

# Explorations in Teacher Education 教師教育の探究他

the Newsletter of the JALT Teacher Education SIG  
Volume 7, No. 1, June 1999

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

- |   |   |  |    |
|---|---|--|----|
| from the coordinator<br>.....   | 2 | コミュニケーション重視<br>方法論は万能薬<br>か? .....                           | 17 |
| コーディネーターから  | 2 | TE SIG committee<br>contacts .....                           | 22 |
| from the editors .  | 3 | the Other Language<br>Educators' Special<br>Interest Group . | 23 |
| 編集委員から .....  | 3 | OLE SIGの声明書 .  | 24 |
| Renewing my<br>Appointment - Or:<br>What I Didn't Learn<br>in Graduate School | 5 | NLP Summer Courses   | 25 |
| 外国人教員の再任に<br>巡って: 大学院で教<br>わらなかったこと   | 5 | NLP 夏期研修 .....   | 25 |
| Communicative<br>Methodology: A<br>Health Warning?                            | 9 | TESOL Journal Special<br>Issue .....                         | 27 |
|   |   | 多様なESOL環境で働く<br>教員を養成する: 国<br>際的視点から ...                     | 28 |

## from the coordinator

### コーディネーターから

Dear teacher colleagues,

#### 1. Kyoto mini-conference

I hope that you are reading this before June 19th. If you are and don't know what to do for the weekend, how about a trip to Kyoto. Janina Tubby (with great help from Kyoto chapter) has organised a superb mini-conference on testing and assessment, with over twelve presentations on the Saturday afternoon and a workshop on the Sunday? These kind of events are always a great place to find out new ideas and meet other teachers socially. If you need more details e-mail Janina <janina@gol.com> or ring her on 078-845-5768.

#### 2. Newsletter articles

Looking through previous newsletters I have been impressed by the great range of writing: email interviews with well-known teacher researchers, personal accounts of teacher development practices and approaches, poems and loads more. Plans in the pipeline include a short series of personal impressions of teacher development from outside Japan.

To carry on publishing this variety we are always looking for contributions from SIG members, and are especially keen to hear the voices of those who have never been published before. If you have

an idea, be it a report, a book review, an opinion, - whatever, but are but are unsure whether it is suitable, please contact me or one of the editors (contact info. on page 22) and we can talk it through and get it into print.

Best wishes, Neil Cowie

敬愛する同僚の皆さん、

#### 1. 京都でのミニ学会について

皆さんはこの文章を6月19日以前に読んでいらっしゃると思います！そして週末に何をしようか、決まってない方  
ミ 京都にお出かけになりませんか？  
ジャーニー・タビー(京都チャプターの多大なる協賛を得て)が土曜日午後は12のプレゼンテーション、そして日曜日はワークショップ、というテストと評価に関する素晴らしいミニ学会を企画しました。このような企画はいつも新しいアイデア、そして他の先生が他と知り合う絶好の機会になります。詳しくお知りになりたい方は、<janina@gol.com> までメールか078-845-5768にお電話ください。

#### 2. ニュースレターの記事

既刊のニュースレターを読んでいて私は皆さんが本当に幅広いレンジで書いていらっしゃることに感心します：著名な教員-研究者へのメールでのインタビュー、教員開発の実践や教授法に関する個人的な見解、詩、等々が満載されているのです。さらに教員開発に関する日本の外から発信した個人的な印象が今後のパイプラインとして計画されています。

このようなバラエティーに富んだものを発行するために我々は常にSIGのメン

バーからの寄稿を期待し、特にまだ何も発表したことのない方からの原稿をお待ちしています。何か良いアイデアがあれば、報告でも、書評でも、意見でも何でも、そしてこんなものでもいいのかしら？と迷っている原稿があれば、是非、私か、あるいは他の編集者（連絡先掲載ページ？）までご連絡ください。相談をして是非、発表しましょう。

よろしく

Neil Cowie

## from the editors

### 編集委員から

読者の皆様、お元気ですか。

何度も申し上げますが、私達TE SIGコーディネーターよりのお願いです。今年度の6月に協賛されて開かれるミニ学会などのグループイベントに参加をお願いすると共に、このニュースレターへの投稿をお願いいたします。私達は、様々な話題の記事を歓迎しますし、提案はいつでも受け入れます。また、ボランティアスタッフができる限り定期的に取り上げるつもりです。

発行にあたりいくつかの問題がありました。その殆どが、継続する為と皆に批評的な（建設的な）フィードバックを供給する為の共同の努力を通して、解消されたと思います。特にTE SIGのコーディネーターのニール カウイ先生は、私共編集チームの不可欠なメンバーとして多大な努力を注いでくださいました。皆を代表して感謝したいと思います。また、もしこのニュースレターの中に何かお気付きの点とか、より良くする為の提案とかがありましたら、どうぞ

私（ポール ポーフェ）にどしどしご意見をお寄せください。あなたのアイデアを私達に分けて下さい。（宛先は22ページ）

私達編集チームは、只今、ニュースレターに新鮮なインスピレーションをもたらし、かつ私達が望んでいる継続的な発行をもたらす為の移行期の真っただ中です。高木信之先生は、何年も私達にご助力いただきましたが、今回、アメリカ合衆国モンタナ州ミズーラに（熊にご注意！）、交換教員として行かれることとなりました。もちろん引き続き、教員教育についての洞察のあるご意見、記事等をくださることと信じています。かつらはるこ先生は、JALTの為に前回のTE SIGニュースレターから翻訳をコーディネートするという、とても重要な役割を引き受けて下さいました。

ニール先生、高木信之先生、二、三人の方に編集者として協力いただけるよう声をかけて頂き、ありがとうございます。私達編集チームと同じくらい強力に、また、すでに貢献して頂いている方々に負担が行き過ぎないように、新しいスタッフを大募集中です！特に、二か国語ニュースレターを発行するのに必要不可欠な翻訳ボランティアを募集しています。多忙ながらも、勤勉で精力的な方々と親しく働けるのは光栄なことです。

さて最後に、皆様に是非お願いいたします。どうぞ教員教育に関心のある人ならどなたでも、声を大にしてお誘いください。記事を出して頂いたり、発行を手伝って頂いたりして下さいませんか。TE SIGやこのニュースレターの存続はすべてあなたにかかっています！

ポーフェ・ポール

Hello everyone,

Please allow me to echo the TE SIG coordinator's call for you not only to participate in group events, such as the jointly sponsored mini-conference this June, but also to contribute to our newsletter. We welcome articles on various topics, accept submissions at any time, and roll them out as regularly as volunteer staff can.

There certainly have been glitches in the process, but most of these have been overcome through cooperative efforts to achieve continuity and provide critical feedback all around. Neil Cowie, the TE SIG coordinator, deserves kudos for his support as an integral member of our editorial team. If you notice a problem or have a suggestion for improving the newsletter, please feel free to blame me (PB) and share your ideas with any of us (contact info., p.22).

The editorial team is in the midst of a transition which should both bring fresh inspiration to the newsletter and yield the desired continuity. After years of service, Nobuyuki Takaki is leaving for a stint in Missoula, Montana, where - avoiding bear attacks - he may continue to contribute insights and solicit articles on teacher education. Haruko Katsura, who wears other hats for JALT as a whole, has assumed the important responsibility of coordinating translations for the TE SIG newsletter since the previous issue.

Thanks to Neil and Nobuyuki's outreach, two - possibly three - co-editors are waiting in the wings. Robust as this editorial team may be, we are ever hopeful of finding new staff so as not to overburden the volunteers already on-line. Especially essential to the production of a bilingual newsletter are the unsung volunteer translators. It is a pleasure to work closely with such busy yet diligent and enthusiastic colleagues.

Let me conclude by urging you - and, by word-of-mouth, everyone you know who is interested in teacher education - to *get involved*, either as a contributor of articles or a volunteer to help in publication. The vitality of the TE SIG and this newsletter will be all yours.

Paul Beaufait

10月下旬から来年の8月末まで、交換教員としてモンタナ大学で過ごすことになりました。E-mail もありますから、何らかの形でTEd SIG への貢献をと考えておりますし、帰国後はまたTEd SIG 活動に復帰したいと思えます。これまでポーフェ先生のご指導を得ながら本ニュースレターの仕事をしてみましたが、私の一貫した気持ちは「日本人の教員や教員教育関係者の参加や貢献が少ないようでは、JALT (TEd SIG) の活動は画竜点睛を欠く」ということで、そのために自分にできることは何かを考えて行動することでした。これまでの皆様のご協力とご支援に感謝いたします。

高木信之

It's been my great joy to work on the TEd SIG Newsletter. I will be out of Japan due to my assignment at the University of Montana from October, 1999 (after Maebashi) through to August, 2000. I am willing to be back with you all if I have survived bear attacks in Montana. Thanks very much for the cooperation you all have offered, and banzai for JALT TEd SIG!

Nobuyuki Takaki

---

Errata: The Number number in the footers on the *previous* issue should have been: Volume 6, Number 3. PB

# Renewing my Appointment - Or: What I Didn't Learn in Graduate School

*Cheiron McMahill*

## 外国人教員の再任に 巡って：大学院で教わ らなかったこと

私は県立大学の外国人教員で、日本人の同僚と同じ仕事をしていますが、私の雇用条件だけは三年間の任期制となっています。日本では、外国人の多くはそのうちに帰国するだろうという先入観が強く、実際に、私の前任の外国人教員は日本語を覚えることもなく、また大学運営の業務に携わることもなくアメリカに帰りました。したがって、三年の任期を終えたときに私のような外国人教員が本当に任期の更新できるかどうか不安でしたし、大学側が更新が望ましいと思っ  
ているかどうかについても不明でした。しかし私の場合、私の所属している学科が、更新の手続きを簡潔で分かりやすく教えてくれたお陰で私は今四年目の学年を迎えています。アメリカと比べると、日本の社会では公平性や明確さに欠けるケースが多いのですが、その一方では対応の仕方がとても柔軟で、うまくいく場合もあります。日本人の大学の先生方には、違う枠に入れられる外国人教員の気持ちをぜひご理解いただきたいと思  
います。と同時に、アメリカのMATESLの大学院では、外国の大学に勤める場合に留意すべきこと（その国の言葉をきちんと覚えて、その文化の違いを認める必要があること等）を大学院生にきちんと教えておいてもらいたいものだと痛感しております。

I am in my third year of a three-year term appointment at a public

university in a gaikokujin kyoin position. When I was first hired, I was told that my appointment was renewable. In fact, in our university's regulations regarding the hiring of gaikokujin kyoin, it states rather cryptically that renewal will "not be obstructed" (in Japanese samatagenai). However, I was informed that after three years, a national search would be conducted and I would have to reapply along with everyone else who reads the papers. If I were chosen then as the best applicant, I could stay another three years. My predecessor had been told the same thing and had perhaps prudently decided not to reapply. I also assumed this was a polite way of saying there was a three-year limit, and steeled myself to move on.

This year, however, the written procedure on renewing or not renewing a gaikokujin kyoin appointment was revised in my department meetings and approved by the university faculty senate. Now, if both the department and the gaikokujin kyoin agree, the contract can be renewed without opening up the position. However, this renewal must first be reviewed by and pass an all-university screening committee. The decision of this committee must then be approved by the faculty senate, although it doesn't have to be put to a vote. (Further clauses dealing with cases where the gaikokujin kyoin wishes to renew, but the department doesn't agree to

renew her or his contract were proposed by the department, but were not approved by the senate, and their revision remains postponed).

Upon this revision of the renewal procedures, I was informed that the university would welcome my intention to renew my appointment. A committee was formed to review my contributions to the university and the greater society, and to evaluate my research publications. I drew up a detailed resume in Japanese with the help of several colleagues, and selected three of my publications for the committee's perusal. I was recently informed that the committee met twice and voted unanimously to renew my contract for another three years. Several committee members made it a point to tell me how much they enjoyed reading my papers or to ask me questions afterwards. The head of the committee was very supportive and encouraging. I was amazed at how smoothly and kindly it went. At the next faculty meeting, my appointment renewal was officially approved.

That is what happened. There are several points, though, I would like to make for the benefit of others who may face the same situation.

One is that there is a lot of confusion about the legal codes governing the employment of foreigners among Japanese and foreign faculty alike. Gaikokujin kyoshi, a one-year renewable

position at national universities in which instructors do not participate in meetings and administrative duties, is often used interchangeably with gaikokujin kyoin, who presumably have the same status, rights, and duties as Japanese faculty and whose appointment term is wholly up to the discretion of the "administrative organization" of the individual university. The Special Provisionary Law for the Employment of Foreign Faculty in National and Public Universities has been appended to clarify "administrative organization" as the university president. In other words, my university may limit my appointment terms to three years, but in theory at least with the president's approval, may also remove these term limits at any time (in fact, because I teach at a prefectural university governed by the prefectural assembly, such a change would require winning over many people whom I have never met). In addition, although I was told when I was hired that I was "exempt" from attending faculty and committee meetings (in exchange for teaching extra classes), in subsequent years I requested that I be allowed to attend these meetings, and this request was granted. However, I have frequently heard my position referred to as gaikokujin kyoshi, or heard various conflicting theories as to why my contract is on a fixed term.

Why set aside such positions from those of Japanese faculty to begin with? As a colleague has

pointed out, it is more a matter of consciousness than of the law. In my university's case, when it was decided to hire a native English speaker on a full-time basis, the category *gaikokujin kyoin* was established as a matter of course, without much debate. In other words, deep in many (most?) people's consciousnesses is a division between foreigners and Japanese, an idea that we are, in some senses, even perhaps different species.

This brings me to my second important point: that consciousness can change, and in fact the procedures for appointment renewal were amended after I had worked here just two years. One thing that has encouraged me through this process is that I see myself as both an educator and a learner, and feel that education and consciousness-raising are tasks not just for me and my students, but for the entire university community.

In other words, although I am aware of my "rights" as a rights-conscious American, I nevertheless realize as a teacher that there is always a gap between the law as a kind of cognitive ideal and the daily life of emotion in which we all swim. I therefore must recognize that there is a real gap between myself and many Japanese faculty members, in understanding, experience, language, comfort, and culture. Depending on the person, this psychological and emotional gap is perceived as big

enough to justify putting me on a fixed-term contract, rather than offering me life-time employment. Whose responsibility is it to close that gap?

As in my marriage to a Japanese, I have come to recognize that we humans tend to evaluate our own efforts over their counterparts'. We each tend to believe we are making the greater effort and that our partner is slacking off. I cannot in conscience indulge this tendency, however, when it comes to my coworkers. Of course, I have spent most of my life since I was 12 learning Japanese, I have lived in Japan nine years, have eagerly attended meetings and parties and tried to participate all in Japanese. But isn't this just common courtesy? Many of my colleagues, on the other hand, speak better English than I do Japanese without ever having lived abroad. They are experts about my language and my country's literature in ways I am ignorant about Japan's. In two years, they went from a very discouraging view of foreign faculty to a very positive one.

Finally, it is no use generalizing about "Japanese faculty members" in any event. A few colleagues have always been supportive and have spoken up for me from the beginning, and they kept me from falling in that trap. In addition, I am still learning about the maze of administrative duties required to be a contributing member of the faculty in Japan; the more I learn, the humbler I must become about

my ability to truly pull my own weight. Of course, this does not justify automatically excluding foreigners from administrative work or devaluating the work we do: other foreign faculty who have been in Japan longer, or in the case of ethnic Koreans were actually born here, debunk that myth.

My final point is less philosophical and more pragmatic. No one ever told me about the need to publish, yet that is what is most highly evaluated, even over a Masters' or PhD degree, in a Japanese university. I wrote loads of papers in graduate school, but was never mentored when it came to publishing. Although I was quite satisfied with it in other ways, my MATESL program was envisioned in light of the U.S. job market only. Luckily I am a fast learner. In the three and a half years I have been teaching at Japanese universities, I have published the exhausting amount of 12 papers.

Yet I encounter foreign peers every day who are still ignorant of the need to publish and how to go about it. Especially other women seem to be intimidated by the need for publications, and have an overinflated idea of the difficulty of getting published. In reaction to this, although it may seem overly conscientious, I make it a point to teach even my undergraduate students how to do research, and talk to them about the process of getting published and the possibilities of university teaching.

I want to leave that door unlocked for them, even if they never decide to open it.

In conclusion, then, my appointment renewal has been both a scary and an affirming process. At times I have been so afraid of rejection that I just wanted to quit before I could be hurt, as in a case of unrequited love. By sticking it out, I have become more realistic and also come to see where my own training in graduate school was lacking, and how I can consequently try to better mentor my friends and students. These are baby steps, maybe, but to paraphrase Buddhist philosophy, if we were all perfect, we wouldn't have been born to start with.

# Communicative Methodology: A Health Warning?

*Sue Collins*

Aichi University of Education

Recently, educators in Far Eastern cultures have questioned the universal relevance of the communicative approach to language teaching. Ellis (1996), discussing the tensions between culture and methodology noted by EFL practitioners in various Asian settings, cites the cultural conflicts arising from the introduction of Western teaching approaches in Vietnam.

In a wider context, Ellis points to the danger of assuming that Western notions of the ideal teacher, such as that of "teacher-as-facilitator", will be universally shared, and reminds us that the communicative approach is premised on a particular set of socially and culturally embedded assumptions. Among these is the belief that verbal fluency will be the primary goal for every student.

In the Japanese context, despite the Ministry of Education's (hereafter "Monbusho") espousal of communicative language teaching a decade ago, many teachers of English in high schools and universities are still uneasy about adopting the communicative approach (CA) in their classrooms, and are inclined to adhere to more traditional methods, including grammar

translation. This can be seen in the treatment of English texts within many university English departments, where lectures are delivered in Japanese notwithstanding the high level of English proficiency among the staff. It is not uncommon for English literature texts to be translated into Japanese by the students for presentation and discussion, and for assignments on the texts to be submitted in Japanese. The reasons given vary, but the most common is the claim that the comprehension and interpretation of the text is beyond the level of the students' English ability.

In this paper, I look at some of the some of the issues which follow from the official policy decision to promote the CA, and the considerations which may cause teachers intuitively to question its status as the most appropriate methodology for meeting the needs of their students. This is a source of conflict for many, since, regardless of their views on educational methodology, teachers of English as a foreign language in Japan may be expected by their institutions to adopt at least some of the classroom practices associated with the CA.

The indications are that the consequences of embracing the CA in the teaching of English in Japanese schools may not always be entirely positive. While teachers and students alike remain under considerable

pressure of preparation for entrance examinations which retain the format and content of grammar translation methodology, there can be an inherent and paralysing dilemma for teachers in choosing teaching methods which are effective in test preparation and, at the same time, accord with the pedagogy of the CA. At the time of writing, there is still no national requirement for a test in listening and speaking in Japanese university entrance examinations.

### The Communicative Approach in Japan

The communicative approach has its origins in a view of language and of grammar as descriptive rather than prescriptive. In other words, a view which sees language as continuously evolving, with the consequent freeing up of judgmental attitudes about what is "wrong" and "right". The work of a number of sociolinguists such as Gumperz (1975), Halliday (1978), and Hymes (1971) has been influential in changing ideas about the importance of attending to functional meaning and socio-cultural settings in the study of language acquisition. This change has also influenced notions of what it means to have "communicative competence" in a language. In this contemporary view, communicative competence involves not just having an adequate knowledge of the grammar, but being able to produce comprehensible language

appropriately, and understand it, in a range of social settings.

The communicative approach is vigorously promulgated in ELT institutions not only in Anglophone countries, but in British-affiliated English Language Colleges, such as those operated by the British Council in widely diverse cultural contexts. Furthermore, English teachers from secondary and tertiary sectors in Asian countries are introduced to communicative methodology through intensive summer courses and post-graduate programs in British, Australasian and American universities. The Monbusho has allocated generous funding for selected senior professors and teacher educators to undergo re-training on these programs in order to be familiarised with the theory and practice associated with the CA.

However, such courses cannot always offer supervised teaching practice, so the disparity between language learners studying English as a second language in an Anglophone setting and those studying English as a foreign language in the classroom setting of the course participant's own culture is neither overt nor clearly articulated. Courses such as these are frequently seen as models of current best practice; but even if there were sufficient data to prove that the approaches and methods they advocate are indeed the most successful, it is not necessarily the case that the methodologies they promote will

be those most suitable for teaching conditions that pertain in the teacher's home country.

Nevertheless, due to the consistent efforts and commitment of trainers and language educators, and to the zealous dissemination of ideas and information through international conferences and publications, hybrid forms of the CA have become accepted and practised by a number of English language teachers throughout Japan. But here as elsewhere, the dearth of data from the classroom is such that we have no evidence to suggest that standards of English have improved since the Monbusho's introduction of communicative methodology, or whether they have declined, as some academics would claim. On a comparison of TOEFL scores across Asian countries, one of the few measures available which might indicate such trends, the scores of Japanese candidates have remained among the lowest for some years. However, it is possible that this test type is open to question as a universally effective measure of proficiency; and it may also be a dubious indicator these trends.

#### **Assumptions and requirements of the Communicative Approach, and some relevant questions**

The assumptions on which the CA is grounded include the following:

#### *Native-like fluency and language awareness*

The CA requires of teachers that they have a very high degree of competence in all four skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing in English. In particular, they should be able to make native-like judgments about the sociolinguistic appropriacy of functional exponents, for example, judging whether the occasion of committing a social offence requires a brief "Sorry", or a more elaborate apology, such as "I'm really terribly sorry. What can I do about it?" Not only is the actual exponent crucial here, but as in all functional language, the intonation is critical to the correct meaning and nuance. Yet many teachers in Japanese high schools lack the phonological and sociolinguistic knowledge which would give them the confidence and expertise required to deal with the complexities of intonation and sentence rhythm. The curriculum they are offered as English majors in national universities of Education, itself dictated by the Monbusho, is not sufficiently specialised or focused, and does not prepare teachers adequately in these areas to be able to deal with the functionally based syllabus required by the CA.

There may be a vicious circle then, of being under-prepared and under-confident in the analysis of the features of spoken English, which may lead teachers to spend less time on this in class, exposing students only to a narrow range of functional exponents and

ignoring features of pronunciation and prosody. Language lessons are typically divided into "listening", "reading" and "writing", rather than being taught as integrated skills, which would normally be the aim in a communicative curriculum. Yet at the same time, the traditional grammar translation approach to teaching reading and writing skills has begun to incorporate certain aspects of the CA, resulting in a more relaxed approach to inculcating the rules of grammar and syntax. The result is that the choice of methodology falls between two stools, with the predictable confusion of aims.

#### *The place of grammar*

Despite the common complaint of students that the high school curriculum over-emphasises "grammar," issues such as the importance of context in deciding meaning, socio-cultural competence, and discourse-level grammar are all largely neglected in the syllabus and materials currently used.

Even after six years of studying English, few students emerge from high school with an accurate understanding of the tense system, and many have failed to master the complexities of English word order, even at the restricted level of the sentence. Required to write an essay in English for the university entrance examination, their output is often limited to a few sentences, marred by inaccuracies in subject-verb

agreement, poorly structured, and demonstrating little or no awareness of the use of conjunctions and cohesive devices.

It may be cause for concern that lessons focussing on dialogues and role-plays, while moving towards a communicative approach, do not always draw enough attention to grammatical patterns. The end result may be to produce learners who may well be more willing to try to communicate, but remain restricted to an impoverished and inadequate interlanguage, where grammatical errors remain "fossilised" and persist even after periods of further study.

#### *Class size and cultural values*

The pair and group practice activities, role plays and dialogues which are seen as an integral part of the CA pre-suppose a class of 10, 15, or even 20 students. The average class size in private ELT centres in the UK, Australia and Canada is around 15. However, the average number of students in junior high school classes in Japan is around 35, and is often higher. In senior high school classes, the average rises to around 35-40 students. Effectively monitoring and correcting students' utterances, paying attention to pronunciation and giving guidance for personalised language practice in these activities becomes a much more difficult task, and often proves a psychological barrier to less experienced teachers.

It may seem easier and more manageable to stay with the more traditional lockstep patterns, which also reflect certain strongly-held cultural values such as mutual co-operation, with the aim of improving the class as a whole entity, rather than the more typically western promotion of individuality and assertiveness associated with certain kinds of role play.

*English in a foreign setting vs. an Anglophone environment.*

Nayar (1977) in a timely article analysing the various glosses of EFL and ESL (types 1, 2 and 3), points out several significant differences between teaching English as a second language in an Anglophone host country such as in the USA, Canada and Australia (ESL2), teaching ESL in a host country which has a high number of English speakers (ESL1, as in Singapore) and EFL (English as a foreign language, as in Thailand, Indonesia and Japan).

In ESL2, an Anglophone setting, students and teachers have the reassurance of immediate accessibility to the language from a multitude of external sources, and any number of enriching models of language use. The goals of the students are likely to be to integrate into the culture, and their motivation is high, fuelled by the need to communicate in order to ensure that daily requirements, as well as those higher in Maslow's "pyramid of needs", are fulfilled. In ESL1, English is not regarded as native to the

environment, so it is not widely spoken as the mother tongue. And in EFL situations, English is taught in schools, but plays no important role in national life.

Discussing the implications of these three very different teaching situations for research, Nayar forcefully makes the point that the sociocultural and affective domains of language learning, along with other political and economic factors that control language use, target language availability and teaching conditions, may render the theoretical assumptions and pedagogical practices commonly used in one setting ineffective and even inoperable in another.

This is borne out in comparing the motivations of learners in an ESL2 situation, who may want to acquire English to participate fully in all levels of social engagement, and the very different motivation of high school students in Japan, which may be confined to passing the university entrance examination, a goal that does not require that they communicate, and they are of course under no pressure to use the language in their daily lives.

The provision, through the JET program, of AETs (Assistant English Teachers) in junior and senior high schools, has at least meant that students hear native speaker models and have some opportunities to interact with them. In August, 1997 the number of AETs in Japan totalled 5,351. Although this would seem to

indicate some potential for improvement in the proficiency of students as a result of contact with the AETs, there are drawbacks. Firstly, few of these teachers received any formal EFL training before arriving in Japan, and some have never taught before. Secondly, the placement and employment of AETs appears to be random; in some regions, AETs are shared around, visiting two or three schools per week, and their role is confined to assisting the Japanese English teacher only when called upon to do so. Many schools see their AET only once a fortnight. This has resulted in a number of AETs expressing dissatisfaction with the scheme, complaining that they feel undervalued and under-used as a resource, and becoming demoralised by the anomalies of their position. Because of the continuing emphasis on preparation for examinations, "conversation classes" taught by AETs tend to be perceived as being of less value to the students, a fact that is reflected in the award of fewer credit points for these classes.

In high schools, students seeking to attain grades high enough to gain entry to universities or colleges make up at least 40% of the total number. For these students, exam preparation will focus on grammar, translation, writing and reading. The long delay and administrative difficulties attending the introduction of more communicatively-based tests has

meant that focussing on classroom interaction, listening and speaking, learner-centred, task-based activities and socio-functional aspects of language would be seen as detrimental to the students' more pressing needs to do well in the university entrance examinations.

For the other 50-60% of students, those who are not seeking tertiary education, the Monbusho has introduced a course of study which aims to develop communicative ability and enhance cross-cultural understanding. However, the very fact that this course is targeted for the less academically able, de-values the acquisition of oral-aural skills and socio-linguistic competencies for those who will themselves become the future educators and leaders in Japan.

#### *Roles of the teacher*

Traditionally, Asian cultures have accorded teachers a very special place, and the terms of "honour" and "respect" are frequently used in relation to the way in which students might view the teacher. However, times are rapidly changing in Japan, and the increasing "Westernisation" of the society has brought with it a subtle shift in roles and value-systems that has now begun to be felt in student-teacher relationships.

These days, it is perhaps due more to the oversized classes than to traditional practice, that the student listens while the teacher

speaks. In recent years, along with traditional rote learning and memorisation, teachers have been making more attempts to encourage their students to ask questions and to engage in some spontaneous use of English. Teachers now tend to regard themselves as being less "authoritarian" than before. Nonetheless, there is still a gulf between notions of the roles of teachers and learners in EFL and ESL settings.

In "communicative classrooms" in Anglophone countries one of the prime tenets of the CA is that the teacher's role is to facilitate communication, and that her contribution to classroom talk should be limited: it is often said that "the students need the practice, not the teacher." In Japan, as in other Asian countries, students may have only limited exposure to spoken English, and are eager for the teacher to read aloud, tell stories or talk about her own experiences. The cultural tradition of the teacher-centred classroom is alive and well, and likely to remain so for some time to come.

Secondly, the teacher tries as far as possible to elicit information about context and meaning, and the target language itself, from the students, who are expected to volunteer their answers in front of the whole class - with associated risks of loss of face if the answer should be "wrong". In the communicative classroom students are encouraged to utter, whether the

utterance be accurate or not, and are encouraged in the idea that mistakes are a normal and acceptable part of the process of language learning.

Thirdly, students are accustomed to asking questions if in doubt, and in some cultures are comfortable about challenging the teacher on rules of grammar if uncertainties arise which conflict with the student's own interpretation of the rule. Although such a challenge might be welcomed by the Japanese teacher of English, such a scenario would still be comparatively rare in Japan.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, it has to be said that the history of language learning methodology is a very long one, stretching back even to the comments made in the "Confessions" of St. Augustine of Hippo in the 4th century. In the last forty years, language teaching has seen a variety of methodological fads. Each new method or approach has been enthusiastically accepted as being the "right" one, capable of satisfying the wonderfully diverse needs of students everywhere, regardless of their individual differences. The large-scale financial investments and rewards of the publishing industry may encourage this pattern to continue.

The Monbusho's choice of the CA as its "official methodology" appears to have been made in an

attempt to increase participation and confidence in cross-cultural contact for a generation of Japanese. However, it was made without taking adequate account of existing educational frameworks, differences in culture, the needs of the students, the requirements of entrance examinations, and the prevailing factors by which Nayar (1997) distinguishes between various ESL and EFL settings. There is no large-scale evaluation currently underway which would indicate whether or not there has been an improvement in the English ability of Japanese students since the adoption of the CA.

In the meantime, Japanese teachers will continue to attend summer courses at institutions abroad, where the CA is often presented as a "one size fits all" methodology, and where the appropriacy of its underlying assumptions for diverse cultural contexts generally remains unchallenged.

All the more reason, perhaps, for teachers to question received opinions, actively pursue research based on classroom data and keep an open mind on approaches to language teaching. It may be that their own knowledge of their students' needs, coupled with an understanding of the cultural setting in which they are teaching, are just as important as the approaches or methodologies they adopt.

## REFERENCES

- Ellis, Greg (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? In *English Language Teaching Journal*, Vol. 50/3, pp. 213-218.
- Gumperz, John J. (1975). On the ethnology of linguistic change. In *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964*. Edited by William Bright. The Hague: Mouton.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1971). *On Communicative Competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Maslow, Abraham (1970). "Motivation and Personality." Second Edition. New York: Harper and Row.
- Nayar, P. Bhaskaran (1997). ESL/EFL Dichotomy Today: Language Politics or Pragmatics? *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Quarterly*, Vol. 31/1, pp. 9-37.

# コミュニケーション重視 方法論は万能薬か？

スー・コリンズ (愛知教育大学)

近年、極東文化圏の教育者たちは、コミュニケーション重視言語教育がどこでも通用するのかという疑問を感じている。エリス(1996)は、アジアの様々な地域の教育者が言及する文化と方法論の間の軋轢を論じつつ、ヴェトナムでの西欧流教授法導入から生じる文化摩擦に触れている。

さらに、もっと広汎な地域においてもエリスは、「能力開発者としての教師」という西欧流理想教師像が全世界的に通用すると考える危険性について指摘し、コミュニケーションアプローチは社会と文化に埋め込まれた一定の仮説のもとで成立つものだと念を押している。

日本においても文部省が10年前からコミュニケーション重視語学教育を奨励しているが、高校大学の教師たちの多くは、未だにコミュニケーションアプローチ(以後、CA)を教室で採用することに不安を感じており、文法訳読を含む伝統的な方法に固執する傾向がある。これは、大学英文科での英語テキストの扱い方にも数多くみられる。そこでは教員スタッフの高い英語運用能力にも関わらず、講義は日本語でなされている。英文学のテキストが学生の発表や討論のために和訳され、テキストに関する課題が日本語で提出されることも珍しいことではない。その理由は様々だが、よく耳にするのはテキストの理解や解釈が学生の英語能力を越えているという主張である。w?この論文において私は、CAを推進しようという公的政策に伴う問題と、CAが学生のニーズに合う最も適切な方法であるかどうか、教師たちに直感的に疑わせる懸念について考察する。これは、多くの人々にとっての葛藤の原因となっている。なぜならば日本で英語を外

国語として教える(EFLの)教師たちは、自分たちの教育方法論とは無関係に、所属する教育機関からCAに関連した学習活動を少なくとも幾つかは採用するように望まれているからだ。

日本の学校で、英語教育にCAを取り入れた結果が必ずしも芳しいものではないことは随所に見られる。教師も生徒も文法訳読の形式と内容を保持している入学試験の準備に追いまくられる一方で、その準備に役立つと同時にCAの教授法とも調和するような教育方法を選ぶという、教師にとって逃れられない解決不能の葛藤が存在するのだ。この論文の執筆時においても、日本の大学入学試験にリスニングとスピーキングのテストを取り入れてほしいという国民的要求は見られない。

## <日本におけるCA>

CAという考え方は、言語と文法を規範的なものというよりは記述的なものとみることに端を発している。言い換えれば、言語を絶えず進化するものとみなし、常に「正誤」を判断しようとする態度から結果的に解き放つ考えである。ガンパーツ(1975)、ハリデイ(1978)、ハイムズ(1971)など多くの社会言語学者の著作の影響で、言語習得の研究における、機能的意味と社会文化的環境が重視されるようになった。この変化は、言語による「コミュニケーション能力」の意味に対する考え方にも影響を与えている。この新しい考え方によれば、コミュニケーション能力は適切な文法の知識を持つことだけではなく、様々な社会的場面において、理解できる言語を適切に発し、かつ理解する能力も含んでいる。

CAは、アングロフォンの国だけではなく、広く様々な文化的環境において、ブリテッシュカウンシル運営の学校のような、イギリスと関係のある英語専門学校でおおいに広められている。さらに、

アジアの国々の中等高等教育機関の英語教師たちが、イギリスやオーストラリアやアメリカの大学での夏期集中コースや大学院課程を通じて、コミュニケーション重視の教授法に目を開かれている。文部省も、古参教授や教職養成者がCAと関連のある理論や学習方法に慣れるために、そのようなコースで再教育を受けるための資金をふんだんに割り当てている。

しかしながら、そのようなコースでは必ずしも個別実践授業を提供していないので、アングロフォンの国で英語を第二言語として学んでいる学習者と、コース参加者自身の文化的環境における教室で、英語を外国語として学んでいる者との間の相違は明確ではないし、はっきりと強調もされない。そのようなコースはしばしば現在行われている訓練の最良モデルとみなされるが、それらが推進している教授法がほんとうに最も成功していることを証明するデータがたとえ十分であったとしても、そのコースで推奨される方法論がコース参加者の母国の教育環境に最もふさわしいとは必ずしも限らない。

にも関わらず、訓練者や言語教育者たちのたゆまぬ努力と関与、国際会議、出版物などを通じ、その考え方や情報が熱心に広められたことによって、CAの混成型が日本中の多くの英語教師によって受け入れられ実践されている。しかし、他の地域と同じようにここ日本でも、教室からのデータ不足により、文部省のコミュニケーション重視教授法の導入以来、英語のレヴェルが上がったという証拠はないし、何人かの学者たちが主張するように、そのレヴェルが下がったという証拠もない。その動向を知る数少ない物差しの一つであるアジア諸国のTOEFLの点数との比較では、日本人の点数はここ数年、最低の部類に属している。しかし、TOEFLのようなタイプの試験が英語運用能力を測る普遍的な

段かどうかは疑問とされているので、そのような動向を探る物差しとしては信頼性に欠けるかもしれない。

<CAの前提条件と必要条件及びそれに関連する諸問題>

CAの前提条件はネイティブ並みの流暢さと言語認識の二点を含んでいる。

CAが教師に要求するのは、英語で話し聞き読み書くという四つの技能すべてにおける高い能力である。とりわけ、教師たちは機能的表現の社会言語学的妥当性についてネイティブ並みの判断ができなければならない。たとえば、何か人に迷惑をかけた時、簡単に「ごめんなさい」と言えばいいのか、あるいは、「ほんとうに申し訳ございません。どうお詫びしたらよろしいでしょうか？」というような、はるかに丁寧な謝罪のどちらを選ぶべきか判断するといったことである。

ここでは実際の表現だけが重要なのではなく、意味とニュアンスを正しく伝えるためにはイントネーションその他の機能的要素も大事なのである。しかし、日本の高校教師の多くは音韻論や社会言語学的知識を欠いているため、複雑なイントネーションやセンテンスリズムを扱う自信も技術もない。国立教育大学の英語教育専門科目として提供されているカリキュラムは文部省そのものに統括されているのだが、十分に専門化集中化されてはいず、従って、CAが必要とする機能重視のシラバスを扱えるような教師を適正に養成していない。

その結果として悪循環も生まれてくる。すなわち、話し言葉としての英語の特徴分析が不十分で自信もない教師は、クラスでの時間をそのことにあまり費やさず、従って生徒たちは機能的表現に触れる範囲がとて狭くなり、発音や韻律の特徴を無視するようになっていくのだ。言語の授業はコミュニケーション重

視のカリキュラム本来の目的である統一的技能として教えられるよりは、リスニングとリーディングとライティングに典型的に分けられてしまう。しかしながら同時にまた、読み書き能力の伝統的教え方である文法訳読教授法がCAの幾つかの側面と結びつき、その結果、文法や統語論の規則をあまり教えなくなる。つまり、方法論の選択がどっちつかずになり、予測し得る目的の混乱を生み出すのだ。

### <文法の位置>

高校のカリキュラムは「文法」に力点が置かれすぎているという生徒たちの不満にも関わらず、意味を決定する上での文脈や、社会文化的能力、談話レベルの文法の重要さは、シラバスや実際に使われている教材においてほとんど全く無視されている。

六年も英語を勉強したあとでさえも、時制の仕組みの正確な理解を持っている高校卒業生はほとんどなく、非常に限られた文のレベルでも、複雑な英語の語順をマスターしていない者が多い。大学入学試験で英語のエッセイを書かされても、彼らの書くものはしばしばほんの数センテンスに限られ、主語動詞の一致は不正確、構文は貧弱、接続詞その他で文の脈絡を保つ工夫も、全くと言っていいほど知らない。

一方、CAを目指すために会話やロールプレイに集中する授業は、必ずしも文法のパターンに十分な注意を払わなくなるという懸念の原因にもなる。

結果として求められる目的は、積極的にコミュニケーションをすることが当然であるような学習者を生み出すことなのだろうが、実際の学習者は貧弱で不適切なインターランゲッジのレベルにとどまっている。このレベルでの文法的誤りは「化石化」し、さらに勉強を続けたあとでさえも残ってしまう。

### <クラスの大きさと文化的価値>

CAの必須部分と考えられているペアワークやグループワーク、ロールプレイや会話は10人から15人、多くても20人のクラスを前提としている。英国やオーストラリア、カナダの民間ELTセンターのクラスは約15人である。しかし、日本の中学校の平均生徒数は約35人か、往々にしてそれ以上のこともある。高校になると、平均生徒数は約35人から40人へと増加する。生徒の発話を効果的にモニターしたり、発音に注意したり、個々の言語練習を指導するのは、かなり困難となり、経験の少ない教師には心理的障害となることも少なくない。

そこでは、もっと伝統的な「全員進め」方式を採用の方がクラスを運営する上でより簡単で、やりやすく思われる。この方式は相互助け合い方式という強固に守られている文化的価値をも反映しているのだが、その目的はクラス全体の向上で、数種のロールプレイと関連のあるもっと典型的に西欧風な個性や自己主張の推進ではない。

### <外国語環境における英語 対 アングロフォンの国の英語>

ネイヤー(1977)は時宜を得た記事の中でEFLやESLの多様な言語圏を分析してタイプ1・2・3に分け、アメリカ、カナダ、オーストラリアといったアングロフォンの国で英語を第二言語として教えること(ESL・タイプ2)と、英語話者のたくさんいる国でESLを教えること(シンガポールのようなESL・タイプ1)と、EFLを教えること(タイやインドネシア、日本といった英語が外国語である国)の間の幾つかの重要な相違を指摘している。

ESL・タイプ2というアングロフォンの国では、教師も生徒も多数の外的情報源から言語の直接的使用の再確認がで

きるし、豊かな言語使用のモデルをいくらでも得ることができる。そういった国々の生徒たちの最終目的は英語文化そのものと一体化したいということなのだ。従って彼らの動機づけは高い。マズロウの「必要性のピラミッド」の中で高位を占める日常的必要を確かに満たすためにコミュニケーションするのだから。

ESL・タイプ1では、英語はその土地本来のものとはみなされていないので、母国語のように広く話されてはいない。そしてEFLの国々では、英語は学校で教えられているが、その国の生活そのものでは重要な役割を果たしてはいない。

これら三つの異なる教育環境が持っている研究上の意味を論じつつ、ネイヤーが強く主張しているのは、言語使用や目標言語の利用頻度、教育環境を左右する他の政治的経済的要素とともに、言語学習の社会文化的感情的領域によって、一般に用いられている理論的前提や教育方法の実践が、ある地域では有用でも、また別の地域では使えないということを引き起こすのだという点である。

このことは、すべての社会的活動に十分に関与するために英語を身につけたいと思っているESL・タイプ2の国の学習者たちの動機づけと、大学入学試験に通るという目的だけに限られていて、コミュニケーションすることは要求されず、従って日常生活で英語を使う必要も勿論ない日本の高校生たちの全く異なる動機づけを比較することで確かめられる。

JET計画による、AET（英語指導助手）の中学や高校への配置は、少なくとも生徒たちがネイティブスピーカーというお手本を聞き、彼らと交流する機会を持つことを意味してきた。1997年8月現在、日本におけるAETの総数は5,351人である。このことは生徒たちの英語運用能力がAETたちと触れ合うことで改善される可能性を示しているかのようだが、欠点もある。第一に、これらの指導助手たちは日本到着以前に正

式なEFLの訓練を受けておらず、中には教育経験の全くない者もいる。第二に、AETの配置や雇用が行き当たりばったりのようにみえることである。幾つかの地域ではAETは週に二つから三つの学校を訪問するように配置され、日本人の英語教師に呼ばれた時だけその手伝いをするというのが彼らの役割である。多くの学校では、AETの姿が見られるのは二週間に一度に過ぎない。その結果、AETの多くは上記のような計画に不満を表明し、自分たちが人的資源として低く評価され、有効に使われていないと不平を持ち、その地位の不安定さに志気を挫かれていくのだ。入学試験の準備が強調され続けるために、AETが教える「会話のクラス」は生徒たちにとって価値の低いものと考えられがちで、その事実は、授業に与えられる単位の少なさという点に反映している。

高校生の中で、大学や短大に入れる程度の学力を身に付けようとしている者は、少なくとも、全体数の40パーセントを占める。その種の生徒たちにとって受験勉強は、文法、和訳、作文、読解が中心である。教室での対話、リスニングとスピーキング、学習者中心の課題中心活動や言語の社会機能的諸相に焦点を合わせることは、大学入学試験で良い成績を取るといふ生徒たちにとっての差し迫った必要には害のあるものとみなされる。そのためにコミュニケーション重視テストの導入が大幅に遅れ、管理上の難点が指摘されているのが現状である。

大学に進まない残りの50から60パーセントの生徒たちのために文部省は、コミュニケーション能力を高め、異文化理解を広げる課程を導入した。しかしながら、このコースが学力の低い子たちを対象にしているという事実そのものが、将来の日本の教育者や指導者になる者たち自身にとっての、口や耳の技能や社会言語学的能力の獲得の価値を貶めている。

## <教師の役割>

伝統的にアジアの文化では、教師に非常に特別な地位を与え、「名誉」とか「敬意」といった言葉が生徒の教師に対する見方に関連してしばしば使われる。しかし、日本においても時代は急速に変わりつつあり、「西欧化」の拡大が、生徒と教師の関係において感じられている役割や価値体系に微かな変化をもたらしている。

今日、教師が話し、生徒は聞いているというのは、伝統的な形態というよりはむしろ大きすぎるクラスのサイズのためであろう。最近では、伝統的な機械的学習や暗記とともに、教師たちは生徒たちに質問するよう促したり、自発的に英語を使わせるようにいろいろと試みている。教師たちは今では自分自身を以前よりは「権威的」ではないようにみなす傾向がある。にもかかわらず、EFLやESLの教育環境において、教師と学習者の役割という考え方の間にはいまだに大きな溝がある。

アングロフォンの国々での「コミュニケーションの教室」における教師の役割は、コミュニケーションを容易にすることだというのがCAの主要なポイントの一つであり、教師は教室ではできるだけ口をきかないようにすべきなのだ。すなわち、よく言われることだが、「生徒は教師ではなく、練習が必要」なのである。日本では、他のアジアの国々と同じように、生徒たちが英語を話す機会はほんとうに限られていて、教師にテキストを大きな声で読んでもらったり、物語をしてもらったり、教師自身の経験を語ってもらいたがる。教師中心の教室は生き残っており、まだしばらくは続くものと思われる。

第二に、教師は文脈や意味、それから目標言語それ自身に関する情報を生徒たちからできるだけ引きだそうと努める。そして生徒たちは、もし答えが間違っ

いたら恥をかく危険を承知の上で、クラス全体の前で自発的に答えを出すことを求められるのだ。コミュニケーション重視の教室では、生徒たちは、正しかろうが間違っていようが、発言することを奨励され、間違いは語学学習の過程の当然の受容し得る部分であるという考えのもとに発言することを促されるのだ。

第三に、生徒たちはもし疑問があれば質問することが習慣になっており、文法規則についても、生徒自身の規則の解釈と矛盾するような不正確さが生じたら、その点について教師に論戦を挑んでもなんの問題もない文化もある。日本人英語教師の中にもそのような論戦を歓迎する者がいるかもしれない。しかし日本ではそのような筋書きはまだなかなか見られない。

## <結論>

結論として言われなければならないのは、4世紀に書かれたヒッポの聖アウグスチヌスの「告白」にまでさかのぼるほど言語学習方法論は非常に長い歴史を持っているということだ。最近40年間に、言語教育には様々な教授法の流行があった。新しい方法やアプローチが「正しい」ものとして熱狂的に受け入れられてきた。地域性の相違を無視し、どこの国でも通用するとともに、学習者の驚くべき多様なニーズを満たすものと見なされたのである。大規模な財政投資や、出版社の利益がこのような形態の続行を促すのだろう。

文部省がCAを「公認教授法」に選んだのは、若い日本人が異文化接触に際して気後れせず、自信を失わないようになってもらいたいと考えたからであろう。しかしながら、現存する教育制度の枠組み、文化の相違、生徒たちのニーズ、入学試験の要求、そして、ネイヤー(1997)がESLやEFLの多様な環境を区別するのに使った支配的要素などに適正に注目して選択がなされたかと

例えば、そうではない。CAの採用以来、日本の生徒たちの英語能力が改善されたのかどうかを示す大規模な評定は現在のところ行われてはいない。

この間、日本の教師たちは海外の教育機関での夏期コースに参加し続けている。そこではCAが「誰にでもぴったりのフリーサイズ」の教授法としてしばしば提示され、様々な文化状況に対する暗黙の前提が適正かどうかについては、一般的には検討されないままである。

それだからこそますます教師たちは一般的に認められている意見に疑問を呈し、教室でのデータに基づく研究を積極的に追求し、言語教育に対するいろいろなアプローチにも心を広くするべきなのだ。自分たちが教えている文化的環境を理解し、生徒たちのニーズを知ることが、教師たちの採用するアプローチや教授法と同じくらい重要かもしれないから。

訳：大熊光子（国学院大学）

## TE SIG committee contacts:

Coordinator: Neil Cowie  
635 Shimo Okubo, Urawa shi  
Saitama 338 0825  
Tel./ Fax: 048-853-4566  
<cowie@crisscross.com>

Mbrship/Printing: Tim Knowles  
Tomigaya 2-34-7, Shibuya-ku  
Tokyo 151-0063  
Tel. (w) 03-3238-3844  
Tel. (h) 03-3485-3041  
Fax (w) 03-3238-3885  
Fax (w) 03-3485-3041  
<t-knowle@hoffman.cc.sophia.ac.jp>

Treasurer: Gordon Bateson  
2-2-23 Shinkanda, Kanazawa-shi  
Ishikawa-ken 921  
Tel. 0762-92-3577  
<gordon@po2.nsknet.or.jp>

Newsletter: Paul Beaufait  
14-23-404, Kengun Honmachi  
Kumamoto-shi 862-0910  
Tel. (w) 096-383-2929 x 646  
Tel. (h) 096-365-5650  
Fax (w) 096-383-2966  
Fax (h) 096-365-5650  
<pab@pu-kumamoto.ac.jp>

Newsletter: Haruko Katsura  
Tel. (w) 011-841-1161 x 281  
Tel. (h) 011-572-9763  
Fax (w) 011-824-7729  
Fax (h) 011-572-9763  
<harubo@elsa.hokkai-s-u.ac.jp>

Program: Merinda Wilson  
8-6-39 Takura-dai, Suma-ku  
Kobe 654  
Tel. (h) 078-731-6198  
Fax (w) 078-732-5161  
<m.wilson@suma.kobe-wu.ac.jp>

Program: Janina Tubby  
c/o Sumikin-Intercom  
7-28 Kitahama 4-chome  
Chuo-ku, Osaka 541-0041  
Tel. (w) 078-845-5768  
<janina@gol.com>

Recording Sec'y: Anthony Robins  
Tobe Mansion B32, Tobe-cho 3-59  
Minami-ku, Nagoya-shi  
Aichi-ken 457-0043  
Tel./ fax (h) 052-823-5753  
<robins@ks.kyy.nitech.ac.jp>

We are publishing the following announcement at the request of the Other Languages Educators' Special Interest Group (OLE SIG) coordinator. If you are interested in obtaining more information about the learning or teaching of languages other than English or Japanese, please contact the OLE SIG coordinator, Rudolf Reinelt.

## Statement of Purpose of the Other Language Educators' Special Interest Group

### 1. Background and aims of OLE

For the goal of world peace and international understanding it is necessary to allow as many individuals as possible to come in contact with, learn or teach different languages and cultures in the most effective and meaningful ways. Additionally, in the face of the impending restructuring at many universities, it is vital that such teachers and learners, as yet not represented professionally on a nationwide scale, be given the opportunity to share their ideas and views with others with related concerns and interests. The organizational form of a SIG (i.e. Special Interest Group) open to teachers and learners of all other foreign languages within JALT, so far comprising about 3000 teachers and learners of English and Japanese, seems appropriate.

### 2. Goals and Activities of this SIG

Our first priority is to enable all interested teachers, learners,

researchers, material developers and administrators to exchange ideas through meetings and publications.

#### 2.1. Workshops, forums and presentations:

- to show that teaching, learning and research in languages and cultures beyond English and Japanese are dynamic and widespread activities throughout Japan, and that these endeavors are very beneficial to Japanese society.

- to improve the teaching of such languages by devising methods that can be used by all teachers, regardless of background or origin, and to encourage research and sharing of ideas, activities and materials among educators of specific languages.

#### 2.2. OLE Newsletter and other publications:

- to gather and disseminate information on all aspects of the teaching and learning of languages and cultures beyond English and Japanese, and especially,

- to help such teachers and learners, by developing a network of friendship and mutual support, to arouse interest in their field and to provide information and material to enable them to optimize the organizational conditions for their study, work and research to the best of their abilities.

### 3. Contact information:

Rudolf Reinelt, Coordinator  
Ehime University, Fac. of Law &  
Letters, Dept. of Humanities  
Bunkyo-cho 3, Matsuyama  
790-8577 JAPAN  
Tel & Fax (w): -81-89-927-9359  
E-mail: reinelt@ll.ehime-u.ac.jp,  
reinelt@iname.com  
URL: <http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/Fields/1456/index.html>

以下のメッセージは「他言語の教育者のSIG」(OLE SIG)のコーディネーターからの養成があつて掲載するものです。英語や日本語以外の言語を学習、教授することに関するより詳しい情報はOLD SIGのコーディネーター、Rudolf Reinelt までお問い合わせください。

## OLE SIGの声明書

### 1. OLEの背景及び目的

世界の平和、国際理解のゴールを達成するには出来るだけ多くの個人が接触しあい、その言語や文化を最も効果的な方法で学習し教えあふ必要があります。さらに、私の大学で起ころうとしている改革に際し、そのような教科の教員や学習者が全国規模ではまだ現わされてないにしても互に関連する興味や問題についての考え方やアイデアを交換する場があることは大変重要なことなのです。現在3000名の英語、及び日本語の教授者、学習者をもつJALTで他の外国言語の教授者、学習者ためのSIGを組織することはふさわしいことであると思えます。

### 2. 本SIGのゴール、及び活動

我々の最優先事項は興味を持つすべての教員、学習者、研究者、教材開発者、そして経営管理者がミーティング、出版物を通してアイデアを交換することができるようになることです。

### 2.1. ワークショップ、フォーラム、発表

- そのためには英語、日本語を越えた他の言語や文化の教授、学習、研究は日本中に広く普及したダイナミックな活動であり、このような努力は日本社会にとって大変有益であることを示すこと。

- このような言語の教授を、背景や期限の異なった言語の全ての教員が使えるような教授法をみだし、向上させること。そしてこれらの言語の教員に対して研究やアイデア、アクティビティや教材の交換を奨励すること。

### 2.2. OLEニューズレター及び他の発行物

- 英語、日本語を越えた他の言語や文化の教授、学習に関するすべての局面の情報を収集し、広めるためのものである。特に、

- そのような教員や学習者を、友好や相互サポートのネットワークを擁立し、助ける。それは会員の各分野への興味を喚起し、学習、仕事、研究が最も効率良くいくように組織的な状況を最大限に活用すべく、情報や教材を供給するためである。

### 3. 連絡先:

コーディネーター: Rudolf Reinelt

愛媛大学法文学部人文学科

松山市文京町3番 790-8577

Tel & Fax (w): -81-89-927-9359

E-mail: reinelt@il.ehime-u.ac.jp,  
reinel@iname.com

URL: <http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/Fields/1456/index.html>

---

## NLP Summer Courses in Tokyo and Nagoya

---

### NLP 夏期研修 (東京・名古屋)

毎年夏に、名古屋の南山大学にて、ニュージーランドからのNLP専門家による、ワークショップが開催されております。今年は、名古屋及び、新たに東京女学館短期大学においても開催されることとなりました。詳細は下記のホームページをご覧ください。

Each summer professional NLP trainers come from New Zealand to Nanzan University in Nagoya to do both short and longer workshops on using NLP in teaching. This year they will be running courses in both Nagoya and in Tokyo at Tokyo Jogakkan Junior College. You can learn more about NLP and how it can enhance both teaching and learning by visiting the special issue about NLP of *JALT Language Teacher* available on line at:

<http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/97/feb/index.html#toc>

#### What is NLP?

NLP provides amazingly simple, powerful methods for changing the way you think, feel, act and learn. These techniques are used to achieve success in teaching, counselling, health care, sports and personal development. *Psychology Today* magazine says 'NLP may be the most powerful vehicle for change in existence.'

NLP or Neuro Linguistic Programming is a field based on the study of how people achieve success. Developed by Professor of Linguistics John Grinder and Mathematician Richard Bandler in the 1970s. By showing in detail the way highly successful people "use their brain" it enables you to learn faster, motivate yourself and others, enjoy daily life more and achieve goals easier. In teaching, NLP explains the science behind the teaching tools of Accelerated Learning.

#### Who are the trainers?

Dr Richard Bolstad and Margot Hamblett are trainers with the International Association for Neuro Linguistic Programming (<http://www.cybermall.co.nz/nz/nlp/index.html>). They have taught in Japan the last four years, and also train each year in Europe and in New Zealand. They are the authors of three books, the latest being "Transforming Communication", which is used as a text in several New Zealand degree programs, including at Auckland Medical School.

Their articles appear in a number of magazines internationally, including "The Language Teacher" in Japan. Richard's doctoral project was based on the work that he and Margot did training psychiatrists and social workers in Bosnia-Herzegovina to deal with the psychological trauma of the Balkan wars. Here's what people said of last summer's courses:

*"Extremely valuable. A method for changing oneself dramatically in ones personal and professional life. Negativity dissolves in the bright searchlight of positivity. Brilliant and heartwarming!"*

Dr. Susan Shingleton, University Professor, Nagoya

*"This course can change you into a happier, wiser person, both personally and career-wise."*

Momoko Adachi, English Teacher, Nagoya

*"Richard and Margot were well organized, interesting, good speakers, good natured people, full of knowledge and experiences. Interesting!! Worth joining it."*

Hiroko, English teacher, Nagoya

### Three courses will be offered this summer:

**Keys to Success weekend:** A two day introduction to the principles and practice of NLP.

**Educational Hypnosis** *What is Educational Hypnosis?* A four day follow up to the initial two days that focuses more on the use of NLP in teaching.

**NLP Practitioner Certificate** *Who is it for?* The above courses are prerequisites to this certification course.

<b>COURSES</b>	<b><u>Tokyo</u></b>	<b><u>Nagoya</u></b>
Keys to Success Weekend:	August 7-8	July 31-August 1
Educational Hypnosis:	August 9-12	August 2-5
NLP Practitioner Certificate:	August 14-19 + 21-26	-----

Cost: ¥10,000/day. 20% discount for full time students. 10% secures your place.

### For more information contact:

- Momoko Adachi (in Japanese) (052) 833-7968 phone/ fax,
- Linda Donan (in English) email: <donan@hum.nagoya-cu.ac.jp> or phone: (052) 872-5836, or
- Sean Conley email: <Sean.Conley@sit.edu>

# TESOL Journal Special Issue

## Preparing teachers for work in diverse ESOL contexts: An international perspective

Coeditors: Lynn Henrichsen & Lilia Savova

The Fall 2000 special issue of the TESOL Journal will focus on how ESOL teacher educators and teacher education programs prepare teachers to work successfully in diverse contexts around the globe. Of particular interest are the processes and adaptations that teacher education programs go through in order to accommodate the needs of teachers going to or coming from different parts of the world.

Contributions from the following topic areas related to this general theme are particularly encouraged:

1. What teacher education programs in English-speaking countries do to prepare participants for teaching EFL abroad. The particular aspects of teaching theory and practice, cultural adjustment, and foreign educational systems that they deal with to accomplish this end.
2. How teacher education courses around the world develop future teachers' sensitivity, flexibility, and adaptability in order to enable them to deal with teaching situations that are new and unknown as well as to explore and learn from the diverse environments in which they may find themselves in the future.
3. The allowances and adjustments that teacher education programs in ESL settings (e.g., TESOL MA programs in North America, the UK, and Australia) make for international students who are from non-English-speaking countries and plan to return to their homelands to teach. Also, the special concerns and difficulties these international students have as they go through a teacher education program in an ESL setting.
4. The special challenges faced by teacher educators as they present workshops or give courses for ESOL teachers in diverse contexts in different parts of the world—especially those that are radically different from the setting in which these teacher educators normally operate.

5. How special connections between teacher education programs in English-speaking countries and "partner" EFL programs in other parts of the world have benefited and shaped the curricula of the teacher preparation programs.

6. How ESOL teacher preparation programs in different parts of the world vary depending on, and reflecting, local circumstances, needs, and resources.

Also encouraged are case studies that

- Focus on specific instances of the diverse situations around the world in which ESOL teachers find themselves and note the implications for teacher education.
- Illustrate the internationalization of preservice and inservice ESOL teacher education programs.
- Demonstrate effective practices used in ESOL teacher education programs around the world.

The topical guidelines listed above are not intended to be exclusive or restrictive. Contributions dealing with other areas relating to the general theme or combining more than one of the topics listed are also welcome. Submissions from authors who currently are, or recently have been, in international (non-US) settings are especially encouraged.

Contributions are welcome in all departments: articles, tips, reviews, and perspectives. All submissions must conform to regular submission guidelines.

The deadline for submission is January 31, 2000. Please send queries and material to:

Lynn Henrichsen, Department of  
Linguistics, 3178 JKHB, Brigham Young  
University, Provo, UT 84602 USA;

or queries, only, to:

<lynn\_henrichsen@byu.edu>.

## 多様なESOL環境で働く教員を養成する：国際的視点から

共編: Lynn Henrichsen and Lilia Savova

TESOL 2000 秋号はESOLの教員養成プログラムで教員達がどのようにして世界中の多様な教育環境で働く教員を養成しているかに焦点を当てます。特に世界の様々な場所から来る、あるいは様々な場所に行く教員達のニーズに答えるべく、教員養成のプログラムがどのようなプロセスを持ち、適合させているのか、というところに特に関心をおきます。

この一般テーマに関する下記の領域に焦点をあてた論文を特に奨励します。

1. 英語圏での教員養成プログラムがどのようにして海外のEFL環境で教える教員を養成しているか。特にこれに関連した教授法理論と実践、文化適合、当該外国の教育システムの理解、等がテーマであるもの。

2. 将来の教員にとって新しく未知である教授環境に対して、彼等が対処できるような感性、柔軟性、適応性を開発し、さらに将来彼等が置かれるであろう多様な環境を探索し、学習する能力を開発している、世界中の教員養成コースについて書かれたもの。

3. ESL諸国の教員養成プログラムで（例えば、北米、英国あるいはオーストラリアのTESOL修士等）英語を母国語としない諸国からの学生を受け入れ、卒業後に各国に彼等が戻り、英語の教員になるための養成ができるプログラムの許容度、および調整に関して書かれたもの。又、このような海外からの学生がESLの教員養成プログラムにおいて経験する難しさ、及びそのための配慮に関するもの。

4. 教員養成の教員がワークショップやコースを世界各国の多様な状況のもとで行なおうとした際に直面した難題、特に

教員養成を行なう各教員にとっての通常の状態、から著しく異なった経験等に関するもの。

5. 英語圏の教員養成プログラムと各国におけるその「パートナー」EFLプログラムの特別な結びつきが、教員準備プログラムをどのように形作り、また、両者にどのような共益があったか、を書いたもの。

6. 世界中の様々な地域でのESOLの教員準備プログラムがどのように各地域の状況、ニーズ、リソースに依存し、またそれを反映しているかについて書かれたもの。

さらに以下のようなケーススタディーも奨励します。

\* 世界各国の多様な状況でESOL教員が各自が特別な事例、あるいは教員教育に対するその掛かり合いに焦点を置いたもの。

\* ESOL教員教育プログラムの教育実習、及び就職後の教員教育における国際化を述べたもの。

\* 世界中のESOLの教員教育プログラムの効果的な実践について著したもの。

上記に並べた題材に関するガイドラインはこれに限定するものでも、その他の題材を制限するものでもありません。一般テーマに関連する他の領域を扱ったもの、上記トピックスの複数を結び付けたものも歓迎します。さらに国際的な（非USの）状況に現在いる、あるいは最近までいた、という著者の応募を奨励します。

応募はすべての分野：論文、助言、論評、展望、で歓迎します。

締め切りは2000年 1月31日。

質問、原稿は Lynn Henrichsen, Department of Linguistics, 3178 JKHB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602 USA. まで。

また質問のみ <lynn\_henrichsen@byu.edu>.