



On the Development of Classroom Communicative Competence in Reading-Based English Class at University Level

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2010-07-12 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 村端, 五郎, 村端, 佳子 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.32150/00004760

On the Development of Classroom Communicative Competence in Reading-Based English Class at the University Level

Goro MURAHATA

and

Yoshiko MURAHATA

Department of Foreign Languages (English Language Education)

Hokkaido University of Education, Iwamizawa

1. Introduction

A major goal in English language education in Japan is maximizing the success of English learners in our schools. Over the last several years there have been perennial discussions on how to develop proficiency and fluency in English, and English education in Japan is certain to shift its focus to actual English use for communication from traditional translation-grammar studying. High schools, for example, started to require "Oral Communication" English courses from 1994 following the revision of the Monbusho Course of Study. Thus, high school graduates who have finished those new courses will enter university in the spring of 1997. As teachers of English at universities in Japan, what can we do with this shift of focus in English education? This simple question has been providing the present writers with a strong impetus for exploring communicative-oriented English classes at the university level.

The aim of this paper is twofold: 1) to explore communication-oriented English classes in practice from socio-cultural perspectives arguing that the learners in those classes should be encouraged to develop classroom communicative competence to participate actively in classroom activities, and 2) to propose that English classes can be made communicative through content- and reading-centered activities in which teacher-student and peer group interactions play a central part.

First we discuss, based on the results of a questionnaire, the proposition that Japanese students should acquire classroom communicative competence to actively participate in classroom events, once they are enrolled in a communication-oriented English class. Such an English class can be viewed as a unique English speaking society where specific norms govern the events. Those norms do not accept Japanese students' acquired learning attitudes in prior classes at high school. By learning how to perform successfully in communicative English classes, they can participate actively in communication in English, which will eventually lead them to acquire communicative competence in English. The English learning environment in Japan shows that they are learning English as a foreign language, which means they are not learning it for actual use out of the class to live their everyday life. Therefore our assumption is that they are rather to be convinced to learn English to use it in the classroom.

Then we discuss how we can offer content- and reading-based English classes with plenty of interactive

activities to keep up with the present move toward English for communication and to foster an English speaking atmosphere in class. Recent studies advocate content English classes as a more effective way to learn English (Richard-Amato, 1996: 298) especially at the university level (Musumeci, 1996; Torikai and Shindo, 1996). Also, reading is quite an active interaction between readers and texts, between learners and their instructor, and among readers (Brown, 1994a: 283-303; G. Murahata, 1996: 103-105; Rivers, 1981: 266-268). Reading would be no longer taken as a passive behavior. It can provide various activities where students can interact with one another, ranging from question-and-answers for checking comprehension to writing comments or having discussions as post-reading activities (Rivers, 1981: 265). These activities create communicative situations where genuine interactions for meaning are possible. Those interactions are the essential factor for language acquisition (Brown, 1994a: 159-160; Brown, 1994b: 41).

2. English Class as a Unique Society

2. 1 English Classes in Japan

First we should acknowledge the fact that English learning in Japan does not premise its practical use in society. Therefore, classroom teaching should be viewed with much more importance given to interactive communication if English for communication is stressed. Though English words and phrases are commonplace in Japanese society and we can make full use of TV or radio programs for learning English, ordinary university students are isolated from English for real communication in their daily life once they get out of the classroom. Given this, how can they be expected to acquire English for communication unless they are taught and trained to use English in real communicative situations?

It is often said that English teachers teaching in Japan often face a big barrier of students' silence (Helgesen, 1993). Even if they try to organize a communicative English class, interactive activities among students or those between the teacher and the class do not go very well as expected. By a "communicative English class" we mean here a class where all of the attendees are expected to use English as a means of communication, whatever information they may get across: from instructions for classroom activities, to question-and-answer activities for comprehension checking, to expressing their own opinions and ideas during the class (details and examples will be presented in Section 3). It is a class where only English is used except on very special occasions. In order for such a communicative class to be successful, reciprocal person-to-person interactions for real meaning are necessary. In recent studies researchers stress the importance of interaction in communicative language class (Aoki, 1990: 131; Brown, 1994a: 81; Gass and Varonis, 1994: 300; Malamah-Thomas, 1987: 11; Pica, 1987: 4). However it is very difficult for interactions in English to occur in the present situation of English classes in Japan, as will be described below.

University English classes in Japan usually provide the following homogeneous learning environment. They consist of 30 to 50 native speakers of Japanese learning English as a required foreign language and an instructor who is a native Japanese speaker. This environment for learning a language may in a sense produce an easily conductive class but at the same time it lacks the urge for communication through the target language. That is, all of the learners' first language is Japanese and they all know that their teacher is a Japanese, therefore, they feel no need to use any foreign language to communicate with one another other than for the genuine purpose of learning it. This situation hardly convinces all of the classroom attendees to

communicate and negotiate for meaning in the target language.

We have to remember, however, that the students in university English classes are not completely beginners of English learning. They are only “false beginners” in that they “have studied and attained language skills in some areas, but because their instruction was limited in focus, function at a beginning level” (Helgesen, 1993 : 38). They have at least six years of experience of studying English in high school, and they have stored some amount of English knowledge. Then all we have to do is to activate their stored linguistic knowledge toward its practical use. How can we have them interact with one another and use their knowledge of English for communication? One thing we can say here is that once they are enrolled in a communicative English class we should at least have them change their classroom attitudes toward learning English which they have acquired through prior experience. Thus we will examine what kind of classroom attitudes our students have acquired so far in the following section.

2. 2 Classroom Attitudes of Japanese Students

2. 2. 1 Methods

Here, we should concern ourselves with the acquired classroom attitudes of Japanese students. For better understanding of class participation attitudes of university students from socio-cultural perspectives, a questionnaire survey was conducted around the beginning of December 1996 in two universities –University A (UA) and University B (UB)– in Hokkaido, where the present writers are teaching. The participants were non-English major freshmen and sophomores. The classes were reading-based communicative English classes, where only English was used throughout the lesson.

The questions were mainly concerned with the style of the participants’ English classes at university and at high school, and their use of English for communication. Also their attitudes toward asking questions were inquired into, because this area seemed to produce major obstacles in classroom activities. They seldom ask questions, though asking a question has many advantages in language learning: to start a conversation quite easily, to practice the target language, to check both their linguistic knowledge and understanding of what they learned, to show their cooperative attitudes to produce a good English speaking environment, to control the conversation topic so that they can follow it, and eventually to get greater linguistic exposure by their interlocutors. Besides, teachers in a language class always welcome questions because good questions show deep individual involvement in class activities and contribute greatly to the activation of a lesson. Therefore, it is one of the most expected behaviors in a communicative language class.

The original questionnaire was composed in Japanese so that it would be easier for the students to complete. All of the questions were in multiple-choice form and all the students had to do was to circle the number of the description which they thought most closely expressed their attitudes and ideas. For some of the questions they were free to choose more than one answer.

2. 2. 2 Results

The number of participants in UA was 50, and 82 in UB . In the tables below the numbers without parentheses show the raw numbers of students and the numbers in parentheses express percentages.

From the questionnaire, the following enumerated below became clear regarding classroom attitudes of

Japanese high school and university students and their learning environments.

1. 64.0% of the students in UA and 70.7% in UB are taking or have taken an English course taught in English only, besides the present class. Those English classes are not always conversation classes but some are content-based classes. The instructor may be a Japanese or a native speaker of English, and UB has more of the latter case. In UA more students are taught through content-based English classes in English by a Japanese instructor, while in UB more students tend to take an English conversation class taught by a native speaker of English (Table 1). This is simply because their curricula are different.
2. 64.0% of the students in UA and 70.7% in UB have asked a question in English in class. The rest (46.0% in UA and 29.2% in UB) have not asked any questions for at least nine months. 38% of the students in UA and 40.2% in UB replied that they hesitate to ask because not many students actually do so in class. Modest as their behavior is, however, in their mind 80.0% of the students in UA and 78.0% in UB think that asking a question shows a positive attitude to a lesson, and few of them have any negative ideas about the act of asking questions. They do not take it as an unexpected behavior, showing poor understanding or lack of preparation, or interruption of classroom procedure (Table 2: Questions 4, 5, and 6).
3. 50.0% of the students in UA and 64.6% in UB would like to ask teachers in class what linguistic form to use to express their ideas. This result is consistent with that of Question 7; what makes asking a question difficult seems to be that they do not know an appropriate linguistic form for expressing their ideas in English (76.0% in UA and 61.0% in UB). An unexpectedly small number of students (24.0% in UA and 15.9% in UB), however, consider the behavior of asking a question as good practice for using the language (Table 2: Question 5, 6, and 7).
4. 52.0% of the students in UA and 41.5% in UB would like to ask questions about the content of the written passage which they read. This slightly contradicts the result that 24.0% in UA and 32.9% in UB would like to check their understanding by asking questions (Table 2: Question 5).
5. To 34.0% of the students in UA and 40.0% in UB it would be less difficult to ask questions during group work when an instructor walks around the class. This tendency is quite understandable because they do not have to stand out if they ask a question during group work. It is interesting, in contrast, to find that more than half of the students, 56.0% in UA and 56.1% in UB, chose the answer that asking question itself is difficult because they are not used to doing so in class in the first place (Table 4: 7).
6. 62.0% of the students in UA and 78.0% in UB admitted they received Japanese translation and grammatical explanation in English classes in high school. 84.0% of the students in UA and 73.2% in UB pointed out that "students do not speak until teachers call on them." Some students, 12.0% in UA and 14.6% in UB, even chose the description that "teachers did not ask students for their ideas and opinions." These results describe how students are used to taking passive English classes translating English into Japanese and listening to grammatical explanations without asking questions voluntarily (Table 3: Question 8 and 9).
7. Concerning their experience of practical use of English, in senior high school 62.0% of the students in UA and 65.9% in UB seldom used English or did not use English at all for real communication in class. As for the use of English outside of class, more students, 78.0% in UA and 69.5% in UB, seldom used it or never did in real communicative settings during their senior high school days.
8. As for their English exposure outside of class, during their high school days nearly half of them studied privately for the STEP (Society for Testing English Proficiency) test at home or attended English conversation

Table 1 Kinds of University English Classes Taken by Students

Question	Choices	University A (n = 50)		University (n = 82)	
		n	%	n	%
1. Have you had a course taught in English besides this course ?	yes	32	64.0	58	70.7
	no	18	36.0	24	29.8
2. What kind of class ? (out of Yes's in Q.1)(You may choose more than one answer.)	conversation	15	46.9	34	58.6
	literature reading	3	9.4	2	3.4
	general reading	16	50.0	11	19.0
	cross cultural	2	6.3	10	17.2
	listening	0	0.0	4	6.9
	other	2	6.3	4	6.9
3. The instructor was ? (out of Yes's in Q.1)(You may choose more than one answer.)	Japanese	22	68.8	16	27.6
	native speaker	13	40.6	53	91.4
	team teaching	0	0.0	1	1.7

Table 2 Students' Attitude toward Asking Questions in University English Classes

Question	Choices	University A (n = 50)		University B (n = 82)	
		n	%	n	%
4. Have you asked a question in English in class ?	yes	26	52.0	57	69.5
	no	23	46.0	24	29.2
	no answer	1	2.0	1	1.2
5. What kind of questions do you want to ask in class ? (You may choose more than one answer.)	on meaning of words and phrases	23	46.0	31	37.8
	on sentence structure	15	30.0	26	31.7
	on content of the passage	26	52.0	34	41.5
	on class activities	12	24.0	29	35.4
	on expressions	25	50.0	53	64.6
	to check understanding	12	24.0	27	32.9
	should not ask at all	0	0.0	1	1.2
	should ask after the class if at all	0	0.0	1	1.2
	other	2	4.0	1	1.2
no answer	0	0.0	1	1.2	
6. What does 'asking questions' mean to you ? (You may choose more than one answer.)	lack of understanding	3	6.0	1	1.2
	good preparation for the lesson	14	28.0	28	34.1
	showing positive attitude to class	40	80.0	64	78.0
	hesitate because not many ask	19	38.0	33	40.2
	good practice	12	24.0	13	15.9
	some questions are too basic to ask	0	0.0	10	12.2
	bad attitude in class	0	0.0	0	0.0
	other	0	0.0	1	1.2
no answer	0	0.0	1	1.2	
7. What makes it difficult to ask questions in English in class ? (You may choose more than one answer.)	not used to asking	28	56.0	46	56.1
	not knowing how to say	38	76.0	50	61.0
	shyness	8	16.0	23	28.0
	showing poor preparation	1	2.0	0	0.0
	not in class but in group or in person	17	34.0	33	40.2
	questions too easy to ask	5	10.0	14	17.0
	lack of preparation	7	14.0	14	17.0
	other	0	0.0	2	2.4

Table 3 Ways of Using English and Asking Questions in Junior and Senior High School English Classes

Question	Choices	University A (n = 50)		University B (n = 82)	
		n	%	n	%
8. How did you use English in class? (You can choose more than one answer.)	easy English throughout the class	5	10.0	5	6.1
	used only for greetings	33	66.0	37	45.1
	used for Q & A about what is written	4	8.0	7	8.5
	sometimes had team teaching	12	24.0	11	13.4
	not used, but translation and grammar explanation were given	31	62.0	64	78.0
	other	1	2.0	3	3.6
9. How were questions asked in class? (You can choose more than one answer.)	comparatively free to ask a question	10	20.0	11	13.4
	not enough time to ask a question	13	26.0	14	17.0
	questions mean poor preparation for class	0	0.0	1	1.2
	students said nothing until called on	42	84.0	60	73.2
	teachers did not ask students for ideas	6	12.0	12	14.6
	other	2	4.0	3	3.6
	no answer	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 4 Frequency of Students' Use of English in and outside of Junior and Senior High School English Classes

Question	Choices	University A (n = 50)		University B (n = 82)	
		n	%	n	%
10. How often did you use English to express your own ideas and opinions in class?	quite often	1	2.0	3	3.6
	sometimes	17	34.0	19	23.2
	seldom	18	36.0	40	48.8
	never	13	26.0	14	17.1
11. How often did you use English to express your own ideas and opinions outside of class?	quite often	1	2.0	8	9.8
	sometimes	10	20.0	16	19.5
	seldom	18	36.0	26	31.7
	never	21	42.0	31	37.8

school or 'juku' after school. This does not guarantee, however, that they used it as a means of communication as stated above. Nearly half of the students from each university (46.0% in UA and 50.0% in UB) had no exposure to English outside of class during their senior high school days. After they enter university, the exposure becomes even less: 74.0% at UA and 56.1% at UB have no exposure to English outside of class in their everyday life.

2.3 Discussion of the Results

2.3.1 Classroom Attitudes

The results of the questionnaire on students, English learning environment and classroom attitudes give us some implications from socio-cultural perspectives, which might easily be overlooked when we promote a communicative English lesson. As any member of a society will learn and acquire appropriate ways to behave, reflecting the sociocultural values of their society, school students also acquire certain types of attitudes suitable for the norms which organize the class. It is very important for the teacher, therefore, to realize that any discontinuity between the acquired class participation styles of the classroom attendees and the

Table 5 Students' Exposure to English at Present and in High School Days

Question	Choices	University A (n = 50)		University B (n = 82)	
		n	%	n	%
12. Do you have any chance to use English outside of class now? (You can choose more than one answer.)	attended conversation school abroad for a short time	0	0.0	5	6.1
	in seminar or club activities	5	10.0	13	15.9
	studying privately for STEP or TOEFL at home	2	4.0	23	28.0
	have a chance to talk with friends from abroad	1	2.0	9	10.8
	write to a pen pal abroad	1	2.0	2	2.4
	had a trip to abroad	1	2.0	4	4.9
	none at all	37	74.0	46	56.1
	other	4	8.0	4	4.9
13. Did you have any chance to use English outside of class in high school days? (You can choose more than one answer.)	attended school abroad as an exchange student	1	2.0	5	6.1
	lived abroad	0	0.0	1	1.2
	in club activities	1	2.0	4	4.8
	attended juku or conversation school	14	28.0	21	25.6
	studied privately for STEP or conversation at home	13	26.0	26	31.7
	offered a homestay for people from abroad	1	2.0	4	4.8
	wrote to a pen pal abroad	4	8.0	6	7.3
	none at all	23	46.0	41	50.0
other	5	10.0	3	3.6	

expected class participation styles in the class would hinder learning and devalue the students' class performance (Johnson, 1995). That the students do not do well in class or do not look willing to learn does not always mean that they are lazy. Rather they just do not know how to adjust themselves to the new class.

Thus when students are enrolled in a new class organized by unfamiliar norms, they have to learn how to participate in classroom activities successfully and to become communicatively competent in class. This competence is called classroom communicative competence (Wilkinson, 1982). Johnson (1995) strongly argues for the importance of acquiring classroom communicative competence in the second language classroom. The competence should be recognized as "contributing to successful classroom participation, productive classroom learning, opportunities for second language acquisition, and, of greatest importance, the development of overall communicative competence in a second language" (Johnson, 1995: 160-161). We should not forget that any class consists of what resides not only in teachers but also in their students and a successful classroom lesson depends largely on ideal classroom attitudes of the attendees.

2.3.2 Classroom Communicative Competence

First, let us review the definition of communicative competence to highlight what classroom communicative competence is. Communicative competence is often defined as such that is composed of four competencies, as follows (Canale and Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983):

1. Grammatical competence : knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar, semantics, and phonology.
2. Sociolinguistic competence : sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse.
3. Discourse competence : the ability to combine correct sentences or utterances into a single discourse and give the whole a coherent meaning.
4. Communication strategies or Strategic competence : verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdown in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence.

Johnson (1995) defines classroom communicative competence as follows (p. 160):

the knowledge and competencies that second language students need in order to participate in, learn from, and acquire a second language in the classroom

As the difference between the two competencies can be seen from the definitions, communicative competence is defined in terms of mainly linguistic knowledge of how to make meaningful sentences and how to fit the utterances to the linguistic or social context. On the other hand, classroom communicative competence is defined in terms of how to behave in a language learning classroom, which is more clearly stated as "students' knowledge and competence in the structural, functional, social, and interactional norms that govern classroom communication" (Johnson, 1995: 160). In the absence of any class participation, students cannot learn from a classroom lesson.

Johnson (1995; 56-71) cited some studies on how non-English speaking people with different social and cultural backgrounds have a hard time adjusting themselves in specific ways of communication in Anglo-American schools. She also showed that young school children need to learn how to learn at school because of the discontinuity between the home and school even within the same culture because a classroom itself creates a unique society with specific patterns of communication. The problem in class does not come from only the language differences; it also comes from such unwritten rules which govern when to talk, how to respond to a teacher, how to behave and communicate with others, and to guess what is expected.

Facing different communication patterns is exactly what Japanese students would experience in a communicative English class. They are often just not sure what they are expected to do, what kind of questions they can ask, when they can speak up. They never expect that they should be willing to make mistakes. In this sense, our students need to acquire classroom communicative competence in order to participate actively in classroom events in a communication-oriented English class.

Here we suggest basic competencies as parts of classroom communicative competence which university students in Japan are expected to acquire when they attend a communicative English class.

First of all, students need to understand how to behave in class. Students first should know what to say or write; they should ask questions about linguistic forms or content, they should make spoken or written summaries of their own ideas or comments related to the topic under discussion. Sometimes they may be asked to do some practice purely for a linguistic purpose apart from the content. In such cases they should know when to speak up, whether they should do individual work or they should listen to teacher explanation,

or whether they have to wait to be called on or they should instead speak voluntarily. Also they should know who to speak to and in what kind of language they should speak: they may be required to speak to the whole class, to their partner, or to their group members. If they speak to the teacher, they may speak differently from when they speak to their peers. They cannot say, for example, "I wanna" or "You should....." to teachers, but instead they may say, "I would like to" or "Will you?"

Secondly, students have no choice but to try to use English for communication and to realize that they learn how to use English only through using it in actual meaningful communication settings. In this way, they will learn how to involve themselves in having access to stored knowledge and finding some suitable linguistic forms for expressing something in English.

2.4 For the Development of Classroom Communicative Competence

Let us examine the results of the questionnaire in more detail and compare them with what is expected in a communicative language class in the hope that this will lead us to consider what we can do in class. The results of the questionnaire show that students have acquired passive ways of attending English classes; they learned English by translating English into Japanese and listening to the teacher explaining grammatical points without using the target language (62.0% in UA and 78.0% in UB) and did not speak up until called on (84.0% in UA and 73.2% in UB). This result supports the widely held notion that Japanese students are passive in class as described that they do not respond as much as teachers expect in communicative or conversational English classes (Helgesen, 1993). It has been also said that they tend to accept whatever is taught and to keep silent except when explicitly asked to speak (Scollon and Scollon, 1990 as cited by Johnson, 1995: 54).

In the questionnaire not many students answered that they are shy. However, more than one third of the students (38.0% in UA and 40.2% in UB) answered that they do not ask questions because not many students do so. This is also compatible with the description that "they dislike a person who stands out and violates the unity of a class" (Scollon and Scollon, 1990 as cited by Johnson, 1995: 54). This means that they respect the harmony of the group they belong to and that they do not want to break the conformity to group norms that is an essential aspect of communicative style as Clancy (1986: 216) describes.

As for 'shyness' of speaking up in class, as can be seen, only a few students answered that they are shy. After considering their socio-cultural backgrounds we cannot describe them as shy. Quite often people say that Japanese students are so shy that they do not speak up and that they do not want to make mistakes in front of others. It is, however, not 'shyness' but almost 'fear' that they feel when they speak up, because it means they are breaking the very important social norm of conformity. Also if they speak up and do not perform right, that makes them feel 'they have failed' not 'shy'. This happens because they have gone through all the undue focus on grammatical accuracy that seeks only a single right answer, for passing university entrance examinations, where mistakes result in failure. These two internal emotional constraints of breaking the social norm of conformity and of feeling failure must make them more passive, besides the external factor of the one-way style of class instruction.

One more factor of Japanese students' passiveness may come from their communication styles. Typical Japanese communication relies on indirect ways of self-expression and depends on others to imagine and understand without saying anything clearly (Clancy, 1986: 216). Clancy also pointed out that the Japanese

language has various content-appropriate formulas to which all speakers can suit their feelings. There is no need to invent personal and individualized verbal expression. That communicative feature explains why we often come across students who only say, "Watashi mo so omoimasu. (I have the same opinion.)" or "Doukan desu. (I feel the same way.)" or just "Onaji desu. (Same.)," pointing to the student who has already said something before, rather than trying to express their ideas in words of their own choosing.

In a communicative language class, however, students are not expected to be passive at all. When an English class should be communicative, it must have active interaction using English. Interaction, not mere exposure to language, is one of the essential factors for communication to take place (Berko-Gleason, 1982: 20 as cited by Brown, 1994: 41). It should be "a constant pattern of mutual influence and adjustment" (Malamah-Thomas, 1987: 7). Suppose a teacher acts upon the class and the class reacts, then the class reaction in turn becomes the action in itself to provoke the subsequent teacher's reaction, and so on. This kind of impromptness is something to be observed in language communication. To be silent and to expect others to imagine and understand what you want to say is never expected when the aim of the lesson is foreign language acquisition. Here is a good reason for them to learn how to learn: they must acquire classroom communicative competence to participate successfully in classroom activities.

Another point clarified by the questionnaire was that many students (50.0% in UA and 64.6% in UB) would like to ask how to express their ideas, and more students (76.0% in UA and 61.0% in UB) feel it difficult to ask a question because they do not know how to put the question in English. To combine meanings with linguistic forms is exactly the process of language learning itself. Expressing ideas in English is, therefore, what is most expected in a content-based communicative English class.

There is little disagreement that semantic options (what one wants to say) are largely determined by the grammatical options (what one can actually say), especially at the beginning stage of a second language learning (Canale and Swain, 1980: 18). A student might have to say (1a) instead of (1b), below, because they have limited access to their stored knowledge of some linguistic forms.

- (1) a I wanted to ask the same question.
 b That's exactly what I wanted to ask.

The feeling of dissatisfaction which is caused by the linguistic gap between the two performances of (1a) and (1b) is what we all have to endure at the beginning stage of a second language learning or probably all through the process until we reach a native like level. However, as long as students keep silent in class there is nothing we teachers can do for their English learning. Only when they say something can we react to it by praising, affirming, rephrasing the ideas, extending the idea, or correcting a mistake if any. So what can be done to elicit some actual utterances from students?

It is possible to offer some grammatical options for learners to express their communicative needs. They would facilitate learners' interaction in the classroom. Some linguistic forms to initiate a conversation in class could be questions or assertions as follows :

- (2) a What does '.....' mean?
 b Well, I looked into a dictionary, but I am still not sure what '.....' means.

- (3) a Which is the main verb of the third sentence?
b I wonder which is the main verb of the third sentence.
- (4) a I don't understand the first sentence of the second paragraph.
b Could you explain the first sentence of the second paragraph?
- (5) a This writer wants to say that.....
b What the writer wants to say most in this paragraph is that.....

The b-sentences are surely more complicated and therefore would be more suitable forms for university students. They might feel more satisfied with saying those because those are more closely equivalent to the Japanese expressions which would come across in their mind.

Given those grammatical options, learners may still be reluctant to speak to the class. One quick solution in this case is to adopt a lot of group work and pair work in classroom activities. Group work or pair work will reduce students' anxiety of speaking to the whole class in a big voice. This is why in the questionnaire some students (34.0% in UA and 41.2% in UB) answered they would rather ask questions during group work than during the whole class instruction with a teacher standing in front of the class. Another good point about group work is that it would provide much more interaction not only between students but also between the instructor and each student, so that it would be easier to maintain an English speaking atmosphere with more use of English.

The problem of 'how to say something' mentioned a little earlier is largely related to their experience of using English as a means of communication. As the results of the questionnaire show, most of the students did not use English for communication both in class (62.0% in UA and 65.9% in UB) and outside of class (78.0% in UA and 69.5% in UB) during their high school days. Also once they got out of English class they did not have much active involvement into English except self-study or 'juku'. After entering university, many of the students (74.0% in UA and 56.1% in UB) have no exposure to English outside of class. From these results we can easily imagine how difficult they might feel it would be to determine how to say something. Even when they want to say "Because I missed the usual train," answering a question as easy as "Why were you late for the class today?" they look quite at a loss. Some murmur the question repeatedly as if they are writing it out in their mind. Unless they have been using English for practical communicative use from the very outset of learning, there is little reason to expect them to acquire even basic communication skills (Canale and Swain, 1980: 15) in English.

In this section we have seen that students in high schools in Japan have had passive English classes and that they have acquired some classroom attitudes and class participation styles suited to those classes. Then it was argued that if they attend a communication-oriented English class, they need to acquire classroom communicative competence to actively participate in classroom events where we expect them to use their linguistic knowledge for communication. Also it was argued that because they have little exposure to English outside of class, it is more important that meaningful interaction in class should be realized. Classes provide them with the only English speaking community in the present English learning environment in Japan. We would suggest that students should be encouraged to keep being exposed to English outside of class in order to try practical use of it in class, rather than learn it in class to use it outside.

3. Content-Based English Classes at Universities in Japan

3.1 Reading-Based English Class

We would like to stress here that 'communicative' activities do not always mean only oral skills of speaking and listening. Reading and writing can be communicative, once they are regarded as personal interactions between readers and writers by means of written forms of language. (For discussion see G. Murahata (1996) and Y. Murahata (1996)). Besides, as Carroll (1980) indicates, reading is the skill most frequently used in the academic context, among the four skills. If English classes offer only oral activities, it is easily imagined that the topics dealt with would become limited and boring, so there is the question of whether they are stimulating enough for university students as academic study.

We read a great deal of miscellaneous writings to get immediate information or instruction to do something, to know what is happening within or outside of the country, to get specific knowledge for academic purposes, or just for pleasure (Wallace, 1992). At the same time we talk to people about what we read. If we consider how we deal with the activity of reading and its consequences in everyday life, it can be possible to create authentic communicative situations in reading classes of foreign language. What kind of reading text should be used is, however, beyond the scope of this paper. Such factors as quality and quantity of the written text, and interests and concern of the students should be considered to be suitable for the students involved.

In this section we will see how reading-based English classes will go, by looking at some actual interaction from the class. The excerpts below were hand-written during or after class, or taken from what students wrote. In case of oral interaction, they do not show overlapping speech, the length of pauses, nor any other paralinguistic features, but they are enough to show, for the aim of this paper, what kinds of interaction are possible during class.

3.2 Interactions in Reading-Based English Class

As for the while reading activities question-and-answer drill about the written passage is quite a common activity which would easily produce interaction between the instructor and the class. Most of the questions at this stage are display questions, in the sense that the class attendees presumably know the answers because they are all written in the passage. At least, however, they must read the passage and understand the contents to answer them. Some questions are meant to make them analyze some linguistic structures of complicated sentences with ellipsis or participial construction. Some are meant to lead them to active involvement in the reading and to give them opportunities to try to use some of the linguistic forms they have read, let alone, to give oral interactions with the instructor as much as possible.

At this stage the following oral interactions happened during the whole class instruction. You can see that, in Excerpts 6 and 7, the students at first merely read some part of the textbook to answer the question. Later, however, encouraged by the instructor, Student A tries to change the answer from "they" to "we" to make it appropriate in the classroom context, in Excerpt 6. Student B tries to answer in his own words by saying "They want to marry but they can't find their partners," which is not written in the textbook in Excerpt 7. In Excerpt 8 Student C at first seems surprised to be called on, but manages to make his own sentences and explains picking up one of the examples in the textbook. ("T" stands for Teacher, and SA, SB,

SC, for unidentified students of Student A, Student B, Student C, etc., respectively. Quotation marks stand for an exact excerpt from the textbook. Ellipses (...) indicate pauses. [] shows commentary of any kind. Bold type shows emphasis by the speaker's tone of voice. Italics indicates a codeswitch to Japanese.)

(6) T : Why are we "social animals"?

SA : Because "they need relationships with others."

T : Yes, but you're just reading. Can you answer my question in your own words?

SA :Aah [noticing what the instructor meant]. Because **we** need relationships with **other people**.

T : Yeah, good.

(7) T : Why do many people become members matchmaking of service companies?

SB : Because they want to "find prospective marriage partners from among many people."

T : OK. That's right. But you're just reading the passage. Can you answer in your own words?

SB : Because...they want to ... **marry**.

T : Yeah, they want to marry. They want to find their partners.

SB : Yes [nodding], er.... They want to marry but they can't find their partners.

T : Good. Right.

(8) T : What kind of problems could happen? For example, in Canada. What might happen in Canada?
er....How about you, Sc?

SC : Me? Well,er.... for example, er ... an Australian student go to Canada. At school, the student may...say... for example, 'station'. But...station means ..er... 'stock farm' in Australia. So the teacher er.... [shrugging his shoulders] ... don't know...what the student saying ... er ...don't understand the student.

T : Right. Good. Yes, they may misunderstand each other. So in such a case the teacher wonders if he should correct the English or not.

In all three interactions the students go over simple deciphering of the written text and try to talk with the instructor by re-telling in their own words what is written. They are not copying the written text to answer the question. Of the three Student-C shows particularly interesting reactions. He makes up a case of an Australian student moving to Canada who uses Australian English at school, while the written passage only says "Canada has many immigrants from Jamaica and India, especially, , many Canadian teachers are sometimes quite puzzled about how they should view them," without giving any particular example. And he continues, "so the teacher don't know what the student saying ... er ... don't understand the student," without copying "are puzzled." Then the instructor follows to say, expecting the class to understand and remember the expression of "wonder if," that the Canadian teacher "wonders if he should correct the English or not" by rephrasing the written expression of "be puzzled." If students continue to have interactions like this they will be provided a very good chance to retrieve their stored linguistic knowledge for actual use in a certain context.

There must be little disagreement that this kind of interaction using English would never happen in a grammar-translation-oriented class where students depend and concentrate too much on Japanese translation. Instructors, however, often feel frustrated because they notice they are controlling most of the talk and because each interaction does not last long. Most of the interactions have a typical IRE pattern (an Initiation act of a teacher, a Response act of a student, and an Evaluation act of a teacher, Johnson, 1995: 9). A student only gives a brief right answer after a teacher's long speech (Johnson, 1995: 16-38), even though teachers ask many questions to elicit as much English as possible from students. In fact they wish the students would actively participate in class discussions, and speak voluntarily and at greater length (Musumeci, 1996: 290).

For this reason teachers always expect students to ask questions. That is why their attitudes toward asking a question was inquired into in the questionnaire in 2.2. As one of the ways for students to take the opportunity to initiate a conversation, we suggested offering some linguistic options to talk about and check their understanding of what is written.

The following excerpt is a conversation which was initiated by a group of students and lasted comparatively long. In this excerpt, students work together in their group to answer several prepared questions printed on a piece of paper. Because the contents seemed too difficult to talk about, written work was preferable in this case. The instructor walked around the class and talked to each group. One group stopped and talked to the instructor, pointing to one of the questions on the paper: Why should we consider whether the speaker is "conveying with voice tones and facial expressions that the spoken words are not the entire message"?

(9) SD : [pointing to the question] *muzukashii*. This questions is difficult.

T : Yes, this is difficult. What do you think? ...

SD : ...er...er...It means...er...I don't know.

SE : No, no, 'I' *janakute* 'we' *daro* . **We** don't know.

T : O.K. Good. Well, I think it means ... er ..., well, look at the latter part of the section. You can find the answer around there.

SD : *aa...kokone* ... "a deep tone of voice"? ... "smooth speaking manner"?

T : Yeah, the writer says around here that a deep tone of voice and smooth speaking manner are good.

But if you depend too much on only such paralanguage, it is not very good.

SE : Too much? Not good?

T : Yeah, [slowly] if you depend on those too much, it is not good. Look at here [pointing to a paragraph in the textbook]. If you depend on "voice cues alone," you "are seldom accurate in" your "judgments."

S : [all reading the paragraph]

T : You can't find the truth. So you have to be careful of both the content and the paralanguage.

O.K.?

SE : Ah! We...

T : Yes? Try.

SE : It means that we ... should *ryouhou wo kouryoshite* ...

T : [Looking at C] No no no. In English. We should 'consider' ...?

SE : Yes, yes, consider...

T : [Another group calls the instructor, so she leaves the group.] Why don't you use 'not only...but also...'

SD : Yes. O.K.

Later one of the group member read the written answer to the class as 'It means that we should consider not only contents but also nonverbal signals.'

As shown in the conversation immediately above, class activities do not have to be always occupied with oral work; some can be done as written work. If they are allowed to write first and asked to read it aloud to the class later, students can spend more time on linguistic forms to retrieve their knowledge for their desirable expressions and would feel more at ease in reading prepared English in front of others. This kind of writing work is quite useful for summarizing after reading a written passage of some reasonable amount.

The following conversation was also initiated by a student. This was to ask for extra instruction when they had a problem in their group.

(10) SF : [Raises his hand to show he has a question.]

T : O.K. I'm coming..... What?

SF : er..Yes. The student who is going to ... er ... explain today's part ... er ... is absent today.

What shall we do?

T : Well, in that case, you should talk together about what is written. Er.. maybe Each of you tell what you understand from today's section ... one by one. Take turns. And talk what is written.

O.K?

This obviously deviates from the IRE pattern and shows a natural communication setting of an English speaking society where everything should be said in English. The students were in communicative needs to know what his group should do because the key person for that day's group activity was absent from the class.

3.3 Evaluation in Reading-Based English Class

Evaluation methods should also be deeply concerned when we organize a course of communicative English class. Some test types can be a very good motivation of classroom learning. Usually two pencil-and-paper tests given at the end of two terms will be the only instrument to assess the whole course learning. In a communicative English course, however, evaluation should be focused more on classroom participation and performance of each lesson. Then the term-end test will be naturally changed because basically we should test what students have learned in class. Thus it is important to realize that we cannot directly measure how much and what kind of communicative competence students have acquired from the lessons, but that we can only observe their performance (Canale and Swain, 1983: 6).

As one of the practicable performance tests, a one-to-one interview test at the end of a term was required as a part of evaluation to the students enrolled in a communicative content-based English class. Each

student was required to tell what they learned in the course and what they thought about it. They could pick up one of the topics which they were most interested in from what they have read in the class. They had to first write what they were going to talk in the interview, then memorize it and tell it, not read it, in front of the teacher within five minutes. They were told that they would be asked a few questions after the speech. They were also required to hand in the written manuscript of their own speech after the interview. In one class they read *Language in Society* (Wardhaugh, 1994), which is sociolinguistic readings about when, where and what kind of language is used how in our everyday life.

The following are the examples from the interview test taken from their written manuscripts :

(11) ,..... Sexism is the thought that has been for a long time in Japan. But Japanese sexism is not language but system and position. And so, we don't think that the Japanese language itself is essentially sexist. In fact, Japanese people don't have that idea. On the other hand, the English language itself is essentially sexist. It is discrimination that everyone's pronoun is "his". And it is sexism that 'jinrui' is "man". The Japanese language is not certainly sexist, but I think that the following kanji are sexist. "妬 (envy)," "嫌 (hate)," "媚 (flatter)," and "奴 (slave)." [All of the four Chinese characters have a letter of 'woman' on the left-hand side.] They use as bad meaning, though they don't concern women.(Explanation in the parenthesis added.)

(12) In this course, during the second semester, I learned about English language from a regional and social point of view, and the relation between language and sex.,..... The most important thing is to abolish people's idea of sexism which has established here and there. Essentially, language don't have sexism. People's prejudice is expressed clearly by language.

Both of the students memorized their prepared speech perfectly and sounded really talking. Though there are grammatical mistakes and the discourse structure is rather circular, the former student of (11) showed deep interest in the issue of sexism and language use in this speech. All of the phrases and sentences are completely her original, and so was the idea in the passage. The Chinese characters she mentioned were not at all in the textbook. The whole speech was comparatively long among the test participants and made of about 320 words. The student of (12) also seemed quite stimulated by the issue. She also wrote quite a long passage of about 310 words which was not a copy from the textbook but was completely her original. She described the male and female difference in Japanese language use reflecting the difference in English written in the textbook, and drew a conclusion that it is not language but people that have prejudice against women.

Another term-end performance test actually given was a pair-conversation type as a part of evaluation to the students enrolled in a communicative content-based English class. In this test students were required to pair up and make up a conversation, and to perform the prepared-conversation in front of the teacher. They were also required to hand in their written manuscripts of their prepared-conversation. The time allotted to perform the conversation was five minutes, and each student had to take more than five turns of speech. Then the teacher would ask several questions on the topic they have dealt with in the conversation. As in the one-to-one interview test above, they could pick up one of the topics they were most interested in from what they have read in the class. The following are taken from the manuscripts written by the students for

the pair-conversation test :

- (13) A : I was very surprised to know that there are about a billion speakers of some form of English about a fifth of the world's population.
- B : Yes, but people from different parts of the English-speaking world speak English very differently.
- A : It was interesting to learn about the differences. Let's look at the differences between standard varieties of British English and American English, first.
- A : O.K. For example the pronunciation is quite different. In British English, they say [ka :] for car. On the other hand American say [ka :r] for car.
- B : That's right. Spelling, too. British people spell c-o-l-o-u-r for color, but American people spell c-o-l-o-r for it.
- A : As for vocabulary, they express same things by different words. For example, in British English, they use the word "petrol" and in American English they use "gas".
- B : The differences are amazing, aren't they?
- A : They are just one example. I know other variations in that language.
- B : Oh! You mean Canadian English or Australia and New Zealand and so on?
- A : Yes, Canadian English is much more like American English than British English. Even Americans, it's difficult to distinguish Canadians from themselves.
- B : I know. But, Canadians have a different system of government and different tradition, so some words like "igloo" and "parka" borrowed from Eskimo languages.
- A : Another feature is the use of "eh?" It is sometimes added at the end of a sentence with a rising intonation like "You bought the book, eh?"
- B : In Australia, they say "Goodday!" instead of "Hello!" and foot path instead of pavement. Generally, they pronounce "ai" for A [ei].
- A : There are a lot of speakers of English in South Africa, West African countries, Jamaica, India, Singapore and so on, too.
- B : You are right. We learned many variations of English. In many countries, people use them every-day as a first, second, or even as a third or fourth language.
- A : Each has its own local features. They are often very difficult for a visitor to understand.
- B : But, these varieties of English are now usually no longer regarded as "bad" in comparison to British or American English.
- A : From now on, varieties of English will be spread everywhere on the globe more and more.

In (13) the conversation goes like a summary of one whole chapter in the textbook with each student explaining main points by turns. This example shows that a performance test can be a good chance for summary making. It also shows that this test has provided a good chance to discuss the students' understanding. For example, the last utterance, "From now on, varieties of English will be spread everywhere on the globe more and more," was not actually the writer's idea but the students'. After the conversation the two students and the teacher discussed this issue and the teacher explained that their interpretation went too

far from the writer's intention. The teacher also advised them to make it clear whether each statement is of the student's own or not and to give explicit reasons for their own ideas. The following was suggested as the last utterance.

I think varieties of English will be spread everywhere more and more because the world is getting smaller and smaller, and people have more chance to talk with people from different countries.

(14) A : Don't you smoke, do you?

B : No, I don't. I dislike the smell out of tobacco. What do you think of it?

A : I really dislike it, too. So I'm for the condition many people think smoking should be banned in public places.

B : I think so, too. Secondhand tobacco smoke is a nuisance for nonsmokers.

A : Talking of tobacco, do you know "Airs"?

B : "Airs"? What is it?

A : It is the name of smokeless tobacco. I heard that JT will sell it in a few days.

B : I know, it doesn't produce ashes, right?

A : Right, so it is a problem for smokers that they are hard to distinguish whether it has be end or not.

B : Really? I wonder the smokeless tobacco is more harmful to smokers themselves' health than before, because they come to breathe all smoke inside it in, don't you? If it's so, we can't say it's a nice solution.

A : I don't know. I hope less dangerous tobacco will be invented.

B : Definitely. By the way, with all its carcinogen, why won't smokers stop it? I can't understand.

A : Me, either. It's the best that production of it is prohibited.

B : That may be true, but many workers for tobacco industry must be unemployed.

A : There're many problems. Is there any good way of overcoming the smoking problem?

B : I think smoking under age should be forbidden more strictly.

A : I think vending machine of tobacco is bad system as that of alcohol. Suppose shops demand ID card from people when they well tobacco.

B : That's good idea. The system people can't buy it with ease may reduce the number of smokers.

A : Exactly, this problem should be solved little by little.

In (14) the students talked freely about smoking, introducing a new kind of tobacco named "Airs" and making a suggestion that restrictions should be put on people selling tobacco. This performance is full of conversational routines and fillers such as "I heard that" "That may be true, but" "Me, either." and "so" This shows, therefore, that this kind of test also can create a good chance for students to learn how to manage a conversation.

The performance in the two kinds of communicative testing above was scored with respect to five criteria of attitude, voice, content, fluency, and grammar. "Attitude" concerned how well participants prepared and memorized for performance, and how natural they sounded. "Voice" concerned how clearly they talked. The

pronunciation did not have to approach native perfection, but they were required to speak, without murmuring, in an appropriately loud voice with confidence. "Content" dealt with whether they chose the topic related to what had been read in class and how deeply they were involved in the issue. It was preferable to express their own ideas rather than just to repeat what is written in the textbook. "Fluency" means how much they could talk within the allotted time. They were supposed to talk at reasonable speed. "Grammar" means accuracy of speech. However, peripheral grammatical features, which do not always convey important meanings like the third-person-singular-present 's' or the article 'a' in some linguistic contexts, were not considered.

The most important thing here is that if they had not been required to take this kind of performance test, the student would not have written such a long passage in English and would not have had any chance to express her own idea in her own words. Therefore, the test was a good motivation for them. Also they must have been satisfied with what they did to some extent as university students. They memorized such a long passage and said something worthy of English discussion, rather than the usual pencil-and-paper test. This is something only a content-based communicative English class can achieve.

4. Conclusion

Throughout this paper we have discussed how to develop communicative competence in English of Japanese university students. We have seen the importance of classroom communicative competence with which classroom communication would be maintained. It was suggested that students should learn first how to behave in a class if they are enrolled in a communicative English class. The classroom attitudes which Japanese students have acquired in passive English classes during high school education are not compatible with the norms in a communicative English class. It was also suggested that English classes can be communicative based on reading, which could be developed into various interactions among classroom attendees.

We have also seen several interactive activities actually implemented in communicative English classes at universities. More empirical studies, however, should be conducted to examine how to make students' interactions more natural in class. The interactions we have seen above are still at a beginning and primitive level, where the participants are just talking or chatting with each other. Very few students ask back to whoever the interlocutor is; "What do you mean by that? Do you mean A or B?" It should be necessary to investigate how we can give constant and technical assistance to develop the simple talking into more dynamic interactions with negotiations for meaning and strong assertions. Also most of the students' utterances in oral interaction are still at a one-sentence level. We need to encourage students to speak for a longer time and to give them enough practice to develop a meaningful discourse with several sentences.

Also the evaluation process and procedure in the communicative-oriented course should be carefully designed along with the aim of the course. If the aim of a particular language course is to develop the student's oral proficiency in that language, the evaluation process and procedure should be fundamentally based on 'genuine' oral interactions. In a natural oral interaction situation real people meet face-to-face and talk to each other, and this person-to-person, i.e. "humanistic", aspect should be necessarily held and primary importance should be put on it in an oral test. Underhill (1987) elucidates clearly what a genuine oral testing should be like as follows:

... The 'test' may not even exist, in the same way that a written test does, on paper. It is the people and what passes between them that are important, and the test instrument is secondary. In fact, with a technique like an oral interview, it becomes impossible to talk about the 'test' independently of the people involved in it because it doesn't have a separate existence as a set of questions on paper. (p. 3)

We also should not forget that testing is not only for the teacher to evaluate the student's achievement but also for both the teacher and the student to realize how far each of the students has come to achieve the final goal. Teachers should make full use of testing as one of the devices to maximize the success of students' acquiring communicative competence.

(Goro Murahata is Associate Professor of English Language Education, Hokkaido University of Education, Iwamizawa ; Yoshiko Murahata is a part-time instructor of English, Hokkaido University of Education, Iwamizawa)

(Our Correspondence : murahata @ atson.iwa.hokkyodai.ac.jp)

References

- Aoki, Shoroku (青木昭六) 『英語授業の組立 — よりわかりやすく, より興味深く —』 開隆堂出版, 1990.
- Breen, Michael P. "Authenticity in the Language Classroom." *Applied Linguistics* 6-1: 60-70. 1985.
- Brown, H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principles : an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York : Prentice Hall Regents. 1994a.
- Brown, H. Douglas. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York : Prentice Hall Regents. 1994b.
- Canale, Michael. "From Communicative Competence to Language Pedagogy." In Jack C. Richards and Richard W. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication*. London : Longman. 2-27. 1983.
- Canale, Michael and Merrill Swain. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." *Applied Linguistics* 1-1 : 1-47. 1980.
- Carroll, B. J. *Testing Communicative Performance*. Oxford : Pergamon. 1980.
- Clancy, Patricia M. "The Acquisition of Communicative Style in Japanese." In Bambi B. Schieffelin and Elinor Ochs (Eds.) *Language Socialization across Cultures*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 213-250. 1986.
- Gass, Susan M. & Evangeline Marlos Varonis. 'Input, Interaction, and Second Language Production,' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16 : 283-302. 1994.
- Helgesen, Marc. "Dismantling a Wall of Silence : The 'English Conversation' Class." In Paul Wadden (Ed.) *A Handbook for Teaching English at Japanese Colleges and Universities*. New York : Oxford University Press. 37-49. 1993.
- Jacob, Evelyn, Lori Rottenberg, Sandra Patrick, and Edyth Wheeler. "Cooperative Learning : Context and Opportunities for Acquiring Academic English." *TESOL Quarterly* 30-2 : 253-280. 1996.
- Johnson, K.E. *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge University Press. 1995.
- Malamah-Thomas, Ann. *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford University Press. 1987
- Richard-Amato, Patricia A. *Making It Happen : Interaction in the Second Language Classroom*. (2nd Ed.) New York : Longman. 1996.
- Rivers, Wilga M. *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills*. (2nd Ed.) Chicago : The University of Chicago Press. 1981.
- Murahata, Goro. "Revisiting English Language Education at University Level (Part I) : Exploration of Reading-Centered Integrated Language Activities." *Iwamizawa Annual Review* (Hokkaido University of Education, Iwamizawa) : 99-110. 1996.
- Murahata, Yoshiko. "Exploration of Communication-Oriented English Reading Class at the University Level." (Center for Language Studies, Otaru University of Commerce). 139- 148. 1996.
- Musumeci, Diane. "Teacher-Learner Negotiation in Content-Based Instruction : Communication at Cross- Purposes?" *Applied Linguistics* 17-3 : 286-325. 1996.
- Pica, Teresa. "Second -Language Acquisition, Social Interaction , and the Classroom." *Applied Linguistics* 8-1 : 286-325. 1987.
- Torikai, Kumiko and Kumiko Shindou (鳥飼久美子・進藤久美子) 『大学英語教育の改革 — 東洋英和女学院大学の試み』 三修社, 1996.
- Underhill, Nic. *Testing Spoken Language : A Handbook of Oral Testing Techniques*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1987.
- Wallace, Catherine. *Reading*. Oxford : Oxford University Press. 1992.

Wardhaugh, Ronald and Sachiko Tanaka. *Language in Society*. Tokyo: Seibido. 1994.

Wilkinson, Louise C. "Introduction: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Communicating in the Classroom." In Louise C. Wilkinson (ed.) *Communicating in the Classroom*. New York: Academic Press. 3-21. 1982.

APPENDIX :

The questionnaire given to students in two universities was the following.

英語学習に関するアンケート

このアンケートは、「英語学習に対する学習者の意識」と、「英語の授業」について調査するものです。授業の評価には全く関係しませんので、正直に思うところを記してください。

質問の答えはすべて多肢選択項目の中から選ぶようになっていますので、選んだ文字を○で囲んでください。もし当てはまる項目がない場合は、その他の欄に記入してください。大学入学後と、中学・高校時代については別になっていますので、注意してください。

あなたの在学年数（年） あなたの専攻（ ）

<大学の英語の授業、及び授業外の英語に関わる体験について>

1) 大学の英語の授業について尋ねます。あなたは本講以外で英語だけを用いた授業を受けていますか。あるいは、今までに受けたことがありますか。

またあるとすれば、1) いつ、2) 内容はどんなものですか。また3) 先生はどんな人でしたか。

ア. 受けたことがある イ. 受けたことがない

(上でアと答えた人だけ答えてください。)

1. 1) いつですか。(2つ以上あれば、すべてに○をしてください。)

ア. 本年度 イ. 昨年度 ウ. () 年度

1. 2) 内容はどんなものですか(でしたか)。

ア. 日常会話 イ. 英米文学購読 ウ. 一般購読(文化・教育・時事問題など)
エ. 異文化理解 オ. リスニング中心 カ. その他()

1. 3) 先生はどんな人ですか(でしたか)。

ア. 日本人 イ. 英語の母語話者 ウ. 両者によるチームティーチング

2) あなたは大学の英語の授業中に先生に英語で質問をしたことがありますか。

ア. ある イ. ない

3) 英語を使った授業の場合どういう場合に質問をしたい、あるいはするべきだと思いますか。いくつ○をしてもかまいません。

ア. 自分で調べてみたが単語や文の意味がはっきりとわからない場合。

イ. 構文が複雑でわからない場合。

ウ. 内容が英語だけでは理解できないので、日本語で説明して欲しい場合。

エ. 授業中の活動(何をしてよいか)がわからない場合。

オ. 自分でどのように表現したらいいのか分からない場合。

カ. 自分で理解したことを確認したいとき。

キ. 本来、質問はすべきではなく、説明を聞いて理解すべきである。

ク. 授業中ではなく授業の後で個人的に質問に行くべきである。

ケ. その他()

4) 英語を使った授業で、授業中に先生に「質問する」ことについてどう思いますか。いくつ○をしてもかまいません。

- ア. 質問をするのは予習していなくて、わからないことを示している。
- イ. 質問ができるのは予習してきた証拠だ。
- ウ. 質問をすることは興味を示し、授業に対する前向きの姿勢を表す行為だ。
- エ. 質問したいことはあるが、みんながあまりしないので質問しづらい。
- オ. 英語で質問すると英語を使う練習になるので、たとえ答えがわかっているでも質問して英語を使う機会を増やしたい。
- カ. 質問の内容にもよるが、あまり基本的なことや常識的なことは質問すべきではない。
- キ. 授業中に質問するのはよくないことだ。授業を受ける側は黙って聞くべきだ。
- ク. その他 ()

5) 英語を使った授業で、授業中に英語で質問するのが難しいとすれば、それはなぜだと思いますか。いくつ○をしてもかまいません。

- ア. 中学・高校を通じてあまり質問したことがないので、質問すること自体慣れていない。
- イ. 英語で質問するのはどのように言っているかわからない。日本語でなら質問する。
- ウ. みんながあまり質問しないので、質問することで注目を浴びたら恥ずかしい。
- エ. 予習の段階でわからないことは沢山あるが、質問すると予習してきてないと思われるので質問しづらい。
- オ. クラス全体での授業の時は質問しづらいが、グループワークの時ならば個人的に聞けるので質問しやすい。
- カ. 質問の内容があまりに簡単なことであれば質問しづらい。
- キ. 予習してきてないので、何を質問しているかわからない。
- ク. その他 ()

6) あなたは大学に入学以降、英語の授業以外でどの程度英語に接する機会を持っていますか。いくつ○をしてもかまいませんが、「・・・しようと思っている」とか「・・・したほうがいいと思っている」ではなくて、今までにしたこと、あるいは実際に現在していることを教えてください。

- ア. 海外の大学に長期留学（10カ月以上）した経験がある。
- イ. 長期休暇を利用して海外の短期語学研修に参加したことがある。
- ウ. ゼミや輪読会などで英語を読む機会がある。
- エ. クラブや部活動で英語を使う機会がある。
- オ. 現在、個人的に英会話学校に通っている。
- カ. 現在、自宅で別の教材（ラジオのテキストなど）を使って会話を勉強している。
- キ. 現在、自分で英検や TOEFL, TOEIC などのための勉強をしている。
- ク. 現在、個人的に英語を話す人に会う機会があり、英語で話すことがある。
- ケ. 現在、海外に文通相手がいって英語で手紙を書く機会がある。
- コ. 大学入学後今までに海外旅行の経験があり、旅行中は英語を使用した。
- サ. 現在、教室以外では全くない。
- シ. その他 ()

<中学・高校時代の英語の授業、及び授業外の英語に関わる体験について>

1) あなたの中学・高校時代について尋ねます。思い出してください。授業中にどの程度英語を使って、コミュニケーションがなされていましたか。二つ以上○をしてもかまいません。

- ア. 授業全体を通して活動の指示や、かんたんな会話に英語を使っていた。
- イ. 挨拶程度は英語を使っていた。
- ウ. 教科書の内容について、英語で口頭による質疑応答をした。
- エ. 英語を母国語とする AET と日本人の先生のチームティーチングがときどきあり、その時は英語を使った授業

だった。

オ. AET と日本人の先生のティームティーチングの授業の時でも、日本人の先生は主に日本語を使っていた。

カ. 先生は和訳と、文法の説明をするだけで、生徒に英語で話しかけることはほとんどなかった。

ク. その他 ()

2) 中学や高校では、英語の授業中に生徒が質問したり、先生の質問に対して生徒が手を挙げるなどして自発的に答えたり、することがありましたか。あなた自身のことも含めて、学級全体の雰囲気について答えてください。二つ以上○をしてもかまいません。

ア. 授業中わりと自由に質問したり、質問に答えたりする雰囲気があった。

イ. 授業の進度が速くて、自由に質問するような時間はほとんどなかった。

ウ. 質問すると予習してきていないと思われるので、質問する生徒はほとんどいなかった。

エ. 先生の質問に対して、生徒が自発的に自由に答えることもあった。

オ. 授業中は指名されるまで、生徒は発言することはほとんどなかった。

カ. 先生が生徒の意見を聞くようなことはあまりなかった。

キ. その他 ()

3) 中学や高校の授業で、書かれたものを読んだり、練習問題をしたりする以外に、授業で習った構文や表現を使って、自分の考えを英語で表した(何らかの自己表現を英語を使って行った)ことがありますか。

ア. よくあった

イ. ときどきあった

ウ. ほとんどなかった

エ. まったくなかった

4) 中学や高校の授業以外で、書かれたものを読んだり、練習問題をしたりする以外に、自分の考えを英語で表した(何らかの自己表現を英語を使って行った) ことがありましたか。またあるとすればそれはどんなときでしたか。

ア. よくあった

イ. ときどきあった

ウ. ほとんどなかった

エ. まったくなかった

(上でア. イ. と答えた人だけ答えてください。) それはどんなとき、誰とでしたか。

ア. 英会話教室で。 イ. 塾で。 ウ. 友達と。 エ. 文通相手と。

オ. 知り合いの英語話者と。 カ. 町で旅行者などの知らない人と。 キ. AET と。

ク. その他 ()

5) 中学・高校時代を通じて、授業以外で英語に接する機会は何ほどの程度ありましたか。もしあれば、その期間と頻度も書いてください。

(例) 期間: 3カ月, 1年, など。

頻度: 一週間に2回程度ならば 2/週, 1月に2~3回ならば 2~3/月, ほぼ毎日, など。あるいは、今までに2回, など。

ア. 交換留学制度などで海外の高校に長期留学をしていた。(期間:)

イ. 交換留学制度などで高校に短期で留学, あるいはホームステイをしたことがある。

(期間:)

ウ. 家庭の都合で海外で生活したことがある。(期間:)

エ. 学校で英会話クラブなどに入っていた。(期間:)

オ. 個人で英会話教室に通っていた。(期間: 頻度:)

カ. 個人で受験のための塾に通っていた。(期間: 頻度:)

キ. 自宅で別の教材(ラジオやテレビのテキストなど)を使って会話を勉強していた。

(期間: 頻度:)

- ク. 自宅で英検のための勉強をした。(期間： 頻度：)
- ケ. 家庭で留学生のホームステイの受け入れなど個人的に英語を話す人に会う機会があり、
英語で話すことがあった。(頻度：)
- コ. 海外に文通相手がいる、英語で手紙を書く機会があった。(期間： 頻度：)
- サ. 学校以外では全くない。
- シ. その他 ()

以上です。ご協力どうもありがとうございました。