

Why is it Important to Teach in Mixed Language Teaching Approaches?

なぜ様々な言語教育法を混ぜて教えるのが大切なのか

Junko Winch

ウィンチ純子 (旧姓 赤井純子)

Abstract

An increasing number of international students whose culture of teaching and learning practices are very different from that of the UK are now studying under a teaching approach which originated in Anglophone countries. This study poses the question of whether Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is still considered to be a universally effective and appropriate approach to multicultural students regardless of cultural variations. This paper investigates whether the Japanese teaching method (Japanisation), which is presented as an alternative teaching method to CLT, gives any influence on multicultural students in Japanese language teaching at a university in the South of England. The concept of Japanisation is drawn from a study of the Japanese car manufacturing industry and transferred into the language teaching context. The study was conducted for one semester during the 2009/2010 academic year. Two teaching methods, Japanisation and CLT, were applied. Three tests which produced quantitative data were used. The quantitative results showed that there was no statistically significant differences between the two teaching approaches regarding the results of the first two tests. However, Japanisation was associated with significantly higher results in the third and final test, compared with CLT.

Key Words : Culture, higher education, Japanese language, teaching, multicultural

Introduction

Globalization in education has allowed students to study anywhere around the world. An increasing number of non-British people live in the UK, compared with 10 years ago. Similarly, an increasing number of international students whose educational culture is different from that of the UK is now studying under British teaching approaches and educational culture. Foreign language teaching is also a significant part of internationalisation in education. In particular, at the university where this study was conducted, there were a total of nine different cultures among the 19 students in the Japanese classroom in the pilot study. It is claimed that the lecturers face additional challenges in the classroom (Slee, 2010).

“Every teacher is the product of their culture, their training and their experiences” (Harmer, 2003, p.291). If a teacher teaches students influencing them through his/her culture, the teaching approach they received in their training and their own learning experiences as a student, multicultural students may show different responses. If a teacher and students do not share the same educational culture, the teacher is more likely to teach students using teaching approaches which students may not be familiar with.

The Issue Under Consideration

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is the most recent and frequently employed language teaching approach which was also used in this study. CLT has now been practised for over four decades, during which various developments have taken place. CLT consists of classic and current CLT (Richards, 2006, p.6). The classic “CLT started in the late 1970s in Europe and gained momentum in the early 1980s. Since then it has taken hold and acquired the status of a new dogma” (Hu, 2002, p.94). CLT has “the CLT attitude” (Bax, 2003, p.280), giving the implicit message to language teachers that “a country without CLT is somehow backward . . . CLT is not only ‘modern’ but in fact the only way to learn a language properly” (Bax, 2003, p.279) : “The Communicative Approach is the way to do it, no matter where you are . . . CLT will work anywhere—the methodology is king” (Bax, 2003, p.281). Bax criticises that CLT “assumes and insist that CLT is the whole and complete solution to language learning” and “assume that no other method could be any good” (Bax, 2003, p.280).

From its inception, the focus of CLT has been always communicative competence to “produce or understand utterances which are not so grammatical” (Campbell and Wales, 1970, p.247). A question of whether the communicative approach refers exclusively to the communicative knowledge or includes grammatical competence was raised. This led to CLT evolve into three perspectives or theories : theory of basic communication skills ; sociolinguistic perspective ; and integrative theory. The theories of basic communication skills mainly focuses on “oral communication to get along in or cope with” (Canale and Swain, 1980, p.9) and “do not emphasise grammatical accuracy” (Canale and Swain, 1980, p.9). The sociolinguistic perspective emphasises the importance of sociolinguistic aspects in language teaching. The integrative theories are explained as “a synthesis of knowledge of grammatical principles, knowledge of how language is used in a social context to perform a communicative” (Canale and Swain, 1980, p.20).

The current CLT is the further development of classic CLT in the communicative competence, grammatical competence and sociolinguistics competence further. Howatt’s (1984) ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ forms of CLT are on the further development on communicative competence, which distinguishes the aim of CLT is whether “learning to use English” or “using English to learn it” (Ellis, 2012, p.196). Byram’s (1997) model of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) is further elaboration of sociolinguistic competence in CLT into the five ‘savoirs’ associated with ICC. There is also a development on the grammatical competence related to the accuracy and error correction, which “the ultimate goal of learning is to be able to use the new language both accurately and fluently” (Richards, 2006, pp.22-23).

Despite these developments of CLT, the changes of globalised language learning environment seems to be far more substantial compared to the inception of CLT when a language classroom contained significantly fewer international students. It may be early to establish the impact of the current CLT on multicultural diversity and currently there still seem to have a gap between the language approach and the multicultural learning environment.

The teaching methods and approaches are usually assumed to be universally effective regardless of educational culture. However, does CLT actually work universally regardless of educational culture? Stevens (1998) has addressed problems in teaching English to multicultural students as follows :

During my training as an EFL teacher I was given instruction in, for example, lesson planning, English grammar, understanding pronunciation problems, etc. but was totally unprepared for the problems posed by teaching different nationalities. (Stevens, 1998, p.44)

The problem appears to stem from the fact that the teacher does not share the same educational culture with the students. Absence or ignorance of cultural sensitivity on this issue has resulted in language teachers who teach international students using CLT, which may be counterproductive.

It is claimed that cultural cognitive differences exist between Asian and Western learners (Dimmock and Walker, 2005 ; Watkinsons and Biggs, 2001). Furthermore, there are differences in the preference of language teaching approaches between American and Asian students. A previous study has shown that different learning preferences exist between American and Asian students. Furuhata (2002) tested the participants of students by teaching Japanese using both traditional language teaching and CLT methods. A preference for CLT was confirmed among the American students, whereas the Asian students preferred the traditional methods (Furuhata, 2002, p.140). However, the study does not investigate which teaching approach enhances students' learning, which relates to the research questions of this study.

Research Questions

Throughout the course of both pilot and this study, some of the non-British students did not appear to be very enthusiastic in response to CLT compared to the British students. It was unclear why CLT worked better for British students than non-British students. CLT's universal effectiveness regardless of students' culture was questioned. Encountering this problem, the initial hypothesis was that CLT may not offer the universal optimum language-teaching approach in the multicultural teaching and learning environment. The second hypothesis was that CLT may be only appropriate and effective for British students as it is a Western originated theory.

The aim of this study was to ascertain the efficacy of an Anglophone originated teaching

approach (CLT) by comparing with non-Anglophone teaching approaches. As a non-Anglophone teaching approach, the Japanese teaching approach (Japanisation) was used, by setting up one group teaching in CLT and the other teaching in Japanisation with the use of quantitative method.

Study Format

The next section discusses the framework of British and Japanese educational culture, which will help to understand the teaching approaches used in this study, i.e. CLT and Japanisation. This is followed by a description of methods and results before finally the discussion and conclusion are shown.

Theoretical Framework, CLT and Japanisation

Theoretical Framework

Hofstede *et al.* (2010) categorises culture in five dimensions: power distance (PD); individualism-collectivism; uncertainty avoidance; masculinity-femininity; and long-term-short-term. Only the first three dimensions are used in this study. Each dimension consists of two opposing poles which will help to position where Japan and the Britain stand for the purpose of this study.

Power Distance (PD) is defined as “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organisations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally” (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p.61). Japan and the UK are ranked at 49-50th and 65-67th places out of 76 countries, respectively (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p.59).

Individualist and collectivist are “the interests of the individual prevail over the interests of the group” (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p.91) and “the interest of the group prevails over the interest of individual” (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p.90) respectively. Japan and the UK are ranked at 35-37th places and the third place out of 76 countries, respectively (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, pp.95-96), which positions the UK as individualist country. Hofstede’s data do not strongly identify Japan as either an individualist or a collectivist society. However, Hofstede (1991) uses Japan as being an example of a collectivist country, and specifically highlights the Japanese family (Hofstede : 1991 : 57) which is a small group unit that con-

sists Japanese society. Therefore, Japan is considered as one of the collectivist countries in this research.

Uncertainty avoidance is defined as “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations” (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, p.191). Japan and UK are ranked at 11-13th and 68-69th places out of 76 countries, respectively (Hofstede *et al.*, 2010, pp.192-194).

With the understanding that Japan has a large power distance, collectivist and strong uncertainty avoidance and Britain has a small power distance, individualist and weak uncertainty avoidance, the next section explains the two teaching approaches using Hofstede *et al.*'s dimensions.

CLT

CLT adopts the following Hofstede *et al.*'s dimensions : small power distance, weak uncertainty avoidance, and individualism. Firstly, CLT resembles a small power distance culture, as CLT is “less teacher-centred” (Brumfit, 1985, p.7) and “CLT is firmly opposed to teacher dominance in the classroom” (Hu, 2002, p.95). Secondly, CLT has a weak uncertainty avoidance culture because creativity is valued in CLT : “learners are not being constantly corrected. Errors are regarded with greater tolerance” (Littlewood, 1981, p.94) and CLT “avoid linguistic correction entirely” (Brumfit and Johnson, 1979, p.173). Finally, CLT focuses on the individual student, thereby making it a culture of individualism. For example, some of CLT's favourite tasks such as information gap, problem solving, role plays (Hu, 2002, p.96) usually use pair work. Pair work allows one-to-one interaction more effectively and pays attention to the needs of individual student.

Japanisation

Japanisation is a unique Japanese concept, which originates from a study of the Japanese manufacturing industry and came into vogue in the mid-1980s. Since then, Japanisation has been been utilised to management beyond manufacturing industry, yet not in the language teaching context. Therefore, this concept was utilised and adapted to language teaching context in this research. The unique Japanese concept is the main rationale for why the concept

of Japanisation from the manufacturing was applied to language teaching in this study.

Some of the key words of Japanisation uses group concept, one of which is called Quality Control (QC) groups. In the Japanese manufacturing industries, QC groups are used to make use of all staff of very different experience and skills over an extended period of time in order to improve quality. The equivalence of QC groups also exists at Japanese schools where they are known as 'Han groups'. Han groups are regular working groups used in Japanese classrooms (Fukuzawa and LeTendre, 2001 ; Dimmock and Walker, 2002 ; Tsuneyoshi, 2001). "Each Han [group] includes five to eight children" (Benjamin, 1997, p.53) and Han groups "comprise a mixture of different academic abilities" (Okano and Tsuchiya, 1999, p.59), which resembles QC groups "very different experience and skills". In contrast, Anglophone groups tend to form with those of similar academic abilities.

Han groups have characteristics based on Hofstede *et al.*'s following dimensions : strong uncertainty avoidance and collectivism.

Firstly, Han groups contribute strong uncertainty avoidance. Han groups only "change the groupings at the beginning of each term of the school year" (Benjamin, 1997, p.53). Being with a same member of the group for long period contributes to strong uncertainty avoidance in a collectivist society. Han groups are "formal groups" meaning "more or less permanent with defined roles over a long period" (Brumfit, 1985, p.72). Han groups resemble QC group's 'extended period of time' as group concept. In contrast, Anglophone group formations are "informal groups". Informal groups are usually of *ad hoc* formation (Brumfit, 1985, p.72).

Secondly, Han groups contribute to collectivism. In Han groups, the group's (all member) achievement is considered more important than an individual's achievement. In manufacturing context, it is claimed that "Japanese workers' willingness to subordinate individual goals to group goals is frequently cited as a reason for the success of Japanese work groups" (Shields, 1989, p.29). Therefore, when one person is underperforming within the Han group, the rest of the members help that person. This Han group concept is also used in this study.

Specific Research Question

This study addresses the following research question :

Do students in the Japanese language classes taught using CLT and Japanisation methods show any differences in performance of the Reading and Written Test and Assignments?

Method

This section discusses the measures of three tests used in this research, procedures of two teaching methods, details of participants and the analysis.

Measures

During the semester three tests (Assignment 1, Assignment 2 and Reading and Written Test) were the collected data. The Part-time Programme of the Modern Languages Department in the University stipulates assessment tasks for students to undertake, utilising two main assessment schemes: “heavily based on home assignments” which students can take home and use any reference and “timed and supervised assessment tasks” (Modern languages Part-time Programme, 2009, p.7). The former consists of two pieces of assessed home assignments weighted at 10% each (20% of the total) that were submitted on certain deadlines (submission in week 6 and week 9 of 12, respectively). For simplicity, these are referred to as Assignment 1 and Assignment 2. The timed and supervised assessment task is the Reading and Written Test, which is normally assessed on a Saturday by invigilators. It consists of one timed, task-based written examination lasting 90 minutes and is weighted at 40% (Teaching and Assessment Guide, 2009/2010, pp.7-8). The Reading and Written Test also needs to be inspected and approved by either the Part-time Programme Co-ordinator or the Deputy Director of the Centre for Language Study before the exam is administered. The structure and content of Assignments 1 and 2 and the Reading and Written Test are fundamentally similar. Speaking and listening skills were assessed in separate assessments called Oral Test and Listening Test respectively. Assignment 1, Assignment 2, and the Reading and Written test assessed reading comprehension and writing skills. Structurally, all of them consist of fill-in-the-blank questions, multiple choice questions relating to grammar, and free writing open-ended questions. Fill-in-the-blank questions and multiple choice questions require one correct answer, which relates to strong uncertainty avoidance. Open-ended questions require creativity, which relates to weak uncertainty avoidance. It is worth noting that

the ratio of ‘one correct answer’ questions to open-ended questions in both Assignment 1 and 2 is 3 : 7, and in the Reading and Written Test the ratio is 5 : 5. The fairly high ratio of open-ended questions implies that these assessments subscribe to the value of creativity and is typical of a British university educational culture.

Assignment 1 was given on 6/11/2009, Week 6, Assignment 2 was given on 9/12/2009, Week 9 and the Reading and Written Test was administered on 23/01/2010, Week 12. The results of the three tests were analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (version 12), evaluated and the implications of applying CLT to the diverse cultural background of students was considered.

Procedure

The study was conducted during the first semester of the 2009/2010 academic year at a university in the South of England. Students were taught using two different language teaching approaches, CLT and Japanisation. CLT was applied to Group 2 (21 students) and Japanisation to Group 3 (13 students) and students were randomly assigned into two groups. Below are the details of the two groups :

Typical procedures used in CLT (Group 2). CLT adopts the following three dimensions : small power distance, weak uncertainty avoidance, and individualism. The CLT class was achieved by exposing the participants students to a combination of the following three dimensions :

With regards to the power distance dimension, CLT is “less teacher-centred” (Brumfit, 1985, p.7) and it is claimed that “CLT is firmly opposed to teacher dominance in the classroom” (Hu, 2002, p.95). This was established by creating a student centred class.

Secondly, with regards to the uncertainty avoidance dimension, CLT takes weak uncertainty avoidance. A weak uncertainty avoidance was achieved by encouraging students’ creativity and avoiding linguistic correction : “learners are not being constantly corrected. Errors are regarded with greater tolerance,” (Littlewood, 1981, p.94), and CLT “avoid(s) linguistic correction entirely” (Brumfit and Johnson, 1979, p.173).

Lastly, with regards to the individualism *versus* collectivism dimension, CLT adheres to individualism. Individualism was demonstrated through speaking activities in pair using in-

formation gap tasks and problem-solving tasks. Harmer (2003) maintains that “it is true that dialogue-making, discussion, role-play are now staples of the western-base classroom, and the various forms of information gap activity are widely in use” (Harmer, 2003, p.289).

Typical procedures used in Japanisation (Group 3). Japanisation adopts following three dimensions : large power distance, strong uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism. The Japanisation class was achieved by exposing the participants students to a combination of the following of Hofstede *et al.*'s three dimensions :

With regards to the individualism *versus* collectivism dimension, Japanisation adheres to collectivism. Collectivism was demonstrated through Han groups. The main purpose of the Han group was to work with other members of the group to complete the task. For example, those who had questions in the worksheet were encouraged to ask any members of the Han group who knew the answer rather than asking questions to the teacher. It was expected that all the members of the Han group contributed to share their knowledge and look after each other so that everyone completed the task without the tutor. Each student was able to talk relatively freely and discussions were also allowed to take place freely during the Han group although they rarely happened.

Secondly, with regards to the uncertainty avoidance dimension, Japanisation takes strong uncertainty avoidance. This was achieved by the use of tasks which required one correct answer, routinisation and the elimination of errors. Specifically, students work on grammar exercises which have only one correct answer using the textbook which consists of repetitive substitution exercises. These routinised exercises were opposite from using the creativity which is emphasised in CLT. Furthermore, the class was taught in an orderly row with whole class instruction and students were expected to answer questions in the textbook turn. This procedure allows students to predict which question they have to answer in advance, which helped to create a strong uncertainty avoidance culture.

Finally, with regards to the power distance dimension, Japanisation adopts a large power distance. This was created by a teacher-centred whole-class instruction where students were expected to play a passive role during the class : “the teacher teaches and the students are taught” (Freire, 1972, pp.46-47) and “the teacher talks and the students listen” (Freire, 1972, pp.46-47). Teacher-centred whole-class instruction is Asian classrooms’ characteristics (Ste-

venson and Stigler, 1994, p.70) and it may be considered suitable pedagogy to represent Japanese education. However, according to Tsuneyoshi (2001), Japanese education used individualised instruction between 1600 and 1868, until whole-class instruction was imported in 1872 by an American, M. M. Scott, who was invited to Japan to demonstrate this teaching technique (Tsuneyoshi, 2001, p.86). Tsuneyoshi (2001) rightly points out that ‘it is again an irony of history that whole-class instruction took root in Japanese classrooms, and now seems to be more entrenched there than in the countries where it originated’ (Tsuneyoshi, 2001, p.86). Therefore, teacher-centred whole-class instruction is not a unique Japanese pedagogy. In fact, there is evidence that American teaching used to take the form of whole-class instruction as the National Education Association (NEA) stated in 1893 :

Every subject which is taught at all in a secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be or at what point his education is to cease (Stevenson and Stigler, 1994, p.107).

For this reason, teacher-centred whole-class instruction was considered an irrelevant pedagogy to represent Japanese pedagogy as Japanisation and used as a supplement to Japanisation in this research.

Contrast to the CLT class, it should be noted that the opportunity of speaking practice in pairs in Japanese class was rarely provided.

Participants

The participants comprises a mixture of undergraduate and postgraduate students who were studying Stage 1 Japanese (no previous knowledge of the language) at a university in the South of England. The university offers 16 language courses, between Stage 1 and Stage 7 (near native). Japanese courses were offered as non-credit bearing evening classes between Stage 1 and Stage 3 when the study was conducted. The breakdown of the participants were : one Australian, eleven British, three British-Chinese, one British Indian, one Bulgarian, seven Chinese, one Egyptian, two Greek, one Hong Kong-Chinese, one Indone-

sian, one Korean, three Malaysian-Chinese and one New Zealand Chinese. The focus of this research is culture, which related to students' nationality. For this reason, therefore, students' gender was not required to be identified. A noticeable difference between Groups 2 and 3 is that the dominant ethnic group in Group 2 was British, whereas in Group 3 it was Chinese. Although the Chinese heritage students (Chinese, New Zealand-Chinese and British-Chinese) were the dominant group ethnicity group in Group 3, it contained an almost equal number of students of other nationalities. Group 2 had 8 cultures among 13 students whereas Group 3 had 9 cultures among 21 students. The two participant groups constitute a variety of nationalities, and are therefore considered an international population and hence suitable for this study. Below table summaries the participants of three tests used in this study.

Table 1 *Summary of the number of participants who took the three tests*

| | Assignment 1 (n) | Assignment 2 (n) | Reading and Written Test (n) |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Group 2 (CLT) | 22 | 21 | 19 |
| Group 3 (Japanisation) | 13 | 13 | 12 |
| Total number of students | 35 | 34 | 31 |

Analysis

The collected three sets of quantitative data were analysed using both descriptive and statistical analysis of the data including mean, Standard Deviation (SD), minimum score, maximum score, skewness and kurtosis of the two groups, as well as an analysis of the significant differences between the teachings of two groups found with the independent-sample t -test, using SPSS. In the statistical analysis of the three datasets, the three sets of data, namely, Assignment 1, Assignment 2 and the Reading and Written Test results were compared using an independent-sample t -test as it is "used when you want to compare the mean scores of two different groups of people or conditions" (Pallant, 2005, p.205). The skewness and kurtosis of the data distribution are examined to ensure their suitability for parametric testing. All of the distributions of all the variables are inspected to ensure that they are acceptable for conducting the t -test. For all tests, the level of confidence is set at 0.05.

Results

This section presents two results from three datasets: Firstly, the results of descriptive statistics, followed by the results of statistical analysis.

Description of the Three Datasets

There was a large difference between the two group's minimum scores in the Reading and Written Test. The minimum score of Group 2 was 49.75 and that of Group 3 was 59. The difference in maximum scores (7.00) in the Reading and Written Test was not as large as that of the minimum scores (9.25).

Although there was no large difference between the skewness of the two groups in the Reading and Written Test, the distribution of kurtosis of Group 3 (+0.85) was almost twice that of Group 2 (+0.48). This means that Group 3 (Japanisation) was more clustered in the centre than Group 2 (CLT). In addition, the mean score in Group 3 was 6.97 points higher than that of Group 2. Since kurtosis provides information about the "peakness of the distribution" (Pallant, 2010, p.57), this results show that the distribution of Group 3 students was almost twice as clustered around the peak compared to that of CLT.

Statistical Analysis of the Three Datasets

Assignment 1. For the difference in Assignment 1 scores between Groups 2 and 3 (CLT *versus* Japanisation), it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference between Group 2 ($Mean = 72.63, SD = 2.48$) and Group 3 ($Mean = 73.32, SD = 2.22$). The mean difference was not significant, $t(33) = -0.82, p = 0.42$. The difference between the mean scores in each group was very small.

Assignment 2. For the difference in Assignment 2 scores between Groups 2 and 3 (CLT *versus* Japanisation), there was no statistically significant difference between Group 2 ($Mean = 70.10, SD = 3.99$) and Group 3 ($Mean = 70.72, SD = 3.32$). The mean difference was not significant, $t(32) = -0.47, p = 0.64$. The difference between the mean scores in each group was very small.

Reading and written test. For the difference in the Reading and Written test scores between Groups 2 and 3 (CLT *versus* Japanisation), it was concluded that Group 3 ($Mean =$

75.92, $SD = 7.69$) had significantly better marks than Group 2 ($Mean = 68.95$, $SD = 7.98$). The mean difference was modest but significant, $t(29) = -2.40$, $p = 0.02$, $d = 0.17$. The difference in mean (effect size) was classified as very large ($\eta^2 = 0.17$) (Pallant, 2005, p.209).

Discussion

The quantitative data obtained from the three tests between the two groups suggested that there was no statistically significant difference in the first two Assignments. However, there was a statistically significant difference in the Reading and Written Test, where the Japanisation class obtained higher average marks (the mean score of Group 3 was 6.97 points higher than that of Group 2) than the CLT class. The difference between the mean scores of the two groups for the Reading and Written test was very large ($\eta^2 = 0.17$) (Pallant, 2005, p.209). Furthermore, the distribution of kurtosis of Group 3 (Japanisation) was almost twice as that of Group 2 (CLT), meaning that the marks in Group 3 were more clustered around the average than the marks in Group 2. In addition, not only Group 3 showed statistically higher average results, but it also gave consistent results. Since Japanisation aims teaching around the average students, this may have been one of the factors contributing to the observed distribution of Group 3 where more students in Reading and Written tests were clustered around the average. Japanese teaching methods may be one of the factors that contribute to a greater clustering around the average and higher scores, especially in reading and writing areas in this group. However, the research was not able to control for other variables, e.g. pre-attainment, individual effort of the students.

The quantitative results showed that the Japanisation class achieved on average consistent better marks than the CLT class. The results imply that one educational culture which focuses on teaching the average student could produce students with higher marks than the other culture which focuses on the individual student.

Implications

The first implication asks the focus our teaching. The US is one of the countries which prefers individualism, and it is claimed that “the American educational system as it cur-

rently exists is producing an educationally advantaged minority and disadvantaged majority” (Stevenson and Stigler, 1994, p.223). CLT is an ideal teaching approach for an individualist educational culture as it pays attention to the needs of individual student. However, focusing on the individual student’s needs may not necessarily meet the needs of all students as a class or the majority of average students. Sometimes focusing and trying to meet the needs of individuals could mean sacrificing the majority. For example, the teacher has only a finite amount of time with the class. If a student requires special attention from the teacher during the class, the teacher’s attention may be paid disproportionately to the student. This would leave the majority of students’ who have no problem with the work not receiving the benefit of time with the teacher.

In contrast, Japanisation focuses on the majority students and it is beneficial for the large majority which is ideal for collectivist educational culture. However, this does not necessarily mean to meet the needs of minority individuals at either end of the ability spectrum, (i. e., very high and very low ability).

Meeting with the diverse students’ learning preferences and expectation is one aspect of enhancing students’ learning experience. CLT focuses on individuals due to Anglophone originated theory. If CLT could be incorporated with teaching approaches from other non-Anglophone countries, students’ preferences, abilities and expectations from collectivist and individualist, weak and strong uncertainty avoidance and small and large power distance cultures could be captured. It is also more likely to enhance the students’ learning experience. The higher students’ learning experiences are enhanced, the higher the students’ satisfaction level is demonstrated and this contributes to students’ perception of high quality teaching.

Secondly, is CLT considered to be the most effective universal optimum language-teaching approach regardless of cultural background? CLT has evolved over four decades. However, CLT is originated and closely associated with the Western individualist, weak uncertainty avoidance and small power distance educational culture. The current British multicultural learning environment includes students coming from collectivist, large power distance and strong uncertainty avoidance culture which could be considered as directly opposite from the Anglophone educational culture. Considering the language teaching and learn-

ing environment has significantly changed following the globalisation in education, British universities now faces new challenges from the non-Anglophone students, which may be very different from those of British educational culture. It may be possible to say that “a teaching or learning approach that is taken for granted and regarded as universal and common sense by people from one culture may be seen as idiosyncratic and ineffective in the eyes of people from a different culture” (Gu and Schweisfurth, 2006, p.75). Therefore, CLT may “conflict” (Hu, 2002, p.102) or be “incompatible” (Hu, 2002, p.102) to some educational culture, and thus may not offer a universal optimum language-teaching theory. “While shared human values may make certain methods (or certain aspects of specific methods) universally applicable, this should not always be assumed to be the case” (Sonaiya, 2002, p.107).

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation was the number of participants in this study. The total number of participants in this study was 34, which is a relatively small participant size, especially for quantitative data purposes. Furthermore, the number of students submitting the two assignments or taking the Reading and Written test fluctuated. For example, in Group 2, the number submitting Assignment 1 was 21, and for Assignment 2 it was 21, but the number taking the Reading and Written Test was 19. Whereas in Group 3, 13 participants submitted Assignments 1 and 2, but the number taking the Reading and Written Test was 12. It was not feasible to increase the size of the participants and the control on the number of students taking three tests. Nonetheless, it may be possible to draw some conclusions about the specific participants population.

The second main limitation of this study relates to the difference between the two groups. The ratio of different ethnicities and work/school cultures in Groups 2 and 3 were not similar. Increasing the number of participants and equalising the ratios within the two groups was not feasible. Considering these limitations, studies with access to a larger participants and a power to manipulate two groups to make them as identical in profile as possible would benefit future study.

Future Research

Where the Anglophone teaching approaches and the study of Anglophone teaching approaches are dominated, the study of non-Anglophone teaching approaches may not receive full attention as teaching practices of non-Anglophone countries are still currently unfamiliar to majority of language practitioners. However, this study shows that some of the teaching practices from non-Anglophone countries may be also valid and useful in non-communicative areas. The result of the Reading and Written Test showed that the students appeared to cluster more around the average in the Japanisation class compared with CLT class. The study of teaching practices from other non-Anglophone countries has potential for the future language theory building and may be extended further.

Conclusions

CLT and Japanisation are two extremes although these two teaching approaches work perfectly for people from both ends of the cultural spectrum. However, as the learning environment becomes globalised and multicultural, these two language teaching approaches face challenges from the people of the opposite end of the Hofstede *et al.* (2010)'s cultural spectrum. Various alternative theories to CLT have been suggested, yet CLT still hold its popularity for more than 40 years. This study suggests that other teaching approaches from non-Anglophone countries may also be equally valid as CLT, and incorporating CLT with non-Anglophone educational culture would appeal people from both end of the educational cultural spectrum more. It is hoped that one teaching approach which incorporates teaching approaches from both Anglophone and non-Anglophone countries will be created in the near future.

References

- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT : a content approach to language teaching, *ELT journal*, 57(3), pp.278-287. doi : 10.1093/elt/57.3.278
- Benjamin, G. R. (1997). *Japanese lessons : A year in a Japanese school through the eyes of an American Anthropologist and her children*. New York, NY : New York University Press.

- Brumfit, C. J. (1985). *Language and Literature Teaching : From Practice to Principle*. Oxford, UK : Pergamon Institute of English.
- Brumfit, C. J. & Johnson, K. (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford, UK : Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, R. & Wales, R. (1970). 'The study of language acquisition', in J. Lyon (Ed.) *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harmondsworth : Penguin.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing, *Applied Linguistics*. 1(1), 3-47. doi : 10.1093/applin/1.1.1
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy*. Chichester, UK : Wiley-Blackwell.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY : Penguin Books.
- Furuhata, H. (2002). Learning Japanese in America : A Survey of preferred Teaching Methods, *Language Culture and Curriculum*. 15(2), 134-142. doi : 10.1080/07908310208666639
- Gu, Q. & Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Who adapts? Beyond Cultural model of 'the' Chinese Learner, *Language Culture and Curriculum*. 19(1), 74-89. doi : 10.1080/07908310608668755
- Harmer, J. (2003). Popular culture, methods, and context, *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 288-294. doi : 10.1093/elt/57.3.288
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations – Software of the mind (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY : McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports : the case of communicative language teaching in China, *Language Culture and Curriculum*. 15(2), 93-105. doi : 10.1080/07908310208666636
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching – An introduction*. London, UK : Cambridge University Press.
- Okano, K. & Tsuchiya, M. (1999). *Education in contemporary Japan-Inequality and diversity*. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS Survival Manual – A step by step guide to data analysis using*

- SPPSS for Windows (Version 12)*. Maidenhead, UK : Open University Press.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual – A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS (4th ed)*. Maidenhead : Open University Press.
- Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press.
- Shields, J. J., Jr. (Ed.). (1989). *Japanese schooling*. University Park, PA : The Pennsylvania state University.
- Slee, J. (2010). A Systematic Approach to Culturally Responsive Assessment Practices and Evaluation. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 64(3), 246-260.
- Sonaiya, R. (2002). Autonomous Language Learning in Africa : A Mismatch of Cultural Assumptions, *Language Culture and Curriculum*. 15(2), 106-116. doi: 10.1080/07908310208666637
- Stevens, B. (1998). *An investigation of problems experienced by Japanese students, learning English in Great Britain* (MA dissertation). Available from University of Southampton Library.
- Stevenson, H. W. & Stigler, J. W. (1994). *The learning gap : why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education*. New York, NY : Simon & Schuster.

