a **qualified** Japanese teacher, I think of a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher.
34. When I think of a **qualified** Japanese teacher, I think of a **native** Japanese-speaking teacher.
C. Strengths and Weaknesses of Native vs. Non-native Japanese-Speaking Instructors
35. Which instructor would you prefer? **Native** or **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructor? Why?
36. What are your **perceived strengths** of **native** Japanese-speaking instructors?
37. What are your **perceived strengths** of **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructors?
38. Does the instructor being **native** or **non-native** have any influence on your course choices? Why?
39. If you have **Japanese learning questions,** would you ask a **native** or a **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructor? Why?
40. Would you participate differently in classes taught by **native** Japanese-speaking instructors vs. **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructors? If so, how?
41. What **aspects of communication** (e.g., job interviews, requesting information, stating an opinion, etc.…) do you think **non-native** speaking teachers are qualified?
42. What **aspects of communication** (e.g., job interviews, requesting information, stating an opinion, etc.…) do you think **native** speaking teachers are qualified?

43. If possible, would you prefer to have **both native** and **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers as language instructors at your current level of Japanese? Why?
44. Any additional thoughts about Japanese language learning you would like to share?

E.II Language Logs

Directions: Use the following guiding questions to reflect on your learning. You may use any modality (writing, video or voice recording, etc.) to record your reflection. Please send it to the instructor by the end of the week.

1. **Remembering**
    - What did I learn this week?
    - How did I feel during the instructor's explanations of content this week?
2. **Understanding**
    - What was an important point that I learned from the instructor this week?
3. **Applying**
    - Where could I use what I have learned this week?
4. **Analyzing**
    - What were the biggest learning obstacles I faced this week?
5. **Evaluating**
    - What are my strengths in my performance this week?
    - How have I improved in overcoming my personal learning obstacles?
    - Did the teaching of materials help or hinder my learning this week?
6. **Creating**
    - How can the instructor help me improve my learning?
    - What concrete steps can I take to overcome Japanese language-learning obstacles?

E.III Post-Course Survey

Contact information	First and Last name [University] Email Address

A. Background questions

Answer the questions based on your initial thoughts about the course.

Please read all of the questions carefully. There is no right or wrong answer, so please indicate your honest feelings. Your response will be kept anonymous.

2. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why or why not?
3. What goals did you achieve during this five-weeks?
4. Do you feel that you progressed in high-intermediate Japanese during the five-weeks? If so, how?
5. What are your thoughts about **native** versus **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructors after taking the course?

B. Beliefs and Perceptions of a Non-Native Japanese-Speaking Instructor

This section contains agreement statements about non-native Japanese-speaking instructors. Please choose **one** answer for each statement.

Please read all of the questions carefully. There is no right or wrong answer, so please indicate your honest feelings. Your response will be kept anonymous.

Questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
13. When it comes to studying **grammar**, I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers.					
14. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate listening** classes.					
15. When it comes to learning about the **culture** of the foreign language, I prefer a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher.					
16. When it comes to learning **formal expressions**, I prefer a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher.					
17. When it comes to **grading**, I think a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher is more lenient.					
18. I want to develop **pronunciation** skills like a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher.					

19. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers for their **engaging language teaching**.
21. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner speaking** classes.
22. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner listening** classes.
23. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner writing** classes.
24. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **beginner reading** classes.
25. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate speaking** classes.
26. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate listening** classes.
27. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate writing** classes.
28. I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers in **intermediate reading** classes.
29. In general, I prefer **native** Japanese-speaking teachers.
30. In general, I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers.
31. If my teacher is **not** trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers.
32. If my teacher is **not** trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer **native** Japanese-speaking teachers.

33. When I think of a **qualified** Japanese teacher, I think of a **non-native** Japanese-speaking teacher.
34. When I think of a **qualified** Japanese teacher, I think of a **native** Japanese-speaking teacher.
C. Strengths and Weaknesses of Native vs. Non-native Japanese-Speaking Instructors
27. Which instructor would you prefer? **Native** or **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructor? Why?
28. What are your **perceived strengths** and **weaknesses** of **native** Japanese-speaking instructors?
29. What are your **perceived strengths** and **weaknesses** of **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructors?
30. Does the instructor being **native** or **non-native** have any influence on your course choices? Why?
31. If you have **Japanese learning questions,** would you ask a **native** or a **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructor? Why?
32. Would you participate differently in classes taught by **native** Japanese-speaking instructors vs. **non-native** Japanese-speaking instructors? If so, how?
33. What **aspects of communication** (e.g., job interviews, requesting information, stating an opinion, etc.…) do you think **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers are qualified to teach?
34. What **aspects of communication** (e.g., job interviews, requesting information, stating an opinion, etc.…) do you think **native** Japanese-speaking teachers are qualified to teach?
35. If possible, would you prefer to have **both native** and **non-native** Japanese-speaking teachers as language teachers
36. Any additional thoughts about Japanese language learning you would like to share?

E.IV Follow-up Interview Script

Hello, my name is [first name]. How are you today?
[Make small talk to build rapport]

This follow up interview is for the study: *Nihonjin Kyoushi Dake?: The Perceptions of a Non-Native Speaking Teacher in a High-intermediate Japanese Language Class* that is conducted by Matthew Somerville.

This interview will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.
You may decline to answer any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering. Do you consent to this interview being recorded?

No Yes

After 20 minutes and you are not finished answering all of the questions

It has been 20 minutes. There are (# of questions left) remaining. Would you like to continue answering the rest of the questions or would you like to end it here?

If **Yes** to staying: Thank you so much. I will continue with question #.....

No: (Read script for *after finishing the interview)

After finishing the interview

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions. Have a great evening.

E.V Follow-up Interview Sample Questions

1. You stated in the pre-course survey that your goals for the course included expanding your knowledge of Japanese honourifics. Do you believe that you achieved your goals during the five-weeks? Why?
2. Reflecting on your experience with the course, do you believe that the instructor helped you achieve those goals? How?
3. What is something you improved upon during the course?
4. In what ways do you think you will use the concepts you learned in this class in the future?
5. You mentioned in your pre- and post-course surveys that the strengths of the native
6. Japanese speaking teacher are their cultural understanding and native fluency of the language. Could you elaborate on these strengths?
7. Next, you mentioned that the native Japanese speaking teacher's weakness is that they do not have experience learning a second language. Could you elaborate on this weakness?
8. In regards to non-native Japanese-speaking teachers, you mentioned that the strength was that they understand the language better. Could you elaborate on this strength?
9. As for the weaknesses of a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher, you mentioned that they do not understand the language fully. Could you elaborate on this weakness?

Prompt for interviewer: After taking the course, what did you think about the non-native Japanese-speaking teacher's...

- Target language (Japanese) knowledge,
- Communication skills (language proficiency)
- Pedagogic capabilities (i.e. teaching, explanations of concepts, task-design, correction/feedback)
- Cultural knowledge

10. If this class was taught by a native Japanese-speaking instructor, in what ways do you think your learning would be different?
11. Do you think the non-native Japanese-speaking helped or hindered your overall learning? How so?

Prompt for interviewer: For example, did the teaching of topics in this course, such as stating an opinion, talking on the phone, or interviews, help or hinder your learning?

12. Having taken this course, would you take a high-intermediate Japanese course with a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher again? Why or why not?

Appendix F: Code Books

F.I Reflexive Journal Entry Codebook

Name	Description	Example Quotes	References
Attitudes			0
Dissatisfaction	Refers to instances where the instructor felt discontented.		0
Vocabulary breadth	Instructor feels dissatisfied due to poor vocabulary usage.	Instructor: "I think I used Japanese well enough, but my speaking wasn't varied."	4
Embarrassment	Refers to instances where the instructor felt ashamed.		0
Preparation	Instructor felt ashamed due to poor teaching.		1
Reading	Instructor felt ashamed due to reading ability	Instructor: "There was one *kanji* I couldn't read. Very embarrassing."	3
Speaking	Instructor felt ashamed due to speaking.	Instructor: "My Japanese was awful. I slipped so many times with my pronunciation. At one point, I read purposefully read slower than I normally do."	1
Self-efficacy	Refers to instances where the instructor felt their instruction was lacking due to their language ability.		0
Instruction	Instances where the instructor felt self-efficacy issues related to instruction.		2
Improvement			0
Linguistic improvements	Refers to improvement to aspects of language.		0
Text readability	Refers to modifications the instructor made to increase readability of kanji	Instructor: "I tried to overcome [the obstacle of *kanji* readability] by providing *furigana* for difficult *kanji*…."	1

Improving tasks	Refers to instances where the instructor modified tasks for improvement		0
DC-FIB Task Improvements	Refers to instances where the instructor modified DC/FIB tasks for improvement.	Instructor: "I realized that I should have given hints or taken out the unnecessary sections out altogether to mitigate confusion."	1
Elicited Conversation Task Improvements	Refers to instances where the instructor modified	"I think if they had more preparation time [they would have less difficulty]	1
General task Improvements			
Post-tasks	Refers to modifications made to post-tasks for improvement.	Instructor: "I did more focus on post-tasks, which allowed for deeper reflection."	1
Role-play tasks	Refers to modifications made to Role-play tasks for improvement.	Instructor: "I gave students more time to think about answering for role-plays."	2
Warm-up activity improvements	Refers to modifications to warm-up activities for improvement.	Instructor: "I changed the warm-up game to *shiritori,* which was more interactive than the "average day" warm-up."	1
Instruction			0
Cultural instruction	Instruction of cultural aspects of Japan	Instructor: "…we went over to how to apologize. I also showed them a ranking of common misses in Japan."	3
Examples	Instances where examples are used for teaching	Instructor: "Then, I gave example phrases of each aspect of a job interview introduction…"	2
Explanations	Refers to the instructor answering students' questions or providing insight.	Instructor: "My explanations helped students."	5
Focus on form	Instances where the NNST goes over explicit grammar, phrases, or steps.	Instructor: "…I discussed	38

		examples for each aspect of interview introductions, as well as grammar that is used…"	
Instruction process	Refers to the organization of instruction, including tasks. Examples: "We started the lesson, Then, I went over this concept, After, I did x task…."	Instructor: "After, the warm-up, I started teaching the lesson."	151
Instructor performance	Refers to how the instructor felt they did.	Instructor: "Over, I think I did okay, but I did notice somethings that I need to improve upon."	9
Pragmatic teaching	Instances where instruction is related to pragmatics.	Instructor: "I provided steps on the phone conversation pints… as well as "*uchi*" and "*soto*" of phone calls."	17
Non-communication in business	Non-verbal communication aspects related to practical communication in Japanese	Instructor: "…some important tips such as taking a memo."	2
Verbal-communication in business	Verbal communication aspects related to practical communication in Japanese	Instructor: "I gave example phrases of each aspect of a job interview (greetings, profile, experience, reason why I should be hired, and conclusion).	5
Native Speaking Teachers' Capabilities	Refers to the linguistic capabilities of the native Japanese-speaking instructor		0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to the linguistic aspects of Japanese that the NST is able to do.	Instructor: "Unlike a NST, I feel that I need to do a warm-up or something to help my Japanese."	1
NNSTs' Strengths and Weaknesses	Refers to the linguistic and pedagogic capabilities for the non-native Japanese-speaking instructor		0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to the linguistic aspects of Japanese that the NNST is able to do.		0
L2 usage	Refers to positive aspects of the NNST's L2 (Japanese) use	Instructor: "Japanese was much better."	4
Pragmatic knowledge	Refers to the knowledge that the NNST possesses in regards to using	Instructor: "I said that	46

	language in different contexts.	service *keigo* is shorter than normal *keigo* and this can be rude if not used correctly."	
Reading-kanji	Refers to the instructor struggling to read kanji.	Instructor: "I was able to help one student with their *kanji*."	4
Use of L1 and L2	Refers to positive aspects of the NNST's use of English and Japanese		1
Linguistic weaknesses	Any instance where a linguistic weakness (i.e. grammar, speaking, writing) is mentioned.		0
L2 usage	Instances in where I mention I did not use enough Japanese during a lesson.	Instructor: "I wasn't as fluent as I wanted to be."	11
Lack of Grammar knowledge	Refers to the NNST's lack of grammatical knowledge.	Instructor: "…at one point, I wanted to give an example to illustrate a step, but I couldn't [think of a good example]. The reason was because I didn't know the concept myself."	1
Linguistic inaccuracies	Instances where the instructor noted spelling mistakes.	Instructor: "I wrote '*itadakimasu*' as '*itakimasu'*."	2
Reading *kanji*	Instances where the NNST mentioned weakness in reading kanji	Instructor: "I wasn't always 100% on the readings either because I forgot…"	8
Vocabulary	Instances where the NNST felt they used wrong vocabulary or less varied vocabulary.	Instructor: "I read the question, and found out that I used the wrong word for 'my own company' thanks to a student's feedback."	3
Other capabilities	Refers to aspects outside of pedagogy or linguistics that a NNST is able to do.		0
NNST Capability	Refers to the NNST being an apt instructor at a high-intermediate level	Instructor: "Overall, I	1

	class	learned a lot from this experience. I proved to myself that as a NNST I can teach a high level class..”	
NNST Cultural knowledge	Instances where NNST uses culture to instruct.	Instructor: “I discussed ‘inside (*uchi*)’ and ‘outside *(soto*)’ in regards to phone calls…”	1
Research skills	Refers to the instructor’s skills in exploring topics.	Instructor: “I did a lot of research on ‘doing a job interview’ using various websites.”	4
Pedagogical strengths	Refers to instructional aspects that the NNST is able to do.		0
Corrective feedback	Any instance in which the NNST provided feedback to students.	Instructor: “I corrected their mistakes, bringing their attention to form.”	20
Engagement	Engagement refers to an action done by the NNST that motivates a student to partake in the lesson.	Instructor: “I also think I was positive and engaging.”	7
Example choice	Instances where the NNST felt that the examples were effective.	Instructor: “…we went over a good example…”	2
Explanations	Instances where the NNST felt that the explanations were effective.	Instructor: “When students had questions, I believe I answered well.”	15
Feedback response	How the NNST responded to students’ feedback and/or correction	Instructor: “After reviewing this feedback, I corrected the mistake.”	2
Guidance	Guidance refers to the NNST prompting students by asking questions or pointing out certain concepts during instruction.	Instructor: “I also prompted them by asking if his introduction matched the context.’	26
Strategies	Refers to tactics or strategies that the instructor has taught students.	Instructor: “I went over how to answer these questions using the STAR method.”	2
Pedagogical weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of the NNSTs’ instructional capabilities.		0
Explanations weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of explanations.	Instructor: “My	11

		explanations were not satisfactory…"	
Lack of preparation	Problems in instruction related to not preparing beforehand.	Instructor: "I was not able to read a lot the *kanji* that I put on the slides due to lack of preparation."	7
Time Management	Refers to the instructor not properly managing time during instruction	Instructor: "I skipped the post task due to time constraints."	3
Reflection			0
General reflections	Refers to reflections that are not specific.	Instructor: "I think it was a lot of fun."	14
Reflection on instruction	Refers to instances where the instructor reflects on their own instruction.	Instructor: "I would appreciative training in task design."	5
Task reflection	Refers to the instructor's reflections on tasks		0
Reflection on DC-FIB Tasks	Refers to the instructor's reflections on DC-FIB Tasks	Instructor: "DC tasks can be must better… some of the underlined sections caused students trouble."	6
Role-play reflection	Refers to the instructor's reflections on role-plays.	Instructor: "Students did very well with this task."	2
Vocabulary	Refers to the instructor's reflections on their vocabulary knowledge.	Instructor: "What could be improved: My vocabulary knowledge."	3
Students			0
Student observations	Refers to what the NNST noticed in regards to students' performance and understanding.		0
Performance	Refers to the instructor's perceptions of how students did during lessons.	Instructor: "Both students did very well with the role-play."	47
Student difficulty			1
DC Tasks	Instances when the NNST observed students having difficulty with DC Tasks	Instructor: "…I noticed that students had trouble filling some of the underlined sections."	5
Instruction	Refers to students' difficulties with instruction	Instructor: "There were	1

		many steps and I think I confused one of my students..”	
Kanji	Instances when the NNST observed students having difficulty with kanji	Instructor: “…I noticed that one student had trouble with *kanji*.”	1
Role-play Task	Instances when the NNST observed students having difficulty with role-play tasks	Instructor: “The roleplay was not clear enough as students seemed to struggle.”	8
Warm-ups	Refers to students’ having trouble with warm-up activities.	Instructor: “However, I will say that students seemed a bit confused.”	2
Student understanding	Refers to the students’ comprehension in response to instruction.		0
General understanding	Refers to students’ understanding which does not pertain to “pragmatics”	Instructor: “I think the students were able to understand the task instructions well enough.:	11
Pragmatic understanding	Refers to students’ understanding of language is used in the real world in response to instruction.	Instructor: “They had great insight, such as that service *keigo* is easier to remember than normal *keigo*.”	32
Warm-ups	Instances when the NNST observed students in regards to warm-ups.	Instructor: “First, I did a warm-up with them We introduced souvenirs to each other. They did very well.”	2
Student questions	Any instance where the NNST mentions that the student asked questions.	Instructor: “Conrad asked two great questions regarding the script.”	2
Task Design	Refers to how tasks are created and/or modified for student learning	0	
Task design strengths	Any instance where the NNST mentions a positive aspect in regards to task design		0
Ease of creation	Refers to the ease of making tasks.	Instructor: “It was easy for me since I didn’t have to draft up a script…”	1
General strengths	Refers to positive aspects that are not specific.	Instructor: “I think the	2

		tasks were designed well enough. Especially since I've never done tasks before."	
Task design effectiveness	Refers to how good the instructor believes the tasks to be.	Instructor: "While this script was small, I thought it effectively showed what is needed to answer questions correct."	5
Tasks			0
Main Task	Refers to any mention of a main-task.		0
DC-FIB Task	Any instance when the NNST talks about DC tasks. Note: FIB tasks are the same as DC tasks.	Instructor: "The first task was a DC task."	17
Elicited Conversation Task	Any instance when the NNST discusses elicited conversation tasks.	Instructor: "…we did a task where the students had to come up with their own strengths/weaknesses, episode to show these strengths and weaknesses, and how they can be used for the employees."	6
Role-play task	Any instance when the NNST talks about role-play tasks	Instructor: "This activity was a role-play, but instead of creating a situation for them, I wanted them to choose."	17
Script Task	Any instance where the NNST talks about script tasks.	Instructor: "…we looked at a script that needed to be corrected."	16
Post-Task	Refers to any mention of a post-task.		0
Cultural Reflection Questions	Refers to guiding questions that enable students' to ponder on cultural aspects.	Instructor: "As a post-task, I asked them what they thought about opinion sharing in Japan and Canada. What did they think?"	2
General reflection questions	Refers to guiding questions that do not related to linguistics, pedagogy,	Instructor: "I asked them if	4

	or pragmatics.	they thought of any good or bad points."	
Linguistic reflection questions	Reflection questions that prompt students to think about linguistic aspects of Japanese	Instructor: "I asked after what types of *keigo* were used with the customer and why."	8
Pragmatic reflection	Refers to questions that prompt students to think about pragmatics. That is, how language is used in different settings.	Instructor: "First, I asked the students what the differences between general introductions and interview introductions."	8
Task processes	Refers to the layout of tasks during instruction		0
DC Task processes	Refers to the layout of DC tasks during instruction	Instructor: "For this section, I instead had two activities back to back and then I taught the grammar."	2
Elicited Conversation Task processes	Refers to the layout of elicited conversation tasks during instruction.	Instructor: "I gave them 5 minutes and if they needed more time, they could tell me."	1
Role-play task processes	Refers to the layout of Role-play tasks during instruction	Instructor: "I gave them points to consider and gave them 2 minutes to think."	9
Script task processes	Refers to the layout of script tasks during instruction	Instructor: "I had them read both actors and then asked them what was wrong."	35
Task scenarios	Any instance where the NNST mentions a scenario from a task		0
DC Task Scenarios	Refers to instances where dc task scenarios are mentioned.	Instructor: "We did a FIB task which consisted of two parts: -welcoming the customer; taking their order."	2
Elicited conversation task scenarios	Refers to elicited conversation task scenarios.	Instructor: "In this simulation, I had them	3

		enter the room and say a greeting, then an introduction…"	
Role-play task scenarios	Refers to role-play scenarios.	Instructor: "They offered to help their senior who needed help with French."	6
Task Strengths	Instances when the NNST mentioned positive aspects of tasks (i.e. if it benefitted students; were the tasks effective?)		0
DC Task Strengths	Any instance where the NNST mentions a positive aspect of DC tasks	Instructor: "…the function of the FIB is to test their pragmatic knowledge"	4
Elicited conversation strengths	Refers to positive aspect of elicited conversation tasks.	Instructor: "I loved their answers regardless. They weren't perfect, which I told them was okay. I got them thinking."	1
General strengths	Any instance where the NNST mentions a positive aspect of tasks	Instructor: "However, I think the tasks illustrated what I wanted them to learn, so I am grateful."	2
Post-tasks strengths	Any instance where the NNST mentions a positive aspect of the post-tasks.	Instructor: "I did more focus on post-tasks, which allowed for deeper reflecting…"	2
Pre-task strengths	Any instance where the NNST mentions a positive aspect about pre-tasks.	Instructor: "I think the students were able to understand the task instructions well enough."	1
Role-play tasks	Any instance where the NNST mentions a positive aspect of role-play tasks.	Instructor: "I provided two role-plays which had students use what they learned (phone call language both inside and outside the company).	3
Script Task	Any instance where the NNST mentions a positive aspect of Script tasks.	Instructor: "While the script was small, I thought	3

		it effectively showed what is needed to answer questions correctly."	
Task Weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of tasks		0
DC Task weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of DC tasks.		4
Script tasks	Refers to negative aspects of script tasks.	Instructor: "…the script was small.."	1
Task clarity	Refers to tasks, including instructions, not being clear.	Instructor: "DC tasks can be much better… some of the underlined sentences caused students trouble."	6
Task difficulty	Refers to the tasks being too difficult or easy.	Instructor: "I wonder if my task activities were difficult enough for the students' level. I gave 10 minutes and they finished faster than I expected."	4
Task variety	Refers to the lack of various amounts of tasks.	Instructor: "Making tasks was quite difficulty. I wanted to make creative and engaging activities that aided students' learning, but due to the time, I ended up doing the same tasks with some variation."	1
Time management	Refers to poor management due to task design.	Instructor: "We had a lot of time left over, unlike the other group. I don't know exactly why, but maybe I need more tasks in case they finish early."	1
Warm-ups	Instances where short activities before lessons are mentioned.		0
Warm-up Activities	Any instance when the NNST mentions a warm-up activity or an aspect of a warm-up activity	Instructor: "We started off with "mystery words,"	11

		which is a warm-up game.	
Warm-up activity strengths	Instances where the NNST mentions a positive aspect of warm-up activities	Instructor: “Great warm-up”	4
Warm-up process	Refers to the warm-up procedures.	Instructor: “I give students words and they have to get others to guess.”	6
Teaching Material	Any instance where the NNST mentions “teaching material,” or describes an aspect of the teaching material.		0
Teaching material strengths	Refers to positive aspects regarding teaching materials.	Instructor: “Students were able to choose their strengths and weaken by themselves or use one from a list I provided.”	1
Topics			0
Topic choice	Instances where the NNST discusses the topics of choice for each lesson.	Instructor: “First, we did a warm-up.”	27
Topic Strengths	Refers to positive aspects of topics.	Instructor: “I think the topics were interesting.”	6

F.II Pre-Course Survey Codebook

Name	Description	Examples Quotes	References
Asking questions	Refers to which type of teacher (native or non-native) that a student prefers to ask questions to		0
Both	Refers to the asking questions to both NNSTs and NSTs	Lily: "I think I would ask a native Japanese speaking person, since I have the conversational skills to explain it. However at the same time, if I asked a non-native speaker (i.e., an English speaker), then I could ask what I need in English which would be way easier."	3
NNSTs	Student prefers to ask questions non-native speaking teachers		0
Experience learning the TL	Refers to the NNST's experience learning Japanese as a second language, which allows them to better answer questions.	Conrad: "..as they would have most likely been in my position as a student at one point in their life, and therefore would be able to give better advice."	1
Personable	Refers to students being comfortable about NNSTs	Lily: "I don't think I would feel weird asking questions."	1
NSTs		Lauren: "Native."	1
Aspects of Communications	Refers to the instructor teaching activities related to communication, such as job interviews, requesting information, sharing an opinion.		0
Both	Refers to both instructors being able to teach aspects of communications		0

Pragmatic aspects	Refers to both instructors being able to teach pragmatic aspects.	Candice: "…job interviews, request information and stating opinion."	1
Qualified	Refers to that the instructors can teach any aspect of communication due to their experiences.	Conrad: "I think as long as the instructor has had those kinds of experiences before, they are qualified to teach…."	1
NNSTs			1
Influence on communication	Refers to the NNST's ability to influence the style of communication when speaking with others.	Lily: "I think they can change the way Japanese people communicate around them, like when I was in Japan, my friends became more opinionated and used less *tatamae* around me as time went one."	1
NSTs			2
Pragmatics-Communication styles	Refers to the NST's qualifications to teach different communication styles.	Lily: "…they can also teach you about communication styles."	1
Course participation	Students preference to participate more if the course based on the instructor		0

Both instructors	The student will participate regardless if the teacher is native or non-native	Conrad: "I don't think so generally. ….I feel like questions about how to speak most naturally would be better answered by a native instructor, but perhaps more complex grammar questions might be better answered by a non-native instructor who has deliberately studied such things."	3
NNSTs	The student will participate in the course if the teacher is a non-native speaking instructor	Lily: "I think so. I've found Japanese speaking instructors in Canada to be harder to learn from to be honest… With non-native teachers, I don't think I would feel weird about asking questions.	1
Instructor preference	Students preferences towards instructor (i.e. native, non-native, or both)		0
Both	Instances where the student has no preference on which teach they have	Lily: "No, I don't think so. I just register for courses that I can count towards my degree, I don't think about the teacher."	7
NNST preferences	Instances where the student has a preference towards non-native speaking teachers	Conrad: "I do think that non-native instructors could have the edge in terms of grammar or general language-learning advice…."	3

NST preferences	Instances where the student has a preference towards native speaking teachers	Lauren: "I would prefer native."	7
Knowledge			0
Declarative knowledge	Refers to the knowledge that an instructor possesses.	Conrad: "I think that as long as the teacher knows relatively a lot more that the students, it doesn't matter if the teacher is native or not."	3
NNST perceptions	Students' conception of a non-native speaking Japanese teacher		0
Strengths	Skills that a non-native speaking teacher is particularly strong in		0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to the positive aspects of a NNST's language skills.		0
Experience with learning the TL	Refers to the NNST's experience learning Japanese as a second language.	Lauren: "They understand how to learn the language better."	5
Grammatical knowledge	Refers to the NNST's knowledge of L2 grammar.	Lily; "I do wish I had a non-native Japanese teacher to teach me grammar as they would be able to explain it to me easier I think."	3
Native Language Proficiency	Refers to students' preferences in asking NNSTs' questions because they can speak the language of the students.	Lily: "However, at the same time, if I asked a non-native speaker (i.e., an English speaker), then I could ask what I need in English which would be way easier."	1
Pedagogical strengths	Refers to the NNST's strengths in instruction.		0
Empathy	Refers to NNSTs' strength of having shared experiences with students, such as learning a second language.	Candice: "Understand the difficulties non-native speaker may face when learning the language."	9

Explanations	Refers to the perceived strength that NNSTs possess in answering questions and/or discussing topics in a way that students understand.	Conrad: "Possibly able to give more in-depth explanations of complex grammar points."	2
Learning strategies	Refers to the students' preferences towards NNSTs due to their ability to offer language learning tips.	Conrad: "I do think that non-native instructors could have the edge in terms of grammar or general language-teaching advice…"	2
Leniency	Refers to the students' preference for NNSTs due to their leniency.	Lily: "I have an image that they're a bit more lenient.."	2
Teaching qualifications	Refers to perceptions that students have which are connected to instructor's previous qualities or experiences.	Lily: "Unsure as I've never had a non-native Japanese speaking instructor, but I'm sure they're qualified if they're teaching."	1
NST perceptions	Students' conception notions of a native speaking teacher		0
Strengths	Skills that a native speaking teacher is particularly strong in		0
Cultural understanding	Refers to the NST's perceived strength in understanding the target culture.	Candice: "I think native speaker may have a better understanding on Japanese culture…"	3
Linguistic strengths	Refers to NST's language skills.		0
Pragmatic knowledge	Refers to the NST's knowledge of how language is used in the real-world.	Candice: "I think native speaker may have a better understanding of.. how Japanese speak in daily life."	2

Speaking	Refers to the perceived strength of speaking which includes pronunciation.	Conrad: "I think overall, I would prefer a native teacher because of their natural, innate abilities."	7
Vocabulary knowledge	Refers to the perceived strength that NSTs are strong in vocabulary.	Lily: "They know pretty much every single word, so if someone were interested vocabulary on a specific topic they could learn from the teacher…"	2
Writing	Refers to the perceived strength of writing.	Conrad: "I think they might also be better at teaching calligraphy."	1
Pedagogical strengths	Refers to NST's teaching skills.		0
Explanations	Refers to the NST's perceived strength in answering students' questions and/or providing insight on topics that are difficult for students.	Lily: "I think being able to navigate questions that put you on the spot is helpful…"	1
Weaknesses	Skills that the native speaker lacks or does not possess		0
Pedagogical weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects in regards to the NST's instruction		0
Focus on non-native students	Refers to the NST"s weakness in focusing on non-native students.	Lily: "…focus they're energy on fluent speaking non-Japanese students, rather than someone ethnically Japanese that might still be having issues…"	1
General teaching ability	Refers to NST's instruction in general	Candice: "No, native instructors can be a really bad teaching teacher too."	2

Strictness	Refers to the NST's rigid teaching	Lily: "I've found Japanese speaking instructor in Canada to be harder to learn from to be honest, they're harsher…"	1
Overcoming challenges	Refers to the ways in which students overcome obstacles that they may face (either by themselves or with support from the instructor's)		0
Instructor support	Refers to how an instructor can assist in students overcoming their challenges		0
Application	Refers to the instructor creating outlets for students' to use what they have learned.	Candice: "exercise."	2
Engagement	Refers to the instructor's ability to make an active learning environment that promotes student participation.	Lauren: "…create a fun environment…"	2
Enthusiasm	Refers to instructor's positivity about topics.	Conrad: "Be enthusiastic about the topic…"	4
Explanations	Refers to the instructor's ability to answer questions and/or discuss topics in a way that students understand.	Conrad: '…answer any questions I may have…"	3
Keigo	Refers to instructor's ability to help students with keigo (Japanese honourifics).	Lily: "Work on *keigo* primarily.."	1
Student challenges	Refers to the obstacles (instructional or linguistic) that students may face.		0
Linguistic challenges	Refers to students who state obstacles relating to language.		2
Grammar	Refers to a weakness in grammar.	Lily: "Little grammatical issues…"	4
Keigo	Refers to a weakness in Japanese honourifics.	Candice: "Honourific form and particle."	3
Language maintenance	Refers to difficulty in maintaining the target language at a proficient level.	Lauren: "Its hard to maintain to maintain the language at a proficient level."	1
Vocabulary	Refers to a weakness in vocabulary.	Lily: "vocabulary on niche topics.."	1

Work Study Balance	Refers to difficulties maintaining a balance between studying languages and other activities, such as school and/or work.	Conrad: "It can be hard to balance Japanese studies with other courses."	1
Students			0
Course motivations	Refers to the reasons why the student enrolled in the course		0
General interest	Refers to students' interest in taking the course. However, student does not specify what specifically they are interested in.	Candice: "As an interest."	3
Improve target language	Refers to students who take the course to improve their Japanese.	Conrad: "I am always looking for opportunities to improve my Japanese. I simply couldn't pass up free class like this."	1
Interest in Research	Refers to students' interest in learning about the research.	Lauren: "I want to learn more about your research!"	1
Learner recommendations	Refers to the student being recommended to take the course.	Lily: "A friend referred me."	1
Learner goals	Refers to the goals that learners wanted to achieve during the course		1
Improve polite speaking	Refers to the student wanting to improve their politeness.	Lily: 'I don't have the most polite Japanese speaking (very casual) so and improvement on the would be nice!"	1
Professional Context Understanding	Refers to students who want to improve their understanding of professional contexts (i.e. business and/or academic contexts)	Conrad: "I hope that my understanding of… Japanese business settings will improve.	2
Understand Keigo	Refers to students' goal in improving their understanding of Japanese honourifics.	Lauren: "I would like to expand my knowledge."	5
Student background			
Age range	Refers to the age range that students fall into	N/A	5
Ethnicity	Refers to the students' ethnic range	N/A	5

Gender	Refers to the students' assigned gender	N/A	5
Native language	Refers to the students' native language	N/A	5
Proficiency	Refers to the students' proficiency level in Japanese	N/A	5
Experience with NSTs	Experience with NSTs in Japan	N/A	5
Inexperience with NNSTs	Refers to the students' previous inexperience with NNSTs.	N/A	5

F.III Language Log Codebook

Name	Description	Example Quotes	References
Applicability			0
Use in Japan	Refers to learned concepts can be used within business (or outside) within Japan.		0
Outside the professional Context within Japan	The student feels that they can use the learned concept(s) in an everyday context (i.e., talking with friends) within Japan	Lauren: "Whenever I am in situations when I need to introduce myself in work setting or with new people."	11
Professional Context within Japan	The student feels that they can use the learned concept(s) within a business or academic setting in Japan.	Candice: "If I work in Japan or work with Japanese I may need to use it."	32
Use outside of Japan	Refers to learned concepts can be used within business (or outside) outside of Japan.		0
Outside the professional Context outside of Japan	The student feels that they can use the learned concept(s) in an everyday context (i.e., talking with friends) outside of Japan	Lauren: "Whenever I am in situations where I need to improve myself in work setting or with new people."	6
Professional Context outside of Japan	The student feels that they can use the learned concept(s) within a business or academic setting outside of Japan	Conrad: "I anticipate that adding my opinions to a conversation will be very useful in many situations, especially when meeting new people and in work environments."	11
Class format	Refers to the format of the classroom		0
Class format strengths	Refers to the positive aspects of the classroom format	Lauren: "And being breakout rooms and getting to talk to different people was a great idea too."	2
Course			0

Course weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects about the course		0
Limited time	Refers to the amount of time during the course in which students felt was short.	Candice: "It is easier to understand the differences in [class number]. Perhaps because there was limited time (in this class)."	1
Instructor			0
Course instructor strengths	Refers to the linguistic and pedagogic capabilities of the non-native Japanese speaking course instructor.		0
Pedagogic strengths	Refers to instructional aspects that the NNST is able to do.		0
Enthusiasm	Refers to the instructor's positivity during instruction. Example: "They were positive," "I found the instructor really enthusiastic about a concept.."	Lauren: "I love the encouragement from the instructor."	1
Examples	Instances when students mentioned a positive aspect about examples.		0
Amount	Refers to positive aspects towards example amounts.	Lauren: "…the amount of examples and types of examples are very well structured."	1
Applicability	Refers to the how examples can be used in real world situations.	Conrad: "The sample conversation seemed like a conversation that I could hypothetically have if I was in Japan."	6
General strengths	Refers to strengths that are not specific.	Lauren: "I think the examples are great."	10
Variance	Refers to positive aspects towards example variety.	Lauren: "…the types of examples are very well structured."	1
Explanations	Instances where the student mentioned positive aspects related to the instructor's explanations.	Conrad: "I liked the explanations a lot. Providing example sentences really helped me understand the couple of points I hadn't seen until now."	16
Pedagogical weaknesses	Refers to the negative aspects of the NNST's instructional practices.		0

Examples	Instances where students mentioned a negative aspect of examples.	Lauren: "Some of the examples were a bit tricky."	2
Explanations	Instances where the student mentioned negative aspects relating to the instructor's explanations.	Lauren: "I want more detailed explanations."	3
Instructor performance	Refers to how the instructor did.	Lauren: "I think he did a good job."	7
Student-Instructor Rapport	Refers to a friendly or harmonious relationship between the instructor and student(s)	Lauren: "I did like it that the instructor was in the same breakout room when my partner and I were working on the examples as it was nice to get feedback.	1
Pedagogy			0
Instruction	Refers to students' perceptions of instructio		0
Instructor hinderance	Instances where students felt the instruction did not help them.	Candice: "..but not good for revision."	3
Instructor support	Instances where students felt the instruction helped them.		0
Feedback	Refers to the positive aspects of instructor's feedback.	Lauren: "….as it was nice to get feedback."	1
General	Refers to general positive aspects of instructor's support.	Lily: "I think it helped."	10
Teaching materials	Examples: "Cheat sheets, presentation slides, worksheet)		7
Cheat-sheet	Instances where the student mentions a positive aspect of cheat-sheets	Conrad: "The *keigo* conjugation cheat-sheat was especially was especially helpful, and if I ever forget a conjugation, I will definitely be referring back to that sheet."	5
Cheat-sheet weaknesses	Instances where a student mentions a negative aspect about cheat sheets.	Conrad: "One small thing was being able to read the chart of possible strengths and weaknesses, as I had to translate about half of them to understand what they meant."	2

DC Task Weaknesses	Refers to weaknesses regarding the DC task.	Conrad: "Although I feel that filling in some of the blanks in the example dialogues seemed guide long, and I wasn't always sure what to say to fill them in."	1
Presentations	Strengths regarding class slides.	Lauren: "I definitely have forgotten a lot about the rules and so it was good that you had a summary slide which I found very helpful."	4
Teaching material strengths	Refers to a positive aspect of teaching materials.	Lily: "I think the overall material helped."	28
Teaching material weaknesses	Refers to the negative aspects of teaching materials	Lily: "I prepped a majority of the *kanji* before the lesson which I think helped a lot with the lesson, so I think	1
Warm-up strengths			0
Engagement	Refers to the students' perception of warm-up activities as "fun."	Lily: "I also enjoy the warm up do every week."	1
Student rapport	Refers to warm-up exercises aiding students in building a friendly or harmonious relationship between each other.	Lily: "…did warm up exercises just to the group comfortable which I appreciated since I'm quite shy."	1
Student Strengths	Refers to positive aspects related to students.		0
General strengths	Refers to positive aspects that are not specific to any other category.	Lauren: "I think I felt pretty confident…"	2
Learning strengths	Strengths regarding the learning of content.		0
Not Aware	Instances where students were not aware of their strengths during units.	Candice: "Not sure."	1
Participation	Student is participating in class.	Conrad: "I think I participated an adequate amount."	1

Understanding content	Student is able to understand content	Conrad: "I was able to understand everything really well."	6
Linguistic strengths	Strengths related to Japanese language.		0
Comprehension	Refers to the students' strengths in understanding the target language	Lily: "I think my strengths were… understanding what has said to my verbally."	2
Linguistic awareness		Candice: "Able to realize mistake by myself."	3
Pragmatics	Refers to a skill in understanding how to use language in different contexts, understanding proper register, and using the correct register with another person.	Conrad: "I think overall I did a good job at properly using *keigo* during the sample conversation."	5
Speaking	Refers to the students' strengths in speaking.	Lily: "I think my strengths were speaking…"	8
Professional experience	Instances where the students' previous work experiences.	Lauren: "I think that my experienced helped…"	1
Task strengths	Refers to students' strengths related to tasks (i.e. fill in the blank, role-play, or DC tasks).		0
Role-play strengths	Refers to students' strengths related to role-play activities.	Lily: "My strength was the script making I think, I feel like I come up with a fun setting when we are told to create our own scripts.	2
Warm-up	Refers to students' strengths in the warm-up activities.	Lily: "I think my strength this week was for the warm-up game…"	2
Students			0
Learner recommendations	Suggestions made by students to improve their learning		0
Early access to teaching material	Instances where the students mention wanting early access to presentation.	Candice: "Include the correct form in the worksheet or give the model answer after class."	9
Examples	Instances where the participant mentions a suggestion related to explanations.	Lauren: "I think would have been really helpful if there were more examples…"	2

Explanations	Instances where the learner offers suggestions for explanations.	Lauren: "I want more detailed explanations."	1
Kanji	Suggestions related to improving students' learning with kanji (Chinese characters)	Lily: "If there were some more *furigana* for some of the harder *kanji* I would really appreciate it."	4
Lesson organization	Instances where student suggests a way to improve lesson organization.	Conrad: "…I feel that sometimes we were given a bit too much time to do the practice dialogues.'	1
Learning	Instances where the students expressed concepts that they acquired		0
Culture	Cultural aspects that students expressed they acquired	Candice: "Different between self-introduction at school and company/office."	1
General	Refers to students' learning which is general	Lauren: "I learnt interesting facts."	4
Grammar	Grammatical aspects that students acquired	Candice: "Use [*keigo*] more."	9
Pragmatics	"Pragmatics" refers to the language one uses in different contexts. Pragmatic aspects that students acquired are those that reflect Japanese honourific or how language is used in different contexts.	Conrad: "Polite self-introductions for academic and business settings."	82
Vocabulary	Instances where a student acquired a word or phrase.	Lily: ".using the line '*meiwakuninaru'* when doing a self-introduction work environment."	17
Strategies	Refers to strategies students use to overcome their personal learning obstacles.		0
Application	Refers to using learned concepts to improve learning	Lily: "I think I just have to be in more settings where *keigo* is needed."	15
Asking questions	Refers to students asking questions to better their understanding of the content.	Conrad: "However, after asking some questions, I was able to somewhat grasp the concepts that were taught."	2

Mitigating embarrassment	Refers to lowering embarrassment.	Lily: "…also not being embarrassed about asking what the *kanji* means when I don't know the reading…"	1
Preparation	Refers to going over material before the class starts to improve learning.	Conrad: "For next week, I 'll be sure to read ahead so that I can better read and comprehend the material."	34
Reading-Kanji	Refers to strategies on how to better read kanji.	Lily: "I just have to expose myself to more *kanji* to memorize the readings…"	10
Reliance on Technology	Instances where the student mentions a need to not use technology to solve a problem.	Lily: "I need to stop relying on google translate and my phone keyboard to deal with *kanji*…."	1
Revision	Refers to students' revising learned concepts to improve their learning.	Conrad: "Now reflecting on the class and reviewing the slides afterwards, everything is much clearer, and I feel I fully understand what was being taught."	11
Time-Management	Strategies related to time management	Conrad: "I will certainly have to prioritize time-management as the weeks pass."	1
Student Challenges	Refers to the challenges that students face during instruction.		0
Culture	Refers to cultural understanding in which students are not skilled at.		0
Cross-cultural differences	Refers to students' weaknesses due to cultural differences between their native country and Japan	Lily: "..but I wouldn't know where to start, as Japan's social cues//social norms are quite different from Canadian ones…"	1
Linguistic challenges	Refers to obstacles related to language.		0
Application	Refers to the challenges of using the language outside of the classroom.	Lauren: "…. one thing I can try doing is to practice using what I [learned] in this class in real life…"	4

Keigo	Refers to students' challenges with using honourific language.	Candice: "Switching between *keigo* and *desu/masu tai*."	11
Reading - Kanji	Refers to a weakness in reading kanji or Chinese characters.	Lily: "My biggest weakness in general has always been reading *kanji*…"	13
Speaking	Refers to students' having difficulties with speaking.	Conrad: "Usually I'd say that my speaking was my strength, but for this class in particular… I found myself tripping up on a couple of words…"	2
Vocabulary	Refers to students' difficulty with Japanese vocabulary.	Conrad: "there were some… words that I was unfamiliar with."	9
No Challenges	Instances where the student felt that they did not have any challenges	Lauren: "I didn't find that I faced any obstacles…"	2
Organization	Weaknesses regarding organization. Examples: "I struggle with time-management"	Conrad: "I will certainly have to prioritize time-management as the weeks pass."	1
Other factors	Refers to factors that affect students' learning such as being tired.	Lily: "I think for me I was just overtired this week…"	4
Student Improvement	Refers to the students' feeling about their improvement		0
Japanese honourifics	Refers to improvements made by students which connect to Japanese honourifics.	Lily: "I know what to include when introducing myself in a professional manner…"	1
Reading kanji	Refers to instances where students felt they improved in reading kanji.	Lily: "I think I faced less obstacles with *kanji* learning this week, as I was able to prep with *furigana."*	4
Student rapport	Refers to the building of connection between two (or more) students.	Lauren: "…it was fun to work with a new partner too."	4
Tasks			0

Task Strengths	Instances where students mention a positive aspect in regards to a task		2
Creating examples	Instances where students created their own examples	Lauren: "I really liked the use of examples and creating my own."	1
Engagement	Refers to tasks as fun	Lily: "I find…'fill-in-the-blank' and 'make your own script' method really helpful and fun to do in class."	3
Fill in the blank strengths	Instances where students mention a positive aspect in regards to fill in the blank tasks.	Lauren: "….having the fill in the blank questions are great."	3
Role-play script	Instances where the student mentions a positive aspect about the role-play task.	Lauren: "I always the script making…"	4
Task Weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of tasks.		0
DC-FIB Tasks	Refers to negative aspects about DC-FIB tasks	Conrad: "Although I feel that filling in some of the blanks in the example dialogues seemed quite long, and I wasn't always sure what to fill them in."	2
Warm-up activities			0
Warm-up activity strengths	Refers to positive aspects of the warm-up activities.		0
Engagement	Refers to warm-up activities being engaging.	Lily: "the] game at the beginning of the class is always very fun."	4
Rapport	Refers to warm-up activities building rapport.	Lily: "I think we did a good job…and did warm-up exercises just to the group comfortable which I appreciated since I'm quite shy."	1

F.IV Post-Course Surveys

Name	Description	Example Quotes	References
Asking questions	Refers to which type of teacher (native or non-native) that a student prefers to ask questions to		0
Both	Refers to the students' preference to ask both teachers.	Lauren: "I think would lean towards more the native instructor, however, after participating in this class in this class I wouldn't either.	2
NNSTs	Student prefers to ask questions non-native speaking teachers	Conrad: "…I think that non-native Japanese-speaking instructors would have a slight edge, as those instructors ….could share their own experiences that come from a similar perspective to more thoroughly answer Japanese learning questions."	1
NSTs	Students prefers to ask native speaking teachers questions	Lily: "Probably a native speaker, as I would imagine they would have a faster answer for me."	4
Aspects of Communication	Refers to the instructor teaching activities related to communication, such as job interviews, requesting information, sharing an opinion.		0

Both	Refers to students' perceptions that both native and non-native speaking teachers can teach aspects of communication.	Conrad: "I think that any Japanese instructor who has had those types of experiences or is extremely proficient in Japanese would be qualified to teach the aspects of communication mentioned."	2
NNSTs	Refers to students' perceptions that non-native speaking teachers can teach aspects of communication.		0
General agreement	Refers to students' general agreement that NNSTs can teach aspects of communication.	Lauren: "everything!"	1
General disagreement	Refers to students' general disagreement that NNSTs can teach aspects of communication.	Candice: "No."	1
Professional contexts	Refers to the non-native speaking teacher's ability to teach aspects of communication related to business and academia.	Lily; "I think interviews, and how to properly introduce myself."	1
NSTs	Refers to students' perceptions that native speaking teachers can teach aspects of communication.		0
General	Refers to students' general agreement that NSTs can teach aspects of communication.	Candice: "Yes."	
Non-verbal communication	Refers to areas of communication in the non-verbal category (such as body language, clothing)	Lily: "I think unspoken dialogue (i.e., body language, *tatemae*) is when they would be great teachers.	1

Tangible experiences	Refers to the NST having experiences at the target country thus being able to teach aspects of communication.	Lauren: "I think that a native teacher would have experience in Japan and so they would have insight on personal interactions that would be helpful when teaching communication.	1
Course Participation	Students preference to participate more if the course based on the instructor		0
Both instructors	The student will participate regardless if the teacher is native or non-native	Conrad: "I would still try my by best as a student, regardless of the instructor."	3
NSTs	The student will participate in the course if the teacher is a non-native speaking instructor	Lily: "I think I would participate less in a native speaking class…"	1
Course recommendation	Refers to if students would or would not recommend the course		0
Do not recommend	Instances where the students do not recommend the course	Candice: "No, most of my friends learn Japanese as an interest. And this course is not suitable for them."	1
Would recommend	Instances where students would recommend the course.	Conrad: "If I had a friend that was interested in improving their Japanese and learning *keigo,* I would absolutely recommend this course."	4
Instructor preference	Students preferences towards instructor (i.e. native, non-native, or both)		0

Both	Instances where the student has no preference on which teach they have		
Beyond nativeness	Students do not prefer instructors based on their instructors.	Connor: "I don't think the speaking ability of the instructor has any influence on my learning because I am happy to learn more Japanese, regardless of the instructor."	3
Differing strengths	Refers to students' preferences to learning from both because of their differing strengths.	Lily: "…the *keigo* was easier to learn through a non-native speaker, but I found learning *kanji* with Japanese teachers easier."	2
Proficiency		Lauren: "As long as the instructor has proficient language abilities, I will respect them and have a good attitude towards the class."	1
NNST preferences	Instances where the student has a preference towards non-native speaking teachers	Lauren: "…I personally had a great experience especially because I found that a non-native instructor understand the difficulty of learning the language and had better insight than a native instructor."	4

No preference	Refers to the student not having a preference towards the instructor's nativeness.	Candice: "No."	1
NST preferences	Instances where the student has a preference towards native speaking teachers	Lauren: "At my current level I think that I would prefer a native instructor just because I am already native and I would like to challenge myself and improve my Japanese skills."	7
NNST perceptions	Students' conception of a non-native speaking Japanese teacher		0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to NNST's language skills that they possess		0
Experience with Target Language	Refers to the perceived strength of having experience learning a second language.	Lauren:"…the main strength would be that they understand how to learn a language."	8
Learning Honourifics	Refers to students' preference of learning honourific from NNSTs.	Lily: "…the *keigo* was easier to learn through a native speaker…"	1
Linguistic weaknesses	Refers to NNST's language skills that they lack		0
Poor proficiency	Refers to the level of input/output that a NNST ca not produce.	Lauren: "A perceived weakness of a non-native instructor is that they may not fully native in the language…"	1
Pedagogic strengths	Refers to the teaching skills that NNSTs possess.		0

Empathy	Refers to students' preferences asking NNSTs questions because their shared experiences with students, such as learning a second language.	Lauren: "I found that a non-native instructor understands the difficulty of learning the language and had better insight that a native instructor."	2
Explanations	Refers to the instructor's effectiveness in answering questions and/or discussing topics in a way that students understand.	Conrad: "Everything was clearly explained.:	2
Learning strategies	Refers to the language learning tips that NNSTs can provide their students.	Conrad: "…I think that a non-native Japanese speaking instructor would probably be able to give extra tips or advice to their students in terms of studying…."	2
Pedagogic weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of the NNST's teaching		0
Non-native student focused	Refers to NNSTs that focus on non-native students.	Lily: "…would be teaching in a way meant for non-native speakers."	1
NST perceptions	Students' conception notions of a native speaking teacher		0
Strengths	Skills that a native speaking teacher is particularly strong in		0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to the NST's language skills that they possess.		0

Fluent speaking proficiency	Refers to the perceived strength in which NSTs are fluent in the target language.	Lauren: "My perceived strengths of a native instructor would be that they are very well educated on the language at a native level…"	4
Pragmatic understanding	Refers to the NST's pragmatic knowledge	Lily: "They can give natural examples that would occur in Japan when explaining scenarios where one might use a specific term…"	1
Pronunciation	Refers to the perceived strength of the NNSTs' pronunciation.	Conrad: "…I think that a native Japanese-speaking instructor would most likely have better pronunciation."	5
Linguistic weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects about the NST's language		0
Inexperience with learning the TL	Refers to the lack of experience in learning Japanese as a second language.	Lauren: "…the weakness would be that they have not personally gone through the difficulty of learning [a second] language."	4
Other strengths	Refers to NSTs' strengths that are not related to language or teaching		

Cultural understanding	Refers to a perceived strength that NSTs' can provide more understanding of Japanese culture.	Candice: "Native will provide more information about Japanese culture."	2
Lived experience	Refers to the NST's experience living in Japan	Lauren: "I think that a native teacher would have experience in Japan and so they would have insight on personal interactions that would be helpful when teaching communication."	3
Pedagogic strengths	Refers to the NST's teaching skills.		0
Examples	Refers to the NST's teaching skills of examples	Lily: "they can give natural examples that would occur in Japan when explaining scenarios…"	1
Pedagogic weaknesses	Refers to the NST's teaching skills that they lack or do not possess.		0
Explanation	Refers to teaching skills that NSTs do not possess.	Conrad: "….perhaps may not be able to explain some grammar points as well."	1
Harsh	Refers to the NST's corrective feedback.	Lily: "…I find sometimes that native Japanese speakers correct me harsher when I ask questions."	1

Pedagogic ignorance	Refers to instructors skipping over information that the student feels is needed.	Lily: "…might think certain situations are common knowledge and brush past it."	1
Students			0
Achievements			0
Keigo (Japanese Honourifics)	Refers to achievements related to keigo.	Lauren: "I was able to familiarize myself with honourifics…"	5
Pragmatics	Refers to using the language in the real world.	Candice: "Have a better understanding about Japanese use in work place and classroom."	4
Influences on motivation	Refers to what students' motivation for learning		0
Attitudes		Lauren: "What influences my motivation is the attitude of the instructor not whether they are native or not."	1
No preference towards nativeness	Refers to students not having a preference towards instructor's nativeness	Conrad: "No, I don't think so, if they're good teachers then I'll make an effort regardless of who the teacher is."	2
Progress in High-Intermediate Japanese	Refers to if students felt they made progress in high-intermediate Japanese after the five weeks.		

Improved	Refers to students feeling they improved in high-intermediate Japanese after the instructional period.	Lauren: "I think I started off with a good foundation and background which really helped but I overall felt like I improved a lot."	3
No improvement	Refers to students not feeling they improved in high-intermediate Japanese after the instructional period.	Candice: "No."	1
Regaining *keigo* knowledge			1
Reasons to take the course	Refers to reasons students would enroll in the course.		0
Course format	Refers to the organization of the course.	Lauren: "Yes, I thought it was very well formatted."	1
Course price	Refers to the price of the course.	Conrad: "…the price can't be beaten either."	1
Explanations	Refers to the instructor's effectiveness in answering questions and/or discussing topics in a way that students understand.	Conrad: "Everything was clearly explained..."	1
Improving Japanese	Refers to the interest in improving Japanese.	Conrad: "If I had a friend that was interested in improving their Japanese…."	2
Improving keigo	Refers to the interest in improving their Japanese honourifics.	Conrad: "I feel that after these five-weeks, I have gotten a lot more comfortable using *keigo* in conversations, and knowing when it would be appropriate to use *keigo* in the first place.	2
Student background	Refers to the obstacles that students may face related to instructional or linguistic aspects.		0
Inexperience with a NNST	Refers to the students' previous inexperience with a NNST.	N/A	2
Previous learning experiences	Refers to the students' previous learning experiences with Japanese.	N/A	3

F.V Follow-up Interview Codebook

Name	Description	Example Quotes	References
Applicability	Refers to how students' can use learned content		0
In Japan	Refers to the applicability of content within Japan		0
Other contexts	Refers to content being used outside the professional context within Japan.	Lily: "..honestly, although a lot of it was set up for… working in Japan, but.. there's the occasional Japanese customer or patient and stuff that comes into my work so being able to -and that don't speak great English- so talking to them politely from a work employee standpoint…"	4
Professional contexts	Refers to the student using learned concepts within professional contexts (i.e. academic and business) within Japan	Conrad: "…if I'm working in Japan while I'm living there, that's… gonna…. that what I've learned in this class is probably going to be used every day."	5
Outside of Japan	Refers to the applicability of content outside of Japan		0
Professional contexts outside of Japan	Refers to the student using learned concepts within professional contexts (i.e., academic and business) outside of Japan.	Lily: "…the advertising yourself set-up is something that's going to be relevant in English as well…."	3
Changes in learning	Refers to the students' perception on how their learning would change based on the nativeness of instructor		0
Change	Refers to the students' perceptions that their learning would change based on the nativeness of the instructor	Lily: "I think I would have struggled even	2

		more with the *kanji* I think because for the ones that were really uncommon Matthew put in *hiraga*…. I don't think a natve speaker would have done that…."	
No changes	Refers to participants perceptions that their learning would not change based on the nativeness of the instructor.	Conrad: "….the main difference that I see between native and non-native Japanese teachers is the pronunciation that as certified teachers or close to, I think their teaching abilities are all really great."	2
Course format			0
Strengths	Refers to the positive aspects of the course aspects	Lauren: "So, that helps with the small classes and that just allows us more time to [inaudible] I guess. Which is definitely great."	1
Course Instructor			0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to positive aspects about the course instructor's language abilities.		0
Language proficiency	Refers to the instructor's language proficiency	Conrad: "….Matthew is still a very talented individual that I- his Japanese is still a benchmark that I aspire to."	4
Linguistic knowledge	Refers to the NNSTs' knowledge of the target language	Conrad: "I guess for Matthew, I was really	2

		impressed. He seems to be very, very knowledgeable in Japanese."	
Other strengths	Refers to strengths that do not relate to the pedagogical or linguistic strengths of the course instructor.		0
Communication skills	Refers to the communication skills that the instructor possesses.	Conrad: "The classes were all very clear."	5
Cultural knowledge	Refers to the cultural knowledge that the instructor possesses.	Lauren: "I thought it was really good. Just Matthew himself has lived in Japan and knows a lot, sometimes more, about… than me cause I lived here like 18 years of my life. So, I was very impressed."	5
General strengths	Refers to the strengths that are not specific.	Lily: "I thought he was a great teacher."	2
Pedagogical strengths	Refers to positive aspects about the course instructor's teaching abilities.		0
Activity strengths	Refers to positive aspects of activities.	Lily: "I think it was really well thought out and good variety of activities throughout each class."	1
Corrective feedback	Refers to the instructor's corrective feedback.	Lily: "…it was a very firm but gentle correction, which was nice."	1
Examples	Refers to positive aspects of examples.	Lily: "He had very concrete examples, like	4

		with the interview."	
Explanation	Refers to the instructor's ability to answer students' question or help them understand difficult concepts.	Conrad: "He answered the questions very thoroughly that I felt like I really understood it after."	4
Lesson strengths	Refers to the positive aspects about lessons.	Lily: "One lesson being dedicated towards interviews and not just… being able to speak politely but… situationally how to speak correctly. And those were things I've never really learned."	1
Pedagogic capabilities	Refers to the instructor's skills in teaching.	Lily: "I thought he was a great teacher. I really enjoyed the class so…."	4
Pedagogic effectiveness	Refers to the effectiveness of the teacher's instruction ability.	Conrad: "I've ever had a bad Japanese teacher before. I still haven't after this course."	4
Course participation	Students preference to participate more if the course based on the instructor		0
NNSTs	Refers to the preference to participate in a course taught by a NNST.		0
Change in perception	Refers to students changing their perception of NNSTs after taking the course.	Lily:: "I think Matthew definitely made it more- me open-minded to it because in the past I don't think I would have done something like that."	1
More opportunity	Refers to any opportunity to learn Japanese regardless of the source.	Lauren: "I think it's just opened up more opportunities."	2
NSTs	Refers to the preference to participate in a course taught by a native speaking teacher		0

Advanced courses	Refers to students' preferences in having NSTs at higher levels.	Conrad: "…I do think that as I get to a higher level that perhaps a native speaking teacher might be a more advantageous…"	1
Instruction support			0
Helped	Refers to how the instructor supported the students.	Lauren: "I think it… almost helped. Just because they're so much more passionate."	2
Neutral	Refers to the student feeling that the instruction was neither helpful or a hinderance.	Conrad: "For this, I don't really see being a non-native speaker hindering my learning in any way."	2
NNSTs Perceptions			0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to the language skills that NNSTs possess		0
Experience with Target language	Refers to the perceived strength of having experience learning a second language.	Lily: "…because they learned- had to learn the language and didn't grow up with it naturally I think they're… gonna being more understanding to go over certain certain grammar or whatever that you don't understand multiple times."	5
Linguistic weaknesses	Refers to the language skills that NNSTs lack		
Proficiency	Refers to the NNST's poor fluency in the L2.	Connor: "That is, [I] don't see a lot of non-native teachers up to that, you know, 100% level."	1
Pronunciation	Refers to the NNST's poor pronunciation.	Connor: "The one thing that comes to mind	1

		immediately is just, again, pronunciation… And I don't think that is something that can be overcome by most non native speakers."	
Other strengths	Refers to NNSTs' strengths not related to language or teaching.		
Real-world experience	Refers to the NNSTs' understanding of the TL beyond the textbook.	Lauren: "…they not only learned it in a textbook but they know how to use it in a real world setting and they have doe that. They have lived there."	1
Other weaknesses	Refers to NNSTs' weaknesses not related to language or teaching		
Authentic experiences	Refers to NNSTs' lacking authentic experiences because they are non-native.	Lily: "…if you are visibly not Japanese then they're a little more lenient in what you say and aren't able to say…."	4
Pedagogic strengths	Refers to the teaching abilities that NNST's possess.		0
Empathy	Refers to the instructor being able to understand what a student is going through due to a shared experience.	Conrad: "…non-native teachers obviously have studied Japanese themselves quite heavily… I'd assume that they'd be able to kind of share of putting themselves in their students' shoes…"	5
Leniency	Refers to NNSTs' understanding toward students' mistakes.	Lily: "Matthew was very understanding with that stuff …"	3
Pedagogic weaknesses	Refers to teaching skills that NNSTs lack		0

Focus on non-native students' learning	Refers to instances where NNSTs' instruction is focused on non-native students.	Lily: "…I think that is something more catered towards non-native speakers because they're more… inclined and motivated to have all that stuff memorized from other classes."	1
NST Perceptions			0
Linguistic strengths	Refers to the language skills that NST's possess		0
Innate linguistic ability	Refers to the NSTs' acquisition of linguistic	Conrad: "If you're a native speaker, you probably grew up in Japan. So you had that Japanese schooling and that it's your first language that you probably just naturally have those strengths."	7
Pronunciation	Refers to the NST's pronunciation.	Conrad: "The one thing that comes to mind immediately is just, again, pronunciation. That native speakers just have that advantage."	8
Linguistic weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of NST's language		0
Inexperience with learning a Japanese as an L2	Refers to the lack of experience in learning Japanese as a second language.	Lauren: "Even if they do know a second language I think it's just like language share so different and especially for example Japanese in this case."	1
Other strengths	Refers to NSTs' strengths not related to language and teaching		0

Tangible experience with the target country	Refers to the experiences that NSTs' possess which is personal.	Conrad: "If you're a native speaker, you probably grew up n Japan. So you had that Japanese schooling…."	7
Pedagogical weaknesses	Refers to negative aspects of NST's teaching		0
Harshness	Refers to the NSTs' strictness or frustration when a student makes mistake.	Lily: "…having been taught by native speakers -when they- -cause- because I know I'm really weak with *kanji* reading they get a little frustrated after a while with a lot of it."	2
Pedagogical ignorance	Refers to the NST skipping over information that a student feels is important.	Lily: "…a drawback with them is if you're learning at a certain level they assume that you know these things, which if you haven't taken a lower level language class or whatever then you might not -were not have taught that way and brushed past it."	1
Students			0
Achieving goals	Refers to the ways that students achieved their goals		0
Application	Refers to using learned concepts	Lauren: "I think one of the biggest things that helped with this is he continuously gave us a lot of practice problems. Every concept we learned, he followed up with a practice problem or a real life example…"	2

Teaching materials	Refers to teaching materials (i.e., worksheet, slides, and/or cheat sheets).	Conrad: "Well, for one thing, the teaching resources that he provided were really great"	1
Improvement	Refers to the progression that students' felt they made after taking the course.		0
Aspect of communication	Instances where students mentioned specific improvement on communication aspects.	Lily: 'I think specifically the interview one.. that one was one that definitely stuck with me…"	3
Keigo (Japanese honourifics)	Instances where students mentioned improvement in *keigo*.	Lauren: "I think that I improved with expanding my knowledge and ability to use honourifics…"	5
Learner background	Refers to the information that students provided about themselves		0
Ethnic background	Refers to students' ethnicity	N/A	1
Experience with NST	Refers to students' previous experience with NSTs	N/A	2
In experience with NNST	Refers to students' inexperience with NNSTs	N/A	1
Time lived in Japan	Refers to students' duration that they lived in Japan	N/A	1
Learning motivation	Refers to learner's motivation	N/A	0
Non-native speaking student motivation	Refers to motivations that non-native speaking students are perceived to have	Lily: "…I think that is something more catered towards non-native speakers because they're more… inclined to have all that stuff memorized from other classes."	2
Student challenges			0
Kanji	Refers to challenge of reading kanji (Japanese characters)	Lily: "…I'm really weak at *kanji* reading."	2
Tasks			0
Strengths	Refers to a positive aspect of task based language instruction		0

Pedagogical effectiveness	Refers to the task' effective in connecting teaching points to examples.	Lauren: "I think one of the biggest things that helped me with this is he continuously gave us a lot of practice problems."	2
Variety of tasks	Refers to the number of tasks.	Conrad: "I think it was really thought out and good variety of activities throughout each class."	1
Teaching Material	Refers to the materials that the NNST used during instruction. Example: "Presentation slides, worksheets, cheat sheets"		0
Amount	Refers to the number of teaching materials	Conrad: "…to provide lots of resources…"	3
Variety of materials	Refers to the number of materials that were used.	Conrad: With each class that he held, he had some extra resources, whether it be a little bit of a cheat sheet, or giving us the slides that he was going through."	5

Appendix G: Student Likert Rankings (Raw Data)

	Lauren	*Lily*	*Conrad*	*Candice*	*M*	*SD*	*Lauren*	*Lily*	*Conrad*	*Candice*	*M*	*SD*	*Diff*
1.When it comes to studying grammar, I prefer a non-native Japanese teacher.	3	5	3	3	3.5	1	3	NA	3	3	3	0	0.5
2. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate listening classes.	3	NA	2	3	2.7	0.6	3	NA	1	3	2.3	1.2	0.33
3. When it comes to learning about the culture of the foreign language, I prefer a non-native Japanese speaking teacher.	2	3	3	2	2.5	0.6	3	3	3	2	2.8	0.5	-0.25
4. When it comes to learning formal expressions, I prefer a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher.	3	NA	3	3	3	0	3	1	3	3	2.5	1	0.5
5. When it comes to grading, I think a non-native Japanese-speaking more lenient.	2	3	2	3	2.5	0.6	4	1	3	3	2.8	1.3	-0.25
6. I want to develop pronunciation skills like a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher.	3	NA	3	3	3	0	3	NA	4	2	3	1	0
7. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers for their engaging language teaching.	3	NA	3	3	3	0	3	4	3	3	3.3	0.5	-0.25
8. I prefer non-native Japanese speaking teachers in beginner speaking classes.	3	NA	NA	3	3	1.5	3	NA	2	3	2	1.2	-0.5
9. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in beginner listening classes.	3	NA	4	3	3.3	1.5	3	NA	2	3	2	1.2	0.5
10. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in beginner writing classes.	3	NA	3	3	3	1.3	3	NA	3	2	2	1.2	0.25
11. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in beginner reading classes.	3	NA	3	2	2.7	1.2	3	NA	3	2	2	1.2	0

12. I prefer non-native Japanese speaking teachers in intermediate speaking classes.	3	NA	2	2	2.3	1.1	3	NA	2	3	2	1.22	-0.25
*13. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate listening classes.	NA	NA	2	2	2	1.1	3	NA	2	4	2.3	1.48	-0.5
14. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate writing classes.	3	NA	3	2	2.7	1.2	3	NA	3	3	2.3	1.3	-0.25
15. I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers in intermediate reading classes.	NA	NA	3	2	2.5	1.2	3	NA	3	3	2.3	1.3	-0.25
16. In general, I prefer native Japanese-speaking teachers.	3	NA	4	4	3.7	0.4	3	3	4	4	3.5	0.5	0.25
17. In general, I prefer non-native Japanese speaking teachers.	3	NA	3	2	2.7	1.2	4	3	3	2	3	0.7	-1
18. If my teacher is not trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer non-native Japanese-speaking teachers.	3	NA	2	2	2.3	0.9	2	NA	1	3	1.5	1.1	0
19. If my teacher is not trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer native Japanese-speaking teachers.	NA	NA	2	3	2.5	1.5	4	NA	1	4	2.3	1.8	0
20. When I think of a qualified Japanese teacher, I think of a non-native Japanese-speaking teacher.	NA	NA	2	3	2.5	1.1	2	NA	4	3	2.3	1.5	-0.5
21. When I think of a qualified Japanese teacher, I think of a native Japanese-speaking teacher.	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	NA	4	4	3	1.7	1
Note. NA= "Non-applicable;" 1= "Strongly Disagree"; 2="Disagree;" 3="Neutral;" 4="Agree"; 5="Strongly Agree"				*Total averages*	**2.82**						**2.5**		**0.36**

M=Mean *SD*=Standard deviation. *Diff*=Difference *=Indicates a duplicate questions							