

論 文

A study on the roles of L1 and L2 in foreign language classroom

— Language awareness, Language planning, and Translanguaging —

飯 田 毅

同志社女子大学
学芸学部・国際教養学科
教授

Tsuyoshi Iida

Department of International Studies,
Faculty of Liberal Arts, Doshisha Women's College of Liberal Arts,
Professor**Abstract**

The present *Course of Study* proposed by Japan's Ministry of Culture, Sports and Technology (MEXT) states that English courses at upper secondary schools basically have to be carried out through the medium of English. This has led to many controversies among teachers and researchers over the use of English in the classroom. However, it does not seem that there have not been any truly fruitful discussions on this issue up to now. One of the main reasons for promoting English-only classrooms is the belief that exclusive use of English in the classroom will motivate and improve students' English skills. Therefore, first, this study examined the background of second language (L2) use in the classroom as proposed by MEXT, while contending that first language (L1) plays a significant role in the L2 classroom. In addition, it considers not only the roles of L1 and L2, but also the effective use of both languages in the classroom. In particular, it emphasized that L2 teachers need to raise students' interest in language by means of language awareness, and to consider the balance of L1 and L2 within the classroom in order to develop students' L1 and L2 skills simultaneously. Finally, this paper proposes language planning in the classroom, paying particular attention to translanguaging (Williams, 1996), as a method of developing both L1 and L2 language skills.

Keywords: English through English, bilingual education, translanguaging, case study

Introduction

The new *Course of Study* published by MEXT (2009) states that English courses at upper secondary school level should be basically conducted through English so that students can have more opportunities to be exposed to English in the classroom. MEXT

also emphasizes that teachers should make English classrooms more communicative. After initially making a strong official statement about the use of English in the classroom, the attitude of MEXT then became weaker, suggesting that Japanese could also be used when a teacher explains a grammatical item in the classroom. Also,

MEXT published *Globalka ni taioshita eigokyoiku kaikaku jiko keikaku* (2013), stating that English courses at lower secondary school should be basically conducted through the medium of English. These statements were significant in that previously *the Course of Study* had not referred to any practical teaching techniques. Also, this innovation provoked some English teachers' uneasiness about conducting English classes in English (e.g., Mainichi, 2009; Fukuda, 2013), suggesting that most Japanese English teachers in secondary schools might face difficulties when using English exclusively in the classroom. Therefore, it is perhaps pertinent to examine the meaning of teaching English through English in the classroom now when the new *Course of Study for English* has just been implemented. This requirement generally can be rephrased as "teaching a target language through the target language" in the classroom. Under such a condition, the present research is significant in that it reconsiders the roles of L1 and L2 in language education. In particular, it pays more attention to the role of L1 in L2 classroom. Is it sound to recommend that teachers should aim at the acquisition of a target language through the target language itself in the homogeneous classroom? The purpose of this paper is to discuss the roles of English (the target language, L2) and Japanese (mother tongue, L1) in English language education, and to suggest a method of developing students' skills and confidence in both the L1 and L2 in the classroom by utilizing a method based on language awareness and bilingual education.

First, an important term 'technique' must be defined in order for this paper to have its

full impact. Based on a definition proposed by Richard and Rodgers (1986), "technique is the level at which classroom procedures are described" (p. 15); therefore, English through English, or English-only in the classroom, can be described as a technique, unlike the approach or method that refer to "the level at which assumption and beliefs about language and language learning are specified" (ibid.) or "the level at which classroom procedures are described" (ibid), respectively.

Background

Significance of L1 in L2 class

The new *Course of Study* published by MEXT (2009) was unprecedented in that it stipulated that English language teaching in upper secondary school should be carried out via the target language. No previous *Course of Study* until now has forced English teachers to use English-only in the classroom. *The Course of Study* mentioned that English through English aims at having students exposed to English in the classroom, thus ensuring opportunities to communicate through English in the classroom, and forcing students to understand in English and communicate through English exclusively. It also stresses that English classes should not focus on traditional English teaching techniques such as English-Japanese, Japanese-English translation, or English grammar teaching, but instead concentrate on English language activities that allow students to truly use English.

There have been many discussions on the English-through-English technique to date. Some researchers acknowledge that it is a desirable technique, but some do not. In Japan some people believe that the English-only classroom is superior to the bilingual

classroom in which both languages are used, because more exposure to English in the classroom is important for the improvement of English skills. However, it is debatable whether simply using the English-through-English technique can honestly contribute to making students understand English in itself, and then communicate effectively via English.

First of all, this paper needs to clarify the background of the English-through-English technique from the theoretical perspectives on the use of L1 in the L2 learning. Scott and De La Furente (2008) contended that the belief that only L2 should be used in the classroom was founded on the notion that acquisition is better than learning. This belief was based Krashen's (1988) monitor theory, which was influential in Japan during the 1980's and early 1990's. Once there were many researchers who argued that approaches to foreign language teaching aiming at a subconscious and spontaneous development of L2 competence, should be considered superior to those of rule-governed teaching. Atkinson (1993) argued that although several approaches to foreign language teaching emphasized the importance of L2 and suggested that the L1 might be undesirable to the acquisition process, there was no research to support an L2-only technique in the classroom. From the above, the English-through-English technique proposed by MEXT might then be derived from Krashen's monitor theory. It cannot be denied that Krashen's theories had a great influence on English language teaching in Japan. Still, and to date there are many researchers and practitioners who support them.

However, the idea that the L1 has some

relationship with the L2 when one learns a foreign/second language has validity (Cook, 2002; Cummins, 2008). Recent theories reconsidering the role of the L1 in foreign language teaching have been proposed. Cook (2001) contended that the L1 might have a significant role in foreign language teaching, in particular in task-based learning approaches. He argued that the L1 can help students explain the task to each other, negotiate roles they are going to take, or check their understanding or production of language with them. Centeno-Cortes and Jimenez (2004) expressed the importance of the L1 during problem-solving tasks. They discovered that, during private verbal thinking— private speech that surfaces during the reasoning process as a tool used in the resolution of problem-solving tasks— intermediate and advanced L2 learners of Spanish used both Spanish and their L1, English, while native speakers of Spanish who were bilingual used Spanish. Also, they mentioned that unlike advanced learners, the intermediate learners were not able to use the L2 during the reasoning or problem-solving tasks. They concluded that because private verbal thinking plays a crucial role in the case of L2 speakers engaged in problem-solving, the L1 has very important roles in the process of learning. Moreover, they added that “If the first language is prohibited in the language classroom, this might hinder language learning” (p. 31) because the L1 serves as a key cognitive and metacognitive tool for learners. However, it is important to note that they did not “advocate that the L1 should be allowed in the language classroom for all purposes” (p. 31). These studies suggest that L1 may play an important role in L2 learning.

The important role of L1 can also be suggested by research on collaborative L2 learning. Referring to recent studies of collaborative L2 learning from a sociocultural viewpoint, Ortega (2007) claimed that the L1 takes on a cognitive tool function during task-based group work. In a collaborative L2 task-based group work, students can engage in more negotiation of form and metatalk (language talk to reflect on language use) by using their L1. Similarly, Swain and Lapkin (1998) clarified that the L1 was a “meditational tool fully available to [learners], to regulate their own behavior, to focus attention on specific L2 structures, and to generate and assess alternatives” (p. 333). Furthermore, Ortega argued that all language learners actively use their knowledge of additional languages to form hypotheses about the target language and to selectively give their attention to aspects of the L2 input (e.g., Bley-Vroman, 1989). These studies show that L2 learners use their knowledge of the L1 effectively when learning the L2. They also suggest that exclusive use of the target language in the classroom will not lead to communicative activities smoothly in the classroom, or the improvement of students’ communicative skills.

It is important to look at different role of L1 in the linguistic homogeneous classroom from that of L1 in the linguistic heterogeneous classroom. Ortega (2007) contended that the L1 in the linguistic homogeneous EFL classroom can be utilized fully despite the fact that many foreign language teachers committed themselves to using the target language as much as possible. She emphasized the advantage of linguistic homogeneity in the foreign

language classroom. In a linguistic heterogeneous situation teachers are forced to use only the target language that not all students might have equally acquired. She considered VanPatten and Cadierno’s (1993) input processing instruction as an advantage given by linguistic homogeneity in the foreign language classroom. Their hypothesis was that it might be better for students to be given practice comprehending the pronoun in Object-Verb-Subject sentences, than to be taught to practice the pronouns in traditional gap-filling exercises in order for students to internalize the use of the Spanish direct object pronoun system. VanPatten and Cadierno revealed the evidence that students need to internalize the use of the Spanish direct object pronoun system. Ortega stated that this practice designed to emphasize specific and crucial L1-L2 differences might not be similarly effective in the same way as in linguistically heterogeneous classroom. This study promotes the advantages provided by linguistic homogeneity in the foreign language classroom. Also, Ortega maintained that students make use of their shared L1 in L2 learning. In English language teaching in Japanese secondary schools, the use of Japanese is very effective for learners not only in understanding teacher explanations of English grammar, but also in internalizing differences between English and Japanese grammar because Japanese is a usually shared L1 in English classes in Japan.

The above studies that show an important role of L1 in the L2 classroom suggest that L1 and L2 are influencing to each other even when learners are learning an L2. This is supported by recent research. Scott and Furente (2008) maintained that “an increasing number of studies have shown

that multilingual functioning is a normal process that involves a nearly subconscious interaction between or among a person's different languages" (p. 101). Studies on cognition and multilingual functioning have confirmed the idea that two (or more) languages have collaborative influences each other (de Bot, 1992; Kroll & Sunderman, 2003). The collaborative roles of two (or more) languages in one's mind can be seen in L1 metalanguage in L2 learning. It should be stressed that an appropriate use of metalanguage in the L1 such as parts of speech, subject, object, and complement is beneficial for L2 learners in that it helps learners to understand the construction of English sentences, although too much use of the metalanguage confuses learners. Berry (2005) discussed the role of metalanguage more extensively than any other researcher in terms of its usefulness for L2 learners. He referred to Roman Jakobson's statement that metalanguage is useful not only for logicians and linguists, but also for normal people in everyday language use. Berry (2005) raised a question about the weak relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and language proficiency (Alderson et al., 1997). He argued that metalanguage was needed to identify metalinguistic knowledge. Berry (1997) found evidence of a correlation between knowledge of terminology and proficiency among his subjects. Berry (2001) also showed that knowledge of terminology was important for self-study, to gain access to explanations in grammar materials as far as teachers of English were concerned. Cajkler and Hislam (2002) showed that knowledge of grammatical terms was important for editing writing. Moreover, we can find an important role of the knowledge

of grammatical terms in multilingual education (e.g., Jessner, 2005). Despite the usefulness of metalanguage in L2 learning, it has mostly been regarded as useless in Japan. This might be due to the fact that referring to metalanguage in the L2 classroom reminds L2 teachers of the grammar-translation method. Although metalanguage does not have any relationship with L2 proficiency (Iida, 2010), it has the function of bridging grammatical relationship between English and Japanese.

L1 learning in L2 class

English language teaching in Japan is generally called English as a Foreign Language (EFL) because English is not used as a daily language as Japanese is. The boundary of this concept has recently been blurred owing to the fact that people can be exposed to English if they desire through bilingual TV, videos, and the Internet (e.g., Brown, 2005). Therefore, there are some researchers who refer to English language teaching in Japan as English as a second Language (ESL) rather than EFL. However, it is also of importance to consider that both EFL and ESL exclusively look at the target language itself without considering the role of the mother tongue in language education. This statement appears to be as a matter of course because learning English is an objective of such a course. It might not be necessary to think about the Japanese language at all in the English classroom. However, unlike the English language teaching in the linguistically heterogeneous classroom such as English as ESL in the United States, the mother tongue should be effectively used in the classroom where the L1 is almost always the same language that

all students are endeavoring to understand

Despite the importance of the role of the L1 in the L2 classroom, this notion in L1 school education in Japan has not been sufficiently researched. In support of this, Fukuzawa (2010) examined some Japanese politicians' debates in the Diet, arguing that not only politicians but also Japanese students in general do not discuss logically. The lack of discussion skills is not a result of the Japanese language itself, but seems to be caused by a lack of training of language arts in school education in Japan. Many researchers have made a similar statement, but it was Kinoshita (1981), a physicist, who emphasized the importance of L1 skills for university students of science. He discovered that students were unable to use the L2 effectively because of insufficiency of L1 skills. His rich experiences of using L2 in the international conferences made him realize the importance of the L1 and published some books on use of the L1 for university students. Recently similar L1 language training has been promoted by Sanmori (e.g., 2003), who shows that basic language skills such as explaining, argumentation, discussion, and debating skills are also essential for the development of L1. All these researchers maintained that such L1 skills are necessary for the development of L2 skills. In conclusion, these researchers contend that L1 skills need to be improved for better improved L2 communication.

Also, Japanese university students' lack of L1 academic language skills has become an important issue recently. An increasing number of Japanese universities have been designing and implementing curriculum to teach academic Japanese as an introductory course. Tsutsui (2008) introduced some

examples of L1 academic courses at university, showing that two thirds of universities in Japan are offering L1 academic courses now. More and more university teachers are recognizing that the number of students who cannot use their mother tongue effectively in academic classes, such as report and thesis writing and discussion skills is increasing. This spread of L1 academic skill courses at tertiary education level indicates that L1 education in primary and secondary schools might not be being conducted effectively to develop students' L1 skills. It could be said that this type of academic L1 course in Japan is comparable with expository writing courses in the American universities that first-year students are required to take.

Raising interest in language

Although it might be true that Japanese students do not always have sufficient L1 academic skills, a discussion as to whether L1 teaching should be carried out in L2 classes exists. There are some people who argue that academic L1 courses should first be carried out in courses conducted in Japanese, not in English class. However, it is perhaps of importance to pay more attention to L1 in English class in order to make students interest in L1. Without interest in language, it would be impossible to develop students' language skills. In particular, it might be possible to raise students' awareness of language by studying L2 in a homogeneous L1 environment before to improve L1 skills. It might be possible for teachers to raise students' awareness about language because they often have students who have some questions about language. Japanese students are always required to

compare and contrast structures of the English language with those of Japanese while studying English. They also have to think about the differences and similarities between English and Japanese vocabularies when they read and write English. They never fail to consider Japanese and English sentence structures while translating Japanese into English or English into Japanese. Regarding speaking and listening, basically this process of language transformation is similar, but the speed of processing is different. Students do not recognize L1 structures and vocabulary until they learn those of L2. What is important for L2 teachers in L2 classroom is that they should encourage students to develop an interest in the differences and similarities between L1 and L2, as well as to develop L2 skills. It might not be possible for L2 teachers to teach L1 in L2 classes, but it might be possible to raise students' interest in language itself.

Language awareness (LA)

There are many ways to develop students' interest in language, but this paper first looks at language awareness first because there suggestions can be found for raising awareness about language. Language awareness originates in the movement of foreign language teaches' to change language education in Britain, becoming a national movement in Britain in 1970s and 1980s. Its main aim is to develop students' L1 and L2 abilities by engaging students in knowledge about language (KAL) in the classroom. The phrase 'Language awareness' has been variously interpreted, but it is defined as a "person's sensitivity to and conscious awareness of the nature of language and its

role in human life" (Donmall, 1985, p. 7) by a working party on LA of the National Congress at Language in Education (NCLE). Now Association for Language Awareness (ALA, 2012) defines LA as "the explicit knowledge about language, and conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use" (<http://www.languageawareness.org/web.ala/web/about/tout.php>). In fact, LA has a close connection with KAL. Advocates of KAL (e.g., Richmond, 1990) declare that language learners need to have KAL to be able to learn it more quickly and use it more proficiently. According to Cots (2008), KAL has been an issue of interest in both mother tongue and foreign language education in several guises, such as language awareness (e.g., James and Garette, 1992), metalinguistic knowledge (e.g., Alderson et al., 1997), and explicit knowledge (e.g., Ellis, 2004).

As this definition shows, LA does not make a distinction between L1 and L2, which creates the possibility of promoting a close collaboration between the teaching of L1 and L2. It can perhaps be rephrased as LA that can promote language education including both L1 and L2. Despite the fact that LA is still unknown to most teachers and researchers in Japan, there have been plenty of publications not only about LA *per se* (e.g., Van Essen, 1997; Van Lier, 1995, 2000; White et al., 2000), but also about the LA movement in particular contexts in the UK (e.g., Aplin, 1988; Donmall, 1985; Donmall-Hickes, 1997), which identify an important role of the study and acquisition of language generally in education. Moreover, at present, LA is widely acknowledged particularly in Western countries (e.g., Donmall-Hicks,

1997; Singleton, 1992; Van Lier, 2000). What is significant in this movement is that not only L2 teachers but also L1 teachers collaborated to improve language education in their schools.

In fact, such an idea of language education does exist in Japan, although it is not referred to as LA as such. In particular, some researchers of foreign language education have been focusing on the contents of language education here (e.g., Kinoshita, 1981; Kurasawa, 1967; Morizumi, 1980; Otsu, 1983, 1989; Yasunaga, 1969). Among them there are some differences in their definitions among them; for instance, Yasunaga (1969) defines the goals of language education as developing students' logical recognition, thinking ability, and critical thinking whereas Morizumi (1992) provides a different definition—developing students' communicative proficiency, deepening their recognition and thought about language, and empowering them to form their own mental and affective domains. However, they share a similar idea that KAL is necessary for students in both their mother tongue and in foreign language education. Among these researchers, Otsu (1989) states the aim of language education more clearly than other researchers. He insists that developing students' metalinguistic knowledge should be the most fundamental aim of both mother tongue and foreign language education. He also argues that metalinguistic knowledge, developed by learning two languages such as English and Japanese, enables students to understand the relativity of an individual language, and consequently, the relativity of an individual culture as well. Metalinguistic knowledge is defined as “abstract and analyzed knowledge

about language” (Iida, 2010). Recent research shows that there is a connection between metalinguistic knowledge and L2 proficiency, in particular academic proficiency (e.g., Roehr, 2008; Iida, 2010). This suggests that developing metalinguistic knowledge will lead to L2 proficiency. However, what should be done to raise students' awareness about language in the classroom? And further, is it really necessary to raise students' interest in language?

First the latter question should be answered. The question is closely related to the fundamental objectives of foreign language education. Although there are a large number of explanations of these objectives, one of the simplest definitions is provided in *the Course of Study* published by MEXT (2009), in which three objectives are stated: first, developing communication ability; second, deepening the understanding of language and culture; and finally, fostering a positive attitude toward communication. Since the deepening of the understanding of language and culture is concerned with LA, it could be said that secondary school teachers need to raise students' awareness of language in the English-medium classroom.

Next, a hint to the former question can be found with one of the founders of LA. Hawkins' (1984) pioneering work concerning LA suggests how it can be promoted in Japan. His initial involvement in LA was derived from his concerns regarding mother tongue education, the lack of language education in the curriculum of schools in Britain, and linguistic parochialism. His objectives for LA, which are also his own definitions of LA, can be summarized in the following eight points:

1. bridging the difficult transition from primary to secondary school language work,
2. filling the space among the different aspects of language education (English/foreign language/minority language/mother tongue/English as a second language/Latin),
3. challenging pupils to ask questions about language,
4. giving pupils patterns in language in order to raise insight into language,
5. emphasizing listening skills for foreign language,
6. learning an approach to the match the spoken and the written forms of language,
7. enhancing students' interest in language by covering such topics as language origin and language change,
8. using language chiefly for students' activity.

Although some of his objectives, such as numbers 5 and 8, are a matter of course at present, other items are still worth practicing not only at primary and secondary levels, but also in university education. In particular, number 3, challenging pupils to ask questions about language, seems to be the most important element of language awareness. Students usually have a lot of questions about language when learning L2. However, such questions often have to be dismissed owing to the fact that achieving mastery of the L2 is emphasized more than simply questioning about language in a school curriculum that demands efficiency. Developing students' L2 skills is usually regarded as more important for teachers and students than questioning about language.

Although it is significant to ask questions about language, particularly in L2, it might be impossible to answer all the questions students raise. One way to solve such questions is by referring to a teacher's questions about language and his/her explanations about L2. In the English classroom, a teacher can ask students about English in order to raise their interest in the language and encourage them to have more questions about English. An example of challenging students to ask questions about language can be found in Otsu's publications (e.g., 2008a; 2008b), where he is trying to raise students' metalinguistic knowledge based on recent findings in linguistics. In other words, these books contain materials for contemporary language awareness and materials for KAL. To understand how he raises their interest, Exploration 10 bears quotation: Can you open the window? (Otsu, 2008a, pp. 62-67) In this section, he discusses why in the sentence, "Can you open the window?" the aspect of request not question is implied. In addition, he contrasts and explains in a similar way, the following sentences in easy Japanese:

- (a) Can you swim?
- (b) Can you tell me the time?

Otsu accounts for a reason why (b)'s answer is different from (a)'s by translating these sentences into Japanese. He goes on to explain that it is strange to answer "yes" or "no" to the question (b) in Japanese, and that replying "yes" or "no" implies that the respondent is unkind. What is important in this explanation is that first he allows the readers to think in Japanese and to imagine the situation in which such a dialogue is

conducted in Japanese, and then states that it is unlikely that people would in reality have such a dialogue, except in unusual cases. This teaching method can be utilized in the classroom. An English teacher can ask students, "Is it all right to answer 'yes' or 'no' to the question (b)" in Japanese. As can be seen, teachers can allow students to think about language while explaining grammar or usage. As Otsu showed, it is important for teachers to ask students easy questions about the L2 in the medium of the L1. Moreover, it is clear that the L1 is better for students to understand the meaning of an English sentence and to raise students' awareness of language. Also, it is quite important to raise students' interest in language itself by using both languages in the classroom. If only English is used in the classroom, teachers will never try to explain the above differences in English, because teachers know that such explanations will be complicated for learners. This technique is likely to lead to more superficial explanations and a mechanical feeling in the classroom. To sum up, challenging students to ask about L2 will stimulate their interest in language itself.

Language policy in the classroom

So far we have been discussing the importance of the mother tongue in the target language course. We then need to look at language policy in the classroom in order to enhance L2 skills in the classroom. The key phrase for the development of students' L2 skills is language policy in the classroom. Language policy usually does not seem to be related to classroom language use, but when we look at the English-through-English technique from the macro level, we find that

teachers' decisions to use the L1 or L2 in the classroom conforms to the language policy they adopt in the classroom.

Considering their own L2 proficiency, students' overall L2 proficiencies and objectives of the class, teachers usually decide which language to use in the classroom. This decision is an exact reflection of teachers' language policy in the classroom. To the best of my knowledge, there has not been any reference to teachers' language policy in the classroom with respect to the issue of the English-only classroom. In fact, to discuss the roles of L1 and L2 in the English classroom is deeply related to the discussion of language policy in the classroom. There has not been any discussion about language policy in English classrooms in Japan. This might be due to teachers' and researchers' lack of language awareness about language policy. Teachers need to be aware that the balance of the use of the L1 and L2 affects students' views on language at both a conscious and unconscious level. In other words, classroom language policy can influence the development of the L1 and L2.

If the L1 and L2 are to be developed, then immediate policy intervention and effective strategies in the classroom are necessary via language planning. Language planning originally means "deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language code" (Cooper, 1989, p. 45). It is also called language management or language engineering. In particular, language planning is essential to save a threatened minority language. However, it is also effective to develop bilingualism. Baker (2011) mentions three kinds of traditional planning (status

planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning), adding usage or opportunity language planning as a useful category. These categories of planning raise the status of a language within society, standardize vocabulary and grammar, and create the opportunity of using a language. We can find such attempts at intervention with respect to several languages in the world, such as with Welsh, Basque, and the Native American Indigenous languages of the United States. Such interventions at the societal level can also be applied in the classroom. As Lo Bianco (2010) views teachers as language planners in their professional lives in terms of carrying out curriculum policy in bilingual classes, Japanese English teachers can be regarded as language planners affected by not only *the Course of Study*, but also their own perspectives about language and language learning. All teaching, including the objectives of *the Course of Study*, and teachers' personal views and beliefs about language, constitute the implementation of language planning policy. Teachers have authoritative roles that can influence views about both languages and the control and development of both languages. Then, how do teachers control both languages in the classroom? The key to this question is found in bilingual education.

Translanguaging

There are several similarities and differences between bilingual education and foreign language education. To use a straightforward expression, the former puts more emphasis on developing both languages while the latter focuses on improving L2. However, foreign language education sometimes has utilized elements of bilingual

education, such as immersion programs.

There needs to be strategic classroom language planning in order to facilitate students' use of both languages in the classroom and to develop both language skills. One of the first researchers to implement it was Williams, who shows strategies that develop both languages successfully and lead to successful content learning. Williams coined the term "translanguaging" for the planned and systematic use of two languages in the classroom. Williams (1996, 2000) tried to distinguish between input language (reading and/or listening) and output (speaking and/or writing). This became an important concept in Welsh bilingual education starting in the early 1980s, and now Garcia (2009) has developed this notion to "*multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds*"(p. 45).

Although it was carried out in bilingual education in Wales, translanguaging can be carried out in English language education in Japan. This type of teaching can be implemented in the following way as far as the English reading classroom dealing with an English story is concerned. A teacher gives students a part of a story in English and a worksheet which they are instructed to read. Next, the teacher elicits answers to several questions in English about the story by completing the worksheet. Then, the teacher gives model answers to the questions and explains some parts in Japanese, initiating a discussion about the story in Japanese. This teaching procedure may appear to be fairly routine, but the difference can be found in the next lesson in which the roles of both languages are reversed.

Reviewing the story by some students' oral presentation of a summary of it in English, students read the next part of the story in Japanese and answer Japanese questions in English, so discussing the story in Japanese. Such reversal of language use in the classroom can give students opportunities to use both languages, as well as to enjoy the story itself bilingually. This is an example of translanguaging, which has various methods of execution for the planned and systematic use of two languages inside the same lesson. Baker (2011) pointed out that translanguaging not only can promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter, but also may develop oral communication and literacy in the weaker language. He also contended that it can facilitate home-school cooperation and help integrate fluent English speakers with English learners of various levels of attainment. However, not all of these advantages can be applied to English language education in Japan because of differences between EFL and ESL. With respect to the disadvantages, Baker argued that translanguaging is not suitable for early stages of language learning, and that students may prefer to use their dominant language. Indeed, this teaching method might not be good for lower secondary school students, but might be appropriate for upper secondary and tertiary students.

In particular, translanguaging can be implemented in seminar classes at university. It is usually said that English at university should be conducted in English so as to develop students' English skills, which is similar to the MEXT's *Course of Study* (2009) requirement. However, the English-only classroom sometimes does not lead to

deepening the understanding of the contents of a lesson, even in university seminar class because of the inadequacy of students' English skills. The idea of translanguaging helps to improve the disadvantages of the English-only classroom. In my seminar classroom, students are required to read one chapter of a book on a specific field in English before class. During class, they need to discuss questions about the chapter in Japanese. They are given an assignment to review and discuss the further questions in English. Moreover, they are then asked to read the next chapter in English. In the following class, firstly students present their summary and develop a further discussion with questions in English based on the previous discussion in Japanese. This is the review stage. Next, they discuss the questions in Japanese and are given a similar assignment in English. Unlike the case of secondary schools, the roles of both languages are not reversed, but the ratio of English in the classroom usage increases as the course work continues. Finally, all seminar classes are conducted in English. In fact, such strategic use of both languages helps not only to understand the contents but also to develop L2 and L1.

Conclusions

With respect to bilingual education, Baker (2011) argues that "the separation of L1 and L2 belongs to the 20th century, while the 21st century will see the deliberate and systematic use of both languages in the classroom" (p. 291). This can be applied to the English language classroom in Japan. In this paper, I have discussed the important roles of L1 and L2 in the target language classroom, in particular focusing on the

significant role of L1 in L2 classrooms. I also considered the role of metalanguage in L2 learning. In addition, this paper suggests that language awareness activities should be conducted in Japanese in the English classroom in order to stimulate questions about language and generate interest in the language itself. It also stressed that students' metalinguistic knowledge and teachers' strategic use of both languages should be promoted. Finally, I referred to the significant role of language planning in the classroom, especially stressing that English teachers need to develop strategic use of translanguaging for the planned and systematic use of two languages in the classroom. There are several limitations of this paper. My small case study of practicing translanguaging should be more carefully examined to assess whether this method will in reality be useful to develop both language skills. Therefore, further research needs to be conducted to ascertain whether this method is successful or not only in Japanese secondary classrooms, but also in tertiary classrooms. Also, there might be great number of ways of raising students' interest in language, and it is important that these methods are carried out. More research on strategic use of L1 should be conducted and clarified.

References

- Association for language awareness (ALA) (2012). The definition of language awareness. Retrieved from: <http://www.languageawareness.org/web.ala/web/about/tout.php>.
- Alderson, J. C. , Clapham, C., & Steel, D. (1997). Metalinguistic knowledge, language aptitude & language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research 1*, 93-121.
- Alpine, T. R. (1988). Language awareness. In Phillips (Ed.) *Language in schools: from complacency to conviction*. London: CILT
- Atkinson, D. (1993). Teaching in the target language: A problem in the current orthodoxy. *Language Learning Journal*, 8, 2-5.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism(4th ed.)*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Berry, R. (1997). Teachers' awareness of learners' knowledge: The case of metalinguistic terminology. *Language Awareness*, 12, 81-95.
- Berry, R. (2001). Hong Kong English teachers' attitudes towards the use of metalinguistic terminology. *Asian Pacific Journal of Language in Education*, 4, 101-121.
- Berry, R. (2005). Making the most of metalanguage. *Language Awareness*, 14, 3-20.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1989). What is the logical problem of foreign language acquisition? In S. M. Gass & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspective is second language acquisition* (pp. 41-68). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2005). *The principles of language learning and teaching*. Boston: Person Longman.
- Cajkler, W., & Hislam, J. (2002). Trainee teacher's grammatical knowledge: the tension between public expectation and individual competence. *Language Awareness*, 11, 161-177.
- Centeno-Cortes, B. & Jimenez, A. (2004). Problem-solving tasks in a foreign language: The importance of the L1 in private verbal thinking. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 7-35.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 404-423.
- Cook, V. (2002). Background to the L2 user. In V. Cook (Ed.) *Portraits of the L2 users* (pp. 1-28). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Cots, J. M. (2008). Knowledge about language and in the mother and foreign language curricula. In Cenoz, J. & Hornberger, N.H. (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 15-30). New York: Springer-Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and Theoretical Status of the Distinction. In B. Street & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of language and education (2nd)*, Volume 2, literacy. New York: Springer.
- de Bot, K. (1992). A bilingual production model: Levelt's "speaking" model adapted. *Applied Linguistics*, 13, 1-24.
- Donmall, B. G. (1985). *Language awareness*. London: CILT.
- Donmall-Hicks, B. G. (1997). The history of language awareness in the UK. In L., Van Lier, and D., Corson (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 6* (pp. 21-30). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning*, 54, 227-275.
- Fukuda, T. (2013, December 13). Eigokyoikukaikaku [Improving English language teaching]. *Mainichi Shinbun*, p. 1.
- Fukuzawa, K. (2010). *Giron no rule [Rules of discussion]*. Tokyo: NHK publication
- Garcia, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. London: Blackwell.
- Hawkins, E. W. (1984). *Awareness of language: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iida, T. (2010). *Instructed and Naturalistic L2 learners' metalinguistic knowledge: Does metalinguistic knowledge contribute to L2 proficiency?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Reading, the United Kingdom.
- James, C., & Garrett, P. (Eds.) (1991). *Language awareness in the classroom*. London: Longman.
- Jessner, U. (2005). Multilingual metalanguage, or the way multilinguals talk about their languages. *Language Awareness*, 11, 56-68.
- Kinoshita, K. (1981). *Rikakei no sakubun gijyutsu [Composition skills for science students]*. Tokyo: Chuokoronsha
- Krashen, S. D. (1988). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.
- Kroll, J. F. & Sunderman, G. (2003). Cognitive processes in second language learners and bilinguals: The development of lexical and conceptual representation. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 104-129). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kurasawa, E. (1967). Gengokyoiku no naiyo to hoho—bogokyoiku no tachiba kara [The content and method of language education from the perspective of mother tongue education]. In J. Noji, N. Kakita, H. Matusumoto (Eds.) *Gengokyoiku no naiyo to hoho [The content and method of language education]*(pp. 7- 65). Tokyo: Bunkahyoron Shupan.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2010). Language policy and planning. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mainichi (2009, January 12). Failing in English [Eigo ni tsumazuite] *Mainichi Shinbun*, p. 13.
- Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Technology (MEXT) (2009). Kotogakko gakushu Shidooryo [The course of study for upper secondary school]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/kou/kou.pdf#search
- Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Technology (MEXT) (2013). *Globalka ni taioshita eigokyoiku kaikaku jiko keikaku [A report on the implementation of a reform program for English language teaching to cope with globalization]*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/25/12/1342458.htm
- Morizumi, M. (1980). *Eigokyoiku to nihongo [English language education and Japanese]*. Tokyo: Chukyoshupan.
- Morizumi, M. (1992). Kotoba no kyoiku towa nanika [What is language education?] *Sanseido English Teaching*, 13, 2-4.
- Ortega, L. (2007). Meaningful L2 practice in

- foreign language classrooms: A cognitive-interactionist SLA. In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.) *Practice in a second language: perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 180-207). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Otsu, Y. (1983). Gengoshinrigaku to eigokyouiku. [Psycholinguistics and English language education] *The English Teachers' Magazine*, 31, 7, 28-31.
- Otsu, Y. (1989). Metagengonoryoku no hatatsu to gengokyoiku [The development of metalinguistic ability and language education], *Gekan Gengo [Monthly Language]* 18, 10, 26-34.
- Otsu, Y. (2008a). *Tanken kotoba no sekai [To explore the world of language]*. Tokyo: Hitsujishobo.
- Otsu, Y. (2008b). *Kotoba ni miserarete taiwa hen [Attracted by language: dialogue]*. Tokyo: Hitsujishobo.
- Richmond, J. (1990). What do we mean by knowledge about language? In R., Carter (Ed.) *Knowledge about language and curriculum* (pp. 90-115). London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approach and method of language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roehr, K. (2008). Metalinguistic knowledge and language ability in university-level L2 learners. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 173-199.
- Sanmori, Y. (2003). *Gaikokugo wo minitsukeru tameno nihongo lessen [Lessons for mastering foreign languages]*. Tokyo: Hakusuisha.
- Singleton, D. (1992). Education towards language awareness in Ireland. *Language Awareness*, 1, 47-57.
- Scott, V. M. & De La Fuente, M. J. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *The Modern Language Learning*, 92, 100-113.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337.
- Tsutusi, Y. (2008). Nihongohyogen no igi to kongo no tenbo [The significance of Japanese expression for Japanese and future development]. *Gekkan Gengo [Monthly Language]*, 37, 3, 18-25.
- Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: teaching in a bilingual section. In C. Williams, G. Lewis & C. Baker (Eds.). *The language policy: Taking Stock*. Llangefni (Wales): CAI.
- Williams, C. (2000). Welsh-medium and bilingual teaching in the further education sector. *International Journal Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 3, 129-148.
- VanPatten, B & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 225-241.
- Van Essen, A. (1997). Language awareness and knowledge about language: an overview. In L. Van Lier & D. Corson, D. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education Vol. 6* (pp. 1-9). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Van Lier, L. (1995) *Introducing language awareness*. London: Penguin Books.
- Van Lier, L. (2000) Language awareness. In R. Carter (Ed.) *Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 160-165). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, L., Maylath, B., Adames, A., Couzujin, M. (2000). *Language awareness— a history and implementations*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Yasunaga, T. (1969). Gengo kyoiku shiron [Essay on language education]. *Kikan Kyoiku undo [Quarterly Educational Movement]*, 14, 29-35.