

# jalt journal

The research journal of  
the Japan Association  
for Language Teaching

Volume 41 • No. 1 • May 2019



# JALT

全国語学教育学会

Japan Association for Language Teaching

¥1,900 ISSN 0287-2420

# JALT Journal

Volume 41 • No. 1

May 2019

## Editor

Eric Hauser

*University of Electro-Communications  
and University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

## Associate Editor

Gregory Paul Glasgow

*Kanda University of International Studies*

## Japanese-Language Editor

Yo In'nami

*Chuo University*

## Associate Japanese-Language Editor

Natsuko Shintani

*Kobe Gakuin University*

## Reviews Editor

Greg Rouault

*Hiroshima Shudo University*

## Assistant Reviews Editor

Bill Snyder

*Bunkyo University*

## Consulting Editors

Anne McLellan Howard

*Miyazaki International College*

Greg Sholdt

*Kobe University*

Ken Urano

*Hokkai-Gakuen University*

## Editorial Board

William Acton

*Trinity Western University,  
Canada*

David Aline

*Kanagawa University*

David Beglar

*Temple University—Japan  
Campus*

James Dean Brown

*University of Hawai'i, Mānoa, USA*

Charles Browne

*Meiji Gakuin University*

Yuko Goto Butler

*University of Pennsylvania, USA*

Christine Pearson Casanave

*Temple University—Japan  
Campus*

Eton Churchill

*Kanagawa University*

Melodie Cook

*University of Niigata Prefecture*

Steve Cornwell

*Osaka Jogakuin University*

Neil Cowie

*Okayama University*

Anne Ediger

*Hunter College, City University of  
New York, USA*

James A. Elwood

*Meiji University*

Peter Gobel

*Kyoto Sangyo University*

Michael Guest

*Miyazaki University*

Ian Isemonger

*Kumamoto University*

Gabriele Kasper

*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

Yuriko Kite

*Kansai University*

Setsuko Mori

*Kindai University*

Tim Murphey

*Kanda University of International  
Studies*

Carol Rinnert

*Hiroshima City University*

Hidetoshi Saito

*Ibaraki University*

Hideki Sakai

*Shinshu University*

David Shea

*Keio University*

Tamara Swenson

*Osaka Jogakuin University*

Yoshinori J. Watanabe

*Sophia University*

**Additional Readers:** Toshie Agawa, Junya Fukuta, Ryoko Hayashi, Akemi Katayama, Keita Kikuchi, Ryuko Kubota, Laura McGregor, Yoko Mori, Kristian Mortensen, Ryo Nitta, Naoko Osuka, Keiko Sakui, Andrea Simon-Maeda, Yuko Shimizu, Takunori Terasawa, Tsutomu Umamoto

**JALT Journal Production Editor:** Amy Aisha Brown

**JALT Journal Proofreading:** Claire Bower, Brian Dubin, Susan Gilfert, Anne Hendler, Marie Kjeldgaard, Aleda Krause, Kurtis McDonald, Steve McGuire, Sachiko Nakamura, Barbara Northwood, Chizuko Tsumatori

**JALT Publications Board Chair:** Caroline Handley

**JALT Journal Layout & Design:** Malcolm Swanson

**JALT Journal on the Internet:** <http://jalt-publications.org/jj/> **Website Editor:** Malcolm Swanson

- 3 In this Issue
- 4 From the Editor

## Articles

- 5 How Do Japanese Junior High School English Teachers React to the Teaching English in English Policy? — *Tomohisa Machida*
- 27 明治期から大正期日本の高等学校入学試験と中学校の外国語教育: 第一高等学校における変遷を中心に [Higher School Entrance Exams and Middle School Foreign Language Education in Meiji- and Taisho-Era Japan: The Case of Daiichi Koto Gakko] — 下 絵津子 (*Etsuko Shimo*)

## Perspectives

- 49 Conceptualizing Integration in CLIL: More Than Just Learning Content and Language — *Sachiko Yasuda*

## Reviews

- 66 *Autonomous Language Learning With Technology: Beyond the Classroom* (Chun Lai) — Reviewed by Kevin Ballou
- 70 *Language Teacher Psychology* (Sarah Mercer and Achilleas Kostoulas, Eds.) — Reviewed by Brian Cullen
- 73 *English-Medium Instruction in Japanese Higher Education: Policy, Challenges and Outcomes* (Annette Bradford and Howard Brown, Eds.) — Reviewed by Imogen Custance
- 77 *Reflecting on Critical Incidents in Language Education: 40 Dilemmas for Novice TESOL Professionals* (Thomas S. C. Farrell and Laura Baecher) — Reviewed by Samar Kassim
- 80 *Second Language Testing for Student Evaluation and Classroom Research* (Greta Gorsuch and Dale T. Griffee) — Reviewed by Brandon Kramer
- 84 *Project-Based Language Learning With Technology: Learner Collaboration in an EFL Classroom in Japan* (Michael Thomas) — Reviewed by Kane Linton
- 87 *Cognitive Grammar in Stylistics: A Practical Guide* (Marcello Giovanelli and Chloe Harrison) — Reviewed by Stephen Pihlaja
- 90 *Mapping Genres, Mapping Culture: Japanese Texts in Context* (Elizabeth A. Thomson, Motoki Sano, and Helen de Silva Joyce) — Reviewed by Vicky Ann Richings
- 93 *Complexity Theory and Language Development: In Celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman* (Lourdes Ortega and ZhaoHong Han, Eds.) — Reviewed by Richard J. Sampson

## JALT Journal Information

- 96 JALT Journal Call for Special Issue Proposals
- 97 Information for Contributors (English and Japanese)

All materials in this publication are copyright ©2019 by JALT and their respective authors.  
For more information on copyright in all JALT Publications:  
<http://jalt-publications.org/copyright>

# Japan Association for Language Teaching

## A Nonprofit Organization

The Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) is a nonprofit professional organization dedicated to the improvement of language teaching and learning in Japan. It provides a forum for the exchange of new ideas and techniques and offers a means of keeping informed about developments in the rapidly changing field of second and foreign language education. Established in 1976, JALT serves an international membership of approximately 2,699 language teachers. There are 32 JALT chapters and 27 special interest groups (SIGs). JALT is a founder of PAC (Pan-Asian Consortium), which is an association of language teacher organizations in Pacific Asia. PAC holds annual regional conferences and exchanges information among its member organizations. JALT is the Japan affiliate of International TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) and a branch of IATEFL (International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language). JALT is also affiliated with many other international and domestic organizations.

JALT publishes *JALT Journal*, a semiannual research journal; *The Language Teacher*, a bimonthly periodical containing articles, teaching activities, reviews, and announcements about professional concerns; and the annual *JALT Post Conference Publication*.

The JALT International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning and Educational Materials Exposition attracts some 2,000 participants annually and offers over 600 papers, workshops, colloquia, and poster sessions. Each JALT chapter holds local meetings and JALT's SIGs provide information and newsletters on specific areas of interest. JALT also sponsors special events such as workshops and conferences on specific themes and awards annual grants for research projects related to language teaching and learning.

Membership is open to those interested in language education and includes optional membership in one chapter and one SIG, copies of JALT publications, and free or discounted admission to JALT-sponsored events. JALT members can join as many additional SIGs as they wish for an annual fee of ¥2,000 per SIG. For information, contact the JALT Central Office or visit the JALT website.

## JALT National Officers, 2018-2019

*President:* .....Richmond Stroupe  
*Vice President:* .....Naomi Fujishima  
*Auditor:* .....Steve Brown  
*Director of Treasury:* .....Robert Chartrand  
*Director of Records:* .....Kenn Gale  
*Director of Program:* .....Wayne Malcolm  
*Director of Membership:* .....Joshua Krill  
*Director of Public Relations:* .....Bill Pellowe (acting)

## Chapters

Akita, East Shikoku, Fukui, Fukuoka, Gifu, Gunma, Hiroshima, Hokkaido, Ibaraki, Iwate, Kitakyushu, Kobe, Kyoto, Matsuyama, Nagoya, NanKyu, Nara, Niigata, Oita, Okayama, Okinawa, Osaka, Saitama, Sendai, Shinshu, Shizuoka, Tokyo, Tottori, Toyohashi, West Tokyo, Yamagata, Yokohama

## Special Interest Groups

Bilingualism; Business Communication; College and University Educators; Computer-Assisted Language Learning; Critical Thinking; Extensive Reading; CEFR and Language Portfolio; Gender Awareness in Language Education; Global Issues in Language Education; Intercultural Communication in Language Education; Japanese as a Second Language; Learner Development; Lifelong Language Learning; Literature in Language Teaching; Materials Writers; Mind, Brain, and Education; Mixed, Augmented, and Virtual Realities; Other Language Educators; Pragmatics; School Owners; Speech, Drama, & Debate; Study Abroad; Task-Based Learning; Teacher Development; Teachers Helping Teachers; Teaching Younger Learners; Testing and Evaluation; Vocabulary

## JALT Central Office

Urban Edge Building, 5F 1-37-9 Taito, Taito-ku, Tokyo 110-0016, Japan  
Tel.: 03-3837-1630; Fax: 03-3837-1631; Email: [jco@jalt.org](mailto:jco@jalt.org);  
Website: [www.jalt.org](http://www.jalt.org)

# In This Issue

## Articles

This issue contains two full-length research articles, one in English and one in Japanese, and a Perspectives article. The research article in English is by **Tomohisa Machida**, who investigates the views of junior high school teachers in relation to current policies regarding the use of English in the classroom. The research article in Japanese is by **Etsuko Shimo**, who investigates the history of foreign language education and entrance examinations in Japan. Finally, the Perspectives article, by **Sachiko Yasuda**, discusses Content and Language Integrated Learning in the Japanese context.

## Reviews

The titles reviewed in this issue are drawn from a broad range of themes related to language teaching, learning, and education. The opening review by **Kevin Ballou** looks at the use of technology for autonomous language learning outside of the classroom. Second comes a review by **Brian Cullen** who explores the psychology of teachers, the central figures in language learning success. **Imogen Custance** reports on English-medium instruction in Japanese higher education from an edited volume of that very name. **Samar Kassim** takes up a title that outlines the challenges faced by novice English language teachers as collected through reflective practice. In the next review, **Brandon Kramer** covers a resource introducing second language testing coauthored by Greta Gorsuch and Dale T. Griffee. **Kane Linton** then reviews a research-based account from Michael Thomas on technology-mediated, project-based language learning. **Stephen Pihlaja** calls on his experience in stylistics to share the merits of a book that explains the cognitive and functional elements of grammatical constructions found in Cognitive Grammar. **Vicky Ann Richings** focuses a lens on pragmatics in Japanese linguistics in a review of *Mapping Genres, Mapping Culture: Japanese Texts in Context*. Finally, **Richard J. Sampson**, whose own works have been reviewed in *JALT Journal* (see Vol. 40.1, May 2018), examines an anthology in tribute to Diane Larsen-Freeman and in particular her contributions on complexity theory in language learning.

## Editor's Message

After welcoming two new Associate Editors and a new Production Editor in the last issue, we are now happy to welcome Bill Snyder as the new Assistant Reviews Editor. The production of each issue of *JALT Journal* is the result of the efforts of numerous volunteers, including the various editors, reviewers, and proofreaders, as well as those who submit their work for consideration for publication. I would like to thank all those whose past contributions, and all those whose continuing contributions, make possible the publication of this journal.

As a new feature in *JALT Journal*, we will start publishing occasional special issues related to themes relevant for language teaching and/or learning in the Japanese context. Please see the back of this and future issues for the Call for Special Issue Proposals. We, the editors of *JALT Journal*, look forward to working with guest editors in the production of future special issues.

— Eric Hauser, *JALT Journal* Editor

# Articles

## How Do Japanese Junior High School English Teachers React to the Teaching English in English Policy?

Tomohisa Machida  
*Akita International University*

The Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) proposed the teaching English in English (TEE) policy in junior high schools (JHSs) in 2013. According to the new *Course of Study* (MEXT, 2017), JHS English teachers will be required to teach English in English starting in 2021. A study of JHS English teachers' reactions to the new policy is reported in this paper. Participants included 98 public JHS English teachers (31 males and 67 females) in the northeast region of Japan. Teachers' responses to the policy were investigated using the Teacher Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (TFLAS; Horwitz, 2013), a background questionnaire, class observations, and individual interviews. Due to JHS teachers' lack of confidence in using English for instruction and concern over students' possible struggles in learning, teachers were anxious about TEE. In addition, many teachers wanted practical training opportunities to develop their English communication skills to be ready for successful policy implementation.

文部科学省は2013年に、中学校でも英語の授業を英語で行う方針 (TEE: Teaching English in English) を打ち出した。そして、2017年に改訂された新しい中学校学習指導要領では、2021年からの英語による指導が義務付けられた。本研究は、英語の授業を英語で行う方針に対する中学校英語教師の反応を調査したものである。東北地方の公立中学校英語教師98名 (男性31名、女性67名) が本研究に参加した。調査にあたっては、教師外国語不安スケール (Horwitz, 2013)、質問紙、授業観察、インタビューの手法を活用した。その結果、中学校英語教師は英語を使った指導に対する自信のなさや、生徒の英語学習が困難になるかもしれないという思いから、英語

による指導に不安を感じていることが分かった。さらに、多くの教師はTEEが滞りなく実施されるためにも、教師自身の英語によるコミュニケーション能力を伸ばす実践的な研修の機会の充実を望んでいた。

**Keywords:** English education policy; junior high school teachers; foreign language anxiety; teaching English in English

English education in Japan has been further advanced toward English for communication since the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) published the *Course of Study* in 2008. This national educational guideline has been published approximately once every 10 years, and it is almost always controversial in terms of the feasibility of goal attainment (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009). The 2008 *Course of Study* announced the implementation of English education at the elementary school (ES) level and teaching English in English (TEE) at the senior high school (SHS) level. Soon after the 2008 publication, MEXT (2013) proposed the further development of English education at every school level by releasing its English education reform plan, declaring that “classes will be conducted in English in principle” (p. 1) in junior high schools (JHSs) to develop students’ English communicative competence. The government promotes the sequential development of students’ English by using English as a medium of instruction at JHSs and SHSs. In 2017, MEXT published a new *Course of Study* to activate the TEE policy in JHSs in 2021.

MEXT (2016) determined how many JHS English teachers currently teach English in English (see Table 1). The data show that over half of JHS English teachers use English for more than half of their utterances during lessons. However, in terms of TEE, the current results suggest that implementation of the policy in JHSs will be difficult because only approximately 10% of teachers teach English in English. Given that official enactment of the TEE policy in JHSs will occur in fewer than two years, the aim of this study was to examine the extent to which teachers are likely to implement the policy and investigate potential obstacles by exploring JHS teachers’ reactions to the new policy. Surveys, interviews, and observations of English lessons were used to understand JHS teachers’ pedagogical and affective concerns over the governmental educational reform.



Table 1. JHS Teachers' Use of English

English Use	7th-grade teachers	8th-grade teachers	9th-grade teachers
More than 75%	10.3%	9.1%	9.4%
50%-75%	48.0%	47.8%	45.4%
Less than 50%	41.7%	43.1%	45.2%

### Obstacles to the Implementation of the TEE Policy

Although MEXT officially initiated the TEE policy in SHSs in 2013, the implementation of the policy was more challenging than expected. MEXT (2016) reported that only 13.7% of SHS English teachers used English for more than 75% of their utterances during lessons for the subject English Communication I. Three years after the official implementation of the TEE policy in SHSs, MEXT revealed that the policy had not been successfully carried out.

One of the reasons for the low implementation rate is the pressure teachers face when dealing with grammar-based high-stakes tests (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009). Grammar-focused *juken eigo* [English for entrance exams] and *yakudoku* (an adaptation of the grammar-translation method) in the L1 have been widely adopted in SHSs as washback of university entrance examinations, although “most university exams don’t actually require students to translate” (Gorsuch, 1998, p. 27). To reform the grammar-based approach, “a more communicative-oriented approach in . . . teaching and testing” (Sakamoto, 2012, pp. 414-415) has been advocated. Thus, the Japan Association of National Universities (2017) announced a reform of the Center Test, the grammar-based high-stakes test for university entrance examination, by integrating all four English language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing). The Center Test will be taken over by private-sector tests, such as TOEFL, and the new test will be introduced in 2020. Due to the change of the test format, teachers’ increased use of English for instruction might be expected for communicative purposes.

Another reason for the low implementation rate is SHS teachers’ lack of confidence in speaking English for communication. In Nishino’s (2011) study, SHS English teachers assessed their own speaking ability as weaker than their listening, reading, and writing abilities. Their lack of communicative English learning experience also impeded their use of English in a communicative way. Glasgow (2013) found that SHS teachers who did not have

confidence in their English pronunciation tended to be the most anxious about engaging in English medium instruction.

Many researchers (e.g., Horwitz, 2013) have found that nonnative teachers frequently mentioned foreign language anxiety. MacIntyre (1999) defined this as “the worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using a second language” (p. 27). According to Suzuki and Roger (2014), foreign language anxiety among Japanese SHS teachers prevented them from using English during lessons. They reported that 13 out of 15 SHS English teachers experienced some degree of foreign language anxiety when they used English in class, and most teachers conducted lessons mainly in Japanese due to their negative reaction toward English. The researchers identified two major causes for teachers’ anxiety. The first cause was “teacher cognition about their role in relation to target language use” (p. 185), which means teachers’ lack of confidence in their use of English. Teachers were afraid of making mistakes in front of students, because they thought it would lead to the deterioration of their authority as an English teacher. The other cause was “teacher cognition about learners” (p. 188); they had concerns about students left behind and returnees as well as the relationship between communicative lessons and grammar-based high-stakes tests. SHS English teachers thought that using Japanese would help students understand English lessons better and prepare them to take university entrance examinations.

As with SHS teachers, Japanese ES teachers also experience foreign language anxiety (Machida, 2016). Since the official implementation of *Foreign Language Activities* (English language education) in fifth and sixth grades in 2011, ES teachers have been required to team teach with native English-speaking assistant language teachers (ALTs). Machida and Walsh (2015) pointed out that foreign language anxiety affected ES teachers’ successful collaboration with native English-speaking ALTs. The reasons for their anxiety in using English stem from a lack of confidence in English communication and a lack of experience in preparing English lessons (Machida, 2016).

Foreign language anxiety weakens nonnative English-speaking teachers’ confidence about the target language, especially when they compare their English proficiency with that of native speakers. Their language proficiency often becomes a cause of stress among nonnative teachers (Mousavi, 2007). Nonnative English-speaking teachers tend to pursue “an idealized level of proficiency” (Horwitz, 1996, p. 367), such as a native speaker’s level, and the proficiency gap between them triggers anxiety among nonnative English-speaking teachers. In a similar vein, Nishino and Watanabe (2008) argued

that “many Japanese English teachers perceive their speaking skills as weak and believe that their authority might be tarnished if they make mistakes in front of students” (p. 134).

In other Asian countries, TEE has been implemented at every school level, and it has affected teachers in terms of their confidence in the use of English. For example, with reference to the TEE policy that began in Korea in 2001 (Choi, 2015), Kim and Kim (2004) investigated Korean EFL teachers’ foreign language anxiety and its causes. They reported that Korean teachers strongly believe that English teachers should have a comprehensive understanding of the English language, but many were concerned about TEE. Their limited English proficiency, lack of confidence in speaking English, and lack of preparation for TEE were reported as the main causes of their anxiety. Kim and Kim warned that the TEE policy threatened the teachers’ authority as English teachers.

Researchers who are against English-only policies have pointed out benefits of L1 use in L2 classrooms (e.g., Meyer, 2008; Nation, 2003; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Weschler, 1997). The use of the students’ native language helped students fully understand the meaning of focused tasks (Nation, 2003), complete the tasks “at a higher cognitive level” (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003, p. 767), and reduce their language anxiety (Meyer, 2008). The L1 was also useful for teachers to conduct classroom management and comprehension checks (Meyer, 2008). However, in EFL contexts, “too much use of the native language in the classroom” (Brown, 2007, p. 247) has often received attention for being problematic. Japanese English teachers “overwhelmingly use Japanese” (Gorsuch, 1998, p. 10) as a means of instruction in class due to their “adhere[nce] to the traditional grammar-translation method” (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008, p. 134). MEXT (2016) found that more than 51% of SHS teachers and 41% of JHS teachers mainly used Japanese for teaching the subjects Communication English I and English respectively, and they used this to argue that teachers provided insufficient target language input to students. Many researchers, even if they believe in the benefits of the L1, agree on the importance of L2 input for the development of students’ proficiency in the target language (e.g., Ford, 2009; Nation, 2003). In addition, English language instruction has been adopted as a global trend. Dearden (2015) reported that 70.9% of public secondary schools in 55 countries, including Japan, have officially accepted the idea of English as a medium of instruction not just for English and literature, but also for other subjects, such as math and science. Recently in Japan, MEXT-designated Super English Language High Schools started to develop English education through TEE (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008; Yoshida, 2003).

Given the increasing importance being placed on TEE, further pressure on teachers to do so can be anticipated. However, that appears incongruent with the evidence that language anxiety may prevent such a policy's effective implementation. Therefore, this study sought to assess Japanese JHS teachers reactions to the TEE policy as a way to contribute to advancing the discussion around it.

## Method

### *Participants*

Ninety-eight public JHS English teachers (67 females and 31 males) in a northeastern prefecture (approximately 33.7% of full-time JHS English teachers in the prefecture) participated in this study. All were nonnative English speakers. They taught English weekly to seventh- through ninth-grade students. The teachers' average length of teaching experience was 19.1 years. The participants responded to an anxiety scale and a background questionnaire. Among the participants, 13 teachers (nine female and four male) from five schools additionally agreed to take part in individual semi-structured interviews at their home schools and let the researcher observe their lessons. The length of the teaching experience of these 13 teachers ranged between 2 and 28 years ( $M=16.2$  years).

### *Instruments*

#### *Teacher Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (TFLAS)*

Horwitz (2013) developed the TFLAS to evaluate a teacher's anxiety level about his or her foreign language proficiency. The 18-item survey is scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The TFLAS includes both regular and reverse-scored items. To determine the anxiety level, all responses are summed up, and the total score is divided by 18. According to Horwitz, an average of around 3 on the TFLAS suggests the teacher may have a slight anxiety about their language proficiency. As with other studies (e.g., Tum, 2012), teachers whose average scores are 3 or higher were considered anxious teachers in this study. Although the TFLAS was originally created in English, the researcher translated the scale into Japanese and used the Japanese version in this study.

### *Background questionnaire*

The background questionnaire was administered to participants to elicit each teacher's (a) gender, (b) years of English teaching experience at JHS, (c) formal in-service training experience related to teaching methods, (d) formal test-taking experience (e.g., TOEFL, TOEIC, or EIKEN) and their highest scores, and (e) self-assessed English proficiency level. The results were utilized to understand JHS English teachers' demographic data and analyze sources of their anxiety. In addition, the questionnaire included an open-ended question about MEXT's new TEE policy. JHS English teachers were asked to describe their opinions and feelings about TEE. The collected data were analyzed to identify pedagogical gaps between teachers' current instructional methods and the English-mediated instruction in an effort to reveal obstacles to the implementation of the new policy.

### *Class observations and interviews*

Additional explorations were conducted at willing teachers' schools individually a few months after collecting written data. After obtaining permission from each school principal for class observations and interviews, the researcher made a single visit to each of the five schools where the 13 teachers worked, observed 50-minute lessons (one 50-minute lesson for nine teachers and two 50-minute lessons for four teachers because of each school's schedule), and conducted interviews of approximately 30-minutes with each of the 13 teachers. The aim of the class observations was to examine how and to what extent each JHS teacher used English for instruction in class. Because the class lessons could not be recorded on video, the researcher took careful field notes during observations. In addition, interviews explored teachers' feelings and struggles about TEE. Individual interviews took place in a secured private room in each school and were recorded for transcription after obtaining each participant's permission.

### *Procedure*

To collect data, the TFLAS and questionnaire were administered to teachers during prefectural in-service training at three different locations in the prefecture. The prefectural board of education administers all public schools by dividing them into three different regions (North, Central, and South). Each region has a local education office that disseminates governmental policies to each teacher by providing in-service teacher training. These three regional local offices annually offer one-day in-service teacher

training sessions to JHS English teachers. During one such training session, the TFLAS and background questionnaire were distributed to participants, and JHS teachers were given enough time to complete the written forms. After the quantitative data collection, the researcher contacted the prefectural board of education to ask for permission to conduct interviews and class observations in each region. Once the researcher received the local government's permission for class observations and interviews, the three regional local education offices provided each school's information about English teachers to the researcher. After obtaining permission from each school principal, the researcher and the English teachers in each JHS then arranged possible visiting dates for class observations and interviews. Prior to interviewing teachers individually, the researcher observed their English lessons in classrooms.

### **Data Analysis**

All participants completed the TFLAS and background questionnaire. Once the TFLAS data were collected from each teacher, their responses on the 5-point Likert scale (i.e., ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*) were converted to specific points between 1 and 5. The mean score was computed and utilized to analyze each teacher's anxiety level: the higher the number, the higher the level of anxiety. Their responses to the background questionnaire were categorized into each item and used to understand teachers' English proficiency level and opinions of the TEE policy.

All the interview data were transcribed and analyzed to understand how teachers felt about TEE. Field notes for class observations, which included information about what activities teachers used and how they instructed, were also analyzed to identify teachers' techniques and strategies for TEE during lessons.

### **Results**

#### ***JHS Teachers' Anxiety About English***

Unlike ES teachers, who showed a high level of anxiety (Machida, 2016), JHS English teachers showed a relatively low level of anxiety ( $M = 3.05$ ,  $SD = 0.44$ ), although their average language proficiency anxiety level was still considered "slightly anxious" (Horwitz, 2013, p. 266). Cronbach's alpha (.82) suggests that the anxiety scores were reliable in this study. Table 2 shows the distribution of JHS teachers' anxiety levels: low, medium, and high. As

noted above, teachers in the medium- to high-anxiety groups were considered anxious teachers in this study, indicating that 44 teachers (44.9%) felt anxious about their English proficiency.

Table 2. Teacher Anxiety Levels

Anxiety group	<i>N</i>	Possible range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
High anxiety	1 (1.0%)	4.06	4.06	0
Medium anxiety	43 (43.9%)	3.00-3.78	3.35	0.23
Low anxiety	54 (55.1%)	1.78-2.94	2.65	0.29

### ***JHS Teachers' Backgrounds***

Results from the background questionnaire provided information about participants' experience with in-service training about English teaching methods, formal tests (TOEFL, TOEIC, or EIKEN), and self-assessments of their English proficiency level.

Regarding teachers' in-service training experience, 86 teachers (87.8%) had taken at least one TESOL methodology course through their local government training. Although their years of teaching experience ranged between 2 and 31 years, the prefecture's in-service training system systematically supported each teacher's instructional development at all career stages. For example, the prefecture provides skill-development courses for teachers at specific career stages, such as in the third year and the fifth year, as well as annual English training courses for any teachers who want to improve their lessons. In addition to the TESOL methodology course, teachers can take other skill-based courses, such as listening and speaking, as well as courses for classroom activities that are offered by the prefectural board of education. JHS teachers can also learn how to teach English to ES students. In this prefecture, the board of education sometimes transfers teachers between ESs and JHSs for educational and administrative reasons.

Regarding their test-taking experience, 29 teachers (30.0%) took at least one formal test after starting their teaching career. Because the formal test scores are valid for a limited time (e.g., two years for TOEFL), teachers reported their highest scores within their recent test-taking experience. Although MEXT (2013) requires JHS English teachers to prove their English proficiency by scoring over 80 points on TOEFL iBT, 730 points on TOEIC, or passing Grade Pre-1 on EIKEN, only 20 teachers (20.4%) satisfied the requirements.

In addition, most JHS English teachers evaluated their own English proficiency level as intermediate (Table 3). Teachers were asked to assess what they could do in English from five alternatives: (a) greet someone, (b) shop and order food, (c) have a general conversation, (d) understand an academic lecture, or (e) discuss a specific topic. This question was translated into Japanese and used as a part of the background questionnaire. JHS teachers chose the most difficult feasible task among the alternatives.

**Table 3. Teachers' Self-Reported English Proficiency Level**

Proficiency level	<i>N</i>	%
(a) greet someone	5	5.1
(b) shop and order food	41	41.8
(c) have a general conversation	36	36.7
(d) understand an academic lecture	10	10.2
(e) discuss a specific topic	5	5.1

Almost 80% of the teachers fell into two categories: (b) shop and order food and (c) have a general conversation. Despite MEXT's expectation toward JHS English teachers' high English proficiency, the results indicated that teachers' current levels of English proficiency did not successfully meet MEXT's requirements. For example, a score of 80 points on TOEFL iBT, one of MEXT's requirements for JHS English teachers, is also the minimum passing score for international applicants to apply for many American universities. Thus, people scoring 80 points on the test are thought to have basic academic English skills to study by (d) understanding an academic lecture and (e) discussing a specific topic. However, only 15.3% of the teachers in this study evaluated themselves as able to perform these communication tasks, indicating that most teachers might not have strong confidence in their own communicative competence in English.

### ***JHS Teachers' Reactions to the TEE Policy***

Teachers' responses to the question about the TEE policy were categorized into four main opinion categories: (a) anxiety about the teacher's own command of English, (b) concerns about students' learning, (c) disagreement with the new policy, and (d) joy of transformation to communicative lessons (Table 4). Because their answers were written in an open-ended style, some answers



fell into more than one of the four main opinion categories. More than half of the teachers mentioned anxiety about their command of English. This included three kinds of anxiety: anxiety about their own English proficiency, anxiety about using appropriate expressions with students with different proficiency levels, and anxiety about explaining grammar in English.

Table 4. Teachers' Opinions Toward the TEE Policy

Opinion categories	<i>n</i>	%
(a) anxiety about the teacher's own command of English	51	52.0
(b) concerns about students' learning	42	42.9
(c) disagreement with the new policy	9	9.2
(d) joy of transformation to communication lessons	8	8.2

#### *Anxiety about the teacher's own command of English*

Several teachers replied that their English abilities were not sufficient to teach English in English. One teacher commented, "I am not confident about my English-speaking ability. Unfortunately, I have not reached a high enough level to give students English-mediated instruction." Another responded, "I need to develop my English proficiency." In addition, JHS teachers were diffident about their own English ability to use appropriate expressions with groups of students with mixed proficiency levels. Unlike SHS teachers teaching rather uniform proficiency levels of students within each school, JHS teachers have students with a wide variety of proficiency levels, from low proficiency to an advanced level, in one classroom. According to one teacher, "it would be difficult to manipulate my English for effective explanation depending on students' levels of English ability." In addition, spontaneously switching to "simple" English or providing "alternative expressions" would make it difficult for teachers and make them feel uneasy when students appeared not to understand the teachers. Furthermore, because grammar-translation instruction—*yakudoku*—was still emphasized in secondary schools, introducing grammatical form and meaning seemed to be an indispensable aspect in English lessons. Thus, one teacher responded, "with my English, I am anxious whether or not I can make students understand complicated grammar rules by using only English." TEE implies a communicative, student-centered approach that focuses on fluency, whereas grammar-translation stands in direct opposition to all of these things: It is a noncommunicative, teacher-centered

approach that focuses on accuracy. The contradiction between the two concepts also provoked anxiety among teachers.

### *Concerns about students' learning*

Approximately 43% of the teachers expressed their concerns over students' learning. They worried that students would lose their motivation to study English when teachers shifted to TEE. One teacher commented, "I am afraid that the number of students who give up listening to English might increase because they cannot understand English instruction." Some JHS teachers also thought that TEE would ultimately demotivate students to study English as the teachers assumed that students could not comprehend English sentences or words without translating them into their native language, Japanese. One teacher stated, "because students are Japanese, they must understand grammar rules better in Japanese." Although Suzuki and Roger (2014) argued that an exam-related factor was one of the major concerns among SHS teachers, this was not the case for JHS teachers. Of course, JHS teachers also pointed out a contradiction between communication-based instruction and current grammar-based entrance examinations. However, they anticipated that high school entrance examinations would be reformed along with this TEE policy. One teacher commented, "I want to know the future direction of entrance examinations. I hope the high-stakes tests will be conducted with various elements including a speaking test." Thus, JHS teachers were more concerned about students' progress in learning English than test styles on high school entrance examinations.

### *Disagreement with the new policy*

Less than 10% of the teachers disagreed with the new policy due to their busyness and doubt about its effectiveness. Teachers are not involved in top-down policy development (Machida & Walsh, 2015) and they know that they have no option but to follow it. As such, it seems healthy to have teachers who complained about their working conditions and the feasibility of MEXT's goal attainment involved in this process. Some teachers explained their busy lives in school, mentioning administrating homeroom and operating school division duties in addition to teaching English classes. In fact, Bannai, Ukawa, and Tamakoshi (2015) reported that Japanese JHS teachers worked the most hours per week (53.9 hours) among OECD countries. Overworked teachers seemed reluctant to accept the policy reform, with one stating "I do not have enough vigor or time to adopt the new policy." Others questioned the effectiveness of TEE. One teacher commented, "it is

impossible to develop all Japanese people's English proficiency to a practical level through applying the new policy." Such skeptical teachers might have thought that English was just one of nine school subjects and that weekly 4-hour English lessons would not make a difference.

### *Joy of transformation to communication lessons*

Among the 98 participants, eight teachers (8.2%) expressed very positive attitudes toward TEE. Although this number was very small, they believed that the new policy would lead to the transformation to more communicative lessons. They all supported the policy change and thought that TEE would be "effective and possible even in JHSs."

### ***Class Observations and Interviews***

Class observations revealed that several teachers started to teach English in English before the official implementation of the TEE policy. A total of 850 minutes of observation in JHSs were carried out for this study. Approximately half of the 13 teachers taught English alone; the other half worked with another teacher through team teaching. Although team teaching between a Japanese teacher of English and a native English-speaking ALT has been encouraged by MEXT, most observed team teaching lessons were conducted between two Japanese teachers of English. During the observations, all teachers used English for almost the entire lesson. One possible reason for this highly successful rate of TEE could be that only confident teachers willingly accepted the request for additional class observations and interviews. In those lessons, students seemed to be used to TEE and actively communicated with teachers. Each teacher also effectively demonstrated a set of instructional techniques for teaching lessons in English. For example, one teacher started his lesson with a conversational activity between pairs of students using the following instructions: "Make pairs and talk about what you like to do on weekends. First, window-side students. Go." Students discussed the topic with their classmates in English. This activity appeared to shift the classroom atmosphere to English mode. In another school, two experienced female teachers working together showed a discussion model to students for how to continue conversations in English and effectively gave corrective feedback, such as recasts, to students to facilitate their English utterances. For example, one commented, "Oh, you enjoyed the conversation" after a student said, "conversation enjoy." By performing learner-models of English speakers, the teachers tried to keep using English in class.

Teachers' interview responses mirrored the opinions gathered via the open-ended question about the TEE policy. Interviewees did not show any disagreement toward the TEE policy because they actually taught English in English just before each interview. The three other major opinions—(a) anxiety about the teacher's own command of English, (b) concerns about students' learning, and (d) joy of transformation to communicative lessons—were clearly stated by teachers in the interviews. In addition, JHS teachers revealed their anticipation about the TEE policy implementation in JHS. During the interviews, some teachers mentioned the preceding TEE policy in Japanese SHSs that started in 2013 (MEXT, 2010). An experienced female teacher said, "after the policy changed in high schools, I wondered if the idea of teaching English in English would be implemented in JHSs someday. And it finally comes to us. Now we need to accept it." Her answer represented a sort of relief that teachers felt. They no longer had to worry about when the day would be.

Also some JHS teachers mentioned the joy of the transformation to communicative lessons. The teachers who made this statement showed a relatively lower level of anxiety. Because the teachers actually taught English in English, they seemed to understand the benefits of teaching English by using English communication with students. As one teacher stated, "it's better for students to understand English through listening to English. I think we, JHS English teachers, must teach English in English." These JHS teachers also welcomed MEXT's decision about the TEE policy. A chief teacher in a large school said:

I really appreciate the government proposing the policy. Although I taught English in English personally, it was difficult to change other teachers' ways of teaching. Once MEXT declared the teaching English-in-English policy, the impact was immense. We can finally step forward toward the same goal at prefectural and national levels.

Teachers who welcome the policy seem to have positive expectations about the future of JHS English language education in Japan.

However, at the same time, teachers expressed (a) anxiety about their own command of English and (b) concerns about students' learning. Although the 13 interviewees mostly taught English in English, they were not confident about whether their English was grammatically and pragmatically appropriate. The teachers thought they had to use English as a model for students; thus, they seemed to focus on the appropriateness of their English.

A teacher with 28 years of teaching experience explained, “students try to imitate my English in class. When I see those students, I always feel I must speak English properly.” Therefore, teachers made efforts to develop their English proficiency by taking English learning opportunities. Some teachers privately attended teacher training programs. Others studied for formal tests (e.g., TOEIC or EIKEN). Even during lessons or preparation for lessons, JHS teachers asked ALTs for help with regard to vocabulary and word choices in order to use appropriate English in front of students.

Teachers expressed their empathy toward students, especially those struggling with English. Unlike in SHSs, a wide variety of proficiency levels exists in JHS classrooms. Another teacher stated, “for successfully helping students, it’s not easy for me to decide what level of English should be used and who target students are.” Another male teacher confessed that “teaching in English might leave low-proficiency students and slow learners behind. I try not to do that, but....” Even teachers who already taught English in English appeared to have a hard time supporting students in mixed-level classes.

In addition, all interviewees requested further support from local boards of education to develop their English proficiency. Without sufficient governmental support, including funding, teachers face difficulty in being properly trained to meet the goals of the TEE policy. JHS teachers stated that they made efforts to secure their own learning time and opportunities themselves in their busy teaching lives. Attending even a half-day training seemed hard as they had to trade classes with other teachers to leave school early. Although local boards of education periodically offered a traditionally lecture-styled in-service training, teachers wanted more practical teacher training, such as English language training at overseas institutions. A teacher said, “I want to have a training opportunity in a foreign country to develop my English for a couple of months.” Another teacher “want[ed] to be immersed in an English-speaking environment, such as an English immersion camp.” Online training courses were also frequently requested among interviewees. According to an experienced teacher, “in my busy schedule, web-based training, for example using YouTube, would be very helpful because I need not cancel my regular classes.” Taking even some time off for training can be very difficult for busy teachers. Another teacher wanted to take a sabbatical for training, but the education system rarely provides support for such sabbatical leave in Japan. JHS teachers wanted training opportunities because they seemed to notice that TEE policy would not succeed without developing their own English proficiency, especially their speaking skills.

## Discussion

### *Mixed Feelings Toward the TEE Policy*

JHS English teachers had mixed feelings about TEE. Teachers were positive toward the new policy, but at the same time were not confident about actually implementing the TEE policy due to their anxiety. Their sources of anxiety were a lack of command of English and concerns about students' learning. When comparing JHS teachers' attitudes toward TEE with those of SHS teachers, the former showed relatively more flexibility in accepting the new policy. Although most SHS English teachers still conducted lessons mainly in Japanese (Suzuki & Roger, 2014), all the JHS teachers observed during this study mostly kept using English during their lessons. In EFL contexts, such as Japan, TEE is necessary to increase the amount of target language input to students. It is not enough for teachers to just switch their instructional language from Japanese to English for effective lessons; they must make their English teaching more communicative to expose students to the target language effectively. JHS teachers understood the need for the pedagogical change and believed that the new policy would promote English education in Japan to the next phase. Teachers seemed to know from experience that students could learn English better through communication. Levin (2003) reported that students understood the importance of using the target language (TL) for its acquisition. He also noted that teachers with more frequent use of the target language "perceive lower levels of TL-use anxiety in their students" (p. 355).

However, JHS English teachers were not fully ready to carry out TEE due to a lack of their own English-speaking confidence and concerns about students' learning. In fact, 44.9% of the teachers were anxious about their own English language proficiency, 52% of the teachers were concerned about their own command of English, and almost 80% of the teachers did not reach the English proficiency level that MEXT required of JHS English teachers. Developing JHS teachers' English proficiency levels must be a priority to make lessons more communicative in English. Without a certain level of English proficiency (e.g., CEFR B2 or C1, Pinter, 2017), JHS English teachers do not have sufficient confidence in using English for communicative lessons. Changes do not happen overnight, but all JHS English teachers need to develop their own target language proficiency for the successful implementation of the new policy.

Regarding concerns about students, even teachers who taught English in English sometimes worried whether their lessons were effectively helping students learn English. Some teachers in this study mentioned the students'

possible negative reaction toward TEE, but it could be that they were overly worried. Levin (2003) pointed out that “instructors may perceive higher anxiety about TL use in students than students themselves report feeling” (p. 351), and evidence from elsewhere in Asia also suggests that students may be more ready to adopt the target language as the medium of instruction than teachers (Choi & Leung, 2017). In addition, nonnative English teachers were sensitive to their students’ needs and showed empathy toward students (Reves & Medgyes, 1994; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). As nonverbal cues are commonly used in exchanging messages in Japanese classrooms (Machida & Walsh, 2015), teachers could notice even subtle cues from students needing help. JHS English teachers dedicated themselves to enhancing students’ learning, although they faced the difficulty of mixed-level classes.

One idea for helping students engage in TEE is creating an anxiety-free atmosphere in the classroom (Horwitz, 2013). Pappamihel (2002) indicated that nonnative students were afraid of communicating with experts in the L2. Not only teacher-student communication but also student-student communication through pair and group work should be actively involved. In this study, a teacher successfully adopted pair work between students to lower their anxiety when speaking English, preparing them for English-mediated lessons. Another idea for taking care of students’ learning is team teaching. Teachers can provide more support for students in English language classes through team teaching (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010). Two veteran female teachers in this study successfully collaborated with each other and helped students catch up with lessons by giving corrective feedback. In addition to developing teachers’ English proficiency, adopting student-initiated interactions in an anxiety-free classroom and multiple-teacher collaborations should be considered essential for firmly embedding the TEE policy in JHSs.

### ***Support From Local Governments***

Current in-service training might not successfully contribute to developing confidence for TEE among JHS teachers. Approximately 88% of the teachers took in-service training related to TESOL methodology. However, the high completion rate did not necessarily lead to each teacher’s TEE practice. In fact, more than half of JHS English teachers commented on their anxiety about their command of English, and 44.9% of the teachers in this study were considered “anxious” about their own English proficiency. To cope with anxiety, teachers requested more practical learning opportunities, such as overseas English training, sabbatical leaves, and online training

courses to develop their command of English. Of course, individual teachers made efforts to improve their English skills in their busy daily lives, yet nearly 80% of JHS English teachers did not reach MEXT's required English proficiency level. Thus, local governments in charge of teacher training must make drastic changes to their in-service training and provide new types of practical training to support teachers in the long term. As Butler (2005) and Yamamori (2013) argued, instead of providing methodology courses, more language training courses for teachers should be integrated into the local government training courses. In addition, rather than depending only on individual teachers' efforts, local governments should take a strong leadership approach in providing financial and practical support to teachers, thereby helping to ensure the successful implementation of the TEE policy in JHSs.

## **Conclusion**

JHS English teachers' reactions to MEXT's new TEE policy in JHSs were explored in this study. Teachers showed relatively positive attitudes to the policy because they understood the benefits of TEE; some actually started before the official implementation of the policy. However, due to their foreign language anxiety and lack of English proficiency, JHS teachers did not have enough confidence to teach English in English. In particular, JHS English teachers' low achievement rate (20.4%) on MEXT's English proficiency requirement should be improved before the official implementation of the policy. As Kim (2004) stated, nonnative language teachers must have sufficient target language proficiency to be a language model for students. To carry out communicative lessons in English, JHS teachers should develop their English to prepare themselves for TEE. JHS teachers also struggled to speak English with the spontaneity required to fit the mixed-level students in JHS classrooms. In addition to improving their English proficiency, JHS teachers should learn strategies to cope with such difficulties during in-service training.

The successful implementation of the TEE policy in JHS requires support from local governments. As many researchers (Browne & Wada, 1998; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009) have argued, in-service training is an essential factor for the successful implementation of the policy. Regular in-service training should cover topics related to student-centered lessons and team teaching. Local governments also need to recognize the importance of providing teachers with practical English training to develop their command of the language with some financial and practical support.



This study revealed the reaction of a group of JHS English teachers toward the TEE policy. As with some of the teachers in this study, there are likely to be other teachers who have had a head start and prepared themselves for the TEE implementations. However, given that the majority of JHS teachers appeared to be unprepared for the new policy, it seems likely that many other teachers will require further support. Not only local government in-service training and teachers' self-help efforts, but also locally based professional development opportunities, such as a teacher support group and a training camp sponsored by a local university, should be considered. Carefully listening to teachers' voices at each local level could lead to the successful implementation of the new policy.

**Tomohisa Machida** is an associate professor in the Graduate School at Akita International University. His research interests include elementary-school English education, foreign language anxiety, and teacher education.

## References

- Bannai, A., Ukawa, S., & Tamakoshi, A. (2015). Long working hours and sleep problems among public junior high school teachers in Japan. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 57, 457-464. <https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.15-0053-0a>
- Brown, D. H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Browne, C. M., & Wada, M. (1998). Current issues in high school English teaching in Japan: An exploratory survey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 11(1), 97-112.
- Butler, Y. G. (2005). 日本の小学校英語を考える: アジアの視点からの検証と提言 [English language education in Japanese elementary schools: Analyses and suggestions based on East Asian perspectives]. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Choi, T.-H. (2015). The impact of the 'Teaching English through English' policy on teachers and teaching in South Korea. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16, 201-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2015.970727>
- Choi, T.-H., & Leung, C. (2017). Uses of first and foreign languages as learning resources in a foreign language classroom. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(4), 587-604. <https://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.4.1.587>
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction: A growing global phenomenon*. Retrieved from British Council website: <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/english-language-higher-education/report-english-medium-instruction>

- Ford, K. (2009). Principles and practices of L1/L2 use in the Japanese university EFL classroom. *JALT Journal*, 31(1), 63-80. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/jj/articles/272-principles-and-practices-1112-use-japanese-university-efl-classroom>
- Glasgow, G. P. (2013). The impact of the new national senior high school English curriculum on collaboration between Japanese teachers and native speakers. *JALT Journal*, 35(2), 191-204. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/jj/articles/3437-perspectives-impact-new-national-senior-high-school-english-curriculum-collaboratio>
- Gorsuch, G. (1998). *Yakudoku* EFL instruction in two Japanese high school classrooms: An exploratory study. *JALT Journal*, 20(1), 6-32. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/jj/articles/2777-yakudoku-efl-instruction-two-japanese-high-school-classrooms-exploratory-study>
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2010). *Collaboration and co-teaching: Strategies for English learners*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452219516>
- Horwitz, E. K. (1996). Even teachers get the blues: Recognizing and alleviating language teachers' feelings of foreign language anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 365-372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb01248.x>
- Horwitz, E. K. (2013). *Becoming a language teacher: A practical guide to second language learning and teaching* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- The Japan Association of National Universities. (2017). 平成 32 年度以降の国立大学の入学者選抜制度 [National university entrance examination system in 2020 and after]. Retrieved from <http://www.janu.jp/news/teigen/20171110-wnewnyushi.html>
- Kikuchi, K., & Browne, C. (2009). English education policy for high schools in Japan: Ideals vs. reality. *RELC Journal*, 42, 172-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688209105865>
- Kim, S. (2004). When and how to resolve language issues of nonnative-English-speaking teachers-in-preparation in TESOL programs. *NNEST Newsletter*, 6.
- Kim, S.-Y., & Kim, J.-H. (2004). When the learner becomes a teacher: Foreign language anxiety as an occupational hazard. *English Teaching*, 59(1), 165-185. Retrieved from <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/ArticleDetail/NODE07096478>
- Levin, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 343-364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00194>

- Machida, T. (2016). Japanese elementary school teachers and English language anxiety. *TESOL Journal*, 7, 40-66. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.189>
- Machida, T., & Walsh, D. J. (2015). Implementing EFL policy reform in elementary schools in Japan: A case study. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16, 221-237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2015.970728>
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language teaching: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 24-45). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- MEXT (2008). 小学校学習指導要領 [Course of study for elementary school education]. Retrieved [http://www.mext.go.jp/a\\_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/1304417.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/1304417.htm)
- MEXT. (2010). 高等学校学習指導要領解説:外国語編・英語編 [Course of study for high school English education]. Tokyo, Japan: Kairyudo.
- MEXT. (2013). *English education reform plan corresponding to globalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/en/news/topics/detail/1372656.htm>
- MEXT. (2016). 平成 27 年度「英語教育実施状況調査」の結果について [Results of the state of implementation of English education in AY 2015-2016]. Retrieved from [https://www.mext.go.jp/a\\_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1369258.htm](https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1369258.htm)
- MEXT. (2017). 中学校学習指導要領 [Course of study for junior high school education]. Retrieved from [http://www.mext.go.jp/a\\_menu/shotou/new-cs/1384661.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/1384661.htm)
- Meyer, H. (2008). The pedagogical implications of L1 use in the L2 classroom. *Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College Ronsyu*, 8, 147-159.
- Mousavi, E. S. (2007). Exploring “teacher stress” in non-native and native teachers of EFL. *ELTED*, 10, 33-41. Retrieved from <http://www.elted.net/volume-10.html>
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1-8. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/1460/main-journals/the-role-of-the-first-language-in-foreign-language-learning/>
- Nishino, T. (2011). コミュニカティブ・アプローチに関する日本人高校英語教師の信条と実践 [Japanese high school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding communicative language teaching]. *JALT Journal*, 33(2), 131-155. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/jj/articles/1208-コミュニケーション・アプローチに関する日本人高校英語教師の信条と実践---japanese-high-school-teachers'-beliefs-and-prac>

- Nishino, T., & Watanabe, M. (2008). Communication-oriented policies versus classroom realities in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42, 133-138.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00214.x>
- Pappamihel, N. E. (2002). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36, 327-355.
- Pinter, A. (2017). *Teaching young language learners* (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22, 353-367.
- Sakamoto, M. (2012). Moving toward effective English language teaching in Japan: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33, 409-420. Retrieved from  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661437>
- Samimy, K. K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or nonnative speaker: Perceptions of "nonnative" students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Nonnative educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 760-769. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588224>
- Suzuki, H., & Roger, P. (2014). Foreign language anxiety in teachers. *JALT Journal*, 36(2), 175-200. Retrieved from <http://jalt-publications.org/jj/articles/4169-foreign-language-anxiety-teachers>
- Tum, D. O. (2012). Feelings of language anxiety amongst non-native student teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 2055-2059.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.948>
- Weschler, R. (1997). Uses of Japanese (L1) in the English classroom: Introducing the functional-translation method. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(3). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Weschler-UsingL1.html>
- Yamamori, N. (2013). 外国語活動に求められる教師の教室英語力の枠組みと教員研修プログラムの開発: 理論と現状をふまえて [Teachers' classroom English ability for foreign language activities and teacher training: Integrating theory and reality]. *JES Journal*, 13, 195-210. [https://doi.org/10.20597/jesjournal.13.0\\_195](https://doi.org/10.20597/jesjournal.13.0_195)
- Yoshida, K. (2003). Language education policy in Japan: The problem of espoused objectives versus practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 290-292.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00x165>

# 明治期から大正期日本の高等学校入学試業と 中学校の外国語教育：第一高等学校における 変遷を中心に

## Higher School Entrance Exams and Middle School Foreign Language Education in Meiji- and Taisho-Era Japan: The Case of *Daiichi Koto Gakko*

下 絵津子

Etsuko Shimo

近畿大学

*Kindai University*

本稿では、明治期から大正期、特に1880年代から1910年代にかけて、高等学校の入学試業で英語・ドイツ語・フランス語がどのように扱われたのかを第一高等学校の入試を中心に明らかにし、その位置づけが中学校の外国語教育に与えた影響を考察する。重要な転機として、(1) 1895年の第一部（法文学志望者）の一部においてドイツ語受験が可能とされ、また第三部（医学志望者）はドイツ語のみ受験が可能とされたこと、(2) 1899年に第三部の受験がドイツ語に加えて英語でも可能となったこと、(3) 1919年の規定により、文科乙類・理科乙類ではドイツ語による受験が、文科丙類ではフランス語による受験が可能となったことが挙げられる。ドイツ語やフランス語が入試科目に加えられたことは、高等教育におけるこれらの言語の重要性を維持する一助となった。しかし、どの専門であれ英語での受験が可能となった状況では、東京府立第一中学校の例が示すように、中学校でのドイツ語・フランス語教育推進にはつながらなかった。

Extensive research has been conducted on English entrance exams in Meiji- and Taisho-era Japan (e.g., Erikawa, 2011; Imura, 2003; Matsumura, 1997; Sasaki, 2008). However, very few studies have explored how other foreign languages were treated in entrance exams during this period of secondary and tertiary educational development. This paper, therefore, offers an examination of how English, German, and French were treated in higher school entrance examinations during this period, especially from the 1880s to 1910s, with a focus on *Daiichi Koto Gakko* (the First Higher School; named *Daiichi Koto Chu Gakko*, the First Higher Middle School, between 1886 and 1894), a predecessor of several university programs in the current system. How the treatment of these languages in entrance exams influenced foreign language education at middle schools, many of which turned into senior high schools after World War II, is also discussed.

During the Meiji and Taisho eras, foreign language education in Japan received criticism from education experts for its English-only focus (Shimo, 2018; cf. current criticism in, e.g., Morizumi, Koishi, Sugitani, & Hasegawa, 2016; Otani, 2007). Foreign languages other than English that were important at that time were German and French. An advisory committee to the Prime Minister, *Rinji Kyoiku Kaigi* (Extraordinary Education Committee: September 21, 1917, to May 23, 1919) proposed in its report on May 2, 1918, that German and French, in addition to English, be promoted as foreign language subjects to be taught at middle schools. Discussion in the advisory committee was reflected in *Higher School Order*, which was promulgated in December 1918. According to the *National Higher School Higher Course Entrance Examination Regulations* promulgated in the following year, English, German, and French were included in the foreign language subjects for entrance exams. A unified-test system—with all higher schools using the same test questions—was also introduced. Until 1919, most higher schools offered only English, with an exception of *Daiichi Koto Gakko*.

*Daiichi Koto Gakko* had three departments: The First Department was for candidates for law and literature majors; the Second Department for candidates for science, engineering, and agriculture majors; and the Third Department for candidates for medicine majors. Back in 1886, the school announced that they were going to offer only English from the 1891 entrance examinations, but their entrance examination rules also went through further changes. Among the changes, important turning points were as follows: (a) the change in 1895 allowed the First Department to offer German language as an entrance exam subject for certain groups of majors and the Third Department to offer German as the only foreign language option in their entrance exam; (b) in 1899, the Third Department started to offer English, in addition to German, as an entrance exam subject; and (c) in 1919 (two departments, Humanities and Sciences, were then formed instead of three), one section of Humanities and one of Sciences allowed German exams, and one section of Humanities allowed French ones. The last regulation was implemented nationwide, but not all higher schools offered French and German.

By including German and French as entrance exam subjects, their importance in tertiary education was made stronger or at least kept the same. In spite of all these changes, however, the number of middle schools that taught German or French did not increase; it was limited to a few private middle schools. One notable case was *Tokyo Furitsu Daiichi Chu Gakko* [Tokyo Prefectural First Middle School]. German was added as a foreign language subject in their curriculum in 1902 when Tomoo Katsuura was the principal. In 1901, Katsuura attended the sixth meeting of *Koto Kyoiku Kaigi* (Upper-Level Education Committee; the first advisory committee of the Ministry of Education: 1896-1913), where the committee agreed on their proposal to the Ministry that German be taught in addition to English at one middle school in each prefecture. Katsuura's effort turned out to be ineffective in promoting German education at the middle-school level because *Daiichi Koto Gakko* had already added English to the entrance exam for the Third Department in 1899. This historical examination indicates that when English was offered as an entrance exam subject for all majors at the tertiary level, simply providing other languages in entrance exams was ineffective in promoting those languages at the secondary level.

**本**稿では、明治期から大正期、特に1880年代から1910年代にかけて、英語・ドイツ語・フランス語が高等学校の入学試業(入試)でどのように扱われたのか、そして、入試における外国語の位置づけが中学校の外国語教育にどのような影響を与えたのかを、第一高等学校の入学試業を中心に明らかにする。明治後期には中学校の整備が進み、大正期に入ると臨時教育会議で高等学校の在り方が検討され、高等普通教育がさらに発達した。そして、形式上は全国民に開かれた中学校の出口がエリート人材育成の高等学校へつながり(米田, 1992)、大正前期には上級学校への入試が激化し社会問題化した(吉野, 2001a)。高等学校の入試で多くの生徒の頭を悩ませた科目の一つが外国語だ。

その時期、中学校で教えられた外国語はいくつかの私立学校を除いて英語であり、高等学校入学試業の外国語では英語が課せられた。1904(明治37)年の『中等教育諸学校職員録』(中等教科書協会, 1908a)を見ると、全国の中学校のうち、東京の成城学校、大成中学校、独逸学協会学校中学、東京中学校、青山学院、東京学院にドイツ語教員の記載が、東京の暁星中学校、青山学院にフランス語教員の記載がある程度である。1881(明治14)年7月29日に制定された中学校教則大綱で、英語が科目の一つとして示されたことが背景にある。1899(明治32)年に開催の第三回高等教育会議の決議録(高等教育会議編, 出版年不明)は、「一・二ノ私立學校ヲ除ク外」英語を教授していると指摘しており、当時の中学校の外国語教育は、現在と同様に英語偏重型だったのだ。しかし、英語以外の外国語を推進する動きがなかったわけではない。1918(大正7)年の臨時教育会議の答申では、中学校におけるドイツ語・フランス語教育推進の必要性が言及された。そして、同年に、1894(明治27)年に制定された高等学校令に替わる新たな高等学校令が制定され、その改革案が実施された翌年の1919(大正8)年以降は、全国の高等学校高等科入学者選抜試験で受験外国語の選択肢に制度上、英語・ドイツ語・フランス語が指定された(文部省教育調査部



編, 1940)。一方、第一高等学校(1894年までは第一高等中学校)では、他校において入試の外国語は英語が主であった1919年以前においても、入試科目に英語・ドイツ語・フランス語が含まれた時期がある。そこで、本稿では、第一高等学校の入試における外国語の取り扱いの変遷を中心に、中学校の外国語教育に与えた影響を考察する。

## 研究の背景

現在の日本の外国語教育は英語偏重型であるとしばしば批判される(例えば大谷, 2007; 日本言語政策学会・JALP多言語教育推進研究会, 2014)。Kubota(2002)や久保田(2015)は、「国際化」の進んだ1980年代以降に日本の言語教育政策において英語化が進んだと指摘した。1988年臨時教育審議会の『教育改革に関する答申—臨時教育審議会第一次～第四次(最終)答申—』のなかで、外国語教育の見直し事項として、英語だけではないより多様な外国語教育が挙げられたものの(岡戸, 2002)、1998年告示の中学校学習指導要領では外国語が必修化され、それは原則として英語と明記されるなど、学習指導要領の改訂では審議会の上記意見が反映されたとは言えない。また、2000年以降、国が外国語教育政策として打ち出す計画における「英語化」は進み(例えば2003年の『『英語が使える日本人』の育成のための行動計画』など)、それに対する批判が続いている(例: 森住・古石・杉谷・長谷川, 2016)。

この批判は、実は新しいものではない。学校教育における外国語教育が英語偏重であるとの指摘は明治後期にも教育関係者の間にあり(下, 2018)、それは大正期に入っても見られた。1906(明治39)年4月9日讀賣新聞朝刊は、牧野伸顯新文相が英独仏の三言語に通じるべきであると述べたことを支持し、「嘗て二度までも『外國語学の偏重偏輕』と題せる社論を掲げ、英語の外に今少し獨佛語教育に意を用ふべしと説きしもまた此旨趣にほかならず」(「イロハ便 牧野新文相の『英仏独三国語に通じておきたい』」に賛同, p. 2)と伝えている。

日清戦争(1894-1895)と日露戦争(1904-1905)を経た日本は、近代国家体制の基盤を構築したが、第一次世界大戦(1914-1918)の頃には、変動する国際社会で確固たる地位を確立するために、明治期から整備されてきた教育制度の見直しを迫られた(文部省, 1979)。内閣総理大臣の諮問機関として1917(大正6)年9月21日に設置、1919(大正8)年5月23日に廃止された臨時教育会議が教育改革の役割を担うが(文部省, 1972a; 文部省, 1979)、会議では諮問第二号「男子ノ高等普通教育ニ関シ改善ヲ施スヘキモノナキカ若シ之アリトセハ其ノ要点及方法如何」に対する答申に(二)の六項目として「中学校ノ外国語トシテ英語ノ外ニ独語又ハ仏語ノ採用ヲ奨励スルノ必要アリト認ム」(1918年「大正」年5月2日)と記された(文部省, 1972b, p. 244)。

1980年代と1910年代では国際的な社会背景が大きく異なる。1988年には臨時教育審議会、1918年には臨時教育会議という教育政策決定の過程にて、英語以外の外国語教育を推進する動きが見られたという点は共通するが、その主張の内容と根拠は異なる。昭和から平成期にかけた主張では、JALP多言語教育推進研究会の提言(日本言語政策学会・JALP多言語教育研究会, 2014)のように、国連公用語や近隣諸国の言語が学ぶべき言語として議論のなかに出てくるが、明治期・大正期に英語以外の外国語として推進されたのは、ドイツ語・フランス語のみであった。ただし明治政府のドイツ学振興のもとでは、1880年代に東京帝国大学でドイツ語がより重要な



位置を占めフランス語教育は縮小されるなど、医学・工学・法学においてドイツ学が重視された(井上, 1969; 東京大学, 1984)。そのため、特にドイツ語が高等教育において重要とされた。

ドイツ語・フランス語を推奨する議論は学校教育における外国語教育の在り方にどのような影響を与えたのか。その影響を検証するにあたり、教育の現場の要因として切り離すことができないのが入試である。身近な例を挙げると、大学入試センター試験の英語にリスニングが導入されたのは2008(平成18)年度入試からだ。文部科学省高等教育局学生課大学入試室(2004, p. 25)は、その導入の意義として、大学教育の充実のみならず、外国語によるコミュニケーション能力の育成に高等学校側が主体的に取り組むことを挙げた。

また、杉野・徳田(2008)は、「入試科目の変化は、直接的に高校教育現場の指導の内容に影響を与える」(p. 104)と述べ、センター試験へのリスニング導入以前から音読指導に力を入れ、つまり音声指導を重視してきた高校で、導入後にはさらにリスニングの指導が手厚くなった例を報告しており、単なる「テスト対策」(齊田, 2013, p. 1)であったとしても、導入に対応しなければならないという意識が教育現場に少なからず広がった。このように、教育現場は内容や方法について入試の影響をさまざまなレベルで受ける。

過去の外国語の入試に関する研究は数多くある。しかしそのほとんどは英語に関するものだ。Sasaki(2008)は、明治から2000年代までの150年を時代における英語教育の目的を考慮して第一期から第四期の四つに区分し、英語力の評価方法の変遷を分析した。第一期を1860年から1945年とし、知識を吸収することが目的で実用的ではない受験英語が教育の目的となったとまとめた。また、江利川(2011)は、受験英語が誕生した明治期から戦後までに使用された入試問題と参考書を分析、「競争主義的な『近代的』入試制度」(p. 302)の内容を明らかにし、その歴史的使命は終わり、知識基盤社会に対応した新しい学びのスタイルに合った『『ポスト近代的』』な学力測定の段階」に入ろうとしていると指摘した。伊村(2003)は、英語の試験問題と受験英語用の参考書・学習書を紹介し、その変遷をまとめた。さらに、松村(1997)は、府・県・学校史などの地方教育史資料や旧制中学校に残された史料を活用し、実証的に当時の中学校英語教授・学習の実態を明らかにしたが、そのなかで明治時代の中学校の英語の試験問題を紹介している。松村は「現状に問題が山積みし、その打開や解決に迫られているとき、人は過去をふりかえってみる余裕を持ち得ない」(p. 4)と述べた。現在の英語教育は、新しい評価方法や入試の在り方が検討され常に改革に迫られ、鳥飼(2018)が『『慢性改革病』』とでも呼びたい」(p. 26)と批判するが、そこにもまさに過去を振り返る余裕が見られない。

社会的背景が異なり、歴史的な検証が現在の課題に対する答えを直接提供することは期待しない。しかし、波及効果の高い入試が過去にどのように行われてきたのかを検証することは、外国語教育の目的や意義、そして、入試の在り方を今後検討していくにあたり、重要な示唆を与えるものとなる。現在の教育制度は明治期に確立した近代的学校制度を基盤としており、その時期に遡っての検証が不可欠だ。

そして、ドイツ語やフランス語の入試に関する研究は数が非常に限られる。国立情報学研究所の論文データベースCiNiiで「英語」「入試」をキーワードとして検索すると409件の論文が検出されるのに対し、「フランス語」「入試」の場合には7件、「ドイツ語」「入試」の場合にはわずか3件である(2017年11月22日現在)。ドイツ語教育につい

ては、上村(2006)が熊本におけるドイツ語教育の始まりについて第五高等中学校を中心に明らかにしており、第五高等中学校で設立後初めて実施された1887年10月の入学試験にドイツ語の試験があったことに言及している。熊本県尋常中学校のドイツ語教員藤本末松が作成したが、実際には受験者がいなかったため実施されなかったようだという(上村は五高記念館蔵『入試問題伺書』(明治20~27年)、『大東立教雑誌』第5号(明治20年9月)巻末「第五高等中学校生徒募集広告」、『五高五十年史』(65頁)を参照)。フランス語については、田中(2005)が旧制高等学校における教育をまとめ、大正期から昭和にかけての入学選抜試験規程や試験内容から、その変遷を明らかにした。しかし、これらの研究はドイツ語あるいはフランス語の入試における取り扱いが学校教育にどのような影響を与えたかを考察したものではない。ここでは次に、当時の中学校・高等学校教育の目的を確認し、第一高等学校の入学試験における外国語の取り扱いを検証し、中学校の外国語教育に与えた影響を考察する。

### 中学校と高等学校:その目的と外国語

明治後期には中等教育の整備がなされ、中学校・高等女学校の生徒数は全国的に増加した一方で(財団法人教科書センター, 1984)、高等学校数は1908(明治41)年に第八高等学校が設立されて以降は増設されず、その後、増設されるのは、1918年に出了た高等学校令以降、第一次世界大戦の影響による好景気で財政的に余裕が出來たことを背景としてのことであり、その間入学試験は年々厳しくなつた(吉野, 2001a)。

その頃の中学校教育の目的は、「男子ニ須要ナル高等普通教育ヲ為ス」である(文部省, 1972b, p. 131)。1899(明治32)年の中学校令改正で示され、大学予備教育の要素は中学校教育に加えられなかつた。しかし、明治30年代以降、高等学校入試の受験者数が増加しそれに伴い倍率が高まり受験が厳しくなる(吉野, 2001a)。そのなかで中学校教育が上級学校への進学を意識した教育から抜けることはなく、その傾向は大正期に入りむしろ激化していった。「中學校の教育は事實高中の豫備教育機關たる有様を呈するに至れり。現に府立中學のうちにも競争試験の科目のみを重視し、特に之れが爲に名ある教師を聘し居るものあり」とあり(吉野, 2001a, p. 23が「試験問題正面観」1912年7月19日『読売新聞』を引用)、大正前期は激しい受験競争が社会問題化しはじめた時期であつた。

一方、1918(大正7)年12月5日制定の高等学校令第一条は「高等學校ハ男子ノ高等普通教育ヲ完成スルヲ以テ目的トシ特ニ國民道德ノ充實ニカムヘキモノトス」(文部省教育調査部編, 1940, p. 100)として、高等学校も中学校と同様に高等普通教育を目的すると謳われた。また、この改革で、高等学校は修業年限が七年となり高等科三年と尋常科四年に分けられ、高等科への入学は中学校第四学年修了程度が基準となつた(文部省教育調査部編, 1940; 文部省, 1972a)。

それまで高等学校は大学予科として大学進学の前準備をする機関であつた。大正初期の高等学校の入学試験が「高等学校大学予科入学者選抜試験規程」によつて規定されてゐたのはそのためである。ところが、この改革により、高等学校が中学校と同様の性質をもつ学校として認められ、「中流以上の生活にはいるための教育」と「大学への基礎教育」の二つを目標とする機関となり、「高等学校が帝国大学の予科としての性格を備えていたのを改め」たという(文部省, 1972a, p. 485)。大衆教育・国民教育

としての普通教育のうち、高等のレベルまで完成させることが目的であるが、「大学への基礎教育」が高等学校の目標の一つとなったということは、つまり、高等学校の目的とされた「高等普通教育」には大学への基礎教育が含まれる方向になったと解釈することができる。

この改革の方針は臨時教育会議にて議論されたが、そこでは、大学教育で重視されていた外国語教育について、高等学校、そして中学校で充実されるべきだという議論があった(橋口, 1960)。それは大学への基礎教育が高等学校の目標の一つになったことと関連する。つまり、大学教育を受けるために必要な外国語能力の育成が中学校の段階からより効果的に行われるべきだという認識が審議において共有されたのだ。

臨時教育会議における外国語に関する議論の一部は、「高等普通教育二関スル件」第一回答申(1918「大正7」年1月17日)に集約された(文部省, 1979, pp. 96-101)。「國運ノ進歩ニ鑑ミ更ニ精深ナル高等普通教育ヲ必要トス」(文部省, 1979, p. 98)と説明し、本答申では、「高等學校及七年制高等學校高等科ニ於テハ第二外國語ハ之ヲ随意科目トス」(文部省, 1979, p. 97)とされ、その理由として、「高等普通教育ニ在リテハ英佛獨語ノ一ニ習熟セシムルヲ必要」(文部省, 1979, p. 100)とするものの、二言語以上を習熟することは容易ではなく、大学を卒業したのちに実務に就いた場合に二言語以上を習熟していることが望ましいがそれが必須であるわけではないと指摘された。さらに、中学校・高等学校の間で学ぶ外国語の変更は許可されると説明された。また、1918(大正7)年5月2日の第二回答申(文部省, 1979)では、中学校でドイツ語、フランス語が採用されない一因として「現在ノ中學校ト高等學校トノ聯絡ニ缺クル所アル」という点を指摘し、「當局ハ特ニ此ノ點ニ留意シテ適當ノ方法ヲ講シ英語ノ外獨語、佛語ノ採用ヲ一層奨励セラルヘシ」(文部省, 1979, pp. 104-105)と提案した。

この臨時教育会議の答申が同年制定の新高等学校令の方向性を定めた。そして翌年の1919年(大正8)年4月19日には「官立高等学校高等科入学者選抜試験規程」が制定されたが、選抜試験の外国語について「外國語ハ英語、獨語及佛語ノ中本人ヲシテ其ノ一ツヲ選ハシム」(第三条; 文部省教育調査部編, 1940, p. 130)との規定が入った。この時全国の高等学校の入試は共通の問題を用いたものの、選抜は総合選抜制ではなく学校別に実施されることになった(吉野, 2001a)。1919年の試験規程により、規程上は全国の各高等学校を共通問題のドイツ語・フランス語で受験することが可能となった。『大正八年高等學校高等科入學者選抜試験ニ關スル諸調査』(文部省専門学務局編, 1920)には入学選抜者試験問題の外国語に「英語解釋」「英語書取」「英(獨、佛)譯」「獨語解釋」「獨語書取」「佛語解釋」「佛語書取」が収められている。

1919年以前については、第一高等学校以外の高等学校における受験外国語はほぼ英語のみであった。前述の上村(2006)の例(第五高等中学校におけるドイツ語の入学試験)では、実際には受験者がおらず実施されなかったという。旧制高等学校資料保存会(1985)は、1887(明治20)年の第五高等中学校、1888(明治21)年の山口高等中学校の入学試験において、英語に代えてドイツ語の受験を許可したことがあったことを伝えているが、つまり主には英語であったことを示している。一方、第一高等学校においては、ドイツ語やフランス語が受験科目として採用され実施された時期があり、中学校の英語以外の外国語教育の議論と深く関係した。次章で、第一高等学校の入学試験における外国語の扱いを明らかにする。

## 第一高等学校の入試

第一高等学校は1894(明治27)年の高等学校令までは第一高等中学校と呼ばれていた。第一高等中学校は1886(明治19)年に制定の中学校令により発足し、前身の東京大学予備門時代に東京法学校予科と外国語学校の仏独両語学科を転属させた歴史がある(第一高等学校, 1939, および東京外国語大学史編纂委員会編, 1999)。なお、東京外国語学校では、1873年開設時に英・独・仏・魯・清の五学科が設置されたが、独仏両学科が1885年に東京大学予備門に移されたのに対し、他の三語学科は高等商業学校と合併した。高等教育に必要な言語とそうでない言語に区別され、商業教育を「学問とは認めない」(東京外国語大学史編纂委員会, 1999, p. 72)風潮を示している。

1886年10月21日創定の「生徒部五編成規則」によると、予科生は「英語學ヲ以テ入學シタル者ヨリ成ル」「獨逸學ヲ以テ入學シタル者ヨリ成ル」「佛語學ヲ以テ入學シタル者ヨリ成ル」(第一高等学校, 1939, p. 130)と分けられ、また、1886年12月21日制定の「校務分掌規則」によると、教務部に6つの部が置かれたが、最初の三部が英学部、独逸学部、仏学部、そして理学部や和漢文学部等が続いた。このように、大学予備門時代から、そこで教授された外国語は英語、ドイツ語、またはフランス語であった。

1886(明治19)年12月20日、1891(明治24)年7月の入試からは外国語科目は英語にて実施をする旨の方針が文部省にて裁定された(第一高等学校, 1939; 箕田, 1974)。その内容は、第一外国語を英語と定めること、そして、1891(明治24)年7月入学試験から外国語を英語のみをもって生徒を募集することとなり、それまでであったフランス語やドイツ語による入学ができなくなるといったものであった。ただし、「二十年二十一年二十二年二十三年迄ハ從來ノ通り英佛獨ニテ取ル事」(第一高等学校, 1939, p. 138)と、1890(明治23)年までは英語・ドイツ語・フランス語による入学を許可した。そして、1891(明治24)年からは英語のみで実施するという方針であるが、以下に見るように1895(明治28)年にはドイツ語による受験が可能となっている。なお、この間の1892(明治25)年9月9日には、独逸学協会学校の普通科最上級を卒業した者は第一高等中学校の相当するクラスに編入することが認められており(第一高等学校, 1939)、ドイツ学振興のための方策(井上, 1969)が明治10年代から20年代にかけて実施されていたことが分かる。

1894(明治27)年の高等学校令により、第一高等中学校は第一高等学校となるが、翌年の1895(明治28)年1月に「第一高等学校大学予科入学志望者心得」を制定した(大蔵省印刷局, 1895年1月26日, p. 271; 第一高等学校, 1939, pp. 247-248; 箕田, 1974, pp. 161-162)。その内容のうち外国語と関連のある項目は下記の通りである([ ]は筆者による加筆、以下同じ)。

第三 英語ヲ入學試業ノ外國語トスル一部法科志望者ハ左表〔ここでは表1〕ニ依リ本校ニ於テ修ムヘキ第一外國語ヲモ選定スヘシ

第四 英語ヲ入學試業ノ外國語トスル一部文科志望者中英文學科、佛蘭西文學科、哲学科、漢學科志望ノ者ハ入學出願ノ際其志望學科ヲ届出ツヘク獨逸文學科、國文學科、國史科、史學科、博言學科志望ノ者ハ在學中二届出ツルヲ要ス



第五 獨語ヲ入學試業ノ外國語トスル一部文科志望者中哲學科、漢學科志望ノ者ハ入學出願ノ際其志望學科ヲ届出ツヘク獨逸文學科、國文學科、國史科、史學科、博言學科志望ノ者ハ在學中ニ届出ツルヲ要ス

第六 英語ヲ外國語トセル尋常中學校ヲ卒業シタル者(該校長ノ推薦ニ係ル者)ニシテ獨語ヲ入學試業ノ外國語トスル一部及三部ニ入ラシトスル者ハ入學試業ノ際英語ヲ除キ其他ノ諸学科ノ試業ヲ受クルコトヲ得其及第者ニハ證明書ヲ交付ス

右〔ここでは上〕證明書ヲ有スル者二箇年以内ニ於テ入學ヲ願出ツルトキハ入學試業ノ際獨逸語ノミ試業シ及第ノ者ハ前段ノ一部及三部ニ入學ヲ許ス

但シ英語ヲ入學試業ノ外國語トスル一部及二部ニ入リシトスルトキハ更ニ入學試業ヲ受クルヲ要ス

第七 前項ノ入学志願者ハ其卒業セル尋常中學校力孰ノ高等學校區域内ニ在ルモ其高等學校ノ特待ヲ受クル學校〔注:特待を受ける学校とは、いわゆる推薦入試での入学が許可される学校のこと〕ナルトキハ本校ノ特待ヲ受クル學校ノ卒業生ト同一ノ取扱ヲ爲ス

第八 佛語ヲ第一外國語トスル學級ノ設ナキ他ノ高等學校區域内ニ在リテ其高等學校ノ特待ヲ受クル尋常中學校ノ卒業生ニシテ本校一部法科及文科中佛語ヲ第一外國語トスル學級ニ入學セント欲スル者アルトキハ本校ノ特待ヲ受クル學校ノ卒業生ト其取扱ヲ同クスルコトアルヘシ

但シ此場合ニ於テ其入學セシムル員數八十人マテトス(大蔵省印刷局, 1895年1月26日, p. 271)

表1にあるように、この心得では入学試験の外国語の指定が定員とともに示された。これによると、1891(明治24)年に廃止する旨が宣言されたドイツ語による入学が1895(明治28)年の入試においては可能となったことが分かる。1891(明治24)年から1894(明治27)年の間にも、ドイツ語やフランス語による入学試験は実施されたようである。1891(明治24)年8月1日には第一高等中学校にて「佛語を以て第一外國語とする生徒一組を、本年限り試みに入學せしむること」(第一高等学校, 1939, p. 211)という報告がある。また、1892(明治25)年8月27日讀賣新聞(「広告 第一高等中学校入学試業に合格した本校生徒 / 本郷区 私立獨逸語学校」, p. 4)には、私立獨逸語学校(東京本郷区元町二丁目)が「本年七月第一高等中学校入学試業に合格した生徒の氏名を広告として記載している。ドイツ語の予科二級総数1名中1名、三級総数20名中18名が合格したとの内容だ。また、1890年5月15日朝日新聞朝刊(「獨逸學生大運動」, p. 1)に掲載の記事「獨逸學生大運動」によると、「一旦廢止せられたる第一高等中学校入学試業の外國語中獨逸語の〔科〕目の今回復活することとなるに付」第一高等中学校、ドイツ学校、獨逸協會学校そのほか関係学校の教員と生徒が祝意を表して集会を開くとある。第一高等学校(1939)ではドイツ語の受験科目としての復活について確認できないが、英語のみの試験を実施する予定ではあった1891(明治24)年以降にも、ドイツ語やフランス語による受験が実施されたようだ。

また、この心得によると入試科目としてフランス語は用意されず、また第八項にあるように、フランス語を第一外国語とする学級がないが、第一高等学校以外の高等学校の区域に属しており、その高等学校の特待を受ける尋常中学校の卒業生については、第一高等学校の特待を受ける学校の卒業生と同じ扱いをしたということだ。当時入学試験は特別試業と全科試業の二種に大別されていたが、特別試業では設置区域内尋常中学校出身者に推薦入学の制度が認められ、当該中学校校長の推薦があれば、学力試験を完全に、あるいは部分的に免除された(寛田, 1974)。つまり、上記の尋常中学校は、第一高等学校の設置区域内で特待を受ける尋常中学校と同様に特別試業による入学が可能とされた。フランス語教育を推進していく姿勢が見られる規定である。

表1.「第一高等学校大学予科入学志望者心得」(1895年1月)に示された入試の外国語と専攻及び定員等

入学試験外国語	部	分科	本校ニ於テ課スヘキ第一外国語	毎年募集スヘキ本校第一年級定員	本校卒業ノ上進シ得ル大學専門學科
英語	一部	法科	獨語	六十人	法律學科○政治學科
			佛語	四十人	
		文科	佛語		佛蘭西文學科
			英語	四十人	英文學科
			獨語		獨逸文學科○哲學科○國文學科○漢學科○國史○史學科○博言學科
	二部	工科	英語	六十四人	土木工學科○機械工學科○造船學科○造兵學科○電氣工學科○造家學科○應用化學科○火藥學科○採鑛及冶金學科
		理科	英語	三十二人	數學科○星學科○物理學科○化學科○動物學科○植物學科○地質學科
		農科	英語		農學科○農藝化學科○林學科○獸醫學科
	第六項ニ當ル受験者				入學試業ノ外國語ヲ獨語トスル左欄*〔ここでは下の欄〕ニアル諸學科
獨語	一部	法科	獨語	二十人	法律學科○政治學科
		文科	獨語		獨逸文學科○哲學科○國文學科○漢學科○國史科○史學科○博言學科
	三部	醫科	獨語	四十人	醫學科○藥學科

注. 出典は第一高等学校(1939, p. 248)及び大蔵省印刷局(1895年1月26日, p. 271)

ここで、心得の第六項を確認しておきたい。第六項にあるように、尋常中学校で英語を履修しドイツ語を学習しておらずにドイツ語を第一外国語とする分科を目指す場合に、校長の推薦があれば英語の試験を除いた受験が可能であった。合格すれば証明が与えられ、その証明を以て二年以内にドイツ語だけを受験することで、ドイツ語で受験の第一部および第三部に入学する道が設けられた。この条項は第七項で規定された通り、尋常中学校がいずれかの高等学校区域内にありその高等学校の特待を受ける学校であれば、第一高等学校が特待を与える学校の卒業生と同様に扱うということで、ドイツ語による入学者を全国から集めるための対策であったと考えられる。なお、1895年1月制定の大学予科入学志望者心得は、1895(明治28)年6月28日には改正されたが、上述の第六項の内容は第三項に維持された(詳細は第一高等学校、1939, を参照のこと)。

ドイツ語の受験を促す試みがあった一方で、ドイツ語受験による学生が思いのほか集まらなかった部があった。1895(明治28)年8月8日付の次の報告のように、大学予科第一部法科志望には一クラスを組織するほども集まらなかったというのだ。

此の年大學豫科第一部法科志望者中獨語を入學試業の外國語とする者を募集せし處、應募者少きのみならず、意外にも試業及第者殆ど無き有様にて、到底完全なる一學級を組織し難きが故に、當分之を補ふため、英語を入學試業の外國語とし入學の上外國語は大學豫科規程第五條大學豫科第一部解説中にある佛語を以て法科を希望する者に倣い主として獨語を課する生徒一組を募集し養成せんことを伺い出て、八月八日文部大臣より聴届けられたり。(第一高等学校, 1939, pp. 260-261)

また、1895(明治28)年の第三部の入学試業は特別試業においてのみ実施されており(第一高等学校, 1939)、実際にはドイツ語での入学試験は行われていない。その理由は明らかではないが、入学者が集まらないことを懸念し、英語を学んだ尋常中学校卒業生を学校長の推薦により受け入れた可能性が考えられる。

1896(明治29)年2月28日には「總則及大學豫科學科課程」を合併し、「大學豫科學科程度及組數」(第一高等学校, 1939, pp. 264-282)とし、その条項と各部の学科表が改正された。学科の組織・名称が変更になったが、受験外国語の取り扱いはいままでと同様であった。

さらに1899(明治32)年2月14日、入学規則に変更が加えられた(官報4685号「大蔵省印刷局, 1899年02月16日」で報告されているが、第一高等学校, 1939, p. 288, によると変更の許可を得たのが2月14日となっている)。第十条に「入学志願者ハ…入學ノ上修メントスル志望學科ヲ選定シ之ヲ願書ニ記載スヘシ」として、第一部・第二部・第三部のうちの学科を選ぶように指示があるが、そこに入学試験の外国語として英語とドイツ語が記載されている(表2; 第一高等学校, 1939, p. 289)。それによると、1896年の時点では第三部の試験はドイツ語のみで行っていたが、1899年には英語でも行われるようになった。ドイツ語教育を推進しようとする教育関係者は、この「英語生轉學法」(高等教育會議, 出版年不明, p. 146)つまり、英語を学んだ者に学習言語を転じてドイツ語を学ばせる方法を批判した。その前年の9月に中学校長會議が開かれ、第一高等学校の第三部においてもほかの高等学校と同様に英語による受験を可能としてほしいという建議が決議されたが(「中学校長會議諮問案及建議案」, 1898)、その建議の影響もあろう。

表2. 第一高等学校大学予科の入学試験における外国語科目(1899年2月)

學科	入學試験 の外國語
第一部英法科(法科大學へ進入ノ上英法律ヲ兼修スル者及政治學科 ヲ修ムル者ノ豫科)	英語
第一部佛法科(法科大學へ進入ノ上佛法律ヲ兼修スル者ノ豫科)	英語
第一部獨法科(法科大學へ進入ノ上獨法律ヲ兼修スル者ノ豫科)	獨語
	英語
第一部文科	英語
第二部工科	英語
第二部理科	英語
第二部農科	英語
第三部醫科	獨語
	英語

注. 出典は第一高等学校(1939, p. 289)

また、この新規則の制定は、前年1898年の6月23日付文部省高等学務局長の通牒に鑑みてなされたものだ(第一高等学校, 1939, p. 288)。通牒の内容は以下の通りだ〔下線と〔 〕内は筆者による〕。

○高等學校入學規程ニ關スル通牒 各高等學校入學規程ニ關シ今般「(一)官公私立尋常中學校ノ卒業生ニシテ高等學校ニ入學ヲ志望スル者募集豫定人員法科、醫科、工科、文科、理科及農科ノ各科ニ就キテ定ムルモノトスニ超過セサルトキハ無試験入學ヲ許可スルコト、(二)各高等學校ニ於テ官公私立尋常中學校ヲ承認スルノ規程ハ之ヲ廢止スルコト、(三)官公私立尋常中學校ハ一々之ヲ高等學校ニ通知スルコト、(四)官公私立尋常中學校卒業生ニシテ入學ヲ志望スル者各科豫定人員ニ超過スルトキハ尋常中學校卒業ノ程度ニ依リ明治十七年文部省令第七號第一條第一項ノ各學科ニ就キ試験ヲ試行スルコト但シ時宜ニヨリ三科目以内ヲ省クコトヲ得、(五)尋常中學校ニアラサル學校ニ於テ修學シタル者ハ尋常中學校卒業生ニシテ入學ヲ志願スル者各科豫定人員ニ充タサル場合ニ限り前項ノ試験ヲ行ヒ補關トシテ入學ヲ許可スルコト、(六)前記各項中第二及第三ヲ除クノ外ハ都テ各高等學校規則中ニ明ニ規定スルコト」ニ省議決定シタルニ附キ現行規則中右〔ここでは上〕ニ牴觸ノ廉ハ改正方何出テ來學年ヨリ實施相成ルヘシ但シ從來ノ訓令通知等ニシテ右〔ここでは上〕ニ牴觸スルモノハ當然消滅スル儀ト承知アリタキ旨一昨二十三日文部省高等學務局長ヨリ各高等學校長ニ通牒セリ。(大藏省印刷局, 1898年6月25日, pp. 335-336)



本官報では1884(明治17)年の文部省令第七号に言及されているが、これは1894(明治27)年の誤りではないかと考えられる。中学校令および尋常中学校ノ学科及其程度が制定されたのは1886(明治19)年、そして1891(明治24)年には中学校令が改正されるなどしており、上記の下線部が1894(明治27)年3月1日の文部省令第七号において改正された尋常中学校ノ学科及其程度を指していると判断するのが妥当だ。その第一条は次の通りだ。

第一條 尋常中學校ノ學科ハ倫理、國語及漢文、外國語、歴史、地理、數學、博物、物理、及化學、習字、圖書、体操トス

前項ノ外随意科トシテ簿記及唱歌ヲ加フルコトヲ得(寺尾, 1894, p. 245-255)

つまり、この第一条の第一項で指定された科目で試験をするが、場合によってはそのうち三科目までは省いてもよいと規定された。尋常中学校ノ学科及其程度の科目には「外国語」とあり、その言語の指定はない。しかし、1899年の規程変更の背景には本通牒があり、中学校では教えられている外国語はほぼ英語であるという状況が、この変更の決定に影響を与えたと考えられる。

そして1901(明治34)年5月3日には、第一高等学校の入学規程のうち外国語の選択について変更が加えられた。つまり、仏法科、仏文科志望者にはフランス語による受験が、独文科志望者にはドイツ語が加えられた(第一高等学校, 1939; 表3)。

表3. 第一高等学校入試における外国語:1901(明治34)年

學科		入學試験の外國語
第一部 佛法科		佛語
		英語
第一部 文科	獨逸文學科志望者	英語
		獨語
	佛蘭西文學科志望者	英語
		佛語
	其他	英語

注. 出典は第一高等学校(1939, p. 298)

1903(明治36)年4月21日には、「高等學校大學予科入學者選抜試験規程」が制定され、高等学校における入学者数や選別試験の学科等が発表されている(大蔵省印刷局, 1903年04月21日, p. 427)。それによると、「第一高等學校ノ第三部ニ於テハ七十人ノ内凡四十人ハ獨語ヲ以テ入學試験ノ外國語ト爲シ入學するコトヲ得シム」とあり、学科試験の外国語の説明に「外國語ハ各高等學校ヲ通シテ英語トス但第一高等學校ニ入學セントスル者ニ限り第一部丙類志望者ハ佛語、第一部乙類及第三部志望者ハ獨語ヲ以テ入學試験ヲ受クルコトヲ得」とされた。

その後、高等学校大学予科入学者選抜試験規程は複数回改正され、1908(明治41)年3月12日には廃止された(文部省教育調査部編, 1940, p. 77; 大蔵省印刷局, 1908年03月12日)。それに伴い、第一高等学校は、1908(明治41)年12月22日、入学規程を制定したが、受験の外国語に関して次の通り規定した。

第四條 選抜試験ノ學科目ハ中學校ノ學科目中ニ就キ五箇目以上トシ中學校卒業ノ程度ニ依リ之ヲ行フ外國語ハ各部ヲ通シテ英語トス但シ第一部丁類志望者ハ佛語、第一部丙類志望者及第三部志望者ハ獨語ヲ以テ選抜試験ヲ受クルコトヲ得(第一高等学校, 1939, p. 319)

ここでも第一部でフランス語による受験、第一部と第三部でドイツ語による受験が認められた。

1909(明治42)年4月21日には新たに「高等學校大學豫科入學者選抜試験規程」が制定され(文部省教育調査部編, 1940, p. 81-82)、その後複数回の改正を経るが、1916(大正5)年の改正までそこには具体的な外国語科目の指定は示されない。しかし、第三条で選抜試験の学科目が「中學校ノ學科目(法制經濟及唱歌ヲ除ク)中ニ就キ毎回文部大臣之ヲ告示ス」とある。中学校の科目である外国語は、明治34年制定の中学校令施行規則第一条(文部省, 1972b, p. 136)により、英語、ドイツ語またはフランス語とされていたことから、第一高等学校においては1915(大正4)年まではそれまでの形式を継続していたと考えられる。

ただし、1916(大正5)年の改正での追加条項(文部省教育調査部編, 1940)は、以下の通り第一高等学校の第三部におけるドイツ語による受験のみに言及しており、第一部におけるドイツ語とフランス語による受験に関する条項はなく、これらの受験が継続していたかは不明だ。

第七條 第一高等學校ノ第三部ニ於テ獨語ヲ以テ選抜試験ノ外國語ト爲ス者ニ限り入學セシムル場合ハ前條ノ關係ニ於テ之ヲ一ノ部ト看做ス(p. 98)

この前の条項第六条は入学を許可すべき者の選出方法を定めたもので、第三部をドイツ語で受験した場合はそれをその方法の一部に看做すということだ。つまり、このころは、第一高等学校の第三部においてドイツ語の受験が可能であったということが確かである。

その後、1919(大正8)年に定められた「官立高等學校高等科入學者選抜試験規程」では、受験外国語の選択肢に英語・ドイツ語・フランス語が指定された(文部省教育調査部編, 1940)。

第三條 選抜試験ノ學科目ハ中學校第四學年マテノ必修學科目中ニ就キ之ヲ選定ス

但シ外國語ハ英語、獨語及佛語ノ中本人ヲシテ其ノ一ツヲ選ハシム

前項ノ試験ハ中學校ノ第四學年修了ノ程度ニ依ル

第四條 選抜試験ハ各高等學校同時ニ之ヲ行フ

第五條 入學志願者ハ其入學後修業セントスル科及類ヲ指定スヘシ指定スヘキ科及類ハ左ノ如シ

文科 甲類 英語ヲ第一外國語トスルモノ

文科 乙類 獨語ヲ第一外國語トスルモノ

文科 丙類 佛語ヲ第一外國語トスルモノ

理科 甲類 英語ヲ第一外國語トスルモノ

理科 乙類 獨語ヲ第一外國語トスルモノ

選抜試験ノ外國語ニ英語ヲ選フ者ハ志望ノ類ニ箇所以上(同一科内ノ類ニ限ル)ヲ併セ指定スルコトヲ得此ノ場合ニ於テハ其ノ志望ノ類ノ順位ヲ定ムヘシ獨語ヲ選フ者ノ志望シ得ル類ハ文科乙類又ハ理科乙類ニ限り佛語ヲ選フ者ノ志望シ得ル類ハ文科丙類ニ限ル (pp. 130-131)

このときに共通試験制が採用されており(吉野2001a)、ドイツ語・フランス語の受験は第一高等学校以外の学校でも共通して実施が制度上可能となった。

以上、明治後半から大正期にかけての第一高等学校の入学試験における外国語の取り扱いを見てきたが、その変遷を表4・表5に示した。国としての制度が変更になった際に、変更内容に合わせて第一高等学校の入学選抜規程も変更されたという背景から、表4では参考までに高等学校の入学試験制度の変遷も示したが、詳細は吉野(2001a, 2001b)を参照されたい。

表4. 第一高等学校の受験外国語—英語以外の外国語を中心としたその変遷(1)<sup>a</sup>

年	外国語の受験	(参考)入試制度 <sup>b</sup>
1895 (明治28)	第一部の一部でドイツ語の受験が可能。 第三部はドイツ語の受験のみ可能。	学校別入学試験制度 ↓
1899 (明治32)	第一部の一部でドイツ語の受験が可能。 第三部はドイツ語または英語の受験が可能。	総合選抜制 (1902～1907)
1901 (明治34)	第一部の一部でドイツ語・フランス語の受験が可能。 第三部はドイツ語または英語の受験が可能。	↓
1908 (明治41)	第一部の一部でドイツ語・フランス語の受験が可能。 第三部がドイツ語または英語の受験が可能。	学校別入学試験制度 (1908)
1909～1915	おそらく上記の形態を継続。ただし、フランス語の受験が中止された可能性がある。	共通試験制 (1909～1916) ↓
1916 (大正5)	第一部でドイツ語・フランス語の受験が可能であったかは不明。 第三部がドイツ語または英語の受験が可能。	総合選抜制 (1917～1918)
1919 (大正8) <sup>c</sup>	文科乙類・理科乙類でドイツ語の受験が可能。 文科丙類でフランス語の受験が可能。	共通試験制 (1919～) <sup>d</sup>

注. <sup>a</sup>特に明記のない部は英語が受験科目。<sup>b</sup>入試制度の名称は文献により統一されていないが、吉野(2001a)に倣った。<sup>c</sup>大正8年高等学校令で三部制から文科理科の二科制に変更。<sup>d</sup>大正15年、昭和2年には入試二班制が行われた。詳細は田中(2005, p. 9)が引用の『資料集成 旧制高等学校全集』第一巻(1983)。

表5. 第一高等学校の受験外国語—英語以外の外国語を中心としたその変遷(2):1895~1916年

年	第一部			第二部			第三部		
	英	独	仏	英	独	仏	英	独	仏
1895(明治28)	○	(○)	×	○	×	×	×	○	×
1899(明治32)	○	(○)	×	○	×	×	○	○	×
1901(明治34)	○	(○)	(○)	○	×	×	○	○	×
1908(明治41)	○	(○)	(○)	○	×	×	○	○	×
1909~1915	○	?	?	○	×	×	○	○	×
1916(大正5)	○	?	?	○	×	×	○	○	×

注.(○)は一部の分科で受験が可能なることを示す

### 中学校外国語教育への影響

1919(大正8)年に定められた官立高等学校高等科入学選抜試験規程で英語・ドイツ語・フランス語の受験が全国の官立高等学校で共通試験として可能となったのちも、ドイツ語・フランス語が教えられた中学校は数が非常に限られた。大阪外国語学校(1924)は1~2校に留まると伝えたが、『中等教育諸学校職員録』(中等教科書協会)の1904(明治37)年、1908(明治41)年、1921(大正10)年の記録(1908a, 1908b, 1926aにそれぞれ基づく)を参照すると、この期間、ドイツ語、フランス語が教えられた中学校は全国に複数あった。本職員録には陸軍幼年学校・専修学校・貿易語学校・高等女学校等が含まれており、また、朝鮮・台湾・樺太・関東県・在外の中学校についても、政治的背景および言語事情が異なるため対象からは省いて確認したところ、明治37年には東京の府立第一中学校、私立独逸協会学校、私立成城学校、私立東京中学校、私立青山学院、私立東京学院などで、明治41年には東京府立第一中学校、私立独逸協会学校、私立成城学校、私立青山学院、さらに仙台の私立東北学院、岡山の私立関西中学校でドイツ語教員の記載があったが、大正10年の名簿では、ドイツ語教員が確認できた中学校は東京府立第一中学校、私立東京独逸学院(中学部)、私立独逸学協会学校中学、私立東北学院とその数は減少している。明治37年には全国に254校あった中学校(財団法人教科書センター, 1984, p. 20)の数は、大正10年には385校(p. 32)にまで増加しており、ドイツ語教員がいた中学校は、数のみならず割合も低下した。

この間、ドイツ語クラスの加設があった公立の中学校として注目したいのが、現東京都立日比谷高校前身の東京府立第一中学校である。『中等教育諸学校職員録』では、担当教科名が記載されていない学校が含まれるためさらなる検証が必要ではあるものの、明治終わりから大正期にかけてドイツ語を教えた公立の中学校としては唯一の学校であると考えられる。日比谷高校百年史編集委員会編(1979)によると、明治30年代の半ばになると、時代の進展に伴って、英語以外の外国語の教授を希望する声の一部の父兄からも上がったという。特にドイツ語の学習が強く求められ、当時の校長であった勝浦鞠雄の尽力のもとで、1902(明治35)年4月に外国語科として英語とドイツ語が設けられた。

前年の1901年には、第六回高等教育会議にて道府県中学校の各一校に英語とドイツ語を併置することを提案した建議が決議された。校長の勝浦は第三回高等教育会議の二十九番議員、第七回高等教育会議の四十二番議員として出席している(文部省1903a, 1903b)。第六回の会議速記録は関東大震災の際に焼失してしまったようである(文部省教育調査部編, 1937)。そのため出席議員は不明だが、第三回および第七回に出席した勝浦が、東京府立第一中学校の校長として第六回の会議にも出席していたと考えられる。高等教育会議における議論が、東京府立中学校におけるドイツ語加設を後押ししたのではないかと推測される。

日比谷高校百年史編集委員会編(1979)によると、第一年度は一年に二クラスのドイツ語クラスを予定していたが、結局は一クラスとなり、勝浦が期待したほどの人数が集まらなかった。学生はドイツ語以外の授業においても成績優秀であったというが、第一次世界大戦におけるドイツの敗北を引き金に1919(大正8)年にはドイツ語クラスは廃止された。川田正澄校長時代のことである。ドイツ語の授業は1919(大正8)年入学の学生が卒業した1924(大正13)年まで続けられた。

『中等教育諸学校職員録』(中等教科書協会)には、1904(明治37)年ドイツ語の教諭として弓削久兵衛(1908a)、1908(明治41)年はドイツ語囑託教師として桂多三、細谷香水の名がある(1908b)。ドイツ語の廃止が決まった後のことであるが、1921(大正10)年のドイツ語教員は馬場威夫、マチルデ・カトウ(1926a)、1922(大正11)年のドイツ語教員は橋本清之助の名が記載されている(1926b)。1926(大正15)年の記録(1926c)にはドイツ語教員はなく、ドイツ語が廃止されたことを裏付けている。

東京府立第一中学校(1929)も、1902(明治35)年にドイツ語科が新設されたことを記述している。

従来我が中学校に於ける外国語は、英語若くは獨佛語の内一科を授くべき制度なりしが、公立学校にては絶えて英語以外の外国語を採用するものなく、私立学校にても獨逸協會学校にて獨逸語を、暁星中学校にて佛語を教授するのみなりき。然るに時代の進運に伴ひ、英語以外の外国語をも必要と認むる事年一年に切實を加ふるに到れり。殊に獨逸語は醫學を修得せんとする者は云ふ迄もなく、法律經濟哲學等、我國新興文化の樹立に必要な學問を修めんとする者には、看過するを許さざる状態となりぬ。(pp. 31-32)

東京府立第一中学校(1929)には1889(明治22)年から1929(昭和4)年までの卒業生の集合写真が収められているが、1907(明治40)年のものだけドイツ語科卒業生として撮影したものが入っている。ドイツ語科の第一期生として華々しい思いで撮影されたものであろう。

なお、1902年にドイツ語が開設されたことは、『教育時論』607号(「東京府立第一中学校の獨逸語加設」, 1902, p. 38)で報じられた。それまでは、第一高等学校の第三部の入学試験はドイツ語でのみ行っており、履修外国語が英語の中学を卒業した場合には、外国語以外の科目を受験し合格した場合には証明を受け、その後ドイツ語を学び二年の猶予期間のうちにドイツ語のみ試験を受けて入学するという措置を取っていた。それでは高等学校に入学するまでにかかる期間を助長させるばかりであったが、第一中学校にドイツ語クラスが設置されたことで、そこの卒業生は卒業後すぐに第一高等学校を受験することができるようになったとして、『教育時論』はドイツ語加設を評価し、その将来に期待を寄せている。



しかし、その3年前の1899年2月に第一高等学校の入学試験制度は変更されており、それまでドイツ語のみで行われていた第三部の入学試験に英語が取り入れられるようになった。第一高等学校の校長はその頃、狩野亨吉(在任期間:1898年11月24日～1906年7月5日)であった(第一高等学校, 1939, p. 603)。狩野は第七回高等教育会議には六番議員として出席しているが(文部省, 1903b)、第三回会議の議員に名はない(文部省, 1903a)。第三回会議は1899(明治32)年4月17日～4月25日の開催であり、前任の澤柳政太郎の名が一番議員にあるが、すでに第一高等学校長に就任していた狩野は出席しておらず、高等専門教育におけるドイツ語の重要性を強調した加藤弘之やドクトル・レーンホルムの文書が配布され(詳細は下, 2018, を参照)、中学校の外国語を英語に限るべきかどうか、中学校でドイツ語を教えるべきではないかと主張された議論の場にはいなかった。その狩野在任中に第一高等学校の第三部において英語での受験が可能となった。この変更のために、東京府立第一中学校がドイツ語を加設した意義は弱まることとなった。なお、第一高等学校の第三部において英語での受験が可能となったその前年の1898年に、全国中学校長会議が開催され、英語での受験を求める建議が可決されている。すでに英語中心であった中学校外国語教育の現場からは、ドイツ語推進を進める声は少数派にとどまっていた(下, 2019)。

## 結論

本稿では、第一高等学校における入学試験の外国語の取り扱いの変遷を明らかにしたが、そのなかで重要な転機として次の三点が挙げられる。一つ目は、1895(明治28)年の第一部の一部においてドイツ語受験が可能とされたこと、そして第三部についてはドイツ語のみの受験が可能とされたことである。二つ目は1899(明治32)年に第三部の受験がドイツ語に加えて英語でも可能となったことである。そして、三つ目は、1919(大正8)年の官立高等学校高等科入学者選抜試験規程により、文科乙類・理科乙類でドイツ語による受験が可能に、文科丙類でフランス語による受験が可能となったことである。しかも、1919(大正8)年の改革は第一高等学校のみならず、そのほかの官立高等学校すべてにおいて制度上それが可能とされたことに大きな意義があった。

入学試験の波及効果が大きいことは言うまでもないが、高等教育におけるドイツ語、そしてフランス語の重要性が強調されるなかで、これらの言語の教育を推奨する方法として採られたのが入学試験での利用であったと言える。1891(明治24)年からは受験科目の外国語をそれまでにあったドイツ語とフランス語をなくし、英語のみとする方針をいったんは打ち出しておきながら、1895(明治28)年にドイツ語を加えたのは、ドイツ語教育を推進するためにほかならない。一方で、1899(明治32)年にはドイツ語だけが選択肢であった第三部の受験に英語が可能となり、第一高等学校の第三部に直接入学するというメリットが期待された東京府立第一中学校のドイツ語科設置についても、その効果は顕著ではなかった。

しかし、その後、高等学校も中学校と同様に高等普通教育を目的とすることが規定され、さらに、1918年臨時教育会議は内閣総理大臣への答申で、中学校で英語のほかにドイツ語・フランス語を「一層奨励セラルヘシ」(文部省, 1979, p. 105)と明記した大正期の流れがあった。それを受けた1919年の入試改革により、全国の官立高等学校でドイツ語・フランス語も共通問題が使用されることになったことは、その後の

高等教育におけるドイツ語・フランス語の役割を強める、あるいは少なくとも維持することに役立った。一方で、英語での受験は文科・理科のどの類であっても可能であったことから、中学校においてドイツ語・フランス語の採用が増加することは結局のところなかった。明治10年代以降ドイツ学振興のあおりを受けて縮小していたフランス語教育が、大正期に入ってから、ドイツ語と同様に高等教育におけるその役割の強化が図られる対象にはなったものの、中学校教育における英語一辺倒の状況は変わらなかった。

1899年に第一高等学校第三部において英語の受験が開始されたことが象徴するように、英語による受験で高等教育への切符を手に入れることができる状況では、中学校における外国語教育の英語化を抑制することはできなかった。また、英語のみが外国語の選択肢である中学校側にとっては、高等学校の入学試験に英語以外の外国語が要求されるというのは、理不尽だと判断せざるを得ない状況がある。

中学校における外国語教育が英語中心で、高等学校の入試においても英語中心であるという体制は、近代学校制度が整備・確立された明治・大正の頃から続く。通用度の高い英語が入試で重要な地位を占める限り、英語一辺倒の外国語教育を変えることは難しい。その一方で、入学試験が教育現場に及ぼす波及効果が高いとはいえ、単に英語以外の言語を入試科目に加えるだけでは、その前段階の教育現場の言語の多様化が促されるわけではない。明治期から大正期にかけて、ドイツ語、そしてフランス語を高等学校の入学試験に加えたことは、高等教育におけるその価値を維持することに多少は貢献したが、外国語教育の多言語化を図る方法としては全く不十分であったことを過去の試みは示している。

## 謝辞

本稿の内容について、2018年7月21日、日本英語教育史学会例会にて発表し、示唆に富むコメントを頂きました。また、原稿の執筆にあたっては、査読者の皆様や京都大学大学院人間・環境学研究科の西山教行先生から貴重な助言をいただきました。感謝申し上げます。

下 絵津子は現職近畿大学総合社会学部准教授。ニューヨーク州立大学バッファロー校にて教育学修士(Ed.M in TESOL)を取得。関心のあるテーマは学習者・教師ビリーフ、学習者オートノミー、協力的学習活動、言語教育政策。

## 引用文献

### (日本語)

井上久雄(1969)『近代日本教育法の成立』東京:風間書房。

伊村元道(2003)『日本の英語教育200年』東京:大修館書店。

「イロハ便 牧野新文相の『英仏独三国語に通じておきたい』に賛同」(1906年4月9日)『読売新聞朝刊』, p. 2.

江利川春雄(2011)『受験英語と日本人—入試問題と参考書から見る英語学習史』東京:研究社。

大蔵省印刷局(1895年01月26日)「官報」3471. <https://doi.org/10.11501/2946741>

- 大蔵省印刷局(1898年06月25日)「官報」4495. <https://doi.org/10.11501/2947784>
- 大蔵省印刷局(1899年02月16日)「官報」4685. <https://doi.org/10.11501/2947976>
- 大蔵省印刷局(1903年04月21日)「官報」5937. <https://doi.org/10.11501/2949244>
- 大蔵省印刷局(1908年03月12日)「官報」7410. <https://doi.org/10.11501/2950757>
- 大阪外国語学校(1924)『中学校に於ける外国語に就いて』大阪:大阪外国語学校.
- 大谷泰照(2007)『日本人にとって英語とは何か—異文化理解のあり方を問う』東京:大修館書店.
- 岡戸浩子(2002)『「グローカル化」時代の言語教育政策:「多様化」の試みとこれからの日本』東京:くろしお出版.
- 上村直己(2006)「熊本におけるドイツ語教育の開始:第五高等学校を中心に」『ラフカディオ・ハーンとその時代(熊本大学紀要)』, 65-99. <http://hdl.handle.net/2298/16652>
- 旧制高等学校資料保存会(1985)『旧制高等学校全書 第三巻 教育編』(訂正発行版)東京:旧制高等学校史料保存会.
- 久保田竜子(2015)「グローバル化が日本の言語教育に及ぼすインパクト」(奥田朋世監訳)『グローバル化社会と言語教育:クリティカルな視点から』(pp. 3-22)東京:くろしお出版.
- 「広告 第一高等学校入学試験に合格した本校生徒 / 本郷区 私立独逸語学校」(1892年8月27日)『読売新聞朝刊』, p. 4.
- 高等教育会議編(出版年不明)『第一回～第十回高等教育会議決議録』高等教育会議.
- 斉田智里(2013)『科学研究費助成事業(科学研究費補助金)研究成果報告書:大学入試センター試験リスニングテスト導入の高大英語教育における波及効果の解明』  
<https://kaken.nii.ac.jp/en/file/KAKENHI-PROJECT-22520551/22520551seika.pdf>
- 財団法人教科書研究センター(1984)『旧制中等学校教科内容の変遷』東京:ぎょうせい.
- 下 絵津子(2018)「なぜ外国語を学ぶのか—高等教育会議と明治期中学における外国語教育—」『言語政策』14, 29-54.
- 下 絵津子(2019)「1898年全国中学校長会議:英語かドイツ語か」『言語政策』15, 31-56.
- 杉野健太郎・徳田稔(2008)「センター試験のリスニング導入と高校英語教育—長野県野沢北高等学校の例を中心として—」『人文科学論集・文科コミュニケーション学科編(信州大学)』42, 95-111.
- 第一高等学校(1939)『第一高等学校六十年史』東京:第一高等学校.
- 田中貞夫(2005)『旧制高等学校フランス語教育史』長野:旧制高等学校記念館.
- 「中学校長会議諮問案及建議案」(1898年)『教育時論』485, 23-25.
- 中等教科書協会(1908a)『中等教育諸学校職員録 明治37年版』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/779896>
- 中等教科書協会(1908b)『中等教育諸学校職員録 明治41年版』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/779898>
- 中等教科書協会(1926a)『中等教育諸学校職員録 大正10年版』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/937374>
- 中等教科書協会(1926b)『中等教育諸学校職員録 大正11年版』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/937375>
- 中等教科書協会(1926c)『中等教育諸学校職員録 大正15年版』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/937376>



- 寺尾捨次郎編(1894)「学校管理法 附録教育法令」東京:大日本図書.  
<https://doi.org/10.11501/809678>
- 篁田知義(1974)『旧制高等学校教育の成立』東京:ミネルヴァ書房.
- 「独逸学生大運動」(1890年5月15日)『朝日新聞朝刊』, p. 1.
- 東京外国語大学史編纂委員会(1999)『東京外国語大学史: 独立百周年(建学百二十六年)記念』東京:東京外国語大学出版.
- 東京大学百年史編集委員会(1984)『東京大学百年史通史 一』東京:東京大学百年史編集委員会.
- 東京府立第一中学校(1929)『東京府立第一中學校創立五十年史』東京:東京府立第一中学校.
- 「東京府立第一中學校の獨逸語加設」(1902)『教育時論』607, 38.
- 鳥飼玖美子(2018)『英語教育の危機』東京:ちくま新書.
- 日本言語政策学会・JALP多言語教育推進研究会(2014)『グローバル人材育成のための外国語教育政策に関する提言—高等学校における複数外国語必修化に向けて—』.  
[http://jalp.jp/wp/?page\\_id=1069](http://jalp.jp/wp/?page_id=1069)
- 橋口菊(1960)「諮問第二号 高等普通教育ニ関する件 その一」海後宗臣編『臨時教育会議の研究』(pp. 339-425)東京:東京大学出版会.
- 日比谷高校百年史編集委員会編(1979)『日比谷高校百年史 上巻』東京:日比谷高校百年史編集委員会.
- 松村幹男(1997)『明治期英語教育研究』東京:辞游社.
- 森住衛・古石篤子・杉谷眞佐子・長谷川由紀子編(2016)『外国語教育は英語だけでいいのか』東京:くろしお出版.
- 文部省(1903a)『第三回高等教育会議議事速記録 明治32年開催』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/808681>
- 文部省(1903b)『第七回高等教育会議議事速記録 明治35年開催』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/808682>
- 文部省(1972a)『学制百年史(記述編)』東京:帝国地方行政学会.
- 文部省(1972b)『学制百年史(資料編)』東京:帝国地方行政学会.
- 文部省(1979)『資料臨時教育会議 第一集総覧(解説および基礎史料)』東京:文部省.
- 文部省教育調査部編(1937)『学制に関する諸調査会の審議経過』東京:文部省.
- 文部省教育調査部編(1940)『高等学校関係法令の沿革』東京:文部省.
- 文部省専門学務局編(1920)『大正八年高等學校高等科入學者選抜試験ニ關スル諸調査』.  
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/940437>
- 文部科学省高等教育局学生課大学入試室(2004)「『英語』リスニングテストの導入について」『大学入試フォーラム』26, 24-29.
- 吉野剛弘(2001a)「大正前期における旧制高等学校入試: 入学試験をめぐる議論と入試制度改革—」『慶應義塾大学大学院社会学研究科紀要: 社会学心理学教育学』53, 19-31.
- 吉野剛弘(2001b)「明治後期における旧制高等学校入試: 文部省の入試政策と各学校への影響を中心に」『慶應義塾大学大学院: 社会学研究科紀要: 社会学心理学教育学』52, 51-62.
- 米田俊彦(1992)『近代日本中学校制度の確立 法制・教育機能・支持基盤の形成』東京:東京大学出版会.

(英文)

- Kubota, R. (2002). Impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 13-28). London, England: Routledge.
- Sasaki, M. (2008). The 150-year history of English language assessment in Japanese education. *Language Testing*, 25, 63-83.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0265532207083745>

# Perspectives

## Conceptualizing Integration in CLIL: More Than Just Learning Content and Language

Sachiko Yasuda  
*Kobe University*

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has received a considerable amount of research interest since its inception in the mid-1990s in Europe. The growth thereof has influenced various levels of English language education in Japan. Despite a recent increase in the use of this educational framework, however, a shared understanding of CLIL has yet to emerge. It appears that the term CLIL has acquired some of the characteristics associated with a brand-name that makes it simply appear to be an innovative and forward-looking educational approach. In this paper, I explore the exact nature of CLIL to advocate for the valid application of this pedagogical framework.

1990年代半ばにヨーロッパで始まった「内容言語統合型学習 (Content and Language Integrated Learning、以下CLIL)」は、近年、新しい外国語教育の枠組みとして世界中で注目を集めており、日本の英語学習環境でも、大学から中高等学校、小学校に至るまで様々な教育現場で取り入れられ始めている。しかしながら、国内で急速に拡大したCLILという概念は、いまや、斬新な外国語指導法をイメージさせる流行語のようになっており、本来のCLILの目的や理論的背景に対する正確な共通理解が構築できているとは言いがたい状況である。本稿では、「そもそもなぜ内容と言語の統合なのか」という本質的な問いに立ち返り、CLILが目指す方向性、その背景にある教育理論について整理・再考し、日本の英語学習環境への応用可能性について再検討する。

**Keywords:** Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL); inquiry; integration

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has received a considerable amount of research interest since its inception in the mid-1990s in Europe. Accordingly, the body of internationally accessible research on CLIL is continuously increasing. This growth has influenced the contexts of various levels of EFL education in Japan, not only at university (e.g., Iyobe & Li, 2013; MacGregor, 2016; Paydon, Birchley, & McCasland, 2015; Watanabe, Ikeda, & Izumi, 2011, 2012; Yasuda, 2017), but also at secondary (e.g., Clark, 2013; Ikeda, 2013) and even elementary school levels (e.g., Yamano, 2013a, 2013b). However, as the notion of CLIL has been disseminated among practicing teachers increasingly rapidly in different contexts in Japan, it appears that the term CLIL “has acquired some characteristics of a brand-name” (Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, & Smit, 2010, p. 3) that makes it simply appear to be an innovative, effective, and forward-looking educational approach that can easily transform from (traditional) teacher-centered classrooms to (more innovative) student-centered learning environments. Although no one would disagree with the general CLIL goal of improving students’ language learning, there appears to be lack of shared understanding of the exact nature of CLIL: what its theoretical background, rationale, and underlying assumptions are and, most importantly, what it really means to integrate language and content. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is twofold: (a) to address what CLIL is in the European context in which it was originally developed, and (b) to conceptualize the notion of CLIL based on the original framework so as to ensure that educators and practitioners in Japan can develop an accurate understanding of this borrowed framework and apply it to EFL educational contexts here. I will then discuss what I view as central concerns for CLIL, which may need greater attention from the research community as well as from practitioners in Japan.

### **Theoretical Background and Rationale: What is Meant by CLIL?**

CLIL is a form of education that has spread throughout the world, and particularly in Europe, since the mid-1990s. It draws on earlier models of bilingual education in other countries such as immersion and content-based instruction (Nikula, Dalton-Puffer, Llinates, & Lorenzo, 2016). Expectations associated with CLIL as an effective educational framework for language learning were fueled by “a radical shift from social monolingualism to multilingualism” (Lorenzo, Casal, & Moore, 2009, p. 419) and the *2+1 principle*, which is an “agenda to promote language learning to the extent that every European is fluent in at least two languages in addition to their mother

tongue” (Council of the European Union, 2002, cited in Jaekel, Schurig, Florian, & Ritter, 2017, p. 632).

CLIL is known as a “dual-focused educational approach” (Marsh, 2002, p. 58) that gives equal attention to language and content; it is an educational framework in which subject matter is taught through the medium of a foreign language. CLIL is thus “neither exclusively language learning nor subject learning but rather a fusion of both” (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010, p. 2). The notion of a fusion of content and language is crucial, given the traditional boundary between content education and language education. Meyer, Coyle, Halbach, Schuck, and Ting (2015) expressed this as follows: “In traditional classrooms, content teachers do not usually focus on the quality of learners’ disciplinary literacy and discourse. In language classrooms, subject-specific literacies are considered irrelevant” (p. 41). However, it should be emphasized that in CLIL “language learning and academic achievement are inextricably linked and thus share equal status in terms of educational objectives,” (Lyster, 2007, p. 6). In order for a program to be defined as CLIL, therefore, students need to learn language through content and learn content through language rather than learn the language separately from the content; “otherwise this would not be CLIL” (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p. 33). In this regard, CLIL has the potential to serve as a catalyst for change in both language and content education and plays a role in promoting the interplay between language development and the learning of subject matter.

The crucial point here is that the original concept of what constitutes content in a CLIL context is different from the ways content has traditionally been defined in school curricula in disciplines such as geography, biology, and physics. Because CLIL programs need to consider contextual variables such as teacher availability and language support, a wide selection of content is more appropriate, and therefore, “what exactly is meant by ‘content’ in CLIL will depend on the context of the learning institution” (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 28). It is thus important to understand the flexibility of CLIL in terms of choice of content.

As a “foreign language enrichment measure packaged into content teaching” (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013, p. 546), CLIL has gained traction and has become a widespread phenomenon, not only in Europe but all over the world. It has become increasingly common, including in EFL educational contexts, as a result of the increasing prominence English enjoys. However, one may question how and in what ways CLIL can be implemented so as to optimize the fusion between language and content learning or the concurrent teaching of these two components in different educational contexts.

Researchers and educators have been responding to these challenges, and there is a growing body of research that addresses how to integrate language and content in the most optimal way, as demonstrated below.

### **Achieving a Balance: How Best to Integrate Language and Content?**

The notion of CLIL as a dual-focused approach signifies that “both language and the subject have a joint role” (Marsh, 2002, p. 58) and that “CLIL advocates a 50:50/Content: Language CLIL equilibrium” (Ting, 2010, p. 3). However, empirical CLIL studies conducted during intact CLIL classes have shown that the way in which integration is carried out varies noticeably: Different models are adopted to suit the needs and expectations of each context, with teachers and educators falling along a continuum ranging from those taking more language-driven approaches to those taking more content-driven ones. The extant research has thus indicated that it is not easy to achieve an exact balance between language and content in CLIL classrooms.

Certain variations are to be expected given that CLIL classrooms are highly contextualized not only at the national level but also at the institutional and/or classroom levels. Although such diversity within CLIL is sometimes criticized for lacking coherence (e.g., Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2013), recent studies have shown a general agreement about the “open nature of CLIL as an umbrella term” (Dalton-Puffer et al., 2010, p. 3). This illustrates that CLIL depends on the contingencies of individual contexts and that there is no set formula for CLIL (Coyle et al., 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Gajo, 2007). This does not necessarily mean, however, that the concept of CLIL lacks theoretical utility. Rather, a high degree of contextualization is essential in research conducted on CLIL so as to explore the many realities of learning a foreign language through content and learning content through a foreign language. Accordingly, Dalton-Puffer and Smit (2013) noted,

The fact must not be overlooked that, like all social science and applied linguistic research, the investigation of CLIL deals with a highly contextualized research object. In our view this has important consequences for the further development of CLIL research so as to ensure a mutually profitable dialogue between CLIL researchers from different parts of the world as well as between researchers and practitioners, who have to act locally. (p. 556)

Therefore, one may conclude that a situation-sensitive picture emerges in CLIL implementation. However, when employing the term CLIL, one must take into account that CLIL is not just a set of approaches and methods for teaching language, but an educational framework for facilitating the concurrent development of cognitive and language abilities through a fusion of content and language learning (Ikeda, 2016). In that sense, CLIL should be differentiated from similar approaches such as content-based instruction (CBI), where “the subject matter acts as a vehicle for language learning” (Brown & Bradford, 2017, p. 331); English for Academic Purposes (EAP), where English is taught “with the aim of facilitating learners’ study or research in that language” (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002, p. 2); and English medium instruction (EMI), or “English-taught degree programs . . . predominantly aim at the acquisition of subject knowledge” (Unterberger, 2014, p. 37). Unfortunately, it seems that these terms have often been used synonymously with CLIL by many researchers and teachers in Japan and other parts of Asia (e.g., Clark, 2013; Takano, Kambara, Kedoin, & Suzuki, 2016; Toh, 2013; Wei, 2013; Yang & Zhang, 2013).

Subsequently, one may ask how and to what extent the integration of content and language can affect learners’ actual development in terms of language proficiency and subject-matter knowledge. In the following section, empirical findings concerning learning outcomes of CLIL are considered.

## **Research on the Effectiveness of CLIL on Language and Content Learning**

Variation in CLIL as an educational practice suggests that there is also variation in research perspectives on CLIL. For some researchers, integration lies within the scope of second language pedagogies, and accordingly, integration is used for the benefit of learning the language. Other researchers are of the view that integration lies within the scope of subject pedagogies or bilinguals’ cognitive development; therefore, integration is used for the benefit of learning the subject.

From the perspective of language pedagogies, CLIL can make classrooms meaning-oriented by affording opportunities for *negotiation for meaning*, which involves repeating, rephrasing, and restructuring phrases between two or more learners to enable them to understand the meaning of the messages they are communicating (Long, 1996). This leads learners to develop the target language incidentally and naturally while learning the content, transforming declarative knowledge (i.e., metalinguistic knowledge or knowledge about a linguistic form) to procedural knowledge (i.e.,

knowledge about how to perform certain cognitive activities) and in turn, into automatized knowledge (i.e., fluent, spontaneous, and largely effortless behavior; DeKeyser, 2007). Studies have revealed that the areas where a difference between CLIL and regular EFL learners are noticeable include spontaneous oral production (Roquet & Pérez-Vidal, 2015), greater lexical variation (Agustín Llach & Jiménez Catalán, 2007), increased lexical richness and sophistication (Lo & Murphy, 2010; Moreno, 2009), as well as more elaborate and complex structures (Adrián & Mangado, 2009; Jexenflícker & Dalton-Puffer, 2010; Villarreal Olaizola & García Mayo, 2009). In recent years, attempts have been made by a group of scholars in systemic functional linguistics (an approach developed by M.A.K. Halliday, 1994, 1996, 1998, to analyze language function or how language is used in social contexts to achieve particular goals) to explore how CLIL can enhance learners' use of language in a broader sense by focusing on the following: ideational resources (i.e., language to represent content), interpersonal resources (i.e., language to express register-appropriate styles), and textual resources (i.e., language to express logical relationships in the expression of content; e.g., Llinares, Morton, & Whittaker, 2012; Meyer et al., 2015; Walker, 2010).

By employing a bilingual education perspective, it has been found that bilingual learners in CLIL environments have an increased metalinguistic awareness compared to monolingual children (Bialystok, 2001, 2007; Bialystok, Peets, & Moreno, 2014; Hermanto, Moreno, & Bialystok, 2012). Of great significance is the finding that the influence of an increased metalinguistic awareness may extend beyond the domain of language itself. For instance, studies have shown that bilingual pupils have an advantage in mathematics compared to their monolingual peers because the bilinguals' increased metalinguistic awareness helps them to analyze and understand the "language of math," that is, mathematical concepts (Surmont, Struys, Van den Noort, & Van de Craen, 2016). Jäppinen (2005) explicated this increased metalinguistic awareness, using the term "analogical reasoning system" (p. 163), which allows learners to make comparisons between the semantic systems of two languages and consequently practice classifying concepts, noticing and creating links between concepts, and hypothesizing diverse things.

Meanwhile, one of the concerns for CLIL involves learning subject matter through a foreign language, which is less perfectly known than learners' L1. Consequently, learning content in CLIL environments could result in reduced subject competence as a result of either imperfect understanding or the fact that teachers may simplify content (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; García



& Whittaker, 2010). With respect to content learning, there is a need to seek parity with L1 programs. In other words, the same content objectives should be used to assess the achievement of second language and native speakers alike. Lower standards of achievement should not be established for second language learners (Coyle et al., 2010). However, studies to date have generally shown that the learning of content does not suffer in CLIL environments, and in some cases, CLIL students outperform non-CLIL students even when tested in their L1 (e.g., Van de Craen, Ceuleers, & Mondt, 2007). As noted previously, this is probably the result of the metalinguistic awareness and analogical reasoning system developed by CLIL students. In other words, linguistic problems may prompt “intensified mental construction activity (through elaborating and relating details and discovering contradictions), resulting in deeper semantic processing and better understanding of curricular concepts” (Dalton-Puffer, 2011, p. 188).

In this vein, the findings of previous studies have generally supported positive outcomes of implementing CLIL. However, most of these studies have been conducted in the European EFL context. Therefore, one may question to what extent the same outcomes can be observed in a different instructional setting such as the Japanese EFL context. In the following section, the current state of CLIL in Japan is discussed.

### **CLIL in Japan**

In Japan, the idea of teaching a foreign language through content is not new, but has been adopted since the early 1990s under the label of CBI. However, as the concept of CLIL has gained momentum throughout the world, researchers, educators, and other stakeholders in Japan have started paying attention to this framework, using it to name their content- or theme-based language curricula, programs, and classrooms. Accordingly, the term CLIL has been used extensively in various levels of education in Japan since the early 2010s. However, it is important to note that in Japan CLIL is currently used primarily in foreign language (English) classes (and therefore among language teachers and researchers) and not in content classes as originally intended.

Sophia University is in the forefront as a center for CLIL implementation in this country. Makoto Ikeda, an advocate of CLIL, has devoted himself to designing a systematic CLIL curriculum at this university. Sophia University offers a module on CLIL as part of its 2-year master’s program in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (Ikeda, Pinner, Mehisto, & Marsh, 2013). Sophia’s CLIL course is theoretically underpinned by the

framework's original assumptions: "(i) CLIL should be run by content specialists in subject-matter education and (ii) it is timetabled as content lessons, while the target language normally continues as a subject in its own right in the shape of foreign language classes taught by language specialists" (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013, p. 546). In accordance with this prototypical CLIL form, attempts have been made by other researchers in Japan to develop content-oriented CLIL courses in Japanese universities, such as the 4-year Global Business CLIL course introduced by Paydon et al. (2015) and the one-semester International Economics CLIL course developed by Iyobe and Li (2013).

On the other hand, CLIL approaches have been adopted in language-oriented courses in various Japanese universities, mainly within EAP programs or in classes taught by EAP teachers. One such example is Santos (2013), who described a one-semester CLIL-based academic listening course in which different subjects such as anthropology, history, and sociology are integrated with listening activities to ensure that students can develop both content knowledge and the ability to understand academic lectures. Likewise, Brown (2013) demonstrated how he designed a two-semester sequence of health care English courses for medical students so they can learn medical English vocabulary and doctor-patient communication.

The presence of CLIL can also be found at the secondary level in Japan. For example, Clark (2013) presented a 16-week content-oriented CLIL module embedded within the home economics curriculum at a lower secondary school. The CLIL module was developed through collaboration between a home economics teacher and a language teacher so that a balance between content and language could be achieved. However, Clark reflected on the difficulties she encountered in designing and implementing the course and surmised that the students misconstrued the goal of the course and studied only the language and not the CLIL content. She also outlined the difficulties in measuring gains in content and language knowledge appropriately. Ikeda (2013) detailed a language-driven CLIL course for secondary school students in Japan that was implemented by the teachers who were trained by the researcher in CLIL methodology. The 35-week language-oriented CLIL course was designed so that students gave equal priority to both content (global issues) and language (English knowledge and skills). Interestingly, the year-end evaluation questionnaire revealed that most of the students felt that their learning experience in the CLIL course was denser than in regular English lessons. The CLIL students' written assignments also showed substantial improvement during the year with regard to fluency, lexical di-

versity, and lexical sophistication. These learning outcomes imply that CLIL could work successfully in Japan if the classes are designed and taught by fully trained CLIL teachers.

CLIL has also begun to emerge as a promising framework for developing elementary school EFL curricula. This is mainly the consequence of the recent reform of the national guidelines for Japanese elementary school English education. Compulsory English education at the elementary school level in Japan was officially instituted in April 2011 by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). Teachers have since been searching for appropriate methods to teach English to fifth- and sixth-graders. Furthermore, this drive has been fueled by MEXT's decision to make English a formal elementary-school subject starting in 2020. Under these circumstances, attention to CLIL is understandable considering that the guidelines for Japanese elementary school English education advocate that instructions in class should be linked to several other subjects so as to promote elementary school students' interest in English (MEXT, 2009). Yamano (2013a, 2013b) conducted one of the few empirical studies on CLIL implementation at a Japanese elementary school. To identify the effect of 15-week CLIL lessons, Yamano compared two groups of fifth graders: those learning English in CLIL where English was used as a medium for learning subject matter and those in a non-CLIL class in which the target language was taught as the main focus. Her results revealed that CLIL students were more likely to show higher awareness of global issues than their non-CLIL counterparts, and fostering a more positive attitude toward learning English ultimately accelerated vocabulary learning among students.

In general, the literature on CLIL in Japan thus far highlights the possibility that CLIL can play a role in positively influencing the current English language situation in Japan. Many of these CLIL studies have been conducted in university EFL education, and there is a paucity of research on CLIL in secondary and elementary schools, probably because CLIL researchers are generally involved in university education and thus collect data from their own institutions. However, even among university CLIL researchers, a shared understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of CLIL has yet to be established. In particular, it is problematic that the acronym CLIL is often used as a synonym for CBI, EAP, or EMI to name academic English courses. This suggests that CLIL is not understood properly or widely accepted in the applied linguistics circle in Japan. It further stresses the reality that, "if CLIL in Europe is a toddler, CLIL in Japan is a new-born baby" (Ikeda et al., 2013, p. 1). Under these circumstances, where researchers and educators

conceptualize CLIL in different ways, it is still too early for us to accept generalizations about CLIL outcomes based on the available evidence. To enhance a shared understanding of CLIL and to ensure researchers and educators in this country are able to apply this framework in Japanese EFL contexts, the exact nature of CLIL is reconsidered in the next section with a focus on the fundamental questions: What does it really mean to integrate content and language, and why is integrating content and language necessary in the first place?

### **Concluding Discussion: Integration as an Essential Tool for “Inquiry”**

As noted earlier, what must not be overlooked in labeling a course as CLIL is that CLIL is not a mere language-learning methodology, but an educational framework for facilitating the concurrent development of cognitive and language abilities through a fusion of content and language learning. I have employed the term “cognitive” because cognitive development plays the key role in promoting learning of all subjects and cannot be separated from content and language learning. Cognition can be developed through experiential learning; this is highlighted by Kolb’s (1984) well-known quote: “Learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (p. 38). From this perspective, it can be argued that linking the language with content that engenders students’ interests may enrich experiential learning and lead to the enhancement of both language and content knowledge, and beyond that, it may facilitate metalinguistic awareness, motivation, global awareness, and self-confidence. It is for this reason that CLIL professionals in Europe have proposed an array of additional goals of CLIL: “cultural awareness, cognitive advantages, deeper content learning, internationalization, self-confidence, motivation, pluriliteracy, learner autonomy and others” (Dalton-Puffer & Smit, 2013, p. 547). These extensive goals can also be exemplified by the often-cited 4Cs model of CLIL: content, communication, cognition, and community/culture (Coyle, 2007; Coyle et al., 2010).

In conclusion, it can be argued that the mere integration of meaningful content into the foreign language curriculum is not enough to ensure that the learning experience will be cognitively engaging and motivating to learners. More than just integrating content and language, inquiry should take place as the primary focus in the CLIL classroom because its goal is the concurrent development of content, language knowledge, and beyond: It is not the integration per se, but the context in which the learners are situated that has the largest influence on their increased inquiry. Cammarata (2016)

succinctly defined the context thus: “the act of questioning and the relentless search for answers to important questions that require deeper forms of thinking” (p. 124).

Takano et al.’s study (2016) offers a suggestion for supporting inquiry-oriented CLIL in the language classroom. The authors proposed that to enhance elementary students’ inquiry in CLIL classes, questions such as “How many chairs in this room?” may be cognitively less demanding, whereas questions such as “How many planets in our solar system?” may be more cognitively demanding. This may result in deeper thinking by pupils while helping them to learn the language and the subject matter concurrently. Takano et al. also stressed that expressions such as “It’s a piano” and “It’s a cube” are the same in terms of sentence structure, but are different cognitively if the former sentence is prompted by a simple picture description question and the latter by a more cognitively difficult math question, requiring pupils to think about a complete shape based on the development of a cube. These example prompts suggest that CLIL classrooms, if guided appropriately, can enhance students’ inquiry and, accordingly, lead to the concurrent learning of content and language. Within this paradigm, the integration of language and content in instruction is not simply desirable, but should be viewed as essential, indeed inevitable, to make foreign language education successful. CLIL is a good starting point for teachers and educators to make inquiry happen in the classroom.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) No. 985910.

**Sachiko Yasuda** is an Associate Professor in the School of Languages and Communication at Kobe University, Japan. She received her PhD in Second Language Studies from the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa. Her research is in the area of second language writing, systemic functional linguistics, and foreign language pedagogy and assessment through CLIL, task-based language teaching, and genre-based approaches.

## References

- Adrián, M. M., & Mangado, M. J. G. (2009). The acquisition of English syntax by CLIL learners in the Basque country. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe* (pp. 176-196). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675-013>

- Agustín Llach, M. P., & Jiménez Catalán, R. M. (2007). Lexical reiteration in EFL young learners' essays: Does it relate to the type of instruction? *International Journal of English Studies*, 7(2), 85-103.
- Bialystok, E. (2001). Metalinguistic aspects of bilingual processing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 169-181.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000101>
- Bialystok, E. (2007). Acquisition of literacy in bilingual children: A framework for research. *Language Learning*, 57, 45-77.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00412.x>
- Bialystok, E., Peets, K. F., & Moreno, S. (2014). Producing bilinguals through immersion education: Development of metalinguistic awareness. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 35, 177-191. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716412000288>
- Brown, P. S. (2013). Teaching a medical English CLIL course with vocabulary learning strategies instruction in Japan. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15, 275-304. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7621/monthly-journals/teaching-a-medical-english-clil-course-with-vocabulary-learning-strategies-instruction-in-japan/>
- Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2017). EMI, CLIL, & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in language education* (pp. 328-334). Tokyo: JALT. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/node/4/articles/6058-emi-clil-cbi-differing-approaches-and-goals>
- Cammarata, L. (2016). Foreign language education and the development of inquiry-driven language programs: Key challenges and curricular planning strategies. In L. Cammarata (Ed.), *Content-based foreign language teaching: Curriculum and pedagogy for developing advanced thinking and literacy skills* (pp. 123-146). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203850497>
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 243-262.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011>
- Clark, G. (2013). Snapshot of a lower secondary CLIL program in Japan. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15(4), 382-393. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7641/volume-15-issue-4/snapshot-of-a-lower-secondary-clil-program-in-japan/>
- Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Toward a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 543-562. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb459.0>

- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182-204.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092>
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010). Charting policies, premises, and research on content and language integrated learning. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 1-19). <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.7.01dal>
- Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 46, 545-559.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000256>
- DeKeyser, R. (2007). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667275>
- Gajo, L. (2007). Linguistic knowledge and subject knowledge: How does bilingualism contribute to subject development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 563-581. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb460.0>
- García, A. L., & Whittaker, R. (2010). Writing and speaking in the history class: A comparative analysis of CLIL and first language contexts. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 126-143). <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.7.07lli>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London, England: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1996). Literacy and linguistics: A functional perspective. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 339-376). London, England: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1998). Things and relations: Regrammaticising experience as technical knowledge. In J. R. Martin & R. Veel (Eds.), *Reading science: Critical and functional perspectives on discourses of science* (pp. 185-235). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hermanto, N., Moreno, S., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Linguistic and metalinguistic outcomes of intense immersion education: How bilingual? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15, 131-145.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.652591>
- Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 1-12.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(02\)00002-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(02)00002-4)

- Ikeda, M. (2013). Does CLIL work for Japanese secondary school students? Potential for the 'Weak' Version of CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 2(1), 31-43. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/21/article3.html>
- Ikeda, M. (2016). CLIL focus: An interview with Professor Makoto Ikeda (interviewed by L. MacGregor). *The Language Teacher*, 40(1), 18-21. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/4965-clil-focus-interview-professor-makoto-ikeda>
- Ikeda, M., Pinner, R., Mehisto, P., & Marsh, D. (2013). Editorial. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 2(1), 1-2. Retrieved from <https://www.icrj.eu/21/editorial.html>
- Iyobe, B., & Li, J. (2013). CLIL to what degree: A trial in English medium education at a Japanese university—Is it CLIL or not? *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15(4), 372-381. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7640/volume-15-issue-4/clil-to-what-degree-a-trial-in-english-medium-education-at-a-japanese-university-is-it-clil-or-not/#squelch-taas-tab-content-0-3>
- Jaekel, N., Schurig, M., Florian, M., & Ritter, M. (2017). From early starters to later finishers? A longitudinal study of early foreign language learning in school. *Language Learning*, 67, 631-664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12242>
- Jäppinen, A.-N. (2005). Thinking and content learning of mathematics and science as cognitional development in content and language integrated learning (CLIL): Teaching through a foreign language in Finland. *Language & Education*, 19, 148-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780508668671>
- Jexenflicker, S., & Dalton-Puffer, C. (2010). The CLIL differential: Comparing the writing of CLIL and non-CLIL students in higher colleges of technology. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 169-189). <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.7.09jex>
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (Vol. 1). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lo, Y. Y., & Murphy, V. A. (2010). Vocabulary knowledge and growth in immersion and regular language learning programmes in Hong Kong. *Language & Education*, 24, 215-238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780903576125>
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York, NY: Academic Press.



- Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., Moore, P. (2009). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 418-442.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp041>
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching language through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.18>
- MacGregor, L. (2016). CLIL in Japan: University teachers' viewpoints. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Focus on the learner* (pp. 426-432). Tokyo: JALT. Retrieved from <http://jalt-publications.org/node/4/articles/5419-clil-japan-university-teachers%E2%80%99-viewpoints>
- Marsh, D. (Ed.) (2002). *CLIL/EMILE - The European dimension: Actions, trends and foresight potential*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- MEXT (2009). *Elementary school Course of Study guidelines: Foreign language activities*. Retrieved from [http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a\\_menu/education/micro\\_detail/\\_icsFiles/afieldfile/2010/10/20/1261037\\_12.pdf](http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2010/10/20/1261037_12.pdf)
- Meyer, O., Coyle, D., Halbach, A., Schuck, K., & Ting, T. (2015). A pluriliteracies approach to content and language integrated learning: Mapping learner progressions in knowledge construction and meaning making. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 28, 41-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.1000924>
- Moreno, S. (2009). Young learners' L2 word association response in two different learning contexts. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe* (pp. 93-111). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675>
- Nikula, T., Dalton-Puffer, C., Llinares, A. & Lorenzo, F. (2016). More than content and language: The complexity of integration in CLIL and bilingual education. In T. Nikula, E. Dafouz, P. Moore, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education* (pp. 1-26). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096145-004>
- Paydon, S. A., Birchley, S. L., & McCasland, P. L. (2015). Demystifying current trends in language education. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *JALT2014 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 34-47). Tokyo: JALT. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/proceedings/articles/4690-demystifying-current-trends-language-education>
- Roquet, H., & Pérez-Vidal, C. (2015). Do productive skills improve in content and language integrated learning contexts? The case of writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 38, 489-511. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv050>

- Santos, P. (2013). Learning through in-house videos: How one Japanese college integrates subject content in its EAP program. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15(4), 324-329. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7626/volume-15-issue-4/learning-through-in-house-videos-how-one-japanese-college-integrates-subject-content-in-its-eap-program/>
- Surmont, J., Struys, E., Van den Noort, M., & Van den Craen, P. (2016). The effects of CLIL on mathematical content learning: A longitudinal study. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6, 319-337. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.2.7>
- Takano, N., Kambara, J., Kedoin, E., & Suzuki, Y. (2016). 小学校英語にCBI/CLILを:メリットとコツ [CBI/CLIL for elementary school English: Benefits and tips]. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Focus on the learner*. Tokyo: JALT. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/node/4/articles/5371-cbiclil-elementary-school-english-benefits-and-tips-小学校英語にcbicililを:メリットとコツ>
- Ting, Y.-L. T. (2010). CLIL appeals to how the brain likes its information: Examples from CLIL-(neuro)science. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(3), 3-18. Retrieved from <https://www.icrj.eu/13/article1.html>
- Toh, G. (2013). Towards a critically and dialogically mediated EAP. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15(4), 212-230. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7615/monthly-journals/towards-a-critically-and-dialogically-mediated-eap/#squelch-taas-tab-content-0-3>
- Unterberger, B. (2014). *English-medium degree programmes in Austrian tertiary business studies: Policies and programme design* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Vienna, Austria.
- Van de Craen, P., Ceuleers, E., & Mondt, K. (2007). Cognitive development and bilingualism in primary schools: Teaching maths in a CLIL environment. In D. Marsh & D. Wolff (Eds.), *Diverse contexts—Converging goals. CLIL in Europe* (pp. 185-200). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Villarreal Olaizola, I., & García Mayo, M. P. (2009). Tense and agreement morphology in the interlanguage of Basque/Spanish bilinguals. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & R. M. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe* (pp. 157-175). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691675>
- Walker, E. (2010). Evaluation of a support intervention for senior secondary school English immersion. *System*, 38, 50-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.005>
- Watanabe, Y., Ikeda, M., & Izumi, S. (Eds.). (2011). *CLIL: New challenges in foreign language education* (Vol. 1). Tokyo: Sophia University Press.

- Watanabe, Y., Ikeda, M., & Izumi, S. (Eds.). (2012). *CLIL: New challenges in foreign language education* (Vol. 2). Tokyo: Sophia University Press.
- Wei, R. (2013). Chinese-English bilingual education in China: Model, momentum, and driving forces. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15(4), 184-200. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7611/monthly-journals/chinese-english-bilingual-education-in-china-model-momentum-and-driving-forces/#sqelch-taas-tab-content-0-0>
- Yamano, Y. (2013a). CLIL in a Japanese primary school: Exploring the potential of CLIL in a Japanese EFL context. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 2(1), 19-30. Retrieved from <https://www.icrj.eu/21/article2.html>
- Yamano, Y. (2013b). Using the CLIL approach in a Japanese primary school: A comparative study of CLIL and EFL lessons. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15(4), 160-183. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7609/main-journals/utilizing-the-clil-approach-in-a-japanese-primary-school-a-comparative-study-of-clil-and-efl-lessons/#sqelch-taas-tab-content-0-0>
- Yang, M., & Zhang, Z. (2013). Development of academic competencies as the learning objectives of an English-medicine integrated common-core module. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 15(4), 395-405. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/7642/volume-15-issue-4/development-of-academic-competencies-as-the-learning-objectives-of-an-english-medicine-integrated-common-core-module/#sqelch-taas-tab-content-0-3>
- Yasuda, S. (2017). Towards a framework for linking linguistic knowledge and writing expertise: Interplay between SFL-based genre pedagogy and task-based language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51, 576-606. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.383>

# Reviews

***Autonomous Language Learning With Technology: Beyond the Classroom.*** Chun Lai. London, England: Bloomsbury, 2017. viii + 228 pp.

*Reviewed by*

Kevin Ballou

Kwansei Gakuin University

The influence of technology on the field of language education over the past decade is undeniable, and language educators and researchers alike need to understand the nature of this influence if they are to adapt to rapidly changing educational contexts. A great deal of research in this area has focused on the use of technology in the language classroom with the goal of guiding teachers and curriculum developers as they seek to make the best use of the wide range of digital tools available. *Autonomous Language Learning With Technology Beyond the Classroom* by Chun Lai is a new volume in the “Advances in Digital Language Learning and Teaching” series edited by Michael Thomas, Mark Peterson, and Mark Warschauer that offers a thorough overview of an area that has received far less attention: the use of technology by language learners outside the classroom. The author has divided the topic of autonomous language learning with technology beyond the classroom into three parts: understanding, promoting, and researching.

In Part I, “Understanding Out-of-Class Autonomous Language Learning With Technology,” Lai begins by describing key concepts related to the themes covered in the book. Chapter 1 provides an in-depth review of the literature relevant to a discussion of autonomous language learning, including the nature, sociality, and teachability of autonomy. Rather than simply paraphrasing a list of works and schools of thought, Lai brings together various points of view into an accessible diagram (Figure 1.1) to help the reader visualize the concepts described. Of particular use to those new to this area of research is an explanation of the relationship of various related

terms connected to autonomous learning (Table 1.1), such as self-directed learning, agency, and informal learning.

After this overview of key terms, Lai moves on to related background and theory. In Chapter 2, the reader can find an extensive review of the literature at the crossroads of the fields of autonomy and technology and how they both relate to learning in general and language learning in particular. Lai sheds light on various conceptual frameworks, giving a clear explanation of each author's model or contribution to the understanding of these complex ideas. One especially topical section describes Wong's (2012) learner-centric view of mobile seamless learning, a model that seeks to categorize and explain various social, educational, and spatial factors that influence mobile-assisted learning.

For those interested in research in the current use of digital tools by learners, Chapter 3 provides a detailed overview of studies from Europe, North America, and Asia that have reported on autonomous language learning with technology outside the classroom. The studies show a wide range of types of out-of-class activities, such as watching English language movies and television programs, interacting with English speakers on social media, and using language-learning applications on mobile devices. Despite this diverse collection of data, Lai manages to identify certain trends and evaluates these trends through a theoretical framework where she seeks to define different aspects of autonomous language learning, provide guidance on effective language learning contexts, and interpret language learning environments from a sociocultural perspective. As in other chapters, Lai synthesizes the studies reviewed in a clear diagram (Figure 3.1).

Lai rounds out Part I with arguably the most important chapter of the book: "Factors that Affect Out-of-Class Autonomous Language Learning with Technology." Chapter 4 is significant not only because of its direct application for educators seeking to maximize their students' language learning outside the classroom, but also because this is the area that is most informed by Lai's own research (see Lai, 2015a; Lai, 2015b; Lai & Gu, 2011; Lai, Wang, & Lei, 2012; Lai, Zhu, & Gong, 2015), which sheds light on the role of parents and teachers in influencing students' use of digital tools outside the classroom. The first section of Chapter 4 covers internal factors that affect learners, including gender, proficiency, level, learning beliefs, and preferences. This is followed by a description of external factors, such as social influence on learners, institutional expectations, and features of technological resources available to learners. After looking at both internal and external factors, Lai covers the interplay of these two as-

pects, concluding the chapter with several more diagrams taken from her studies that help readers put together these complex factors into visual representations (see Figures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3).

Part II, "Promoting Out-of-Class Autonomous Language Learning with Technology," covers three areas: learner training (Chapter 5), teachers' role (Chapter 6), and resource and environment design (Chapter 6). Lai begins Chapter 5 with a description of learners' own perceptions of the value of out-of-class language learning. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Lai found that learners see learning beyond the classroom as essential. However, many classroom teachers may be interested to discover it is also reported that learners generally see themselves as being primarily responsible for exploring the use of technology outside the classroom with their teachers providing support, such as recommendations and strategies for using new and effective resources. Lai moves from this realization to offer guidelines for educators who want to support autonomous learning with technology, covering different aspects of this effort as well as how these recommendations may be combined most effectively.

The teacher taking a role in autonomous learning may seem like a contradiction, but Chapter 6 lays out a process for doing just that. According to Lai's recommendations, which are drawn from a range of studies from the fields of education, technology, and language learning, teachers can use in-class curriculum, counselling, and advising to support and reinforce learners' own self-directed language study with technology. She does point out, though, that teachers themselves often create barriers to learner autonomy through their own reluctance to relinquish control. The description of a teacher's role in promoting autonomy in Chapter 7 is completed with a discussion of the resources and environment design that would best contribute to learners' autonomous language learning in Chapter 8. Chapter 7, the last chapter of Part II, may be of particular interest to educators and administrators who are setting up or attempting to improve their self-access center or multimedia library.

After the thorough overview in Part II of the topic of autonomous language learning with technology and guidelines for promoting such learning, Lai moves on to Part III, "Researching Out-of-Class Autonomous Language Learning with Technology." Chapter 8 categorizes the relevant studies that have been carried out, while also providing a framework for future research, and Chapter 9 highlights areas in need of more research. In particular, Lai points out the lack of longitudinal studies that look at changes in learners' use of digital tools over time. In addition, she claims that a deeper and

more dynamic view of learners' use of technology would provide valuable insights for the field. For example, there is a lack of research on the relationships between different technologies as used in overlapping or distinct spaces and contexts. Furthermore, researchers need to take into account the ever-shifting nature of digital resources and learners' use of them. The final chapter sums up the research landscape with one last illuminating diagram that would be of use to anyone looking to orient their next research project in this area (p. 191).

At a time when digital technology is becoming seamlessly integrated into our lives and the lives of our students, Chun Lai has provided a very thorough overview of the interaction of technology with language learners' autonomous learning along with plenty of guidance for both educators and researchers. This book will be a valuable resource for those looking to learn more about how students are making use of technology outside the classroom, as well as how educators and researchers can contribute to this important aspect of language study.

## References

- Lai, C. (2015a). Perceiving and traversing in-class and out-of-class learning: Accounts from foreign language learners in Hong Kong. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 9, 265-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2014.918982>
- Lai, C. (2015b). Modeling teachers' influence on learners' self-directed use of technology for language learning outside the classroom. *Computers & Education*, 82, 74-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.11.005>
- Lai, C., & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24, 317-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.568417>
- Lai, C., Wang, Q., & Lei, J. (2012). What factors predict undergraduate students' use of technology for learning? A case from Hong Kong. *Computers & Education*, 59, 569-579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.03.006>
- Lai, C., Zhu, W., & Gong, G. (2015). Understanding the quality of out-of-class English learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49, 278-308. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.171>
- Wong, L.-H. (2012). A learner-centric view of mobile seamless learning. *British Journal of Education Technology*, 43, E19-E23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01245.x>



***Language Teacher Psychology*. Sarah Mercer and Achilleas Kostoulas (Eds.). Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters, 2018. xxii + 341 pp.**

*Reviewed by*

Brian Cullen

Nagoya Institute of Technology

*Language Teacher Psychology* is an edited collection that aims to generate a greater interest in and awareness of language teacher psychology in both empirical and practical terms. The book successfully achieves this goal, helping to highlight the value and importance of language teachers and their criticality for effective language learning. The collection includes contributions from a wide range of contexts and backgrounds from around the world including Armenia, Pakistan, Finland, China, Japan, and the United States, and thus facilitates the rich development and wide applicability of key psychological constructs. While readers may find it difficult to relate all of the aspects covered to their own local teaching environment, this variety of contexts achieves the editors' goal of raising interest in language teacher psychology within ESL internationally.

The early chapters are quite heavy with the discussion of theoretical constructs but do serve the useful purpose of creating a body of shared terminology, knowledge, and understanding that can act as a foundation for further debate on a more informed basis. This foregrounding also makes the empirical research of the later chapters much easier to follow. Overall, the book does provide a good balance between research to understand language teacher psychology and empirically informed interventions that can help to empower and support teachers. The editors have done a good job of transforming these disparate contexts and approaches into a coherent volume by adding useful cross-references that show how the constructs and examples of various chapters work together to enhance our overall understanding of language teaching psychology.

In Chapter 1, Sarah Mercer and Achilleas Kostoulas set a roadmap and put the focus clearly on the language teacher with a quote from Ken Robinson (2013, April): "There is no system in the world or any school in the country that is better than its teachers. Teachers are the lifeblood of the success of schools" (6:58). The book aims to extend our understanding of the psychology of teachers because they are centrally important in language learning,

and all stakeholders connected to ESL can benefit from a more comprehensive understanding of teachers' behaviors, emotions, motivations, cognition, and other related constructs. The emerging research into teacher language psychology introduced in the book aims to ultimately inform the wider field of language teaching in order to support teachers to be in a more positive and effective state, so that these teachers will not only enjoy their jobs more, but will also do their jobs better, with more creativity and enhanced pedagogical skills. The laying of theoretical groundwork is continued in Chapter 2 where Phil Hiver, Tae-Young Kim, and Youngmi Kim focus on language teacher motivation by discussing what motivates teachers to enter the profession, what motivates them in the classroom, and how teacher motivation influences learner performance. Chapters 3 and 4 continue with the theoretical underpinnings, with a focus on motivation and the contributions of different theories such as goal achievement theory, self-efficacy theory, self-determination theory, and ideal and ought-to self.

Manka M. Varghese (Chapter 5) explores language teacher identity and its connections to teacher education while widening the field by drawing on the constructs of cultural models and figured worlds. In cultural models, teacher identity is seen as culturally formed cognitive schema that is largely shared within a cultural group. Figured worlds look at identity construction as a narrative or story line within which social identities and relationships are continually negotiated, a socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular actors are recognized, certain acts are assigned significance, and particular outcomes are valued over others. In Chapter 6, Wendy Li and Peter I. De Costa take up identity development in novice EFL teachers, a target group explored more fully in the review by Samar Kassim of *Reflecting on Critical Incidents in Language Education: 40 Dilemmas for Novice TESOL Professionals* later in this volume.

In Chapter 7, Anne Feryok explores language teacher cognition (what teachers think, believe, and know) as a self-organizing emergent phenomenon. In other words, a higher system emerges which is more than the sum of its parts. Other chapters cover additional valuable constructs such as self-efficacy (Chapter 8), teacher emotions (Chapter 9), beliefs and practices of competent language teachers (Chapter 10), teacher attitudes (Chapter 11), language teacher agency (Chapter 12), and teacher resilience (Chapters 14 and 15).

I found four chapters near the end of the book to be of most interest. Chapter 13 by Joseph Falout and Tim Murphey on the topic of "job crafting" is influenced by positive psychology. Job crafting happens when people

make alterations in the conventional tasks, relationships, and roles involved with their work so that it becomes more meaningful to them. In their study, the researchers asked teachers to report on how they created meaning in their professional role, and these data were used to define four teacher roles (Navigators, Transformers, Nurturers, and Wonderers) to describe how teachers seemed to conceptualize themselves. In the second phase of the study, these roles were looped back to teachers, who were then asked to reflect on the extent to which they identified with them. This interactive study offered a powerful way for teachers to exert control on their professional well-being and provides a good example of how psychological research can connect directly and usefully with teachers. In Chapter 16, Tammy Gregersen and Peter D. MacIntyre also draw on positive psychology and offer interesting examples to show how signature strengths can be used as a tool to structure mentor-mentee interactions. Chapter 17 by Rebecca L. Oxford, Andrew D. Cohen, and Virginia G. Simmons is a fascinating insight into the lives and perspectives of third age teacher trainers (TATEs), described as relatively healthy “young-old” people who have gone through the first age of life (education) and the second age (employment) and are now retired, while still feeling energy, purpose, and well-being. This is a very readable chapter in which the authors use narratives to analyze themselves as TATEs in the language field, showing that they have strong experience and knowledge, good emotional regulation, and are open to new possibilities while also recognizing emerging health issues.

In Chapter 18, Mehvish Saleem takes a more holistic approach towards the exploration of language teacher psychology, which is refreshingly different from the many distinct psychological constructs that were analyzed separately in most of the other chapters. Although there is no doubt that enhanced understanding of individual constructs such as self-efficacy or motivation is useful, ultimately it is how they work together to produce language teacher psychology in real situations that is going to be of most practical interest to teachers, teacher educators, administrators, and other stakeholders.

Overall, *Language Teacher Psychology* demonstrates successfully that a teacher-centered approach within the field of psychology of language learning deserves further attention at both a theoretical and empirical level, recognizing the value of studying psychological constructs as isolated entities, while ultimately providing more holistic, emergent, and situated approaches, which add practical insight to the subject.

## References

- Robinson, K. (2013, April). *How to escape education's death valley* [Video file]. Retrieved from [https://www.ted.com/talks/ken\\_robinson\\_how\\_to\\_escape\\_education\\_s\\_death\\_valley](https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_how_to_escape_education_s_death_valley)

***English-Medium Instruction in Japanese Higher Education: Policy, Challenges and Outcomes.* Annette Bradford and Howard Brown (Eds.). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters, 2018. xxiii + 300 pp.**

*Reviewed by*  
Imogen Custance  
Kwansei Gakuin University

As English has increasingly come to be used as a lingua franca, greater emphasis has been placed on developing advanced English skills that can assist learners beyond the realm of formal education. This necessitates language education that goes beyond the learning of discrete points of linguistic knowledge and helps learners to recognize English as a medium through which knowledge can be gained and viewpoints explored. One way in which this objective has been operationalized is through English-medium instruction (EMI). The move towards greater use of EMI in higher education circles in non-English speaking countries is noteworthy, and this volume details the policies and issues that have had an effect on the implementation of EMI across Japan. It is of potential use to any institutions that are looking to create EMI programs and even those who have already implemented EMI.

The 18 book chapters are divided into six parts, which make finding materials relevant to a particular reader much easier. To consider how the introduction of EMI could affect students at their institution, readers can easily turn to Part 4, "The Student and Faculty Experience." Program coordinators might be more interested in Parts 2, 3, and 5 on the implementation, challenges and solutions, and curriculum contexts respectively. Collectively, the parts contribute to an overview of EMI in Japan, but they are not built on each other in a way that would make skipping any individual part confusing.

Part 1 situates EMI within the Japanese context and provides a good overview of the governmental policies that have had an effect on the de-

velopment of EMI and English-taught programs (ETPs, in which students can complete a degree through English-taught classes alone) at Japanese universities. In the first chapter, Bradford and Brown use Dafouz and Smit's (2014) *ROAD-MAPPING* framework to help establish the level to which EMI has progressed in Japan. The *ROAD-MAPPING* acronym refers to *roles of English* (RO), *academic disciplines* (AD), *(language) management* (M), *agents* (A), *practices and processes* (PP), and *internationalization and glocalization* (ING), and the explanations of each element do well to set up the context for the rest of the book. Both Hiroko Hashimoto (Chapter 2) and Bern Mulvey (Chapter 3) focus on how EMI has been influenced by MEXT directives, with a very clear demonstration of the ING component, which is concerned with how international and local forces drive decision making, described in the previous chapter.

Part 2, "The Implementation of English-Medium Instruction in Japan," only contains two chapters, but both are insightful. Hiroyuki Takagi considers how EMI can be used to further the internationalization of curricula (IoC), while in the second, Beverley Anne Yamato and Yukiko Ishikura give a detailed explanation of how an English-taught undergraduate program was developed at Osaka University. Takagi introduces his "conceptual framework of IoC" (2013) and uses this to explore the current situation of EMI and the potential directions that it could take. He uses two case studies of universities to clearly show how his framework can be applied to a university's endeavours to become more international and to highlight some of the challenges resulting from trying to increase internationalization through EMI. These challenges are echoed by Yamato and Ishikura. This fifth chapter in the book is likely to be particularly useful for institutions considering instigating their own EMI or ETP programs as the authors highlight not only the success of the program, but also the efforts required by all stakeholders.

Some of the ideas presented in previous chapters are built on in Part 3, where the focus is on implementation challenges. Gregory Poole argues quite successfully that there is a fundamental disconnect between the administrative systems presently in place at institutions and what MEXT and university leaders envision for the internationalization of higher education. Although at times the writing borders on becoming a rail against bureaucracy, there are also reasoned examples of how administrative practice hinders internationalization. This links well to the subsequent chapter by Hiroshi Ota and Kiyomi Horiuchi who look specifically at EMI program accessibility through examining international admissions procedures. They give a general overview of some of the difficulties in applying to study at Japanese universities

and then focus in more detail on the admission procedures for a sample of universities that offer ETPs. It is a very informative chapter and an interesting read for anyone who has ever wondered about what their international students have gone through in order to enter a university. Sarah Louisa Birchley highlights how increased attention to marketing when designing EMI programs might produce better results. Using both her personal experience as an administrator and instructor in Japan, along with marketing and higher education management research, she explains how examining course design from a marketing perspective can help produce a better EMI “product.” Each of the seven perspectives from which a product can be examined (product, price, place, promotion, people, physical facilities, and processes) is well-explained, along with how these ideas can be applied to EMI course development.

Though Part 4 focuses on the experiences of both students and faculty, I feel that Christopher G. Haswell’s examination of issues related to student perceptions of nonnative English (Chapter 9), and Juanita Heigham’s look at the role of international students (Chapter 10) raise issues that are of particular note. Much of the volume’s content focuses on government and university attempts to internationalize higher education through EMI, but these two chapters look at what that means for students in these types of programs in terms of issues relating to varieties of English, integration of international students into campus life, and administrative support for international students. Chapter 11 by Sae Shimauchi on gender differences in motivations towards and perceptions of international awareness is interesting, but less impactful when compared with some of the other chapters. Based on interviews with only 12 students enrolled on an EMI course, Shimauchi concludes that gender does not influence motivations for taking such courses. Bernard Susser’s chapter exploring his own “epiphany” with regard to teaching (viewing students as language users rather than language learners) is one that is likely to resonate with many teachers who have been asked to teach either through content-based instruction (CBI) or EMI. Susser explores some of the subtle distinctions that are important to make when the content, rather than language development, are the focus of a course, as is the case in EMI. In her chapter, Miki Horie provides a good summary of ways to improve intercultural learning in addition to highlighting the need for faculty development. The chapter is thought-provoking and the information provided about a 2008 publication in Japanese by Nakai [*Faculty Guide to Classroom English*] could be very useful for building common ground between colleagues.

Part 5 provides three examples of EMI and ETP curriculums at three institutions. Bethany Mueller Iyobe and Jia Li describe how EMI has been introduced at a small university where the majority of students are domestic and come from local schools. The way in which students are introduced to EMI in a gradual and highly supported manner is of particular note given the nature of the institution. The solid general reflections on the successes and challenges of the programme make this important reading. Jim McKinley highlights the need for students to be considered language users rather than learners if EMI is to be expanded successfully. In addition, he reiterates the need for linguistic support for weaker students. Nílson Kuniوشي and Harushige Nakakoji give an illuminating example of the logistical problems related to developing and implementing an ETP within a science and technology department, such as students gaining access to laboratories or needing to repeat. Together, these chapters provide a good insight into some of the EMI and ETP programs in operation.

The final part includes a chapter from Akira Kuwamura on the future of EMI in Japan and also acts as a useful summary of the book as a whole, with links made across sections and the different situations presented. In the last chapter, Bradford and Brown make extensive use of *Roadblocks on the Information Highways: The IT Revolution in Japan* (Bachnik, 2003) to present parallels between the introduction of IT in the 1990s and the current situation of EMI. From the business community pressing for more graduates with English language (computer) skills to a focus on the number of students taking EMI courses (computers available) rather than quality (usefulness), the parallels are apt and well-explained. The book ends on an almost pleading note, asking stakeholders not only to look to implement but fully integrate EMI into university culture if they want it to be successful.

The diverse range of contributors provides the volume with an excellent overview of the current status of and challenges facing EMI in Japanese higher education. Though the broad scope of the book means that any one individual might not find every section useful, every section will be of use to someone. Sharing the volume amongst relevant stakeholders might help encourage greater understanding of both the need to work together and the level of work that a successful EMI program requires.

## References

- Bachnik, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Roadblocks on the information highway: The IT revolution in Japanese education*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.



- Dafouz, E., & Smit, U. (2014). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 37, 397-415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu034>
- Nakai, T. (Ed.). (2008). 大学教育のための教室英語表現300 [Faculty guide to classroom English]. Tokyo: ALC.
- Takagi, H. (2013). The internationalization of curricula: The complexity and diversity of meaning in and beyond Japanese universities. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 4, 349-359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.820138>

***Reflecting on Critical Incidents in Language Education: 40 Dilemmas for Novice TESOL Professionals.* Thomas S. C. Farrell and Laura Baecher. London, England: Bloomsbury, 2017. vi + 163 pp.**

*Reviewed by*  
Samar Kassim  
Kyushu Sangyo University

The first year for a teacher just entering the classroom has been called one of the most critical points for professional development. It is a time filled with anxiety and challenges for new teachers. The “novice teacher,” as defined by Farrell (2012), is one who has completed a teacher education course and is still in their first three years of working in the English language classroom. This book centers around the novice teacher, showcasing the beliefs of authors Farrell and Baecher that preservice teaching courses focus more on educating teachers based on theory than teaching adequate practical skills on how to deal with the realities of teaching. This theory–practice divide puts these new teachers in a difficult position, and if they cannot manage to improve their teaching situation, many decide to leave the field (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). The authors have realized one way to circumvent this trend is for teacher education programs to better prepare future teachers for what they may face by employing reflective practices. Reflective practices allow teachers to think about and analyze the dilemmas in their professional life for the purpose of cementing their teaching theory.

These stories come from TESOL practitioners from all over the world who teach in a variety of teaching contexts ranging from young learners to adults. Each chapter follows a set format: (1) an introduction to the main theme; (2) a general inquiry question; (3) questions to prompt the reader to think more deeply about the inquiry question, the context of the issue the teacher faced, and how the teacher tried to problem-solve; (4) questions for the reader to reflect on whether they have faced a similar situation and how they had or would handle such a situation; and (5) how the teacher followed up after they attempted their solution. A list of suggestions to further explore the topic in the reader's classroom closes out each chapter.

Chapter 1 deals with creating a positive classroom community in the language classroom. It centers around four specific cases of critical incidents from novice teachers in fostering relationships with challenging students, confronting cultural tensions, establishing the teacher role with students, and promoting collaboration between classmates. As these are all issues that teachers are almost guaranteed to face, it was interesting to read about how different teachers handled these issues in contexts that ranged from a private international middle school in an EFL context to a culturally diverse high school class of students in an ESL context who cannot work together.

Chapter 2 is about curriculum development and features the following four main issues: working with mandated curricula, integrating content and language in an EFL elementary immersion school, aligning lessons to standards, and facing a lack of resources. Teacher preparation programs often focus on teaching methodology and on how to be a teacher while not touching how to handle when teachers are faced with administration duties and constraints that do not align with their teaching philosophies. The gap between teachers' and administrators' expectations prompts a discussion about how there should be more of a focus in teacher training programs regarding teachers and their relationship with education administration.

Chapter 3 is on teaching mixed-level/large classes. The issues addressed are planning for mixed-level classes, managing large classes, engaging lower proficiency students, and supporting preliterate students. Chapter 4 follows with classroom management. One dilemma featured a large high school class that would not stay on task. The novice teacher reflected on it and changed her teaching style into a student-centered style, where students had to use self-access material and took on more responsibility for their learning.

Integrating the four skills in a classroom can be a challenge for teachers, and thus, it is a huge plus that this book addresses various issues with teaching each skill. Chapter 5 contains a relatable story of students who were

too shy to perform speaking activities and how the teacher attempted to problem solve. Chapter 6 focuses on developing reading. With many schools pushing for the increase of independent extensive reading, it was helpful for me to read about a teacher who found a way to increase readership in her once reluctant class. Chapter 7 is about listening skills and features a Japanese teacher in Japan who realized her students were very bored with the passive listening style of her chosen textbook. She analyzed her critical incident and decided to supplement lessons with different types of media to stimulate the interest of the class. Chapter 8 outlines the development of writing skills with a memorable excerpt of a teacher having difficulty persuading students of the benefits of process writing. The students believed that only grammatical accuracy mattered and protested at having to write so many drafts of the same pieces of writing. The teacher struggled with convincing the class of the importance of the content in writing and how it can only be improved through revisions. These chapters offer deep insights into a variety of issues in teaching each respective skill and may inspire teachers to rethink of how they are teaching the four skills in their classrooms. The critical incidents in these chapters felt even more realistic for me because while the teachers tried their best to solve the dilemmas, it did not mean they were always successful or satisfied with the solutions.

In Chapter 9, the authors move on to the theme of addressing challenges in the workplace. The incidents in this chapter take on two issues very familiar to teachers in Japan, high-stakes testing and working in a team-teaching model, and two issues that have not received much attention, special needs and poverty. The last chapter, Chapter 10, introduces specific aspects of professional development. Working with a mentor teacher, understanding one's teaching context, establishing one's identity as a teacher, and developing one's language proficiency are the highlighted critical incidents. These last two chapters center on the many factors outside of teacher control that influence the classroom. TESOL professionals work in a multitude of settings that are constantly changing often with a stream of different students each year. It is valuable to explore how these factors can be problematic for teachers and think about how we can positively change a circumstance and improve upon ourselves.

As a novice TESOL professional, this book was a great read, not only because many of the problems described were so relatable, but also because it easily prompted me to reflect on how to potentially improve my own teaching. In particular, if there is an absence of guidance from other teachers, this

book will help the reader to recognize that there are other professionals who are struggling with similar issues and overcoming them.

## References

- Farrell, T. S. C. (2012). Novice-service language teacher development: Bridging the gap between preservice and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, 435-449. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.36>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 944-956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003>

***Second Language Testing for Student Evaluation and Classroom Research.* Greta Gorsuch and Dale T. Griffee. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2018. xix + 371 pp.**

*Reviewed by*

Brandon Kramer

Osaka Jogakuin University & Junior College

Language testing is an inescapable part of almost any language curriculum. Through its near ubiquitous influence on most courses of study, and even as the entire purpose for many students' English studies, language testing has, deservedly at times, earned somewhat of a bad reputation. In *Second Language Testing for Student Evaluation and Classroom Research*, much thought was given to addressing these concerns head on, encouraging teachers to learn more so that they can enact change and make better decisions using test results. Greta Gorsuch and Dale Griffee both earned their EdD degrees from Temple University Japan, and many of the points they make seem rooted in their experience teaching English as a Foreign Language. The book is very accessible. The authors try to position testing and the ideas that come with it, including discussions of validity and test statistics, in a way that not only allows teachers to understand the concepts but also see the relevance to their own contexts.

Although the book begins with a standard introduction to the history of testing, it is apparent from the start that this is a book made with a conscience, with the authors immediately arguing that we should use tests to

help those in need rather than to find and enable those who started with an advantage. Chapter 1 contains the basics of norm-referenced testing, which refer largely to the standardized tests EIKEN, TOEIC, TOEFL, and IELTS, which are popular with learners in Japan. These tests are designed to separate students by ability or serve as a gatekeeping metric to identify students judged to have a sufficient level of proficiency. It was particularly refreshing to see a discussion of test validation included in this chapter as well, with the salient disclaimer that tests themselves are never “valid,” but “rather, the question of validity is focused on *the interpretation that test consumers make based on the scores* [emphasis in the original]” (p. 12).

In Chapter 2, the authors’ efforts to explain ideas from the ground up with this book become clear as they move from defining basic terms such as *test item* to explaining the different item formats along with their unique considerations. An example of this is on page 26, where the authors advise ensuring item distractors (answer choices) for multiple choice questions are approximately the same length and recommend piloting test items with similar classes before their use. Although some of the rules of thumb provided here seem to lack explanation or justification, the practical focus of the book becomes clear and both novice and experienced test creators would likely find some useful advice within. In Chapter 3, the reader is guided through the process of developing one’s own tests while considering curriculum and course goals. This serves as an introduction to criterion-based testing and its role within a curriculum. In what is perhaps the most useful and important chapter for teachers and researchers new to testing, the authors outline the stages of test creation from construct operationalization to reporting on the test after administration. In Chapter 4, the authors seek to bridge the gap between theory and practice—or rather, the perceived gap between theory and practice. Positioning this book as one aimed for teachers who are not necessarily testing experts, they take great care in this chapter to explain why teachers should indeed care about theory in their daily teaching and testing. Chapter 5 is devoted to performance testing, which they define as a way for learners to demonstrate their language ability through a task or activity that they will likely need to perform in the future. These are, therefore, primarily measuring productive skills, and the authors discuss the creation of holistic and analytic scales to measure student success in addition to rater training, which is an important but easy to neglect part of language assessment.

In Chapters 6, 7, and 8 the authors start to dive into the measurement and statistical aspects of testing, beginning with scales, distributions, and

descriptive statistics, moving to a chapter on correlations and their uses, and then concluding with an introduction to reliability and dependability measures for norm- and criterion-referenced tests. Although whole books have been written on test validity (e.g., Markus & Borsboom, 2013), Gorsuch and Griffiee manage to squeeze in a good deal of important basics into Chapter 9, discussing the most common subcomponents of test validity without getting too philosophical. Washback from testing and its influence on teaching for the test, as well as test use, are included in this discussion, which finishes with a short description of what the test validation process looks like. Chapter 10 is focused on score cutoffs such as the assignment of letter grades based on specific score ranges (e.g., 91%-100% is often an A) or the decision to admit or reject students who are above or below a decided score, as is often the case with admissions tests in Japan. The ideas presented in this chapter are very important given the weight that these score cutoffs often have on our students' futures, either through entrance to university or as records of grades that stay with students throughout their schooling.

In Chapter 11, the authors challenge the reader by pointing out that there is often a mismatch between the assumptions teachers make about learning and the ways that they test knowledge. They suggest ideas to make tests more useful to learners by focusing on two topics, test effect and dynamic assessment. Test effect is the learning that takes place from the taking of tests and quizzes, and dynamic assessment is a growing field of testing which tries to measure not only what students have learned, but also what they "can do with assistance" (p. 275-276). In effect, both ideas stress that tests can be more than simply measurement tools—they can also aid in the learning itself. The authors conclude the book with Chapter 12, a shallow dip into how tests can be used in research, including some example studies.

One of the more unique features of this book is the glossary, which is full of not only statistics and testing vocabulary, but also common idioms and phrases used throughout which may otherwise be difficult for a learner of English reading the book. In addition, this book has an accompanying workbook available with review questions and activities that encourage those using this textbook to bridge the gap between theory and practice in their own contexts. Together, these books would serve as suitable class materials for graduate courses in a master's program and as resource materials for doctoral students looking specifically into testing and assessment.

The strength of *Second Language Testing for Student Evaluation and Classroom Research* is its frequent references to real teacher experiences, and its aim to make language testing principles accessible. The authors wrote

that they started their careers not particularly fond of tests, but over time begrudgingly acknowledged their necessity within language programs. It is easy to imagine this book was written to be the book they wish they had had when taking their testing classes early in their careers—indeed, in some ways, it is the book I wish I had had. The book is very teacher-centered, and it is apparent on every page that these authors still see themselves as teachers first and foremost. In most chapters of the book, they take the time to lay out step-by-step instructions on how to implement the ideas they introduce, helping those who may otherwise feel too overwhelmed to get started.

A weakness of this book could be that it is not comprehensive enough on its own to support the creation and maintenance of a language program. That is not the aim, however, as it seems much more appropriate as an introduction to language testing for graduate students or teachers in training. Readers looking to go to the next step may be interested in Carr's (2011) hands-on introduction to test design and analysis (including practice data sets) or Fulcher's (2010) more advanced introduction with in-depth discussions of topics such as item specifications and washback. Overall, however, in this book, Gorsuch and Griffie provide the necessary explanations and practical advice for teachers to get started and talk about testing principles using accurate and accepted vocabulary. It provides a modest degree of depth for those curious to learn more while focusing more directly on the immediate steps teachers need to take, and the issues they need to think about now in order to improve their approach to language testing.

## References

- Carr, N. T. (2011). *Designing and analyzing language tests*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical language testing*. London, England: Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/980203767399>
- Markus, K. A., & Borsboom, D. (2013). *Frontiers of test validity theory: Measurement, causation, and meaning*. New York, NY: Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203501207>



***Project-Based Language Learning With Technology: Learner Collaboration in an EFL Classroom in Japan.* Michael Thomas. New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. xi + 234 pp.**

*Reviewed by*

Kane Linton

St. Michael's International School

*Project-Based Language Learning With Technology: Learner Collaboration in an EFL Classroom in Japan* is an academic study highlighting the ways in which insights from technology-mediated project-based language learning (PBLL) research can contribute to the understanding of learner interaction. Furthermore, the research conducted by Thomas considers the role of technology in language learning more generally. PBLL is becoming widely used in schools and other educational settings, internationally and within Japan. Therefore, there is a growing need and demand for research that can provide reliable and contextually relevant analysis. This book is an attempt at filling this gap in research by focusing on lower ability learners of EFL within Japan.

The book contains seven chapters, covering a critical review of existing research about project and task-based learning, digital technologies, and foreign language learning. Chapter 1 offers an introduction to the use of technologies in teacher-mediated learning, covering computer-assisted language learning (CALL), task-based language teaching (TBLT), and PBLL. Chapter 2 establishes context for the book by presenting an overview of TBLT, the implementation of task-based approaches in Asia, and the ongoing implications for the development of PBLL in Asia. Chapter 3 takes a historical look at the development of computer-mediated communication through the rapid onset of globalization and how the outcome of these developments have ushered in the widespread acceptance of CALL as a useful tool to mediate language learning and associated anxiety. The chapter goes on to present a detailed look at the effects of ongoing research into CALL and the implications for PBLL in the future. Chapter 4 presents a literature review on CALL in Japan and explores the unique cultural and pedagogical context for English language education in Japan. As a part of this review, Thomas identified a gap relating to research on technology-mediated project-based language teaching with lower proficiency Japanese learners. Chapters 5 and 6 presents two classroom projects that were designed to investigate learner

collaboration in a technology-mediated EFL classroom environment with Japanese university students. These projects were undertaken expressly as part of the research for this book and provide the basis for the discussion in Chapter 7 on how PBLL can better support language learning in Japanese higher education.

The first project to be looked at in detail (the Podcast Project) is taken up in Chapter 5 and tracks three key themes through the implementation of the project: (1) learner anxiety, (2) learner agency and empowerment, and (3) the role of the instructor. Students were tasked with planning and collaborating with other students while utilizing a vast suite of technologies to develop a podcast. As part of this project, students were afforded a considerable amount of freedom in completing their tasks, the most effective of which being the use of smartphone technology. This led to a decrease in learner anxiety and an increase in learner empowerment, both of which are directly related to the use of smartphones in CALL methodologies (Kiernan & Aizawa, 2004).

In Chapter 6, for the second project (the Virtual World Project), Thomas reports on how Japanese students were able to adapt to the role of researcher. In this task, students utilized the 3D world of Second Life (SL), an online environment where individual player-controlled avatars are able to communicate with one another. Using the online avatar they created, students conducted a survey with other SL inhabitants. Students were required to engage in various tasks to complete their overall goal. They needed to design an avatar, familiarize themselves with how to navigate the avatar within the online world of SL, develop knowledge of the multimodal forms of SL communication available, and conduct surveys utilizing these forms of communication. In contrast to the first study, in the second study, there was a larger focus on the development of sociocultural communication skills, along with target language and digital literacy skills.

The research presented in this book leads to the recommendation of a necessity for reform in English language education in Japan, moving away from the favored method of high-stakes testing and moving towards more process-oriented approaches. Further to that point, the book states that Japanese foreign language education needs to consider an approach that is holistic and aimed at the personal and social development of learners by emphasizing the importance of learners' productive and creative skills.

My approach to reflecting on the themes raised as part of the book was to apply the pedagogical principles from the study in Chapter 6 in a classroom setting. I began by revising current in-class tasks to be more effectively

technologically focused, making effectual changes to the class output tasks and aligning technology with language-focused activities. By emulating the Virtual World Project on a smaller scale, I was able to observe that students can successfully incorporate the use of real-world processes, tasks, and tools in their research, design, and implementation of tasks. Furthermore, by making the course contextually authentic through the incorporation of relevant events outside of the school, students were more able to align their learning with problem-solving processes used in the real world. In the case of my classroom, we looked at the efficiency of the Kobe public transportation system and how to minimize delays during peak hours. In line with Ellis (2003), who states that there is a need to advance the development of task-based and project-based language teaching syllabi that are localized and personalized, it was noted that, during this project, students were more able to overcome learner anxiety by engaging in multimodal forms of communication.

Although the viewpoints this book raises are valid and specific to the Japanese context, I have a concern that the long-standing resistance to innovation in the Japanese education system will lead to inevitable constraints on the effectiveness of any prescribed reforms. Although this book does well in providing an achievable framework in certain educational contexts, I remain hesitant as to the efficacy of broader implementations of PBL or other CALL methodologies in response to SLA. Arguably, this resistance to moving away from authoritative pedagogical approaches is reliant upon what Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006) deem the superiority of teacher-based instruction.

In conclusion, this book provides an effective contribution to the ongoing debate about how educators are best able to integrate technology into the classroom and will be of particular interest to educators, researchers, and students in applied linguistics, CALL, TESOL, and especially those promoting task-based learning. Although focused primarily on the Japanese context, the findings contained within this book can have wide-ranging implications as a guideline for potential reform.

## References

- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

- Kiernan, P. J., & Aizawa, K. (2004). Cell phones in task based learning: Are cell phones useful language learning tools? *ReCALL*, 16, 71-84.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0958344004000618>
- Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41, 75-86. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1)

***Cognitive Grammar in Stylistics: A Practical Guide.* Marcello Giovanelli and Chloe Harrison. London, England: Bloomsbury, 2018. vii + 200 pp.**

*Reviewed by*

Stephen Pihlaja

Newman University Birmingham

*Cognitive Grammar in Stylistics* focuses on presenting Ronald Langacker's (1987, 2008) cognitive grammar to students doing linguistic studies of literature. In contrast to systemic functional (Halliday, 1973) and generative (Chomsky, 1959, 2013) grammars, cognitive grammar takes into account both the cognitive and functional elements of grammatical constructions. Although Langacker's presentation of cognitive grammar is notoriously difficult to read and understand, Giovanelli and Harrison are clear, concise, and efficient. They deftly show how a grammar can effectively take into account both cognitive and functional elements to produce holistic, elegant analyses. They also show how the connection between text production and the experience of the reader can be traced and explained using grammar. The book provides a very clear and effective case for the need to pay attention to both how grammar is organised conceptually in the mind and its effects in real-world settings with real people. Despite its rigour and depth, the book has an informal and conversational tone, making it easy to work through.

Each chapter takes a basic, practically-focused approach to the presentation of one of six key topics: conceptual semantics (meanings, schemas, encyclopaedic semantics, and domains), construal (specificity, scope, profiling, trajector-landmark, and vantage points), nouns and verbs (profiles and things/processes, noun and verb schemas, reference point models, and scanning), clauses (archetypal roles, profiling relationships, and clause

types), grounding (instantiation, grounding strategies, clausal grounding, and modality), and discourse (reference points, dominions and cohesion, current discourse space, and simulation). The chapters begin by introducing key terms and definitions, with reference to a variety of interesting examples from literature. The basic concepts of cognitive grammar are presented in a straightforward way. The examples make clear how the terminology can be useful in describing the choices authors make, and how the production of texts have a tangible, empirical effect on how readers experience texts. The presentation of analysis encourages readers to try for themselves and apply the concepts to their own chosen texts and experiences. Each chapter then includes an example of a longer analysis and suggestions for further reading, making it ideal for teachers and lecturers hoping to guide students to work on their own.

The book includes both descriptions of language in the mind and language in use, and the authors emphasise that language is an embodied phenomenon, rejecting a false dichotomy between studies of discourse and cognition. The book is full of illustrations and examples that help the reader visualise difficult concepts and better understand the processes of language use, from political posters that exemplify conceptual metaphors to simple stick figure drawings that further reinforce the book's informal, relaxed tone. Giovanelli and Harrison move seamlessly from constructed, simplified examples to authentic ones taken from literature, advertising, and conversation, showing how basic principles can be applied to texts that students will be engaging with throughout their studies.

A particularly good example of the ways in which the book presents a concept from cognitive grammar in an accessible way, is the chapter on construal, a key concept in cognitive linguistics. The description of construal gives the student a toolbox of words to describe concepts that many will already be implicitly familiar with from their experience of reading; that is, that some texts feel more subjective than others. Giovanelli and Harrison show how breaking down different sentences to investigate the way actions and scenes can be portrayed affects how users interact with texts and how objective and subjective perspectives are taken. These tools then allow students to move beyond impressionistic analysis of texts, thinking vaguely about how they feel when reading, to rich descriptions that make sense of those feelings.

The extent to which Giovanelli and Harrison do this in a seemingly effortless way cannot be overstated. I was consistently surprised at the clarity the book brought to concepts that I have found challenging in my teaching

for many years. *Cognitive Grammar in Stylistics* is one of the easiest-to-read, most accessible grammar books I have encountered. The strength of the book lies in part in embedding the presentation of cognitive grammar in the field of stylistics, because the examples taken from the literature are particularly interesting and illustrative. By producing such a clear set of explanations, the book shows that grammar need not be overly complicated and authors, when they make an effort, can describe complex concepts in direct language.

The key strengths of the book are, however, one of the potential downsides: the simplification of the particulars of cognitive grammar and Langacker's own infamous complicated approach to the concepts. By presenting the theory in a practical way, readers may be tempted to forgo Langacker entirely and rely on these definitions and explanations. Taken alone, the book is internally consistent and coherent, but the extent to which it is an accurate portrayal of the complexities of cognitive grammar is a different question. Of course, Giovanelli and Harrison do not encourage engagement with the book in this way, and readers should remember that it is a textbook intended for students and thus limit their expectations about its level of detail accordingly. Returning to Langacker and empirical work employing this framework is absolutely necessary to go further with cognitive grammar.

Giovanelli and Harrison have produced a remarkable book, one that need not be limited to students interested in cognitive grammar and stylistics, but also anyone wanting to understand how good grammatical descriptions can show how language functions and why we experience particular sentences and utterances in the way that we do. The book can be taken up in any context where grammar is taught because of its power to make grammar and language analysis fun, interesting, and, above all, explanatory.

## References

- Chomsky, N. (1959). On certain formal properties of grammars. *Information and Control*, 2, 137-167.
- Chomsky, N. (2013). *Topics in the theory of generative grammar*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110903843> (Original work published in 1978)
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London, England: Edward Arnold.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume 1. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

***Mapping Genres, Mapping Culture: Japanese Texts in Context.***  
**Elizabeth A. Thomson, Motoki Sano, and Helen de Silva Joyce.**  
**Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins, 2017. vi + 248**  
**pp.**

*Reviewed by*

Vicky Ann Richings

Kobe Shoin Women's University

*Mapping Genres, Mapping Culture: Japanese Texts in Context* is an edited anthology by Japanese language scholars on the bidirectional continuity between Japanese texts and culture. In the opening chapter, "Mapping genres using systemic functional linguistics," the editors explore theories of language in context and text genre and provide a detailed outline of the book. The following eight chapters then each focus on a specific text genre in the Japanese language, yet with the mutual aim to map the genres of Japanese texts from a social semiotic perspective within a systemic functional linguistics (SFL) framework. SFL is an approach to language developed in the 1960s by Michael Halliday. It expands on previous works of linguist Bronislaw Malinowski—also frequently mentioned in this volume—and is associated with a number of purposes such as sociological inquiry and discourse analysis (see Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). In this book, following Halliday's tradition, SFL is referred to as a way of looking at language as a form of social behavior, meaning examining what language is used for. Two key elements of SFL, context and semantics, are repeatedly specified in each chapter, the former being related to genre and the latter to register. In this collection, the chapter authors describe genres in a variety of fields, from the humanities to the media, providing an insightful picture of Japanese culture from the viewpoint of genre.

In Chapter 1, Elizabeth A. Thomson, Motoki Sano, and Helen de Silva Joyce set the scene for the analytical work in this volume by first introducing the readers to SFL, the theoretical framework that has informed the analyses in all following chapters. Next, they sketch the notion of genre within SFL theory, and finally introduce each of the chapters. Kazue Kato (Chapter 2) reports on the procedural genre—a type of text that informs how things are done or should be done, such as how to purchase a ticket—by analyzing five texts from various contexts with the aim of identifying and describing the nature and lexico-grammatical features of Japanese procedural texts.



In Chapter 3, the focus is on the directive genre in the Japanese workplace. Yumiko Mizusawa analyses the administrative genre of 57 written Japanese directives to clarify workplace interpersonal relationships within the Japanese social hierarchy. The topic of Chapter 4 is persuasive text, those texts that express the social activity of persuasion in a culture. This study by Sano comprises 11 persuasive texts varying in terms of field and mode and attempts to examine the linguistic characteristics of these texts. Chapter 5 is on news stories. Masamichi Washitake addresses the generic structure and semantic formation of Japanese front-page newspaper reports with the aim of determining whether Japanese news stories are more narrative in nature or more like the orbital structure of English news stories. In Chapter 6, Noriko Iwamoto describes the analysis of three war reports with the view to identify the ideational and interpersonal orientations of Japanese newspaper texts published during World War II. Katsuyuki Sato explains in Chapter 7 the Japanese procedure and method of reading and interpreting Chinese texts into Japanese with a focus on the genre known as *Kundoku-bun* (text written in a mixture of Chinese characters and *katakana*) to demonstrate how classical Chinese has come to influence Japanese language and culture. Chapter 8 gives a detailed outline of three case studies of Japanese folktales. Through this analysis, Thomson tries to demonstrate how textual organization, semantics, and grammatical choices of traditional tales establish cultural norms in children. In the final chapter, Ken Tann applies the concept of the context of culture to *nihonjinron* (a body of texts that asserts the uniqueness of Japanese national and cultural identity). This chapter complements the referenced studies in cultural anthropology by bringing SFL to the analysis of *nihonjinron* texts to investigate their significance as discourse on culture and characterize them linguistically as a form of identity discourse.

Throughout the chapters, the patterns in texts are investigated to provide linguistic evidence of how texts form genre groups that reflect the broader cultural context. The term “context of culture” is used to describe the general context for language as a system in which lexical items and grammatical categories should be related to their cultural context (Halliday & Hasan, 1989). Collectively, the chapters attempt to describe semantic and lexicogrammatical characteristics; the volume therefore fundamentally focuses on linguistic patterns. One of the greatest strengths of this book is that each chapter provides detailed analysis of the concerned genre and a wealth of information on the language choices in the analyzed texts while skillfully referring to the SFL approach in a comprehensible manner. On the other hand, though some chapters do so more than others, and despite the claims

of the book's objectives, overall there is scant attention given to the nature of Japanese culture and the norms and values found within Japanese society. For example, Chapter 2 ("Exploring the structure and meaning of the family of procedural texts in Japanese") concludes the analysis of procedural texts by stating the results of this study using technical terms of the applied methodology: "It seems that Japanese language is strongly affected by particular aspects of the *context of situation*, especially social status and degree of control in *tenor* [emphasis added]" (p. 53). Although the approach taken throughout the book is a social-semantic one, primarily concerned with meaning making in social contexts and how texts enact social processes in different contexts, it is hard to say that it actually reveals characteristics of Japanese society and culture. This issue could have been further investigated and better presented throughout the book.

Overall, however, I recommend this book to learned scholars and students, especially in the field of Japanese linguistics and pragmatics. Organized around the context of genre and clearly contributing to the understanding of genre and genre variation in the Japanese language, this book is not an easy read. However, it can be of interest to those versed in the SFL approach as well as teachers and learners in a wide range of linguistic fields. I do suggest that a basic knowledge of Japanese is preferable to make this volume even more meaningful and engaging.

## References

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* (2nd. ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

***Complexity Theory and Language Development: In Celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman.*** Lourdes Ortega and ZhaoHong Han (Eds.). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins, 2017. xv + 234 pp.

*Reviewed by*  
Richard J. Sampson  
Gunma University

Diane Larsen-Freeman continues to have a wide-ranging impact on the field of second language acquisition (SLA) research and theory, not least through her insight into drawing upon complexity theory from the natural sciences to push forward understandings of language development. Proponents of complexity theory view systems (e.g., language or a language classroom) as made up of multiple agents, in possession of distributed control, open to nonlinear coadaptive interactions with other systems over different timescales, constantly changing, and emergent (see Davis & Sumara, 2006; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). *Complexity Theory and Language Development: In Celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman*, an edited collection of 10 chapters, aims to honour Larsen-Freeman's contributions by offering "a seminal exploration of complexity thinking, both in theoretical and empirical terms" (p. 1).

Although not containing sections, the book could be divided into three parts. The first comprises an introductory chapter regarding complexity theory in SLA by Larsen-Freeman herself. Larsen-Freeman's chapter is a lengthy affair (that said, the final 12 pages are references). She moves from a brief history of complexity theory to an overview of what complex systems consist of and a narrative of her own development of thinking concerning this perspective. In essence, Larsen-Freeman argues that complexity theory offers a "meta-theory", a "conceptual framework that provides broad theoretical and methodological principles for how to judge what is meaningful (or not), acceptable (or not), and central (or not) in the task of building knowledge about a phenomenon" (pp. 2-3). She does this by outlining 30 axioms dealing with language, language learners and users, language learning, and language teaching understood from a complexity perspective. Although much to take in, any of the axioms would provide a valuable starting point for a research agenda.

The next six chapters deal with theoretical issues. In an extremely brief Chapter 2, Kees de Bot considers whether complexity theory and dynamic systems theory are the same or different. He argues that the terms can be usefully blended together into CDST (complex dynamic systems theory). I would, though, tend to agree with Hiver and Al-Hoorie (2016) who see the insertion of “dynamic” as superfluous; complex systems inherently involve dynamism. Chapter 3, by John H. Schumann, takes the consideration of labels in another direction. By combining research from neuroscience and linguistics, and given a more complex understanding of the mind and its interaction with context, Schumann contends that direct mapping of brain processes to mental processes through precise terminology is not possible. Zoltan Dörnyei (Chapter 4) then turns to the need to reconceptualise individual differences research from a complexity perspective. Based on McAdams’ (2006) work with personality, Dörnyei introduces a fascinating framework for considering the whole person through looking at dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations, and integrative life narratives. Chapter 5, by Peter D. MacIntyre, Emily MacKay, Jessica Ross, and Esther Abel, continues with the theme of individual differences. The authors look at appropriate research tools for conducting empirical work with complexity underpinnings. The chapter draws on past studies to provide an overview of 12 different techniques that might be readily used to explore the dynamism of language learners’ experience. Taking a step back, Wander Lowie (Chapter 6) considers four methodological principles for adequate complexity research. He argues that studies need to focus on time and change, look at individuals, make use of computer simulation techniques to examine nonlinearity, and capture interacting timescales. The final chapter in this section, Chapter 7 by Marjolijn Verspoor, focuses on L2 pedagogy. The author asserts seven principles for teaching that align with complexity and dynamic usage-based views on language. Of key importance, she charges, is meaningful, integrated exposure to authentic language use in which students are encouraged to discover the forms and structures of language themselves.

The final three empirical chapters are intended to illustrate the application of complexity theory to research into language development. In Chapter 8, Conny Opitz focuses on language destabilization and relearning. She offers an intriguing model for how the combination of different studies treating participants as individual cases “affords the basis for the discovery of generalizable patterns and profiles” (p. 187). Barbara Köpke next explores language attrition and aphasia in Chapter 9. The author uses past research to illustrate the brain’s adaptive potential when faced with certain contex-

tual events. Finally, in Chapter 10, ZhaoHong Han, Gang Bao, and Paul Wiita draw a parallel between the law of conservation of energy from physics and interlearner differential L2 attainment. They contend that by assigning numerical values to the four parameters of aptitude, motivation, L2 input, and L1-TL distance it is possible to describe, explain, and predict ultimate L2 attainment.

The book presents somewhat of a conundrum. While the editors admit that the contributors do “not agree with Larsen-Freeman . . . on all counts” (p. 3), some chapters make strong claims that seem to run very much in opposition to the fundamental tenets of complexity thinking (e.g., Lowie’s argument for statistical modelling to be essential, and the assertion by Han et al. of predictability by reduction to numbers). Other chapters could be said to have only tenuous links to complexity (e.g., Köpke). This said, some of the chapters might be useful for novice researchers (e.g., Chapters 1, 5, and 8) and others for practitioners (e.g., Chapter 7). Certainly, Dörnyei’s push for examination of narrative identity from a complexity perspective deserves more empirical attention. All in all, while meeting its stated aim, this volume might be best recommended to people who already have a sound understanding of complexity theory in applied linguistics and wish to explore the territory further.

## References

- Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2006). *Complexity and education: Inquiries into learning, teaching, and research*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203764015>
- Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2016). A dynamic ensemble for second language research: Putting complexity theory into practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100, 741-756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12347>
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- McAdams, D. P. (2006). *The redemptive self: Stories Americans live by*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195176933.001.0001>

## ***JALT Journal* Call for Special Issue Proposals**

*JALT Journal* will publish a maximum of one thematic Special Issue every two years and is calling for Special Issue Proposals. The articles in a Special Issue should all be related to a theme that is relevant for language teaching and/or learning within the Japanese context and will be of interest to journal readers. To submit a Special Issue Proposal, please include the following: 1) contact information for the Guest Editor(s) and invited authors, 2) a description of the theme and why it would be of interest to the Journal's readers (maximum 500 words), 3) abstracts (in English for English manuscripts, in Japanese for Japanese manuscripts) of no more than 150 words or 400 characters (for Japanese abstracts) for each invited manuscript, 4) up to five keywords for each invited manuscript, and 5) a proposed timeline for review and publication. At least one invited manuscript must be in English. Submit the above materials to [jj-editor@jalt-publications.org](mailto:jj-editor@jalt-publications.org)

Proposal submissions will be reviewed by the Editors and Associate Editors of *JALT Journal*. If a proposal is accepted, the Guest Editor(s), under the supervision of one or more of the Journal's Editors (Supervising Editor(s)), will find reviewers for the invited manuscripts, with the exception of manuscripts written by one or more of the Guest Editors. The reviewers for such manuscripts will be found by the Supervising Editor(s). In order to be published, a Special Issue must contain at least three accepted manuscripts, one of which must be in English. In the event that the minimum number of manuscripts is not accepted, authors of accepted manuscripts will be offered the opportunity to publish the manuscript in a regular issue of *JALT Journal*. The Guest Editor(s) will be responsible for writing an introduction in English to the Special Issue, maximum 2,000 words. The Guest Editor(s) may optionally invite a commentary (maximum 2,000 words) from a scholar who is not one of the Guest Editors nor an author of a manuscript in the Special Issue. The introduction and commentary will not be reviewed, but will need to be approved by the Supervising Editor(s).

# Information for Contributors

All submissions must conform to *JALT Journal* Editorial Policy and Guidelines.

## Editorial Policy

*JALT Journal*, the refereed research journal of the Japan Association for Language Teaching (*Zenkoku Gogaku Kyouiku Gakkai*), invites empirical and theoretical research articles and research reports on second and foreign language teaching and learning in Japanese contexts. Submissions from Asian and other international contexts are accepted if applicable to language teaching in Japan. Areas of particular interest include but are not limited to the following:

1. Curriculum design and teaching methods
2. Classroom-centered research
3. Intercultural studies
4. Testing and evaluation
5. Teacher training
6. Language learning and acquisition
7. Overviews of research and practice in related fields

The editors encourage submissions in five categories: (a) full-length articles, (b) short research reports (*Research Forum*), (c) essays on language education framed in theory and supported by argumentation that may include either primary or secondary data (*Perspectives*), (d) comments on previously published *JALT Journal* articles (*Point to Point*), and (e) book and media reviews (*Reviews*). Articles should be written for a general audience of language educators; therefore, statistical techniques and specialized terms must be clearly explained.

## Guidelines

### Style

*JALT Journal* follows the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 6th edition (available from APA Order Department, P.O. Box 2710, Hyattsville, MD 20784, USA; by email: <order@apa.org>; from the website: <www.apa.org/books.ordering.html>). Consult recent copies of *JALT Journal* or *TESOL Quarterly* for examples of documentation and references. A downloadable copy of the *JALT Journal* style sheet is also available on our website at <<http://jalt-publications.org/jj/>>.

### Format

Full-length articles must not be more than 20 pages in length (6,000 words), including references, notes, tables, and figures. *Research Forum* submissions should not be more than 10 pages in length (3,000 words). *Perspectives* submissions should not be more than 15 pages in length (4,500 words). *Point to Point* comments on previously published articles should not be more than 675 words in length, and *Reviews* should generally be around 1,000 words. All submissions must be word processed in A4 or 8.5 x 11" format with line spacing set at 1.5 lines. **For refereed submissions, names and identifying references should appear only on the cover sheet.** Authors are responsible for the accuracy of references and reference citations.

### Submission Procedure

Please submit the following materials, except for reviews, as two email attachments in MS Word format to the appropriate editor indicated below:

1. Cover sheet with the title and author name(s), affiliation(s), and contact information of corresponding author.
2. Manuscript, including title, abstract, and keywords, with no reference to the author. Do not use running heads. Follow the *JALT Journal* style sheet.

If the manuscript is accepted for publication, a Japanese translation of the abstract will be required. Authors will also be asked to provide biographical information. Insert all tables and figures in the manuscript. Do not send as separate files.

**Submissions will be acknowledged within 1 month of their receipt.** All manuscripts are first reviewed by the Editor to ensure they comply with *JALT Journal* Guidelines. Those considered for publication are subject to blind review by at least two readers, with special attention given to (1) compliance with *JALT Journal* Editorial Policy, (2) the significance and originality of the submission, and (3) the use of appropriate research design and methodology. Evaluation is usually completed within 3 months. Each contributing author of published articles and Book Reviews will receive one



complimentary copy of the *Journal* and a PDF of the article (Book Reviews are compiled together as one PDF). *JALT Journal* does not provide off-prints. Contributing authors have the option of ordering further copies of *JALT Journal* (contact JALT Central Office for price details).

### **Restrictions**

Papers submitted to *JALT Journal* must not have been previously published, nor should they be under consideration for publication elsewhere. *JALT Journal* has First World Publication Rights, as defined by International Copyright Conventions, for all manuscripts published. If accepted, the editors reserve the right to edit all copy for length, style, and clarity without prior notification to authors. Plagiarism, including self-plagiarism, will result in articles not being published or being retracted and may also result in the author(s) being banned from submitting to any JALT publication

### **Full-Length Articles, Research Forum, Perspectives, and Point to Point Submissions**

Please send submissions in these categories or general inquiries to:

**[jj-editor@jalt-publications.org](mailto:jj-editor@jalt-publications.org)**

Eric Hauser, *JALT Journal* Editor

### **Japanese-Language Manuscripts**

*JALT Journal* welcomes Japanese-language manuscripts on second/foreign language teaching and learning as well as Japanese-language reviews of publications. Submissions must conform to the Editorial Policy and Guidelines given above. Authors must provide a detailed abstract in English, 500 to 750 words in length, for full-length manuscripts and a 100-word abstract for reviews. Refer to the Japanese-Language Guidelines (following page) for details. Please send Japanese-language manuscripts to:

**[jj-editorj@jalt-publications.org](mailto:jj-editorj@jalt-publications.org)**

Yo In'nami, *JALT Journal* Japanese-Language Editor

### **Reviews**

The editors invite reviews of books and other relevant publications in the field of language education. A list of publications that have been sent to JALT for review is published bimonthly in *The Language Teacher*. Review authors receive one copy of the *Journal*. Please send submissions, queries, or requests for books, materials, and review guidelines to:

**[jj-reviews@jalt-publications.org](mailto:jj-reviews@jalt-publications.org)**

Greg Rouault, *JALT Journal* Reviews Editor

### **Address for Inquiries about Subscriptions, Ordering *JALT Journal*, or Advertising**

JALT Central Office

Urban Edge Building 5F

1-37-9 Taito, Taito-ku, Tokyo 110-0016, Japan

Tel.: 03-3837-1630; Fax: 03-3837-1631

(From overseas: Tel.: 81-3-3837-1630; Fax: 81-3-3837-1631)

Email: [jco@jalt.org](mailto:jco@jalt.org) URL: [www.jalt.org](http://www.jalt.org)

## 日本語論文投稿要領

JALT Journalでは日本語で執筆された論文、研究報告、実践報告、書評等を募集しています。文体:一般的な学術論文のスタイルを用い、章立ての仕方や参考文献のデータの書き方などは、*Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.)*の定める方式に合わせて下さい。不明の場合は、2019年以降に発行されたJALT Journalの日本語論文を参考にしてください。日本語編集者までお問い合わせ下さい。なお、JALT Journalの読者は現場の教師が主なので、特殊な専門用語や統計的手法は、わかりやすく定義するか説明を加えるなどして下さい。原稿: 長さは、参考文献リストも含め18,000字(書評の場合は 2,500字)以内です。A4の用紙に横書きで、1行40字、1ページ30行で印刷して下さい。手書きの原稿は受け付けません。

### 提出するもの:

以下の原稿を電子メールの添付書類、あるいは郵送でお送りください。

- ・ 執筆者の名前と所属機関名を書いた表紙
- ・ MS-Word で保存した本文(執筆者は無記名のこと)
- ・ 執筆者連絡先(住所、電話番号、ファックス、e-mail アドレス)
- ・ 400字以内の和文要旨
- ・ 英文のタイトルと、500～750語の英文要旨(書評の場合は100語程度の英文要旨)
- ・ 100字以内の執筆者略歴
- ・ 審査を経て掲載の認められた草稿は、図表などを全て写植版にしたものにして提出すること

**査読:**編集委員会で投稿要領に合っているかどうかを確認したあと、少なくとも二人の査読者が査読を行います。査読者には執筆者の名前は知らされません。査読の過程では特に、原稿がJALT Journalの目的に合っているか、言語教育にとって意味があるか、独創性はあるか、研究計画や方法論は適切か等が判定されます。査読は通常二か月以内に終了しますが、特に投稿の多い場合などは審査にそれ以上の時間がかかることがあります。

**注意:**JALT Journalに投稿する原稿は、すでに出版されているものや他の学術雑誌に投稿中のものは避けて下さい。JALT Journalは、そこに掲載されるすべての論文に関して国際著作権協定による世界初出版権を持ちます。なお、お送りいただいた原稿は返却しませんので、控を保存して下さい。

投稿原稿送り先またはお問い合わせ:

〒112-8551 東京都文京区春日1-13-27中央大学理工学部英語教室  
JALT Journal 日本語編集者 印南 洋  
電話: 03-3817-1950  
jj-editorj@jalt-publications.org

### **JALT Journal** 第 41 巻 第 1 号

2019年 4月20日 印刷  
2019年 5月1日 発行  
編集人 ハウザー エリック  
発行人 リチモンド・ストゥループ  
発行所 全国語学教育学会事務局  
〒110-0016 東京都台東区台東1-37-9 アーバンエッジビル5F  
TEL(03) 3837-1630; FAX(03) 3837-1631  
印刷所 コーシンシャ株式会社  
〒530-0043 大阪市北区天満1-18-4天満ファーストビル301 TEL(06)6351-8795



#JALT2019 • NAGOYA 11.1-11.4

## JALT2019 — Teacher Efficacy, Learner Agency

**The 45th Annual International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning & Educational Materials Exhibition • WINC AICHI, Nagoya City, Aichi, Japan  
Friday, November 1 to Monday, November 4, 2019**

Enjoy the same high quality presentations, plenary talks, featured workshops, and latest educational materials. There will be plenty of opportunities to develop professionally, network, and enjoy the company of colleagues and friends.

NEW to JALT2019 will be the live-streaming of plenary talks, along with a broader journalistic atmosphere involving familiar JALT social media presences via Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, and so on. This will be implemented using roving reporters who will interview some of the most influential and accomplished professionals in ELT. We look forward to bringing you more in depth coverage at JALT2019!

Set against the backdrop of The WINC Convention Center < <http://www.winc-aichi.jp> > and Nagoya City, those in attendance will always have something to do. Be a part of the conference, but also take the opportunity to experience one of Japan's great cities and regions. Whether traveling from abroad or within Japan, Nagoya is a convenient travel destination. By train, plane, bus, or car, Nagoya City is easily accessible, and, by extension, so is the conference site:

**The WINC:** <<https://jalt.org/conference/jalt2019/access>>

### GETTING THERE

To help you out, here are some simple directions. JALT2019 will be held in Nagoya—centrally located between Tokyo and Osaka.

#### Air Access

- From Chubu Airport (Centrai): *Central Japan International Airport is 28 minutes from Nagoya Station via the Nagoya Railroad (Meitetsu).*
- From Narita International Airport: *Take the Narita Express from Narita Airport to Tokyo Station (60 min.), then take the Shinkansen to Nagoya Station.*
- From Haneda International Airport: *Take the Keikyu Express train from Haneda Airport to Shinagawa Station (22 min.), and then take the JR Shinkansen to Nagoya Station.*
- From Kansai Airport: *Take JR Haruka to Shin-Osaka station (48 min.), then take the Shinkansen to Nagoya Station (53 minutes).*

**For all information regarding JALT2019 please visit**

<<https://jalt.org/conference/jalt2019>>

**For email inquiries, please contact us at <[program@jalt.org](mailto:program@jalt.org)>**