

# Japanese Educators Use of L1 Knowledge in University EFL Classes

Walter DAVIES

Institute of Foreign Language Research and Education  
Hiroshima University

This article focuses on the teaching ideas of a group of Japanese university educators who teach English language courses. It is a small-scale piece of exploratory research used to develop ideas on the basis of the reflections of four experienced practitioners. The main rationale lying behind the research was to investigate how Japanese educators, who are essentially bilingual, use their language resources in teaching general English classes. As a primarily monolingual teacher involved in teaching the same courses as Japanese colleagues, I was interested to explore the decisions Japanese colleagues make in the way they teach their courses.

The research centres on a set of semi-structured interviews designed to gain and share ideas on English in both secondary and tertiary education. One of the advantages of talking to these Japanese educators was that they had all mastered English as a second language, and had experienced different forms of teaching in their student days depending on their age. I was interested to know how they judged they had achieved this mastery, and given their experience of learning and teaching English, how they approached their own classes. I was particularly interested in their use of Japanese as a resource for teaching English.

## MOVING BEYOND APPROACHES AND METHODS

This research is an investigation into ideas on useful ways of teaching and therefore requires an analysis of the ways in which teaching ideas are categorized. A common way is to allocate ideas and techniques to approaches and methods. While such demarcation has the advantage of grouping ideas, this research attempts to move towards a broader framework of analysis, and the reasons for the move develop out of a consideration of the difficulties of categorizing teaching techniques. Consequently, I build the argument from a review of Grammar-Translation and Communicative Language Teaching with a particular focus on L1 use, before seeking a broader framework. In this article, I focus on Richards and Rodgers' definitions, which are also adapted and analysed by White (1988) and Brown (1995). Richards and Rodgers (2001) divide a method into three components: approach, design and procedure. An approach involves theory on the nature of language and/or language learning. The components of design contain the following: the general and specific objectives of the method, a syllabus model, learner roles, teacher roles, the role of instructional materials. Procedure involves classroom techniques, practices and behaviours observed when the method is used.

Brown (1995) cites Anthony, Richards & Rodgers and McKay in relation to frameworks

of categorization for different bodies of teaching ideas. He notes that while Anthony and Richards & Rodgers both use similar terms in their definitions, these terms are defined and used in slightly different ways. Brown further notes that both Anthony and Richards & Rodgers tend to work down from theories of language and learning through design to rational techniques and procedures. As he observes, "the experience of many language teachers are less sequential" than the steps listed by the authors. While such categorization helps with a historical perspective and helps group key ideas, the less sequential and more pragmatic orientations of language teachers themselves may demonstrate a flexibility and creativity in the use of techniques that makes actual teaching difficult to categorize.

Key terms used in debates about classroom practice often revolve around terms such as "translation" and "communication", and there is the risk that these are identified too closely with the approaches and methods of which they form an essential core. Translation may come to be equated with "Grammar-Translation" while communication is aligned with "Communicative Language Teaching" (CLT). However, operating in their classroom contexts, teachers make pragmatic decisions in relation to their teaching objectives, utilizing techniques that they judge to be effective. This is particularly important in a study that focuses on the variety of ways in which the L1 is used to facilitate learning, where translation may be used as a subset of a range of techniques in a way that would be categorized under CLT, a point noted by Brumfit (1984):

There is in comprehension, a role for specific accuracy-based work, and this may take the form of intensive reading exercises of various kinds, of aural comprehension work, even of translation. (p. 83)

The issue is also raised by Okihara, Kimura, Takada et al. (2001), who argue that traditional translation techniques and communicative activities are not mutually exclusive and feel that the issue could be reconciled by introducing more communicative techniques into traditional classrooms. In addition, the variety of meanings that fall under the term "translation" is noted by Howatt & Widdowson (2005): "'Translation' is a complex notion which means different things in different contexts of language learning." They make a key distinction between the use of the mother tongue as "an aid to the comprehension of a foreign language text in contrast to the conversion of texts in the mother-tongue into foreign language texts 'with the same meaning'."

### **Grammar-Translation**

The European form of Grammar-Translation focused on the sentence as the main focus of meaning and utilised practical exercises for the students, 'practical' in this context being used to mean 'practice' rather than 'usefulness'. One purpose of the method was to use grammar in a way that made it (grammar) clearer to the student. Richards & Rodgers (2001) dismiss Grammar-Translation as a method "without advocates" even though they note that it

may be widely practised: “There is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory.” However, it is important to note that the proponents of grammar-translation did not have to address certain twentieth century arguments relating to psychology or educational theory because the method itself pre-dated these developments and was not analysed for its strengths and weaknesses in relation to such disciplines.

If an “approaches and methods” analysis is used, then to dismiss Grammar-Translation as “one without advocates” is a highly political act which disestablishes it in the literature as a legitimate way of teaching and removes it from scrutiny and assessment of its strengths and weaknesses. In addition, if it is widely used, then from a teacher’s perspective it must have many advocates who may value classroom practicality over educational theory. Kumaravadivelu (1994) makes the following observation in relation to theorizers and practitioners:

As conceptualizers of philosophical underpinnings governing language pedagogy, theorizers have traditionally occupied the power centre of language pedagogy while the practitioners of classroom teaching have been relegated to the disempowered periphery. (p. 29)

A further point is that Grammar-Translation as defined by Richards and Rodgers is placed within a time frame that places it before subsequent approaches and methods. However, the situation in the early twenty-first century is that it nestles against these. Consequently, if we wish to analyse approaches and methods in the twenty-first century, then they exist alongside each other rather than as predecessors and successors. If practitioners are using forms of Grammar-Translation, then such teaching competes and potentially cross-fertilizes with other approaches and methods, borrowing what is necessary, and if approaches and methods are porous at the level of technique, then it becomes increasingly difficult to categorize them if they blend into one another.

Several studies and articles have focused on the Japanese form of Grammar-Translation, *yakudoku*. Using a qualitative approach combining interviews with observation, Gorsuch (1998) investigates the use of it in the classrooms of two high school teachers, and makes the following observation: “Despite its seeming prevalence in EFL education in Japan, little detailed, descriptive research on *yakudoku* English instruction in Japanese high school classrooms exists.” She argues that although *yakudoku* and Grammar-Translation are linked, there are also important differences, noting that *yakudoku* is more about the process of translation from English into Japanese than gaining an understanding of grammar through the use of translation. Her key observations from the research are

- 1 Translation lies at the heart of *yakudoku*
- 2 It is a means of classroom control
- 3 There is a washback effect from university examinations

Interestingly, in her study Gorsuch makes an important observation regarding her participants' underlying ideas and orientation towards their classes. They held strong views on developing logical thinking and academic skills in their students, which they believed would be useful throughout the students' lives. They felt that the close study of a text with teacher guidance would lead to this kind of understanding. Therefore, there was a powerful pedagogical aim to the teaching that was not directly related to English language skills themselves.

Hino (1988) cites strong historical factors influencing classroom practice. Drawing on Suzuki (1975), he argues that translation as an academic approach is over 1,000 years old and was initially used in the study of Chinese texts. In traditional *yakudoku* teaching there are three stages:

Stage 1 The reader makes a word by word translation

Stage 2 The translation is reordered to match Japanese syntax

Stage 3 There is a re-coding of the Japanese syntax

He notes the strong similarity between this and the ancient approaches to Chinese texts, and also observes that the "Yakudoku Method is not necessarily something that is politically imposed on the teachers by the administration, but is a long established tradition which exists at a deeper level of the sociolinguistic structure of Japan." Hino found that seventy percent of his university students had been taught to read using *yakudoku*. He argues that "anyone who has studied English through *yakudoku* is able to teach it in the same way without much effort."

### Communicative Language Teaching

The purpose of this section is to explore the historical background of ideas on Communicative Language Teaching. Therefore, I consider the plurality ideas that are embraced by the communicative approach, arguing that they do not form a unitary set of ideas but offer a forum for debate that generates ideas and teaching practices. Okihara (2001) observes that communication and Communicative Language Teaching are ambiguous terms and that the methodological implications are unclear. Nunan (1989) notes that "it is something of a misnomer to talk about the communicative approach as there is a family of approaches, each member of which claims to be communicative."

Historically, communicative approaches and specifically Communicative Language Teaching are identified as a 1970s development designed to redress some of the problems of previous methods. Drawing on the philosophies of writers such as J. L. Austin and John Searle, teachers and linguists initially wrote about speech acts, which in teaching syllabuses came to be defined as functions. A key text was Wilkins' (1976) Notional Syllabuses, where he separated the syllabuses into notions such as 'time' and 'space', and functions such as 'requesting' and 'greeting', and focused on language as communication. Richards & Rodgers (2001) describe CLT as an approach, which in their terminology means a theory of language

and a theory of learning. They consider it to have no central figure but to consist of a variety of groups who subscribe to its broad tenets. This adds complexity to the analysis as, under its banner a variety of syllabuses and types of syllabus have emerged.

The ambiguity cited by Okihara (2001) is evident in the writings on communicative syllabuses. Although Wilkins (1976) himself described his syllabus as analytic, one where stretches of language are presented and then analysed, subsequent writers placed his syllabus in the synthetic category. Here items of language are presented and then combined to form longer stretches of language. Product syllabuses like Wilkins' were identified as focusing narrowly on the language code whereas process syllabuses tended to combine language with teaching practice; White (1988) discusses type A and type B syllabuses making the division between "what is to be" learnt and "how it is to be learnt"; Breen & Littlejohn's (2000) negotiated syllabus and Prabhu's (1985) procedural syllabus are often referred to as type B or process syllabuses; Nunan's (1995) learner-centred syllabus is criticized by Long & Crookes as a type A syllabus masquerading as a type B syllabus; Swan & Walter (1990) adopt a multi-syllabus approach. What is evident is a number of syllabuses and ideas, each foregrounding a particular aspect or aspects of language, teaching or learning and backgrounding others.

In addition to its ideas being many and varied, CLT also has a connection to the works of previous writers associated with other methods. In the United Kingdom a number of writers and teachers had developed situational language teaching (SLT), while in the United States the audiolingual approach was developed, combining behaviourist psychological theory with programs developed from Fries' ideas. These older methods had a strong structuralist element involving habit formation. In relation to CLT, Thornbury (1998) observes the continuity of a number of ideas:

Not only have teachers never abandoned a grammar-driven approach, but there seems to be little evidence that the alternatives, such as task-based pedagogy (Long and Crookes, 1992) have made any lasting impression on the current practice of English language teaching (ELT). (p.109)

He further (ibid) notes that "apart from the absence of pattern practice drills, the addition of information-gap activities, and a greater tolerance of error, the current approach is virtually indistinguishable from its predecessors, such as weak audiolingualism and situational language teaching (Richards and Rodgers, 1986)."

### **Towards a Broader Framework of Analysis**

A number of key points arise out of the above reviews. I have noted that the categorization of teaching ideas into approaches and methods contains weaknesses. Of particular importance in this research is the contrast between "Grammar-Translation" and "Communicative Language Teaching". Richards and Rodgers clearly define CLT as an approach, and the argument I put forward here is that in many respects it absorbed earlier teaching practices

but offered a more all-embracing philosophy of language and learning, with considerable debate over new additions and directions and a variety of internal conflicts. The result is not an enormous qualitative shift between previous methods and itself in relation to classroom practice but a set of additions and re-workings. As Thornbury (1998) observes, there has been a move towards much more tolerance of error in classrooms. The addition of tasks can allow for a more flexible use of the language by students, but many other activities in isolation could fit with previous methods.

In the Japanese context a major issue is the extent to which translation and grammar practices and techniques are used and when they should be used rather than whether they should be used. This debate needs to involve classroom practitioners who can reflect on how they use translation, examine ideas of communicative competence and optimise their classroom time. In keeping with Kumaravadivelu (1994) I agree with a position of principled pragmatism. However, if extensively used practices are excluded from theory, then they go underground, utilised in classrooms but never critically analysed for their strengths and weaknesses.

If an “approaches and methods” categorization is used, then the position of Grammar-Translation is ambiguous: Richards and Rodgers claim it is a method for which there is no theory, but under their categorization, one component of a method is an approach, containing theories of language and/or learning so that Grammar-Translation cannot be called a method under their definitions. In contrast to Richards and Rodgers, Brown (1995) elevates Grammar-Translation to an approach, which he defines as “preconceptions, assumptions, and theoretical underpinnings for what happens in the classroom”, devoting three lines to its definition:

Based on notions of prescriptive grammar and what constituted proper usage, the grammar translation approach advocated economy of time through deductive teaching of language involving reading and translation, but also the emergence of writing and speaking as ultimate goals. (p. 6)

Rather than complicate matters further by attempting to re-define Grammar-Translation and Communicative Language Teaching, a different option is to take a broader view and consider the relationship of theory to classroom practice. In this study, theory’s relevance is as a vehicle for communicating ideas between teachers and for analysing practice. Using theoretical ideas as a framework for analysis, teachers can reflect on what their practices achieve; theory and practice are dependent on one another and exist in tension, with theory exerting pressure on practice and practice exerting pressure on theory. Teachers use a variety of teaching techniques to achieve their aims, and it is possible to describe these techniques. In reflecting on them, teachers may reveal their theories on why they are useful.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research is interpretive in nature and this places the researcher in a particular position in relation to the research, as noted by Cowie (2004): “For me it means that as a researcher I am an instrument of research and that in interaction (talk) with participants I come to a jointly constructed meaning making view of reality.” This is a view that finds resonance with Radnor (2002), who recognises that “the researcher is the research instrument.” Human beings are meaning makers, who engage with each other and the non-human world. While I would argue that no methodology is perfect and that research in both the interpretive and scientific paradigms can tease out common themes and seek to find salient ideas, humanistic inquiry based on discourse and dialogue is better able to accommodate diversity and penetrate beyond surface similarity. The design is built around the following two questions:

- What did the participants consider important in the development of their own English learning?
- How do participants approach their university language classes with particular reference to L1 use?

The type of interview in this study is the semi-structured interview, in contrast to the structured and unstructured interview formats. The position I have taken is one of social constructivism, but it is a broad based form of it, seeking to avoid a descent into pure idealism divorced from a physical and existent world, but accepting that human reality is hugely influenced by social constructions. Silverman (2001) observes that researchers’ philosophical positions affect the status of data collected and the way it is collected. He (*ibid*) distinguishes between positivism, emotionalism and constructionism. He claims that for positivists, the status of data concerns facts about behaviour and attitudes, for emotionalists it concerns authentic experiences and for constructionism it involves mutually constructed meanings. However, categorisation in this way risks giving the appearance of mutual exclusivity. There is also a risk in all these kinds of accounts that relates to human beings’ overall embeddedness in the human world and language itself. We cannot escape from such embeddedness, but we may be able to make certain distinctions, and in terms of educational research we may well be involved in the limited use of all three ways of looking at data: facts, emotional states or intersubjective constructions.

### Data Collection

The four participants in the study were chosen opportunistically from amongst the general body of full-time staff teaching general English courses to undergraduates. In terms of process, a similar format was used for each interview. Before the interview itself, participants would be passed an interview schedule of the main questions that would be asked. The interviews all took place with the interviewer and interviewee seated across a

table or desk from each other. The interview was recorded using podcasting software, with the back-up of a tape-recorder.

The interviews themselves broke down into two parts: The first part followed a standard format for an interview, with the interviewee being asked questions and giving replies. It was this part of the interview that was transcribed. In the second part of the interview roles were reversed and I answered questions that the interviewee asked of me (In interviews where there was plenty of time, this sometimes developed into a discussion of teaching issues). This later stage was an experimental development from previous research, and there were two reasons why I decided to try it: The primary reason was one of fairness - busy colleagues were taking the time to let me interview them for research purposes and they were being asked to reveal ideas and beliefs that they held. It seemed fair that they should have the opportunity to ask similar questions to me. A second reason lay in my interest to see whether ideas would emerge that might aid the study.

### Data Analysis

In this research I use the term 'theme' to describe salient ideas in the research. I would argue that the point of research is to take what Said (1995) describes as "the swarming unpredictable and problematic mess in which human beings live" and to construct some kind of understanding from it by identifying themes within it. My approach is akin to Ryan and Russell Bernard's (2000) observation: "Themes are abstract (and often fuzzy) constructs that investigators identify before, during and after data collection." They note that "researchers start with some general themes derived from reading the literature and add more themes and subthemes as they go." Qualitative data are gathered with general themes serving as a background. The data are then used to add themes and subthemes, and may also be used to challenge the pre-conceived themes in the initial framework. Citing Bulmer, Ryan and Russell Bernard (*ibid*) list sources of themes that include literature reviews, professional definitions, local common-sense constructs, and researchers' values and prior experiences.

Coding is a means of data reduction. Cowie (2004) initially coded line by line but changed to the coding of larger chunks of text, as the more detailed coding was "very time consuming and did not seem to be very revealing of what was going on in the talk over longer stretches of discourse." This is a key point that Cadorath (2005) makes in describing her decision to analyse data manually rather than on computers which focus on word groups. She notes that "frequently meanings are expressed in more roundabout ways, which do not fall into a particular pattern." In this research I followed a similar procedure to previous research work (Davies, 2007), and data analysis fell into four distinct stages

- 1 Reading transcripts
- 2 Rough category coding
- 3 Reorganization of the data
- 4 Analysis of the data

In the initial stage I read all the key transcripts carefully in order to get a general impression of the interviews and reflect on possible points of interest. In the second stage I wrote rough categories for the data, trying to keep them to a minimum. As Coffey & Atkinson (1996) note "if codes are kept to a general level and their number relatively small, then the data are reduced to their bare bones, stripped down to a general form." Categories tended to emerge through an interaction of ideas from the background sections with the data. In the third stage I coloured all transcripts, which were in Microsoft Word files, created a set of category files and then cut and pasted data into the relevant files. The colour coordination was important because it clearly showed where the data had come from.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Reflections on Personal English Language Development

In terms of their own development the participants emphasized a variety of factors. One overall theme that was stressed in most interviews was out-of-class development. Classes were considered part of a broader spectrum of study, and sometimes of minor importance compared to other areas of study.

In relation of out-of-class development, responses were varied, with participants often involving themselves in a variety of learning activities: listening to radio programmes, reading books in English, reading a grammar book in Japanese, making and learning word lists, working through a Linguaphone course, talking to an ALT outside of class on a regular basis, being tutored by an American couple. Of particular importance were the NHK radio English language learning programmes involving a Japanese presenter and a native-speaker of English.

In contrast, there was less commentary on the classes themselves. Participants reflections indicated classes involving reading texts followed by translation of either key parts of the text or all of the text, with a focus on key grammar and the learning of vocabulary. Some classes were oriented towards exam questions at the higher grades of secondary education.

One participant noted that in his student days, being taught by a traditional method, which could be described as Grammar-Translation, had helped him develop a wide vocabulary and grammatical knowledge, but that he had failed to communicate well until working with an English native speaker at post-graduate level. In many ways this reflects Widdowson's (1990) idea of investment: "The structural syllabus provides us with the investment principle we want, but this is associated with formal properties of language and, as is evident from past experience, this sort of investment is not readily realized from communicative behaviour." While Widdowson focuses mainly on the difference between "Situational Language Teaching" and "Communicative Language Teaching," the traditional (Grammar-Translation) method referred to by the participant played the same role in his language development.

### Use of the Students' L1: Japanese

In terms of participants' comments on the use of Japanese in classrooms, a variety of ideas emerged. As noted earlier, translation is a complex term and it is more appropriate to consider L1 use: A rough distinction can be made between explanation and translation. In terms of making a decision to use Japanese a key issue is complexity: This can relate to discourse structure or the conceptual difficulty of a text under study. When students are studying a text that is academically challenging, then Japanese tends to be used to give them an understanding of the ideas lying behind the text: Their teacher will use Japanese to sketch a schematic outline which aids students' understanding and allows them a more top-down approach to reading.

A further use of Japanese as the medium of explanation is much more closely linked with translation, where it is used to check understanding of a passage or a sentence which is a good example of an important grammatical item. Here grammar may be clarified or explained so that it is often associated with a focus on form: As a mainly direct-method teacher, my some of classes involve working from an example of text and include focusing on key sentences. However, where a direct method teacher may use a variety of form-focused activities, such as matching the beginnings and ends of sentences, or sentence completion by filling in gaps, a bilingual teacher may prefer to focus on key language in a text by getting students to identify sentences that have equivalent meaning to Japanese sentences spoken by the teacher and translation of similar Japanese sentences into English:

*Sometimes I ask them to orally translate some Japanese expressions into English.*

It is important to note that in this case, translation moves from the L1 to the L2, which is more difficult than translation from the L2 to the L1. Furthermore, the participant noted that more explanation is added to give the students a much better cultural understanding of when and where to use the phrases, and this is usually done in English:

*If time allows me to do so, I will explain the general cultural background of the words and phrases, the etiquettes or behavioural patterns of people who appear in the dialogue.*

There were also subtle differences in the way Japanese was used in different skill areas. In relation to reading, one of the most powerful arguments for its use is the difference in discourse structure between Japanese and English:

*... I have to explain the structure of that discourse and that is important for when they read academic papers in their fields, so I believe that my class may contribute to that higher level of reading.*

It is also useful to note that in cases where translation is used more extensively, students

are not expected to be dealing with a text for the first time. They are usually required to read it as homework, before it is considered in more detail in the classroom. Consequently, students are expected to grapple with the English text before coming to class, which is then used to gain a more complete understanding of the text. This reflects the point that the development of English skills requires effort out of class as well as in class.

While teachers make decisions on when to use Japanese, in activities requiring the students to express themselves, the students themselves may also decide to switch into Japanese when they are trying to express something difficult. Rather than providing a translation for them, a teacher may ask them to rephrase their ideas in Japanese using different words and then see if they can find an English equivalent. This seems to be a way of integrating translation with strategic competence, boosting learner autonomy by encouraging them to find ways of expressing themselves. Similarly, Japanese may also be used to aid the students to make intelligent guesses and link understandings in Japanese and English:

*Students try to find the sentence meaning from the meanings of the words but they can't reach it, so I ask them "What would you say in this situation in Japanese? Forget the English and say something in Japanese." And that's translation — I try to connect the students' knowledge of Japanese and English.*

Again, translation is used in a very broad sense here to develop strategic competence. The teacher does not provide the students with an answer, but encourages them to hypothesize about the meaning of a sentence or phrase by using their inherent knowledge of communication in their L1.

A further distinction which emerged from the data is the use of translation as a means to an end and translation as an end in itself. While the former was more strongly emphasized, the case was made for developing translation as part of the repertoire of English skills a student may need on graduating from university: In companies and other places of work, employees can be required to make translations of key documents. Translating passages or sentences may therefore be useful for students in their future careers.

One idea that emerged across the skills areas was the use of model texts. For example, some participants considered the difficulties of free-writing, which was considered to be a very challenging task for some students:

*My impression is that it's very difficult for students to write something from scratch and most of the students use a Japanese-English dictionary. They pick out roughly equivalent words and put them together and the result is bizarre.*

Where this judgement was made, the preferred approach was to focus on a model text in English, and practice forming well constructed sentences based on the text.

A further area that emerged is the issue of activities specified by textbooks. While textbooks are clearly extremely useful in terms of providing a body of teaching material that can be scheduled and used in class, each textbook tends to have a limited range of activities within it.

### **Pedagogical Implications**

There are a number of pedagogical implications that come out of this research. The first is that translation cannot be equated with Grammar-Translation. It is quite possible to use it as a technique in itself. Although translation can be utilised with grammar to create something similar to Grammar-Translation, it can also be used in a more focused way to support meaning. It is also worth noting that translation may be categorized as meaning-focused, oriented towards developing an understanding but not necessarily encouraging communication.

One suggestion that came from a participant in the research was the need to develop a framework of analysis for techniques. In this sense it might be better to try to categorize techniques as lying along a continuum from form-focused techniques to communicative techniques and subject them to an analysis through such a framework. The research also indicates that as a body, teachers of English, both native-English speakers and non-native English speakers, draw on a wide variety of techniques in the classroom. This consequently has implications for teaching materials.

Greater unity may be found in the case of input and examples of English used in classes. While this research has not covered a sample of native-speakers of English, as the author of this research reflecting on my own classes, I found that in many cases I too was using input at the start of a class. In relation to a university system which offers teachers autonomy in their selection of textbooks and materials and has guidance in the form of standard syllabuses for each course, a possible development on the current situation would be to develop a set of example L2 passages around which classes could be based. While the techniques used to develop students' abilities may vary, supplying a range of sample texts to teachers might help to develop greater cohesion and an opportunity to map teaching materials to overall syllabus aims.

### **CONCLUSION**

This has been a small-scale piece of exploratory research to gain ideas on how Japanese university educators, who are bilingual, utilise teaching techniques in the classroom. The research indicates that the term "translation" can be interpreted widely, and it is more appropriate to consider the broader category of L1 use in analysing teachers' personal approaches to teaching, as it is sometimes difficult to differentiate "translation" from "explanation": Teachers may not only translate but explain when and where a particular language item may be used, or in the case of conceptually difficult readings, explain some background information. In this sense a bilingual teacher has an advantage over a

monolingual teacher in communicating ideas with more precision, while a monolingual teacher has to place a certain amount of faith that the language under study is sufficiently contextualized to allow a student to infer the meaning and the situation in which the language should be used. Japanese can also be used in other ways, such as helping develop strategic competence and illustrating differences in discourse structure between Japanese and English. In addition, there is the difference between translating from the L2 to the L1 and translating from the L1 to the L2.

Drawing on discussions that followed the more uni-directional interview process, it seems reasonable in the Japanese context to move towards a situation where a framework of analysis that can accommodate the techniques that are currently in use, and help to identify what a particular technique achieves. It seems likely that within any group of teachers there will be variations in personal teaching approach, and in a system which values teacher autonomy in the selection of materials and teaching, this may be more varied than in the more controlled circumstances of secondary education. However, the creation and distribution of example texts is one possible way of moving towards greater cohesion and common purpose.

A final point to note is that this research has specifically investigated the ideas of Japanese university educators of English. The key distinction is between bilingual and primarily monolingual teachers of English as there may be native speakers whose level of Japanese is such that they use similar techniques to those listed in this research. A further possible area of research is an investigation of native speakers of English who teach monolingually to develop ideas on the range of possible techniques utilised in monolingual classrooms.

## REFERENCES

- Breen, M. & Littlejohn, A. (2000). The significance of negotiation. In Breen, P. & Littlejohn, A. (eds.), *Classroom Decision-Making* (pp. 5-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The Elements of the Language Curriculum*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Gorsuch, G. J. (1998). Yakudoku EFL instruction in two Japanese high school classrooms: An exploratory study. *JALT Journal*, 20, 6-32.
- Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL educational policies and educational cultures; Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34/4, 675-710.
- Howatt A. P. R. & Widdowson, H. G. (2005). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). *The postmethod condition: (e)merging strategies for second/ foreign language teaching*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28/1, 27-48.
- Long, M. & Crookes, G. (1992). 3 approaches to task-based syllabuses. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26/1, 27-56.
- Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the gap between learning and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29/1,

133-158.

- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Okihara, K. (2001). *English Teaching in Japan: the Current Situation*. In Gray, K et al.(eds), *The Japanese Learner* (pp. 13-15). Oxford.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1985). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (2004). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rohlen, T. P. (1983). *Japan's High Schools*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sato, K. & Kleinsasser, R. C. (2004). Beliefs, practices and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20/8, 797-816.
- Swan, M. & Walter, C. (1990). *The New Cambridge English Course 1 Teachers Book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (1998). Comments on Marianne Celce-Muria, Zoltan Dornyei, and Sarah Thurrell's "Direct Approaches in L2 Instruction: A Turning Point in Communicative Language Teaching?" *TESOL Quarterly*, 32/1, 109-116.
- White, R. V. (1988). *The ELT Curriculum*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1991). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## 要 約

### 大学英語教室における日本人教師による母語に関する知識の活用

ウォルター, デイビス  
広島大学外国語教育研究センター

本論文は教職経験を積んだ教員の振り返りに基づいて、教授に関する考えをより良いものへと変容させるために活用できる、小規模ではあるが探求的な研究である。本研究では教師自身の「言語学習の振り返り」、どのように教室で言語教育を実践しているか、また母語知識を活用しているか、などの話題を扱っている。前もって準備されたいくつかの面接項目によりデータが収集され、先行研究で扱われている視点に基づいて吟味された。本研究の結果から、教授に際して「指導法の分類」を用いるには限界があり、教師にとってはもう少し広い視野での分析が必要である、ことが分かった。また、面接データからは、母語に関する知識がいろいろな方法で活用されていることが分かった。例えば、深層に関わる概念の説明、談話構造の説明、学生の方略的能力の指導、言語形式に焦点をあてた翻訳活動、などである。さらに、主体性がより期待される大学英語教育システムに関して、教育的示唆が議論された。学生の英語能力の伸長に資するさまざまな指導技術が確保されるならば、教養教育の共通シラバスの内容と方向性を同じくする一連の教材例の開発と普及は、指導を支援のための一助となるであろう。