

Communicative Language Teaching in English at Japanese Junior High schools

文学研究科国際言語教育専攻修士課程修了

大谷 将史

Masashi Otani

Introduction

English language education is currently one of the most emphasized aspects of Japanese public school education (Shirai, 2012). Reflecting this phenomenon, the Course of Study by the Ministry of Education has emphasized English language subjects at junior and senior high schools (MEXT, 2010). One category of those statements is related to communicative language teaching (CLT) which has long been a controversial teaching approach in English classrooms. Although CLT is a well-known teaching approach, actual practice and its outcome have not been investigated thoroughly. Studies show that there is a discrepancy between the CLT policies on governmental documents and classroom realities. Therefore, the present study further investigates the reality of CLT in actual Japanese junior high school classrooms.

I. Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study is to reveal the possible discrepancy between the goals of national English education policy related to CLT as stated in the New Course of Study (MEXT, 2008a) and the ways in which Japanese junior high school teachers interpret and implement CLT in actual classroom environments. Based on the result of this study, logistical and pedagogical implications are offered.

II. Research Questions

Given the importance of investigating the potential mismatch between the English language policy and its practice in CLT, the following research questions were established.

- (1) How does MEXT define CLT in the New Course of Study?
- (2) How do Japanese junior high school English teachers perceive or interpret CLT?
- (3) How do Japanese junior high school English teachers implement CLT in classrooms?

III. Significance

Findings of this study could fill a void left by previous CLT studies. In other words, successful implementation of this research could contribute to the further development of the use of CLT in Japanese English language education, especially in junior high school contexts.

IV. Literature Review

Japanese junior high school and senior high school students devote ample time to learning English language (Shirai, 2012). Although the fifth and sixth grades of Japanese public elementary schools have gradually started to introduce English language, junior high schools are the first place where Japanese students officially study English language as a subject (Hashimoto, 2009). According to Underwood (2012), one of the goals of Japanese junior high school English education is allowing students to express uncomplicated ideas in English with basic grammar structures.

When junior high school English teachers successfully help students comprehend basic levels of English grammar, those students can manage more sophisticated levels of English, such as discussion or presentation skills, at public high school levels (Nishino, 2008). The new national English curriculum, officially implemented at public elementary schools from 2011, at junior high schools from 2012, and at high schools from 2013, is intended to transform the attitude of public school teachers toward English language education (Shirai, 2012). According to the New Course of Study, English language is taught from the fifth grade of public elementary schools as communication-oriented foreign language activities from 2011 (MEXT, 2008a). In addition, teaching English language in English is encouraged at junior high schools from 2012 (MEXT, 2008a). Furthermore, from 2013 at the public high school level, the medium of instruction should be primarily English language (MEXT, 2010). These policies strongly reflect MEXT's intention to educate Japanese students as Japanese being able to utilize English (MEXT, 2002; Hashimoto, 2009).

Numerous issues regarding how English language teachers need to apply concepts of the newly implemented Course of Study have been discussed in the literature. Among those studies, implementing English-medium English language instruction for Japanese junior high school English language teachers is controversial. When Japanese university students desire to be junior high school teachers of English, relatively low English language proficiency levels and little teacher training are required (Nakata, 2011). Moreover, teacher training courses for pre-service English language teachers at Japanese universities employ Japanese language as a medium of

instruction (Takahashi, 2010). The New Course of Study currently encourages Japanese English language teachers to conduct classes in English at junior high schools without enhancing teacher training courses at universities (Stewart, 2009). Therefore, the possible outcome of the implementation of the New Course of Study could be an inconsistent application of English-medium instruction by English language teachers at each school.

Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), teaching English by focusing on function rather than form of language (Savignon & Wang, 2003; Nishino, 2008), attained its prominence in the 1980s and 1990s in North American and European English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts as a response to Stephen Krashen's argument that indicated the lack of the effectiveness of the isolated grammar instruction and emphasized increased second language (L2) input (Loewen & Reinders, 2011). One of the goals of CLT is to increase L2 learners' communicative competence including the ability to express speaker intention based on his or her linguistic system, the awareness of difference between the grammatical knowledge and the ability to perform it, strategies to maintain a conversation, and the acknowledgement of the contextual meaning of language forms (Littlewood, 1981).

CLT in Japanese EFL Contexts

CLT is strongly encouraged in the New Course of Study of both junior and senior high schools (MEXT, 2008a; MEXT, 2010). Although the term CLT is not explicitly written in the Course of Study, the objectives and types of activities promoted in the document are closely connected to the concept of CLT. For instance, two of four objectives for foreign language instructions are "to enable students to understand the speaker's intentions when listening to English" and "to enable students to talk about their own thoughts using English" (MEXT, 2008b, p. 1). In terms of emphasis of speaking activities, "to speak continuously using various techniques such as linking words" (MEXT, 2008b, p.2), "students actually use language to share their thoughts and feelings with each other should be carried out", "they should be able to perform language activities in which they have to think about how to express themselves in a way appropriate to a specific situation and condition" (MEXT, 2008b, p. 3), and "language activities should be conducted in such a way as grammar is effectively utilized for communication, based on the idea that grammar underpins communication" (MEXT, 2008b, p. 6) are relevant to CLT.

Numerous arguments for and against the implementation of English-medium English

language instruction at Japanese public schools have been provided (e.g. Seargeant, 2008; Otsu, 2009; Terashima, 2009; Kanatani, 2012; Tatsukawa, 2012). However, limited studies have been conducted in the Japanese junior high school context. According to Kanatani (2012) who is a member of the sub-advisory committee of the Central Education Council, the discrepancy between English proficiency level of Japanese junior high school students and the degree of content difficulty of English language textbooks is one of the causes of teacher uncertainty regarding CLT implementation. Shirai (2012) states that when English-medium English language courses are conducted in Japanese public school contexts, the content of the textbooks employed by English language teachers needs to be comprehensible, intriguing, and meaningful for their students. Without careful attention to those three aspects, few students are able to be accustomed to CLT in English language courses, especially at junior high schools (Shirai, 2012). Rather, students can be discouraged from continuing English language study. In reality, misinterpretation of CLT by Japanese English teachers is common (Kanatani, 2012). The majority of Japanese English language teachers interpret CLT encouraged in the New Course of Study as English-medium English language instruction with no L1 employment (Campbell, Kikuchi, & Palmer, 2006). Nevertheless, according to Kan et al. (2009), CLT practice based on the New Course of Study is different from teaching English in English. Rather, Kan et al. (2009) claim that English language teachers at public schools do not need to speak English all the time. According to Mochizuki (2010), MEXT's initial intention is to encourage junior and senior high school students, not teachers, to express their thoughts in English. For example, in the New Course of Study, MEXT (2008b, p.1) presents four junior high school English education objectives: "to enable students to understand the speaker's intentions when listening to English", "to enable students to talk about their own thoughts using English", "to accustom and familiarize students with reading English and to enable them to understand the writer's intentions when reading English", and "to familiarize students with writing in English and to enable them to write about their own thoughts using English". Li and Baldauf (2012) claim that the most important aspect of conducting CLT is to minimize teacher-centered aspects of English language instruction. The role of English language teachers is not to teach and talk about English language during class, but to create opportunities for their students to express their opinions in English (Ano, 2012). Regarding this argument, Kanatani (2012) claims that one of the purposes of implementing CLT at Japanese public schools by MEXT is to transform English teacher's attitudes toward English language instruction from teacher-centered to learner-oriented.

However, Inomori (2012) mentions that issues of teacher-centered English language

instruction at Japanese public schools cannot be solved without modifying examinations, especially entrance examinations. English language teachers at junior and senior high schools in Japan are pressured to cover all the content required to pass entrance examinations. That is, as Cook (2010) states, the primary focus of their English language instruction cannot be fluency of English language or CLT without successfully completing grammatical aspects of English, which are keys to success on entrance examinations. Moreover, Shirai (2012) claims that the majority of junior high school students have never experienced English grammar instruction in CLT-based English language courses before entering junior high schools. Therefore, English grammar instruction conducted in English needs more time compared to L1-based English grammar instruction (Mochizuki, 2010). Because junior high school English language teachers are primarily responsible for helping their students pass high school entrance examinations, they might find it difficult to shift from L1-based teacher-centered instruction to student-centered CLT styles without additional training.

Moreover, class size and class time are unignorable factors creating difficulties of conducting CLT in English language courses at junior high schools and high schools in Japan (Nishino, 2008). Pressure to teach the contents necessary for entrance examinations on which accuracy dimensions of English language are frequently emphasized limits English teachers' time to employ CLT at public secondary schools (Kan et al., 2009). However, the emphasis of entrance examinations is not the exclusive factor minimizing teacher instructional time. Teachers of any subjects need to handle both their own teaching and school affairs such as meeting parents or preparing for school events (Nishino, 2008). Therefore, English language teachers at public secondary schools should be provided ample time to achieve CLT, regardless of entrance examination influence (Cook, 2010). Likewise, class size of English language courses is too large to conduct CLT at Japanese public secondary schools (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008; Cook, 2009). Since CLT is a type of student-centered instruction, each class is not always conducted based on initial course plan or syllabus (Savignon & Wang, 2003). While ordinary teacher-centered instruction guides English language students into set course schedules to cover all the entrance examination contents within a restricted time, English language teachers need to realize and identify difficulties of each student in CLT (Harmer, 2007). Every student demonstrates different language issues (Larsen-Freeman, 2008) such as grammar issues, when CLT is conducted. Consequently, English language teachers need to be allowed to respond to all the needs of students in class although they cannot reflect on all students' needs without extra course hours.

CLT in Other Asian EFL Contexts

CLT is widely advocated in Asian EFL contexts. This is because Asian countries such as South Korea, Taiwan, and China have strong needs for educating citizens to be able to utilize English (Littlewood, 2007). In South Korea, since English currently plays a key role in the business field, the government has a plan to upgrade the status of English from EFL to ESL or the second official language (Park, 2009). To increase the number of South Korean citizens able to utilize English in their daily life, the Korean Ministry of Education will fully implement English-medium English language instruction at secondary schools from 2015 (Park, 2009). In Taiwan, although English teachers are positive about implementation of the CLT approach, the mismatch between the CLT curriculum and the grammar-oriented examinations prevent those teachers from fully employing CLT (Butler, 2005; Chang & Goswami, 2011). The Taiwanese government would like to promote CLT at secondary schools; however, national language policies were not revised enough to modify grammar-focused entrance examinations (Tsai & Lee, 2005). This is one of the strongest constraints for many Asian EFL countries including Japan, South Korea, and China (Butler, 2005). On the other hand, even if the entrance examination system of those Asian EFL countries includes more communicative components such as speaking and listening, English teachers do not think that a fixed CLT approach will develop students' English communication skills dramatically (Tsai & Lee, 2005). That is, teachers need to handle diverse students' needs regardless of the structure of entrance examinations (Savignon & Wang, 2003; Savignon, 2007). In China, there are constraints that South Korea and Taiwan also have. Not only entrance examinations and language policies but also lack of class hours, large class size, students' inconsistent levels of English, and students' introverted character are major limitations to teachers' instruction (Xiaoqing, 2004). Nevertheless, those constraints are not necessarily a result of institutional constraints or students' diverse learning needs (Rao, 2002). Especially in China, inadequate teacher training is an unignorable factor that inhibits the government's promotion of CLT at secondary schools or even at elementary schools (Xiaoqing, 2004). Thus, each country in Asian EFL contexts has similar constraints minimizing opportunities to implement CLT.

VI. Methodology

Qualitative-oriented studies have been conducted with four different educational institutions or groups: two public junior high schools, a private junior high school, and a public junior high school English teacher's study group. Three different research methods,

questionnaire, interview, or observation, were employed. To receive permission from the representative of each participant's institution or group, a research and formal letter of consent were provided.

Questionnaire

Nishino's (2008) questionnaire was employed in this study (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was confirmed by two junior high school principals. The purpose of this confirmation process by the principals was to get access to those junior high schools. Thereafter, the questionnaire was modified based on those principals' feedback.

Observation

The purpose of observation was to compare and contrast what 64 teachers mentioned in the questionnaire with actual junior high school English teachers' teaching practice. Observations of English courses were done by simply observing class or by participating in class as a volunteer tutor. The total number of English teachers observed at two public junior high schools was four; on the other hand, three were observed at a private junior high school. At a public school in which the researcher was a volunteer tutor, different classes of all three different grades by three different English teachers were observed for four days in October, 2012. In terms of the other public school, two first grade English classes by an English teacher were observed. As for three English classes at the third public junior high school, three observed classes were English classes of three different grades by three different teachers. Thus, 64 teachers' responses to the questionnaire were supported by the observations of English language courses at two public junior high schools and one private junior high school. Although the structure of observations were different depending on schools, all the teachers that allowed the author to do observations were highly-cooperative.

Interviews

Interviews were employed to ask teachers who were observed the relationship between their teaching beliefs about CLT and what those teachers actually practice in classroom. Six out of seven teachers observed participated in the interviews: three from public school, and the other three from private school. The interview questions (see Appendix B) of this study were devised based on the questionnaire (see Appendix A) and what the author observed at three different junior high schools. The average time for the interview was about 15 minutes.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical issues of each research instrument were covered by three different informed consent forms: informed consent form for the questionnaire, informed consent form for course observation, and informed consent form for interview research. Those three different consent forms were signed by participants of this study.

VII. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the possible differences between MEXT's interpretation of CLT and teacher's interpretation and implementation of CLT in Japanese junior high schools. Based on the results of the questionnaire, interviews, and observations, the research questions are considered again.

1. How does MEXT interpret CLT in the New Course of Study?

As MEXT does not specifically define what CLT is in the Course of Study, MEXT does not intend a certain interpretation of CLT. This means each junior high school could implement CLT in different ways. Despite the obscurity of the definition of CLT in the Course of Study (MEXT, 2008b), there are specific objectives, such as “to enable students to understand the speaker's intention when listening to English” and “to enable students to talk about their own thoughts using English” (p. 1), “to speak continuously using various techniques such as linking words” (p. 2), and “they should be able to perform language activities in which they have to think about how to express themselves in a way appropriate to a specific situation and condition” (p. 3). All of those statements are relevant to CLT according to Krashen's (1982) monitor model, Swain's (1982; 2005) comprehensible output hypothesis, and Long's (1991) focus on form. In other words, although the Course of Study (2008a; 2008b) is interpreted in diverse ways depending on contexts, MEXT consistently emphasizes the significance of comprehensible input and output, and the effectiveness of teaching grammar rules in communicative ways.

2. How do Japanese junior high school English teachers perceive or interpret CLT?

Data collected with the questionnaire revealed that the status of CLT is not well established in the context of Japanese junior high school English education. Only 62.5 percent of the participants have heard of or learned CLT. Among those 62.5 percent of the participants, the most common place where CLT was learned was in-service teacher training. However, many of those participants understand or actually practice CLT approaches such as the use of information gap activities in pairs or discussion in a group. Many of those teachers also believe that achieving native speaker levels of fluency is not the goal of CLT. Rather, what students need to

pursue is expressing their own thoughts or feelings in English effectively. In other words, although 37.5 percent of participants have never learned CLT, many of the same participants utilize CLT activities in teaching practice.

3. How do Japanese junior high school English teachers implement CLT in classroom?

Regardless of English teachers' degree of understanding of CLT, there are diverse approaches to CLT in Japanese junior high schools. Unlike private junior high schools or other higher educational institutions where students' needs are relatively consistent due to entrance examinations, public school students' needs are extremely diverse. There are both high-performing students, and less motivated or low level students in a same classroom. That is, English teachers especially at public junior high schools tend to build their own teaching approaches suitable for the teaching context and their own teaching skills. In addition, contextual diversity such as administrative duties and discipline issues at Japanese junior high schools imposes various constraints limiting teachers' flexibility.

One of the most serious constraints for those participants to implement CLT in the classrooms was lack of preparation time. This means that junior high school English teachers are too busy to cover contents other than textbook or entrance examination preparations. Even if those teachers are positive about employing CLT activities in their classrooms, pressure to cover entrance examination contents focusing on reading and writing does not allow teachers to have time for CLT.

In addition, class size and inconsistency of students' level of English proficiency are persistent constraints to implementing CLT instruction. Some teachers believe smaller class size is more effective for CLT classrooms; on the other hand, other teachers advocate large size classrooms to implement CLT activities. The reason why smaller class size for CLT is supported by some teachers is that those teachers have difficulty to support all the students in large size classrooms. Unlike private junior high schools, students' level of English language proficiency is diverse at public junior high schools. Some public school students do not understand even the most basic grammar rules of English, or in the worst cases, they cannot concentrate on class and move around the classroom during class time. Therefore, at public junior high schools, some teachers support small-sized proficiency dependent CLT classrooms. However, advocates of large classroom mention that there are more opportunities for CLT pair work or group activities in large classrooms (Xiaoqing, 2003). Moreover, students have less fear about mistakes when there are many classmates talking at the same time in the same classroom (Personal Communication, November 2, 2012). Therefore, it is not easy to say which is correct;

nevertheless, CLT in a large classroom is identified as a more effective approach in Asian EFL context by many foreign language educators (Xiaoqing, 2004).

VIII. Implications

The results of the study indicate that there are many constraints to implement CLT in Japanese junior high school classrooms. Since many English teachers are willing to implement CLT, MEXT's support to reduce those constraints is necessary to promote CLT at junior high schools. In addition, English teachers also need to figure out how to effectively overcome those many constraints to implement CLT in the classrooms.

One of the suggestions based on the results of this is to allow English teachers to teach more flexible size and types of classes depending on students' needs. If students' level of English proficiency is too inconsistent to implement CLT activities, creating proficiency-dependent classes (shujukudobetsu jugyou), needs to be allowed or further promoted. However, this does not imply CLT in the large-sized classrooms is not effective at Japanese junior high schools. Indeed, many English teachers, including three to four teachers observed in the present study, successfully conduct CLT with 30 to 40 students. In other words, class size and type needs to be flexible not only based on students' needs but also teachers' skills and availability under various constraints.

In terms of teachers' lack of preparation time, MEXT needs to employ more English teachers for each junior high school because English teachers are the busiest teachers in terms of number of class hours. From the 2012 academic year, there are four English language courses for each grade of junior high schools every week (MEXT, 2008a). Even if each school cannot employ enough English teachers, more teacher-teacher collaboration needs to be encouraged to prepare for CLT instruction. If possible, teachers of other subjects also need to support English teachers. One of the teachers interviewed in this study stated that it would be helpful if teachers of other subjects talk with students in English at school at least for greeting or simple daily conversations (personal communication, October 29, 2012). This would change students' attitude toward English because they are able to experience the usefulness of English as a communication tool in their daily life outside the English classroom. The change of attitude could create more time for English teachers to cover more practical aspects of instruction since even teaching and practicing simple greetings or daily conversations are challenging aspects of instruction that take ample class hours. In addition, since many junior high school English teachers are appointed as a representative teacher of each grade because of their hard work and leadership skills, they need to be supported by other teachers to decrease their administrative tasks including managing

school events, submitting administrative documents, or communicating with parents. If possible, appointing English teachers for administrative positions needs to be avoided. Nevertheless, since undertaking additional administrative tasks increases chances for promotion, English teachers should be provided privileges to achieve higher positions without too many administrative tasks. All the teachers interviewed in this study claimed that one of the strongest factors preventing them from incorporating CLT activities in class is lack of preparation time (personal communication, October 29, 2012; November 2, 2012).

Moreover, since disciplining students frequently uses class time at public junior high schools, the English teachers' job to teach and to discipline needs to be more clearly distinguished. Although this is not realistic because daily life guidance is also a junior high school teachers' job regardless of their subjects, problematic students affecting the progress of English language instruction need to be handled by teachers in charge of daily guidance or school counselors. For instance, one of the teachers observed in this study handled those students with the support of a male teacher representing the daily guidance section. In other words, the English teacher in that classroom did not directly manage that issue individually.

Furthermore, since many English teachers have never heard of CLT, teacher training courses at universities need to be improved to maintain the quality of English language education at junior high schools. If CLT and English-medium instruction are to be promoted, teacher education courses should provide more opportunities for future English teachers to practice different methodologies to employ CLT and to design different activities. Ideally, specialized subjects for future English teachers should be taught in English because it is hard to teach in English if those English teachers have never experienced English-medium English courses or content courses. At the same time, professors teaching English language-related teacher training courses at each university in Japan need to be skilled to teach in English. This is because being able to communicate in English fluently and teaching content courses in English requires different skills which normally need additional training. Different teaching methodologies or activity designing skills also need to be learned by each professor constantly to teach the most updated methodologies to students. In addition, MEXT should provide opportunities for English teachers to gain expertise in CLT methodology at graduate schools, in Japan and overseas.

Not only based on the collected data and the previous studies, but also based on lessons from other Asian EFL contexts, further implications are suggested. Although South Korea, Taiwan, and China share many similar constraints, and therefore implications with Japan, there are still

some aspects applicable to Japanese EFL contexts.

In South Korea, as in Japan, Taiwan, and China, English language instruction is traditionally grammar-focused (Li, 1998). However, recent economic globalization has increased the significance of the ability to utilize English (Park, 2009). To respond to this rising need, the South Korean Ministry of Education is attempting to require English teachers to teach English in English at secondary schools from 2015 (Park, 2009). One of the educational transformations that the South Korean Ministry of Education decided to implement to actualize English-medium instruction is improvement of teachers' examination by incorporating essay and interview examinations (Park, 2009). Although South Korean college students could have become an English teacher if they have effective test taking skills of reading and listening, speaking and essay writing skills will also be significant aspects of successful future English teachers (Xiaoqing, 2003). In other words, the South Korean government is going to enhance the quality of English language education by increasing the quality of teacher in terms of output skills (Park, 2009). Since one of the constraints for Japanese junior high school teachers to implement CLT is their inadequate English proficiency and teaching skills (Shirai, 2012), Japan also needs to modify the requirement to be a junior high school English teacher, for instant, by requiring a minimum score for the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) or TOEFL-iBT. In addition, as the understanding of cultures of English speaking countries helps students' language learning and teaching culture is effectively achieved if the teacher has ample international experiences (Tsai & Lee, 2005), overseas travel experiences also need to be a requirement of future English teachers. Although the overseas experience is not a pre-requisite to apply for English teacher employment exams yet (Shirai, 2012), the present study indicates that teachers employed recently tend to have some living-abroad experiences.

In Taiwan, as other Asian EFL countries, the diversity of students' needs is one of the most serious constraints to implement CLT (Savignon & Wang, 2003). If English teachers are not skilled, responding to each student's needs is challenging (Tsai & Lee, 2005). That is, there are many students who are not motivated to concentrate on English class in Taiwan because their needs are not covered in class (Butler, 2005). What Taiwanese English teachers employ to overcome this situation is technology (Tsai & Lee, 2005). Some English teachers in Taiwan encourage their students to use internet sources, such as online magazines or international news websites (Tsai & Lee, 2005). In addition, some Taiwanese students make friends abroad through online messaging or chatting (Tsai & Lee, 2005). Although those activities primarily happen outside of the class, students are motivated to learn English because they are able to see the

relevancy of English in their own life (Butler, 2005). In Japan, the use of online material could help motivate students. For example, since YouTube is widely employed to provide visual supplements in higher education contexts in Japan recently, that could be applied to junior high school contexts to promote CLT.

Chinese EFL contexts also have various constraints. However, Xiaoqing (2004) emphasizes the importance of being aware of those constraints, especially situational constraints. It is because many English teachers think those situational constraints, including institutional constraints or contents of entrance examinations, are hard to overcome (Ahmad & Rao, 2012). Xiaoqing (2004) claims that teachers need to specify what constraints prevent them from implementing CLT in what situations. This statement is also applicable to Japanese EFL contexts. Since many Japanese English teachers are not skilled enough to scientifically analyze their students' specific needs, they tend to keep facing similar constraints (Shirai, 2012). Therefore, Japanese junior high school teachers should be more aware of what constraints they face, and to accomplish this, those teachers need to be provided more in-service training opportunities to learn how to assess students' needs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, numerous studies about CLT in the Japanese English language education contexts have been previously conducted by various researchers. However, the number of CLT studies in Japanese secondary school contexts is smaller than that of higher education institutional contexts. Therefore, based on previous research in CLT at high school and higher education contexts, specific aspects of CLT research at junior high school contexts were illuminated in the current investigation. Although limited scientific investigations about CLT at junior high school contexts have been achieved in the past, since numerous opinions and experiences about those contexts were accessible through journal articles or books, specific needs for further research on CLT in the context of Japanese junior high school were identified.

Results of the current investigation revealed that there is a mismatch among junior high school English teachers' perception of CLT, the goals of MEXT about implementation of CLT, and what is going on in actual junior high school classrooms. Obviously, many English teachers do not acknowledge what CLT is and therefore are not able to implement CLT in their classrooms. Even if teachers acknowledge CLT, not many teachers actually conduct CLT in their English courses. Teachers' interpretation of, or attitude towards, CLT is seemingly a strong factor contributing to the gap between MEXT's goal and teachers' practice; however, that situation is

not necessarily a result of teachers' reluctant attitude toward CLT. Rather, the lack of enhancement of pre-service teacher education programs and working conditions of English teachers after introducing the New Course of Study inhibits the implementation of CLT. That is, despite the implementation of the New Course of Study promoting CLT and English-medium English language instruction, few changes happened in the teacher training courses at each university or at junior high schools. Most teacher education courses at universities do not adequately provide opportunities for future English teachers to brush up their English and to learn or practice different teaching methodologies suitable for CLT. As some interviewed teachers mentioned, if MEXT desires to promote CLT and English-medium English instruction, teacher training courses also need to be taught in English. In terms of the working conditions, since many teachers mentioned lack of communicative aspects in class, teachers' preparation time, and CLT teaching materials, those factors should have been considered before promoting the New Course of Study.

Implications of the present study indicate the need for the promotion of proficiency-dependent teaching, flexible size classes, increased teachers' preparation time and collaboration opportunities, a clear distinction between teaching and disciplining roles of English teachers, increased financial support for teaching materials and equipment, modification of entrance examinations, and development of teacher training courses at universities. In other words, MEXT's implemented of the New Course of Study without understanding the situation of each junior high school and the condition of teacher training courses at the nation's universities. Nevertheless, not only MEXT but also English teachers or institutions should consider how they could implement CLT within specific constraints. Regardless of the number of constraints, the ability to be aware of those constraints is important. Consequently, the discrepancy between the English language education policy and actual practice at junior high school obviously exists. Therefore, immediate national, regional, and school level support is necessary to promote CLT and practice of the New Course of Study in each junior high school English class in Japan.

References

- Ano, K. (2012). 英語で授業ができる教員に必要な英語力とは [What is the skill to conduct English language class in English?]. *The English Teacher's Magazine*, 61(1), 37-39.
- Butler, Y. G. (2005). Comparative perspectives towards communicative activities among elementary school teachers in South Korea, Japan and Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(4), 423-446. doi: 10.1191/1362168805lr176oa
- Campbell, C., Kikuchi, A., & Palmer, R. (2006). Bridging the gap between CLT theory and practice in a Japanese junior high school. *Kansai University Repository*, (12), 1-20. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10112/1466>
- Chang, M., & Goswami, J. S. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 3-12. doi: 10.5539/elt.v4n2p3
- Cook, M. (2009). Factors inhibiting and facilitating Japanese teachers of English in adopting communicative language teaching methodologies. *K@ta Journal*, 11(2), 99-116. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10623/31580>
- Cook, M. (2010). Offshore outsourcing teacher inservice education: The long-term effects of a four-month pedagogical program on Japanese teachers of English. *TESL Canada Journal*, 28(1), 60-76. Retrieved from <http://www.teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/issue/view/126>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Edinburgh, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hashimoto, K. (2009). Cultivating "Japanese Who Can Use English": Problems and Contradictions in Government Policy. *Asian Studies Review*, 33(1), 21-42. doi: 10.1080/10 357820802716166
- Inomori, T. (2012). 初めての英語で授業まずはここから [A starting point to conduct English language class in English]. *The English Teachers' Magazine*, 61(1), 31-33.
- Kan, M., Takahashi, K., Tajiri, G., Nakashima, Y., & Matsunaga, J. (2009). 新学習指導要領は英語の授業をどう変えるのか:今こそ教師としての belief と autonomy を! [How the New Course of Study change English language class?: Importance of having teacher's belief and autonomy]. *The English Teachers' Magazine*, 58(2), 10-19.
- Kanatani, K. (2012). 「英語授業は英語で」をめざして: 課題と解決策 [Targeting 'Teaching English language course in English': Issues and solutions]. *The English Teachers' Magazine*, 61(1), 10-12.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2008). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588000>

- Li, M., & Baldauf, R. (2012). Beyond the curriculum: A Chinese example of issues constraining effective English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(4), 793-803. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.5054/tq.2011.268058/abstract>
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and taskbased language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243-249. doi: 10.1017/S0261444807004363
- Loewen, S., & Reinders, H. (2011). *Key concepts in second language acquisition*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MEXT. (2002). Developing a strategic plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English abilities'. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/>
- MEXT. (2008a). *中学校学習指導要領解説：外国語編* [The guide to course of study: Foreign language]. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
- MEXT. (2008b). *中学校学習指導要領英訳版（仮訳）：外国語* [Tentative English translation of the guide to course of study: Foreign language]. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/>
- MEXT. (2010). *高等学校学習指導要領解説：外国語編・英語編* [The guide to course of study: Foreign language and English]. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
- MEXT. (2012a). *小学校外国語活動サイト* [Webpage for foreign language activity of elementary schools]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/gaikokugo/index.htm
- MEXT. (2012b). *中央教育審議会* [Central Education Council]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo0/index.htm
- Mochizuki, A. (2010). *改訂版 新学習指導要領にもとづく英語科教育法* [Teaching English as a foreign language in Japan based on the most updated national English language course curriculum] (2nd ed.). Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Nakata, Y. (2011). Teachers' readiness for promoting learner autonomy: A study of Japanese EFL high school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), 900-910. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2011.03.001
- Nishino, T. (2008). Japanese secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding communicative language teaching: An exploratory survey. *JALT Journal*, 30(1), 27-50. Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/jj/issues/2008-05_30.1
- Nishino, T., & Watanabe, M. (2008). Communication-oriented policies versus classroom realities in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(1), 133-138. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264432>
- Otsu, Y. (Ed.). (2009). *危機に立つ日本の英語教育* [Crisis of English language education in Japan]. Tokyo:

Keio Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai.

- Park, K. (2009). Characteristics of Korea English as a Globalized Variety. In K. Murata & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Global English in Asian contexts: Current and future debates* (pp. 94-107). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rao, Z. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *System*, 30(1), 85-105. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(01\)00050-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00050-1)
- Savignon, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 41(3), 223-249. doi: 10.1515/iral.2003.010
- Savignon, S. J. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(1), 207-220. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2006.09.004
- Seargeant, P. (2008). Ideologies of English in Japan: The perspective of policy and pedagogy. *Language Policy*, 7(2), 121-142. doi: 10.1007/s10993-007-9079-y
- Shirai, Y. (2012). 英語教師のための第二言語習得論入門 [Second language acquisition: An introduction for English language teachers]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Stewart, T. (2009). Will the new English curriculum for 2013 work? *The Language Teacher*, 33(11), 9-13. Retrieved from <http://jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/463-will-new-english-curriculum-2013-work>
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Taguchi, N. (2005). The communicative approach in Japanese secondary schools: Teacher's perceptions and practice. *The Language Teacher*, 29(3), 3-12. Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/tlt/issues/2005-03_29.3
- Takahashi, M. (2010). Significance of pre-service teacher education: From the English teaching methodology instructor's perspective lens of the instructor of the methodology of teaching English. *Journal of Bunkyo Gakuin University Department of Foreign Languages and Bunkyo Gakuin College*, (10), 273-283. Retrieved from <http://www.u-bunkyo.ac.jp/center/library/10.html>
- Tatsukawa, K. (2012). Improving logical thinking and developing the ability to express one's ideas effectively in English classes at secondary schools. *Hiroshima University Institutional Repository*, (15), 1-19. Retrieved from http://ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/000322_92
- Terashima, T. (2009). 英語教育が減びるとき：「英語で授業」のイデオロギー [The end of English language education in Japan: Ideology of English-medium English language instruction]. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.

Tsai, T., & Lee, F. (2005). 個案研究：溝通式英語教學法在台灣 [A case study: Communicative language teaching in Taiwan]. *Far East University Institutional Repository*, 24(3), 15-38. Retrieved from <http://www.feu.edu.tw/adms/aa0/aa095/>

Underwood, P. R. (2012). Teacher beliefs and intentions regarding the instruction of English grammar under national curriculum reforms: A theory of planned behaviour perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1-15.

Xiaoqing, L. (2003). *Chinese secondary school EFL teachers' attitudes towards communicative language teaching and their classroom practices*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI 766010931)

Xiaoqing, L. (2004). The need for communicative language teaching in China. *ELT Journal*, 58(3), 270-273. doi: 10.1093/elt/58.3.270

Appendix A

コミュニケーション・ランゲージ・ティーチングに関するアンケート (Modified based on advice from principals after translating from Nishino, 2008)

ご多忙のところ大変恐縮ですが、同意書をお読みにになり、先生の氏名と署名又は捺印をして頂いた上で、質問事項への回答をよろしく願います。回答して頂いたアンケートは英語教員を志す者として先生方にご指導を賜るつもりで扱わせて頂きます。

基本情報：英語教員歴を記入後、海外移住経験の該当箇所チェック をして下さい。

1. 英語教員歴：

西暦 年 月～ 年 月まで

2. 海外居住経験：

なし 1～6 ヶ月 6～12 ヶ月 1～3 年 3 年以上

質問事項 (17 項目)

該当する箇所にチェック を記入して下さい。(質問 2、3、4、9、10 は複数回答可)

1. コミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチングについて聞いた事や学んだ事はありますか。
 はい いいえ (はいをチェックした方は質問 2～4 を飛ばして下さい。)
2. コミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチングをどこで知りましたか。(複数回答可)
 本や論文 英語教授法の講義やセミナー 指導本 学習指導要領
 大学 研究会主催のワークショップ その他 ()
3. コミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチングを採用した授業において生徒にとって重要な事は何ですか。(複数回答可)
 英語を母語とする人 (以下、ネイティブスピーカー) と話す事
 ネイティブスピーカーの様な発音を身につける事
 ネイティブスピーカーの様に滞りなく話す事
 ネイティブスピーカーの様に文法に誤り無く話す事
 英語 (外国語) で効果的に自分の言いたい事を伝える事
 日本語 (母語) を全く使わない事 生徒たちが協力して勉強する事
 英語 (外国語) でのコミュニケーションを楽しむ事 その他 ()

4. コミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチングを採用した授業では英語教員の先生方に何が求められていると思いますか。**(複数回答可)**
- ネイティブスピーカーの様に振舞う事
ネイティブスピーカーの様に発音する事
ネイティブスピーカーの様に滞りなく話す事
ネイティブスピーカーの様に文法に誤り無く話す事
言語学習教材を提供する事
生徒の学びを生徒の目線でサポートする事
自ら英語でのコミュニケーションの一例を示す事
生徒の輪の中に入ってコミュニケーションをはかる事
その他 ()
5. 先生にとって英語でコミュニケーションをはかる能力とはどのような能力ですか。
-

6. 先生の学校にネイティブスピーカーの英語教員（非常勤）はいますか。
はい いいえ
はいをチェックした方はどの位の頻度でネイティブスピーカーの英語教員が教えているか選択して下さい。
不定期 月に1回 2-3週間に1回 週に1回 週に2回 週に3回以上
7. ネイティブスピーカーの英語教員とのチーム・ティーチングを行っていますか。
はい いいえ
(もしALTとの授業を行っていないければ以下の8-①と9-①“ALTとの授業”を飛ばして下さい。)
8. 先生はどの位の頻度でグループまたはペアでのアクティビティを行いますか。
①ALTとの授業：全く行わない 殆ど行わない 時々行う
頻繁に行う 普段から行っている いつも行う
②ALTがない授業：全く行わない 殆ど行わない 時々行う
頻繁に行う 普段から行っている いつも行う
9. 先生の授業では以下うちどのアクティビティを行った事がありますか。**(複数回答可)**
①ALTとの授業：インフォメーションギャップ（自分の知らない事を英語で質問し、相手が知らない事を英語で説明する）プロブレムソルビング（問題解決）ディスカッション リスティング/ランキング（例えば生徒に好きな食べ物を3つ挙げてもらい、その理由を説明してもらう）ロールプレイ ゲーム その他 ()
②ALTのいない授業：インフォメーションギャップ プロブレムソルビング ディスカッション
リスティング/ランキング ロールプレイ ゲーム その他 ()
10. 生徒が好むアクティビティはどれだと先生は思いますか。**(複数回答可)**
インフォメーションギャップ プロブレムソルビング ディスカッション
リスティング/ランキング ロールプレイ ゲーム
その他 ()
11. 先生の学校でコミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチングは効果的に採用されていると思いますか。
はい いいえ
12. いいえにチェックされた先生は以下のどの要因が最も課題だと思いますか。
コミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチングのための教材が不足している
入学/進学試験 先生方の英語習熟度不足 学習指導要領 教科書
1クラスあたりの生徒数 授業時間数 評価方法
その他 ()
13. 先生は言語の機能に焦点を当てたアクティビティをもっと生徒に経験させたいと思いますか。また、その理由は何ですか。
はい いいえ
理由：

14. 先生の授業でコミュニカティブ・ランゲージ・ティーチングをさらに効果的に実践するために最初に変えるべき点は何だと思いますか。
-

15. 先生の生徒が英語を学ぶ上で以下の各項目はどの程度重要ですか。

【該当する箇所（0～5）に○をして下さい。】

Importance	None	Little	Slight	Somewhat	Important	Very Important
Reading	0	1	2	3	4	5
Writing	0	1	2	3	4	5
Listening	0	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking	0	1	2	3	4	5
Grammar	0	1	2	3	4	5
Vocabulary	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yakudoku	0	1	2	3	4	5

16. 先生の生徒が高校入試に合格するために以下の各項目はどの程度重要だと思いますか。

【該当する箇所（0～5）に○をして下さい。】

Importance	None	Little	Slight	Somewhat	Important	Very Important
Reading	0	1	2	3	4	5
Writing	0	1	2	3	4	5
Listening	0	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking	0	1	2	3	4	5
Grammar	0	1	2	3	4	5
Vocabulary	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yakudoku	0	1	2	3	4	5

17. 先生の生徒が大学入試に合格するために以下の各項目はどの程度重要だと思いますか。

【該当する箇所（0～5）に○をして下さい。】

Importance	None	Little	Slight	Somewhat	Important	Very Important
Reading	0	1	2	3	4	5
Writing	0	1	2	3	4	5
Listening	0	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking	0	1	2	3	4	5
Grammar	0	1	2	3	4	5
Vocabulary	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yakudoku	0	1	2	3	4	5

ご多忙のところ、ご協力ありがとうございました。

Appendix B

インタビュー質問事項 (約 10 分)

1. CLT に関して先生はどのような意見をお持ちですか。
2. 先生にとって英語でのコミュニケーション能力とは何ですか。
3. 先生の授業では CLT を実践されていますか。
 - a. 先生は普段どのようなコミュニケーション・アクティビティを実践されていますか。
 - b. 一つの授業の中に様々なねらいがある中で先生はコミュニケーション・アクティビティをどの様に取り入れていますか。
4. 先生の授業ではペア又はグループでのアクティビティを取り入れていますか。
 - a. 例えばどのようなペア又はグループでのアクティビティを先生は実践されていますか。
 - b. 先生の生徒はペア又はグループでのアクティビティが好きですか。
 - c. 生徒の英語でのコミュニケーションを促すには先生はどのようなアクティビティが最も効果的であると考えていますか。
5. 先生の学校では英語科の授業で CLT を実践していると思いますか。
 - a. もし実践している場合、それは一週間当たりどの位の頻度 (回数/時間) ですか。
6. 先生が CLT を実践する中で制約となる要因はありますか。
 - a. 先生の学校で CLT を効果的に実践するには何を変えるべきだと考えていますか。
 - b. 先生が使用している教科書やテストの内容は先生の授業にどのような影響を与えますか。
7. 先生は中学校レベルで CLT が幅広く取り入れられるべきだと思いますか。
8. 中学校の英語教育、とりわけ英語でのコミュニケーションの学習、において先生は何を改善する必要があるとお考えですか。
 - a. そのために文部科学省は何をしたら良いですか。
 - b. そのためにそれぞれの中学校が出来る事は何ですか。
 - c. そのために中学校英語科の先生方が出来る事は何ですか。
9. 先生が CLT のアクティビティを更に実践していくために先生の学校、或いは管理機関、が出来る事はありますか。