English loanwords in the teaching of English in Japan: A case study analysis

David Hugh Bollen
B.A. (Hons.) - University of Sydney; M.A. - University of New South Wales; RSA CTEFLA - University of Technology, Sydney

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Office of Education Research
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
2018
Keywords

Activity theory
Case study
Cultural-historical activity theory
English language learning
Gairaigo - 外来語
Higher education
Japan
Language acquisition
Language teaching
Loanwords
Mediation
Socio-cultural theory
Wasei eigo - 和製英語
Abstract

This study undertakes a socio-cultural approach to examine how the loanword phenomenon has impacted on the Japanese language, and the teaching of English in Japan. The main research question posed is: How do English loanwords contribute to English language teaching in Japan? Following this are three sub-questions: How do Japanese university students perceive and use English loanwords? Why?; How do teachers of English perceive and use loanwords in teaching English to Japanese university students? Why?; and What is the potential of loanwords to enhance English language teaching in Japan?

Cultural-historical activity theory is incorporated into the analysis to illustrate how the teaching and learning activity is currently undertaken and the contradictions that arise from this. An examination of how the current activity systems operate involves the study of tools, resources, subjects, and objects of the systems, along, with an investigation of the elements that facilitate or obstruct learning. The central aim of this study is to investigate how use of loanwords, and an understanding of the socio-cultural approach to language teaching, could assist in effective acquisition of English.

The research employs case study methodology to explore four cases, each involving a university teacher and an English class. Drawing on data from surveys with students, interviews with teachers and students, and classroom observations the study reports on the experiences and views of teachers and students regarding loanwords and also provides snapshots of teaching moments when loanwords were focused on or were consciously avoided.
The study also provides a cross-case analysis to illuminate the central themes within the activity systems and, in particular, how systems of activity impact upon the use of loanwords as tools of English acquisition, the contradictions that exist within these systems, and how loanwords can contribute to the activity of teaching English.

The study concludes by outlining findings, and providing recommendations for future research, pedagogy, and policy. It argues that effective learning systems are promoted when a socio-cultural approach to language teaching, incorporating loanwords, is adopted to teach English in Japan.
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Loanwords are commonly found in many languages throughout the world. These words are often incorporated into a language when a native equivalent is either missing or lacks an exact application. While, as Holmes (2001) notes, words are generally borrowed to fill a lexical gap, the English loanword phenomenon in Japanese has become more extensive in range and application and is a notable feature of the modern Japanese language. The integral nature of English loanwords in the modern Japanese lexicon, and the significant role of English language within the Japanese education system, directs attention to the importance of the English language in Japan. As noted by Uchida (2001), Daulton (2008), and, more recently by Singleton (2016), the scale of this influx of English is immense and worthy of being studied to examine how it might be a resource in the pedagogical environment of English language teaching and learning.

Drawing on a socio-cultural approach to language teaching and cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT), this study examines the approaches and perspectives taken by teachers and students with regards to English loanwords in Japanese in teaching and learning English.

This chapter first provides background and context to the overall study, followed by the research questions and an introduction to English loanwords, known in Japanese as *gairaigo*. The chapter then outlines the four different scripts used in the Japanese language, and discusses the significance of these orthographies in terms of loanword assimilation and English acquisition. This discussion is followed by a
brief summary of the personal and professional experiences that stimulated the researcher’s interest in the phenomenon of English loanwords in Japanese.

The chapter examines the significance of the study for the teaching of English in Japan. It then introduces the theoretical framework and research methodology and concludes by providing an outline for each of the chapters that follow.

1.1 Background and context

Since the late 1970s more than 99% of Japanese high schools and junior high schools have offered English language courses, with most students studying English for approximately four hours per week (Hoshiyama, 1978). Today, almost every Japanese student studies English for at least six years. Many students also enrol at private language schools to undertake independent study, or to participate in international-exchange programs (Ellington, 2005). In 2011, English language classes were introduced into primary schools throughout Japan, and at present many private kindergartens and elementary schools also conduct English classes. In some cases, English is the language of instruction across the entire school curriculum.

Many Japanese universities have English Departments that deliver courses in English language and literature. Other universities, that do not offer English as a major course of study, include compulsory English courses as part of their curricula. At the researcher’s university for example, a private, science/engineering-focused university in Kyushu where this study was undertaken, all students are required to take English Communication (EC) courses for four semesters spread over two years (EC1-4). Each 15-week semester includes 45 hours of classroom instruction, of two 90-minute classes per week, with an additional expectation of 45 hours of homework or self-study. Students can also enrol in elective general English, or academic English programmes in their third and fourth year of undergraduate study, or as
postgraduates. Many students also undertake faculty-specific English instruction, for three hours per week. In this context, a student undertaking a four-year degree will receive a minimum of 300 hours of English instruction. Even for non-English majors in Japanese universities this type of requirement is not unusual (Daulton, 2008). Ultimately, over the course of their primary, secondary, and tertiary education it is estimated that the average Japanese student receives approximately 3,000 hours of formal English instruction, which is a considerable investment in a foreign language (Honna, 1995). The importance of English in Japan can be noted from Brown’s (2017) observation that, more recently, English as the medium of instruction (EMI) in higher education is being actively encouraged by the government (p. 6).

However, such a universal system of English language learning has produced very mixed results. In comparison with other nationalities Japanese students perform poorly as assessed by international measures (Bronner, 2000), such as the TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) and TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language). Many graduates in Japan are unable to communicate in English at a meaningful level despite years of language study (Daulton, 2008). While the system of English language education in Japan has recently undergone significant modifications, overseen by the Ministry of Education (MEXT), with a specific focus on a more communicative approach to language teaching (MEXT, 2003), progress has been slow (Ruegg, 2009). The difficulties of implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodologies into Japanese education are outlined by Tahira (2012), as well as through studies undertaken at the researcher’s university conducted by Thompson and Foale (2009), and Bollen and Faherty (2016). At the same time, survey results have revealed students’ dissatisfaction with the English education they have received, lack of confidence in their English ability, and a strong
belief that the Japanese are a nation of poor language learners. These results mirrored large-scale studies of Japanese students undertaken by Sakui and Gaies (1999).

Throughout the 20th century, and at present, the Japanese education system has promoted and expanded English language-learning programmes across all levels of education. Recent education policies, outlined by MEXT, have continued to highlight the importance of English education, both in linguistic and cultural terms, and incorporated significant changes to the professional qualification requirements of native and foreign English teachers (Stanlaw, 2004). During this time, an increasing number of English loanwords have also been incorporated into the Japanese lexicon. However, none of these developments appear to have positively influenced English acquisition in Japan to any great extent (Daulton, 2008). As Glasgow and Paller (2016, p.154) note, such policy measures will remain “cosmetic” if little attention is paid to how teachers interpret such policies. This study undertakes a closer investigation of the communicative language approach proposed by MEXT, and the place of loanwords as a resource within a socio-cultural approach to teaching English in Japan.

1.2 Defining loanwords - gairaigo

The process of importing linguistic features from other languages, termed linguistic borrowing, or simply borrowing, was outlined by Bloomfield (1933) in his influential work Language , and expanded on by linguists such as Haugen (1950). In Haugen’s words the process involves “the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another” (Haugen, 1950, p.212). Haugen was particularly concerned with clarifying the terminology associated with the borrowing process and analysing the phenomenon linguistically, and categorising the ways in which these linguistic borrowings manifest themselves.
For Haugen, *loanwords* were distinct from other forms of lexical borrowing (Hoffer, 2002) such as loan translation and substitution. However, for the purposes of this study, which examines the phenomenon from a socio-cultural perspective, *loanword* is defined so as to include all linguistic features that exhibit some form of linguistic borrowing. Some modern researchers, such as Daulton, have also used the terms *cognates*, or *loanword cognates* to describe words that display cross-linguistic similarities. Others, such as Crystal (2011), have defined *cognates* as words that share an etymological origin, thus excluding loanwords from the definition. For the purposes of this study, which draws heavily on Daulton’s work, this study adheres to his broader definition unless otherwise stated. Daulton (2008, p.48) also makes the important distinction between *cognates* and *false cognates*, or “false friends”, words that share a similar spelling or pronunciation, but which differ semantically. In Japanese, *gairaigo*, literally “words from outside”, is the closest translation of the English term, *loanword*. Henceforth these terms, *gairaigo* and *loanword*, will be used interchangeably. Chapter Two analyses the different forms of these words, and the functions they fulfil.

**The history of loanwords in Japanese.** The Japanese language has long been particularly receptive to loanwords from other languages. Most influentially, loanwords initially came to Japan from China as long ago as the first century AD, together with kanji, the first writing system used in Japan. Throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, European languages such as Portuguese, Spanish, and Latin were also fruitful sources of loanwords (Stanlaw, 2004). During the period known as *sakoku* (literally “chained country”), the era of almost total Japanese isolation from the 1630s until the Meiji restoration in 1868, Dutch became the main European language in use. This change in focus reflected the preferred status given to Dutch traders.
during this period, although they were primarily confined to the small enclave on Dejima, an artificial island within modern-day Nagasaki Prefecture. The main function of the Dutch language was to facilitate trade between the two nations, and this was reflected in the types of words which found common usage in Japanese. Aspects of western science and medicine, and associated terminology and language, were introduced as a secondary outcome of this trading contact. During this period many hundreds of Dutch loanwords entered the language. Linguists such as Miura (1979) and Tsujimura (1996) note the important Dutch influence on Japanese grammar and language reforms. This initial incorporation of European words into the Japanese lexicon, and the use of a specific syllabary (katakana) to accommodate them, indicated a continued willingness to borrow from other languages (Daulton, 2008). Stanlaw (2004, p.49) goes so far as to claim that the influence of Dutch on the Japanese language “set the stage for the modernisation of the late 19th century, and the impact of Japanese-English contact at that time.” This contact continued to distinguish itself by the “scale and alacrity” (Daulton, 2008, p.9) of the linguistic borrowing it precipitated and the strong influence English has had on Japanese ever since.

Although English grammars became available in Japan in 1810, and a Japanese-English dictionary comprising 6,000 entries was compiled in 1814 (Doi, 1976), it was not until the Meiji restoration in 1868 that English began to challenge the Dutch hegemony over foreign language prestige. English language academies quickly became available to the children of the Japanese elite, and the new, relatively open, trade and travel conditions resulted in varieties of pidgins, including the Yokohama Dialect. By the end of the Meiji Era (1912), according to Simon-Maeda (1995) about 75% of the 1,500 loanwords in common usage were English. At this
time, there were even calls for English to replace Japanese as the official language. Though such extreme measures as abolishing Japanese were never actually adopted in Japan, the point was noted that “English was the language of law and commerce, science and medicine, technology and war. English was the language of modernity and the language of the future” (Stanlaw, 2004, p.65).

Although the period of nationalism and Japanese military expansion during the 1930s and 1940s meant that English was viewed with deep suspicion, and English language education all but eradicated, this proved to be only a brief hiatus. The historical situation surrounding the end of WWII, and in particular the occupation by the USA (1945-1952), became the point when large portions of the Japanese population were first required to interact with English speakers (Daulton, 2008), generally in the language spoken by representatives of the occupying power. The presence of large numbers of US military personnel in Japan during the Korean War (1950-1953) has continued until now, particularly in places such as Okinawa. Since that time, English has continued to grow in popularity and strengthen its claim on the public consciousness, as the foreign language.

Overwhelmingly, new additions to Japanese in the 20th and 21st centuries, particularly in fields such as computing and associated technologies, continue to be derived from English (Daulton, 2008). The use of Roman characters to write in Japanese can also be traced to the Meiji period (Twine, 1991), as can an increasing focus on English literature and English language education. Currently all Japanese students learn Roman characters and study the English language from primary school, if not earlier.

Although this popularity has not resulted in native-speaker competence, it has led to the incorporation of many English loanwords into common Japanese usage.
Daulton (2008, p.13) cites this as an example of “Japan’s legendary knack for adopting foreign ideas and technology” and linguistic borrowing in particular. Regardless, “considering that Japanese and English are linguistically unrelated languages - remote in origin, space and culture” (Daulton, 2008, p.13) the sheer scale of Japan’s adoption of English loanwords has been remarkable and the way these loanwords have been incorporated into Japanese has had a profound influence on the language. The adoption of loanwords has had a less significant impact on English-teaching methodology, however.

To date a lot of research has examined loanwords in Japanese as a linguistic phenomenon. Few studies have examined how the phenomenon could promote language acquisition and communicative competence. From a socio-cultural perspective this research examines the role that English loanwords in Japanese play as tools for language acquisition.

1.3 Japanese scripts

Whilst an understanding of the Japanese scripts may seem to be of only peripheral importance here, there are significant ways in which these scripts influence the way English is taught in Japan, how it is spoken, and how it has become part of the modern Japanese language. To be able to understand the phenomenon of English loanwords in Japanese it is necessary to provide some background to the social, cultural, and historical context of Japanese orthography. To explore the significance of English loanwords in terms of English teaching and learning in Japan it is necessary to explore the effects these scripts have on loanword assimilation.

The Japanese are familiar with four distinct scripts that are introduced at various stages throughout the education system. The scripts are used in different
contexts and for different reasons, but in many authentic texts, such as newspaper articles, all four scripts are used simultaneously.

While Japanese orthographies provide the means for one word to be written in four different ways (five, if we include the widespread use of English), phonologically the language is basically consistent, maintaining a consonant-vowel (CV) formation, with the exception of the syllabic n/m, which stands alone. Place names such as *Kuma/moto*, *Hiroshima*, and *Kyoto* are clear examples of this CV formation. This places Japanese phonology in stark contrast to languages such as English, and the large amount of English phonemes not present in Japanese cause some difficulties when loanwords are incorporated into traditional Japanese orthographies.

**Kanji** - 漢字, date back to around the 4th century AD, at which time there was no written Japanese language, when thousands of words were introduced from China. These kanji, probably the most immediately recognisable to foreigners, are logographic characters used particularly for nouns (including many proper nouns), verb stems, and adjective stems. Since their introduction into Japanese these characters have undergone significant changes. In many cases they have taken on a different meaning from the original Chinese or been simplified. New Japanese-only characters have also been incorporated, and continue to be developed as required by the introduction of new words into the lexicon.

Estimates on the number of kanji vary from 50,000, to well over 100,000. Approximately 3,000 characters are in regular use in Japan, and as of 2010, a little over 2,000 are deemed the basic requirement for literacy – reading a newspaper. Students are expected to have memorised these characters by the end of junior high-school (Halpern, 2001), when aged 14 or 15 years old.
A single kanji may have many different meanings or readings, depending on context, derivation, location within a sentence, or use in a compound word. The character 本, for instance, when standing alone is pronounced hon (ほん), meaning book. When used in a compound, such as 日本, Nihon/Nippon (にほん) it is pronounced either hon or ppon, meaning origin, with the compound as a whole meaning, of course, Japan, or more literally origin of the sun. When used in the compound word, 熊本, Kumamoto (くまもと) - a Japanese prefecture, the character retains a similar meaning, but is pronounced entirely differently, i.e. moto. To further highlight this complexity, some kanji may have as many as ten different possible readings.

Hiragana - 平仮名, ひらがな - (here written in kanji and hiragana respectively), is one of the two Japanese syllabaries. Each character represents one mora, or phonological unit. Developed in the early 5th century, hiragana is used to write Japanese words, or parts of words, for which there is no kanji, notably particles, verb and adjective endings, and suffixes. For example, in the word 飲みました, nomimashita, the first character is kanji and indicates the root of the verb ‘drink’, the following four hiragana characters indicate the simple past tense of the verb, thus ‘drank’. While all kanji can be written in the hiragana script, (here のみました), this is usually only done in cases where the kanji is rather obscure, or may be unknown to the reader. In textbooks, or children’s books, the use of hiragana is more common, even for fairly simple kanji, such as the one analysed here.
**Romaji** - ローマ字, literally *Roman letters*, is the use of the Latin alphabet to write Japanese words. There are various systems of Romaji which have been developed and they are most often employed when non-native speakers are the target audience, or on electronic devices (computers, mobile phones) that do not facilitate the use of Japanese characters.

**Katakana** - 片仮名, カタカナ or かたかな - (here written in kanji, katakana and hiragana respectively) is the other Japanese syllabary, again with each character representing one phonological unit. Katakana is used for onomatopoeia, some technical and scientific terms, and in some rather unusual instances, such as the speech of animals or machines.

However, most notably, katakana is used to transcribe foreign words or loanwords. When a word is written in katakana, it should be immediately obvious to a Japanese speaker that the word is a loanword, most likely derived from English. This clearly differentiates a loanword from the Japanese syllabary, hiragana, and the ideograms, kanji, in a way that is not possible in other languages that employ only one syllabary. Kay (1995, p.73) suggests this script may perform a similar function to the Academie Francaise in a less prescriptive way, allowing Japanese “to gain maximum benefit from their addition to the lexical pool, while protecting the native vocabulary from change”.

A glance at any page of a Japanese language newspaper makes it immediately obvious that knowledge of all four scripts mentioned is necessary for complete understanding of a text. Indeed, the one word ‘Japan’ can be written in five different ways; kanji: 日本; hiragana: にほん; katakana: ニホン; rōmaji: Nihon; English: Japan (adapted from Stanlaw, 2004, p.148). This unique complexity means that learning to read Japanese is a difficult task, even for native speakers. The presence of
non-phonetic characters (wherein no clues to pronunciation are provided) means that many thousands of symbols need to be memorised to achieve even basic literacy. Furthermore, the difficulties involved with learning three different syllabaries are self-evident.

The use of a distinct syllabary (katakana) to incorporate loanwords into the language could be expected to give Japanese learners of English a distinct advantage. Not only does this script facilitate the assimilation of loanwords, and provide a fairly close guide to the original pronunciation, it also immediately identifies these words as loanwords. However, no students interviewed or surveyed throughout this study were able to make this connection. In effect, no student understood why the katakana syllabary is used so widely in Japanese, or the most common reason for its use. This lack of understanding seems to have perpetuated the inability of many Japanese students to use their latent knowledge of loanwords productively (Daulton, 2008).

Not only does Japanese use a script mainly devoted to the transcription of foreign words, since the 1980s this script has officially been revised to be more comprehensive, so as to better match the phonology of loanwords that are entering the language. This response to the influx of loanwords in a language is perhaps unique to Japanese, and is indicative of the major influence of these words on the language. Loanwords are so integral to the language that Japanese has made significant internal modifications to the katakana syllabary to be able to accommodate them.

While Japanese is a flexible language with a fluid system of ready absorption of words and scripts in comparison to many other languages, including English, the intake is not reciprocated by an equally flexible production. Japanese schools have for many years adopted a rigid approach to learning English (Ruegg, 2009) which
has failed to utilise these advantages to the full. This failure is evidenced by continued poor performance on international tests of English by Japanese learners (Hatano, 2009), and teaching approaches which are based around grammar translation and focus primarily on university entrance examinations (Rowberry, 2012). This research examines how embracing the linguistic influence English has had on the Japanese language may also impact on teaching methodologies that utilise loanwords as tools of acquisition.

1.4 Researcher context

The origins of this study can be traced back to the researcher’s personal circumstances: as the spouse of a Japanese national from 2004; as a resident of Japan from 2006; as a Japanese language learner from that time; and as the father of three daughters born and raised in Japan. From the earliest stages of learning the Japanese language, the English loanword presence within the lexicon became apparent to me. As this learning developed, so did an appreciation of how these loanwords manifested themselves in Japanese and the advantages they provided in terms of accelerating language learning. As an understanding of the phenomenon grew, and the relationship between the languages became clearer, so did an interest in how this relationship could be applied in a professional context as a teacher of English to Japanese learners.

Through this understanding came a realisation of the gap between the allocation of resources to English language education in Japan, and the results of that focus in terms of language acquisition. This realisation was informed by many years of involvement in Japanese society and its education system. The most difficult aspect of this realisation to come to terms with was the lack of recognition, even amongst very well-educated, English-proficient Japanese speakers, that a connection
between katakana-Japanese and English exists. Initially I felt this lack of recognition purely in linguistic terms, but gradually realised that a similar lack of recognition was exhibited in religious, culinary, political, and other aspects of Japanese society. The belief that Japan is a unique nation, distinct and in many ways separate from the rest of the world, remains a powerful and unifying force in the country. Often this belief is supported by the education system and the homogenous nature of the country. The belief is also confirmed to some extent by verifiable observation and experience. However, what I feel is sometimes lost is the acceptance that this uniqueness has also come about through the absorption of culture from all over the world: a writing system from China; religion from India; cuisine from Korea, and clothes from the US. The Japanese language is unique, but it is not entirely homemade.

1.5 Research questions

This study examines the real implications of the increasing number of English loanwords in the Japanese language and the current and potential impact of these words on English language teaching.

The main research question for the study is:

*How do English loanwords contribute to English language teaching in Japan?*

Aligned to this question are three sub-questions:

*How do Japanese university students perceive and use English loanwords? Why?*

*How do teachers of English perceive and use loanwords in teaching English to Japanese university students? Why?*

*What is the potential of loanwords to enhance English language teaching in*
1.6 Significance of the study

What began as a personal interest in the loanword phenomenon became a professional desire to investigate the significance of loanwords in the acquisition of English language in Japan. The beliefs of other researchers provided significant support. For Daulton (2008, p. 2), “The scale of Japan’s borrowing of English is virtually unparalleled in the world… Japanese EFL has largely neglected this potential resource, and research on loanword cognates has languished; this is unfortunate, in light of the arguably dismal state of English education in Japan.”

Much of the research into English loanwords in Japanese has focused on morphological, semantic, and phonological differences. Given the vast number of English words that have been borrowed, the Japanese have access to countless potential loanwords and cognates, which include high-frequency and academic words. However, the role that these words may play in second language (L2) acquisition has been largely neglected in studies conducted in Japan, and the examination of loanwords as a tool for teaching English remains largely unexplored, except by some select scholars such as Daulton and Uchida.

As Singleton observes (1999, p. 4), the challenge for learners is often in the “nitty-gritty of the lexicon”, an opinion shared by Hunt and Beglar (2005), and Nation (2005). L2 vocabulary theory and pedagogy has been heavily promoted by researchers such as Nation (2005) and Singleton (1999) focusing on lexical competence and vocabulary development. Others such as Read (2004) and Doughty (2003) have focused on the effective means of teaching vocabulary in a second language. The debate about implicit and explicit attention to vocabulary teaching is summarised by Nation (2005, p. 585): “every course should involve some deliberate
attention to vocabulary as well as opportunities to meet the words in meaning-focused use”. If we are to accept that communicative competence is heavily based on vocabulary knowledge (Meara, 1996b; see also Nation, 2005) and the significant role that lexis has to play in language learning, then the presence of English loanwords in Japanese has obvious implications.

This study, which examines the presence of English loanwords in modern Japanese, analyses current teaching approaches to ELT in Japan and how teachers use this resource. The study investigates how teachers engage in the activity of teaching, and the tools, resources, and language teaching approaches they undertake. It also draws upon research (Daulton, 2008) which indicates that loanwords can be harnessed to assist the acquisition of English in Japan. Relevant literature on second language acquisition, the use of L1 in assisting SLA, and the functions performed by English loanwords in Japanese, are reviewed to discover how the in-built English lexicon may be a resource for the teaching of English in Japan. The work of Paul Nation (2001, 2008) in L2 vocabulary acquisition, and Frank Daulton’s (2003a; 2003b; 2004; 2008; 2011) research on English loanwords in Japanese, provide the most detailed analyses and consistent focus on this subject. This study connects with the contributions of these two scholars and builds on their work to argue for a sociocultural approach to language teaching, where the use of a resource like English loanwords is promoted.

Despite the host of teaching approaches that have found favour at various times in Japan, there has still been little productive harnessing of English loanwords. In examining tools, techniques, and teaching approaches that can harness loanwords, the study explores how English language-learning in Japan may be enhanced through
the adoption of a socio-cultural approach in which students and teachers co-construct knowledge.

According to researchers such as Daulton (2008), loanwords could perform a fundamental role in future ELT approaches in Japan. The vast amount of human (Honna, 1995) and financial capital (R.S. Jones, 2011) spent on English acquisition in the Japanese education system make this a worthwhile avenue of further inquiry.

1.7 Theoretical framework

This study examines loanwords and English language teaching in Japan from a socio-cultural approach to language teaching. Central to this approach is the belief that “the transformation of basic, biological processors, such as perceptual processors, memory…into higher psychological functions such as language and literacy…are substantially transformed in the context of socialization and education” (Vygotsky 1986, cited in Diaz, Neal & Amaya-Williams 1990, p. 127). From this perspective loanwords are not simply linguistic features, but are inherently social and cultural phenomena that need to be examined with this understanding in mind.

Language teaching and learning are also viewed as socially situated and contextualised constructs, in which individuals develop as part of wider communities of practice and through engagement with them. The complex nature of the loanword phenomenon within English teaching in Japan requires a framework that can analyse the tensions within the cultural and linguistic systems discussed here.

Therefore, the theoretical framework of this study draws on cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT), which has developed through the work of Vygotsky (1978), Leontiev (1981) and more recently through researchers such as Engeström. In particular, third-generation Activity Theory, as typified by the work of Engeström (2001), is used to enhance understanding of the language teaching activity. Multiple-
system activity theory is used as a model for observing and understanding the subjects involved in the study, the communities of practice in which they operate, and the rules that impact on their communities. Within these systems loanwords are viewed as tools which, through mediation, help transform activities to achieve outcomes in terms of language acquisition and independent language growth.

Although CHAT has been used to examine certain aspects of language learning, such as motivation (Kim, 2013), it appears that no study has applied the theory to an observation of loanwords and their possible use as a language teaching tool. This study applies multiple-system CHAT to this investigation and adapts the model to the specific context of Japanese learners of English, incorporating loanwords as a mediational tool. The theory is outlined in greater depth in Chapter Three.

1.8 Methodology

The research design for this study incorporates a multiple case-study approach. Research for the study was undertaken at a language institute, within a private university in Japan, where the researcher is currently employed. This methodology was chosen because it seemed most likely to provide rich sources of data that could resolve the research questions that were posed. These questions required the collection of data, from both teachers and students, which reveal the beliefs of the participants in the study, their experiences in teaching and learning contexts, and evidence of these beliefs in action. As a method of inquiry suited to examining phenomena in context, through multiple sources of evidence (Richards, 2011), case study seemed most suitable. Furthermore, as became apparent throughout the study, the ability to interact with participants over a period of time, through surveys, interviews, and observations, and generate rich data from these interactions,
was essential to the study. These interactions, and the case study approach itself, are expanded upon in Chapter Four.

Four cases were studied over the course of an academic semester of six months duration. The four teachers involved in the study represented a variety of backgrounds and nationalities – USA, New Zealand, England, and Australia. Although all four teachers had a similar level of Japanese language ability, a range of levels, from native fluency to beginner, was initially sought. I had assumed that this range would provide a broader and deeper perspective to the study, but ultimately the different language-learning experiences they had undergone provided this more than adequately. The classes involved in the case studies also came from different faculties - Pharmaceutical Science, Nanoscience, Biotechnology, and Computer Information Systems.

The study involved a range of data collection techniques to elicit a broad and detailed amount of information. These techniques included surveys, observations, and interviews. Surveys provided some quantitative data which were incorporated into the cases to reflect student and teacher beliefs and attitudes towards language learning and loanwords. Qualitative data were collected through interviews and classroom observations. These data provided description and evidence of teaching and learning activity in practice. Triangulation of data through a variety of collection methods, cases, and subjects helped to increase the validity of the findings.

1.9 Thesis outline

This introduction provided some background to the research study. Chapter Two reviews the relevant literature on Japanese loanwords, and teaching approaches in the Japanese education system. It also provides an historical overview of ELT in Japan and explores more recent socio-cultural approaches to language learning.
Chapter Three provides the theoretical framework for the study, based around CHAT, specifically the third-generation theory thereof. It examines important developments in socio-cultural theory and explains why this perspective provides a relevant and revealing framework for this context. Chapter Four outlines the research design for the study, incorporating the methodology, the research instruments used, and the reasons behind these choices. Chapter Five introduces the four cases involved in the study while Chapter Six undertakes a cross-case analysis of those cases, and discusses important themes that emerged. Finally, Chapter Seven provides the findings of the research, and revisits how the study answered the research questions posed.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter reviews literature that considers the significance of loanwords both within the Japanese language, and the teaching of English in Japan. The chapter begins with a brief review of the phenomenon of English loanwords in Japanese, with attention to the nature of loanwords, the processes by which they are integrated into Japanese, and the various functions that the naturalised loanwords perform. A review of the teaching of English in Japan is also undertaken to examine how the various pedagogical theories of English language teaching have been enacted in Japan, and how contemporary research has looked at the potential for loanwords to aid the acquisition of English for native speakers of Japanese. The chapter concludes by highlighting the limitations of some of the teaching approaches that have been used in Japan and introduces the theory that is covered in the conceptual framework in Chapter Three.

2.1. The scope of English loanwords in Japanese

Many languages have incorporated English loanwords as a means to facilitate international communication in fields such as commerce, education, science, and politics (Stanlaw, 2004). Japanese has been no exception. While loanwords have been incorporated into Japanese from Mandarin, and European languages, such as Portuguese, Dutch, French, and German, the focus of this study is on English loanwords. As Stanlaw observes, “English in Japan is like the air: it is everywhere” (2004, p. 1) and the breadth and scope of English loanwords in Japanese has been unparalleled. Rebuck (2002), traces the proliferation of loanwords within the
Japanese lexicon through his examination of loanword dictionaries: from 25,000 words in 1967; to 33,500 in 1991; to over 45,000 in 2000. According to Tomoda’s (1999) examination of Japanese language dictionaries about 10% of the lexicon at this time was constituted by loanwords, which supports Honna’s (1995) examination of these publications. Honna (1995, p. 45) concluded that 13% of daily Japanese conversation consisted of foreign loanwords, and that “60-70% of new words in the annually revised dictionaries of neologisms are from English”. Based on these figures, the number of loanwords nearly doubled in the last half of the 20th century and the rate of introduction is accelerating. According to Shinnouchi’s (2000) research into loanword origins, the percentage of English loanwords appears to have increased, from approximately 80% in the 1970s to over 90% at the beginning of the 21st century.

Loveday’s (1996) research on the presence of English-based technical words in academic fields, based on an analysis of academic journals in Japan, gives an insight into how dramatic this impact has been. He found that in computer science 99% of technical words are loanwords, in trade 80%, and in marketing 75%. Even in more traditional fields such as philosophy and history, the figures are 23% and 17% respectively. Daulton (1998, p. 18) initially claimed that there were “valuable (loanword) matches for about a quarter of the 800 university-level high frequency headword groups” and concluded that 734 of the first 2,000 words on the General Service List (GSL) (West, 1953) were part of the Japanese language as loanwords.

In later research, with the universe of high-frequency English words set as the British National Corpus (BNC) 3,000, an even higher percentage of loanword matches was revealed when “self-appraisal was used to validate the 2,381 word types
corresponding to the BNC 3,000 with 140 students at a Japanese university” (Daulton, 2004, p. 83). According to this research, about 46% of the 3,000 most-frequent word families in English had correspondences to common Japanese loanwords. This suggests that loanwords have not only become an important part of academic discourse in Japan, but also of fairly basic, everyday communication.

Daulton’s study strongly supports Stanlaw’s (2004, p. 299) contention that “English is necessary to speak Japanese today”, and based on Daulton’s research it is difficult to deny that an in-built English lexicon exists within the modern Japanese language. Even Honna (1995, p. 61), a less than convinced supporter of loanword usage, admits: “with people in need of the means to describe what they see in new surroundings, they resort to katakana use of English words”.

In summary, English loanwords have become an integral component of the modern Japanese lexicon particularly amongst higher-frequency words, those most often encountered by Japanese learners of English. The cross-linguistic similarities between the two languages have clear implications for the explicit and implicit teaching of vocabulary for these learners, and suggest that pre-existing loanword knowledge may provide an avenue for enhancing English vocabulary learning strategies in Japan, and act as a medium for teaching effective learning of the language. To understand how these strategies may be implemented, it is necessary to analyse how English loanwords are integrated into the Japanese lexicon.

2.2 The nature of English loanwords in Japanese

When introduced into Japanese, English loanwords undergo a variety of alterations in order to conform to Japanese grammatical conventions and allow words to be more “easily incorporated into Japanese sentence structure” (Kay, 1995, p. 72). Typically, this process involves one, or a combination, of the following forms:
“orthographical, phonological, structural or semantic integration” (Kay, 1995, p. 68), as outlined in Table 2.1. One further form is known as *wasei eigo* (completely Japanese-made English).

Table 2.1: The Nature of Loanwords in Japanese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of change</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthographical</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>オーストラリア</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>ohh-su-to-ra-ri-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>shi-do-nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological</td>
<td>rehabilitation</td>
<td>rehembali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>convenience store</td>
<td>conbini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic restriction</td>
<td>table (noun and verb) – an</td>
<td>table (noun) – only an item of furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>item of furniture, a set of facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic extension</td>
<td>handle – the part by which a</td>
<td>handle – also includes “a steering wheel”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thing is held</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic shift (false</td>
<td>mansion – a large house</td>
<td>mansion – an apartment building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasei Eigo</td>
<td>businessman</td>
<td>sarariiman (from <em>salary man</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orthographical change.** Almost all loanwords are changed orthographically through transcription into *katakana*, one of the two Japanese phonetic scripts. Generally, the transcription attempts to approximate the original pronunciation. Thus we see *Australia* written in katakana as オーストラリア (ohh-su-to-ra-ri-a) or *business* as ビジネス (bi-ji-ne-su). Occasionally, and rather less effectively, the original written form of the word is used as the basis for transcription. Here we find words such as *studio* written as スタジオ (su-ta-ji-o), and *energy* as エネルギ (en-e-
ru-gi), even though the transliteration based on pronunciation would give a far closer approximation.

**Phonological change.** Intrinsically linked to the orthographical changes which loanwords undergo when integrated into Japanese are the phonological changes which these cause. *Katakana*, while used primarily for transcribing foreign words, is phonologically virtually the same as *hiragana*, the phonetic script used for Japanese words. Both differ substantially from English, and lack many of the phonemes which are used widely within it.

While there are instances of a loanword maintaining a very similar pronunciation, as in *wine* - ワイン (wa-in), there are also cases where pronunciation can differ markedly, as in *volume* - ボリューム (bo-ryu-u-mu). As a consonant/vowel language, Japanese has difficulty in rendering close equivalents to the variety of consonant clusters found in English. Thus, the four (or perhaps three) syllable word *Australia* has six syllables in Japanese, as outlined above. Furthermore, the lack of differentiation between English consonants such as /b/ or /v/, and /t/ or /l/ results in specifically Japanese homonyms. Daulton (2008, p. 17) identifies *rink/link*, *collection/correction*, *fry/fly*, and *best/vest* as examples of these.

The orthographical changes which loanwords undergo when transcribed into Japanese, and subsequent phonological adjustments, can mean that “even the most skilful non-native speakers of Japanese are…hard-pressed to come up with the original…word” (Sheperd, 1995, p. 2). The limited number of phonemes in Japanese, consonants which are used to transliterate multiple English forms, and syllables of consistent length and stress, are just some of the examples of “changes in the pronunciation of English (*loanwords which*) become a significant impediment for Japanese when they speak English” (Olah, 2007, p. 180).
However, English loanwords have become so integral to the language that Japanese has made significant internal modifications to be able to accommodate these new foreign words. Innovations and additions to the *katakana* have attempted to reduce the phonological differences and from as far back as the 1950s (Stanlaw, 2004, p. 88) the script has been refined so as to be more comprehensive; that is, to better match the phonology of the loans that are entering the language. Stanlaw (2004, p. 85) identifies 42 examples of what he terms “innovative” *katakana* – for which there are no corresponding symbols in the *hiragana* script. Generally, this innovation has taken the form of a diacritic being added to an established symbol. An example of this innovation can be seen in the changing pronunciation of a word such as *Sydney*. Based on original *katakana*, the closest phonological approximation would be シドニー (shi-do-nee). With the introduction of the revised symbol スィ (si) we have (si-do-nee).

Other innovative *katakana* have been able to reduce the consonant/vowel, or consonant cluster problem, an area of marked difference between Japanese and English, and provide a phonology which is closer to the rhythm of the original. Stanlaw (2004, p. 89) gives the example of the English word *film*, which traditionally required four syllables フイルム (fu-i-ru-mu), but requires only three with the introduction of the new syllable フィ (fi), thus フィルム (fi-ru-mu). This response to the influx of loanwords in a language is perhaps unique to Japanese, and is indicative of the major influence these words have had on the language (Stanlaw, 2004). Although problems remain due to the phonological differences between the two languages, the continuing development of new innovations indicates that these differences can gradually be overcome.
**Morphological change.** Another aspect of naturalisation which is evident in many loanwords is the morphological change they undergo. Although there are no rules that categorise which loanwords undergo structural or morphological change, “longer words tend to be shortened to lessen their usability burden to the public” (Rogers, 2010, p. 7, 8).

According to Ishikawa and Rubrecht, in their study of loanwords in the Japanese popular press, (2008, p. 313), the third most common form of transformation is abbreviation or truncation. Kay (1995, p. 70) calls this type of abbreviation “back-clipping”, a term which has gained widespread acceptance. “Back-clipping” involves the removal of the end of a word or phrase, in much the same way that *professional* is reduced to *pro* in English (incidentally, also a loanword in Japanese), or *science fiction* into *sci-fi* (another loanword). This type of abbreviation is common in many languages and very common in Japanese, both with native Japanese words and loanwords, and could be equated in popularity to the English use of acronyms. Kay (1995, p. 70) identifies four distinct types of back-clipping:

- **Back-clipping of a word** - アクセル (ak-u-se-ru) from the English *accelerator*.

- **Back-clipping of the second word in a phrase** - マスコミ (ma-su-ko-mi) from the English *mass communication*.

- **Back-clipping of the first word in a phrase** - オムライス (om-u-rai-su) from *omelet and rice*.

- **Back-clipping of both words in a phrase** - セクハラ (se-ku-ha-ra), occasionally used in full セクシャルハラスメント (se-ku-sha-ru ha-ra-su-men-to) from the English *sexual harassment*. パソコン (pa-so-con) occasionally in full, パーソナルコンピューター (paa-so-na-ru con-pyu-taa) from *personal computer* is truncated in a similar manner.
Loanwords may also be transformed grammatically. Estimates vary as to the exact percentage of loanwords that are nouns: from his examination of a 1991 loanword dictionary, Oshima estimated the figure to approximately 70%. Daulton (2008, p. 19), citing Honna (1995) and Loveday (1996), gives the figure as 90%.

Regardless of the exact figure, nouns are clearly the most common form of English loanwords in Japanese and to facilitate a more flexible integration of these words into the language, speech-part modification of these and other parts of speech incorporates affixes (Kowner & Rosenhouse, 2001, p. 543) and simple additions. For example, the verb する (su-ru) meaning to do is often added to a noun to form a verb, as in ダンスする (dan-su-su-ru) to dance (note the combination of katakana and hiragana scripts here). Similarly, the common adjectival ending な (na) can be added, as in ショックな (sho-ku-na), English shock plus na, giving shocking. The adverbial ending に (ni) can also be affixed, as in スムーズに (su-muu-zu-ni), English smooth plus ni, giving smoothly. Combinations of these are also possible, such as スムーズにする (su-muu-zu-ni-su-ru), to do (something) smoothly.

Morphological changes also occur with the addition of the Japanese verb-ending る (ru), signifying the base form of the verb. Thus we have メモる (me-mo-ru), literally to memo, meaning to write a memo. A more contemporary example mirrors recent changes to the English lexicon, although probably appeared independently of these. The proper noun グーグル (gu-gu ru) meaning Google, the famous search-engine/company, becomes a verb by the elision of the final katakana syllable ル (ru) and the addition of the verb ending る also (ru), giving ググる (gu-gu-ru), literally to goog, meaning its English equivalent, to google - a neat piece of rather typically Japanese word-play.
**Semantic change.** Many loanwords also undergo a process of semantic change, which Daulton (2008, p. 21) summarises into three basic types: semantic restriction, semantic extension, or semantic shift. While Ishikawa and Rubrecht (2008, p. 313) found that only about 5% of the words in their study exhibited this feature, Daulton (2008, p. 21) argues that it is “difficult to find a borrowed word that has retained exactly the same meaning or context of its use as its word of origin” (my emphasis).

Commonly an English word with a variety of meanings only retains one of those in Japanese. For instance the loanword パンツ (pan-tsu), from the English *pants (n)*, which can be used in English to refer to any item of clothing with two legs, only retains the meaning of *underpants* in Japanese. Similarly, the loanword コンペ (kom-pe) from the English *competition*, refers specifically to a golf competition, particularly a company golf-day rather than one of a more professional nature. Daulton surmises, because loanwords are most commonly used to fill specific lexical gaps, that this type of restriction is “the most common type of semantic change” (2008, p. 22).

Contrastingly, the process of semantic expansion involves a loanword taking on more meanings (generally closely associated ones) than exist in English. This seems to be a rarer phenomenon. Ishikawa and Rubrecht encountered no instances during their study (2008, p. 313), although Daulton (2008, p. 22) does provide the example of *handle*, ハンドル (han-do-ru), which has a variety of meanings in Japanese, such as *steering wheel* and *handlebars*, that go beyond the scope of the original definition. Perhaps most famously, however, as in the case of the English adjective *cunning - カンニング* (kun-nin-gu), which in Japanese has come to mean “cheating in an exam”, some words change their meaning entirely.
The semantic changes which occur through loanword naturalisation are common in many languages, and particularly so when the cultural landscape is as different as Japan’s is from the English-speaking world. As Kay (1995, p. 72) observes “the meaning or usage of a word in its original language may not be fully understood; nor need it be…with words of foreign origin, there is no deep cultural motivation to protect their original meanings. The flexibility of form and meaning of loanwords enables them to adapt easily to the structure of the host language, and current trends and needs.”

This flexibility can cause significant problems for the Japanese learner of English. While semantic restriction remains the most common form of semantic change, it is probably the least recognisable. Particularly with higher frequency words, the understanding or communicative production of Japanese speakers is often limited to a specific usage of a word, although it is common for this to correspond with the most common English meaning (Daulton, 2008). While this correspondence has limitations, L1 knowledge of the most common English equivalent of a loanword remains an advantage.

**Loanblends and wasei eigo.** Japanese also incorporates a variety of loanblends which are a combination of a loanword and a Japanese word. According to Ishikawa and Rubrecht’s study (2008) these were the second most common form of loanwords. Examples of these compound words are 歯ブラシ (ha-bu-ra-shi), from the Japanese word for tooth and the English brush, meaning toothbrush and 電子レンジ (den-shi-ren-ji) from the Japanese word for electronic and the English range, meaning microwave oven (note the use of kanji for the Japanese part of the compound). As noted by Kay (1995, p. 71) and Daulton (2008, p. 19), many English words only appear in Japanese in this compound form. Man, woman, boy, girl, baby,
car, and home, words with obvious and direct Japanese equivalents, are examples of these.

These loanblends can lead to the phenomenon known as *wasei eigo*, literally “Japanese-made English”; often referred to as *Japlish* or *Janglish* (Sheperd, 1995, p. 4), or less judgmentally by Daulton (2008, p. 19) as “innovative compounding”. *Wasei eigo* invariably involve the “independent, creative, evolutionary reworking of transferred elements in order to meet local needs” (Loveday, 1996, p. 155) but generally bear little resemblance to the original English meaning of the words.

Compounds such as スキンシップ (su-kin-shi-ppu) *skinship*, (also a loanword in Korean) possibly derived from the English *kinship*, and meaning “physical contact” are well-known. パイプカット (pai-pu-ku-tto) *pipe-cut,* meaning “vasectomy” is another famous example.

Popular English language websites such as www.engrish.com and a plethora of books such as *Japanese Jive: Wacky and Wonderful Products from Japan* (McKeldin, 1993) have focused on the humorous, albeit mostly unintended, aspects of these words and phrases. Andrea Simon-Maeda (1995, p. 1) admits that “even after twenty years residency in Japan (*wasei eigo*) still manage to provide a constant source of amusement”. Perhaps because of this, these words have achieved a notoriety and attention, both in the lay and academic communities, which outweigh their significance (Ishikawa & Rubrecht, 2008, p. 314) and remain a “source of merriment” to native English-speakers (Shepherd, 1995, p. 2).

The result of loanword naturalisation in Japanese can be dramatic, confusing, sometimes humorous, and the extent to which the naturalised word differs from the original may vary considerably. This variance has influenced how loanwords are perceived by Japanese teachers of English and their students (Daulton, 2008).
Despite the large percentage of English loanwords in Japanese, and recent additions to the lexicon, English teachers in Japan seem to have been far more concerned with occasional semantic discrepancies rather than the more obvious similarities between English loanwords in Japanese and their origins (Daulton, 2008). According to Daulton, the recognition that *wasei eigo* can create “ludicrous or otherwise memorable errors” has assumed an “exaggerated importance in learners’ and teachers’ minds” (2011, p. 4) and can diminish confidence in applying L1 knowledge to L2 expression.

This section has outlined the most common ways in which loanwords are naturalised into Japanese. Just as the transformations which loanwords undergo are varied and complex, so are the reasons for their introduction into the language. Rebuck (2002, p. 54) suggests that there are three major functions which English loanwords perform in Japanese: to fill a lexical gap where there is no native equivalent; “to substitute for native equivalents to achieve some kind of special effect”; and to serve as euphemisms. This view is also held by other scholars such as Honna (1995), and Simon-Maeda (1995).

**Lexical gap-fillers.** With English nouns accounting for approximately 90% of loanwords in Japanese (Daulton, 2008, p. 19) it is not surprising that many of these words perform the function of fulfilling a language need, by filling a lexical gap and describing something which is new to the Japanese language or culture.

Technological advances, notably in computing (インターネット, *internet*; イーメイル, *e-mail*; ログアウト, *log out*), are an example of a field whose expanding lexicon is invariably incorporated into Japanese as loanwords. According to Rebuck (2002, p. 55) “The adoption of …technical terms in particular, provide(s) the Japanese with a common international vocabulary that is useful in this era of
globalization”. This adoption is not unique to Japanese, as “English has become the de facto lingua franca and...fragments of its lexicon permeate other languages” (Inagawa, 2014, p. 13). However, with loanwords accounting for an estimated 13% of words in everyday Japanese speech, 25% of words in weekly newspapers (Hogan, 2003), and approximately 95% of these loanwords coming from English (Stanlaw, 2004) the extent of borrowing in Japanese has been particularly pervasive.

Most frequently loanwords have been incorporated to describe things for which there is (or was) no native equivalent, such as certain items of clothing, food, furniture, or other goods. They are also commonly used to differentiate between a Japanese and western-version of a thing (Kay, 1995). The subtle difference between a Japanese 風呂 (fu-ro), and the western bath, (バス), in both appearance and use, most likely accounts for this adoption of loanwords. Similarly, a Japanese 障子 (shoji), a sliding, often wooden/paper door, also has the western counterpart ドア (do-a), although in this instance only the loanword would be used to describe both. Stanlaw (2004, p. 235) comments on “the presence of every English loanword colour term – basic or secondary” as an indication that these are “different somehow from native Japanese colour terms”. The Japanese word もも色 (momo iro) for instance is paler than the loanword equivalentピンク (pink) and “in general, English loanword colour terms seem to be thought of as brighter than their native Japanese correspondents” (Stanlaw, 2004, p. 227). English also incorporates loanwords, perhaps most notably from French and Italian, in this way, although the distinction remains that English generally retains the original form of the word, and borrows it as its own - an easier task when borrowing from a language which shares an alphabet, and many cultural similarities - whereas Japanese tends to fully assimilate the words, “with a minimum of departures from the sounds and sound sequences and spelling principles that
characterize native Japanese words” (Quackenbush, 1974, p. 64). This results in a creolisation and code-mixing which is less evident in English. These words are used not because the object being described is untranslatable, or because no native equivalent exists, but to create an impression associated with the particular culture of the language being used. The title barista adds some prestige to the job of “coffee-slopper” of rural Australia. In much the same way クリーニングスタッフ (ku-rii-nin-gu-su-ta-fu) cleaning staff adds a hint of prestige to the position in Japan. The proliferation of French on English menus is another case in point, where it lends a more stylish tinge to the humble pomme de terre, for example.

Many western foods, such as hamburger, ハンバーグ (han-baa-gu), and steak, ステーキ (su-te-e-ki), have entered the Japanese lexicon as loanwords, in much the same way that French or Italian foods (spaghetti, pate, gelato), or indeed sashimi and sushi from Japanese, have entered English. Loanwords have also entered English through Japanese arts and crafts (origami, ikebana, manga) and popular culture (anime, アニメ). Sports such as soccer, サッカー (sa-kaa) and sporting terminology, from athletics, アンカー (an-kaa), (the anchor of a relay team), and baseball, ピッチャー (pit-chaa), pitcher and キャッチャー (kat-chaa), catcher are common sources of loanwords. Japanese imports such as 空手, karate (and associated language - 道場, dojo, and 先生, sensei) fulfil a similar role in English. The incidence of this gap-filling may be more noticeable in Japanese than many other languages, because of the recent, fairly dramatic, westernisation of the country (Stanlaw, 2004), but the fundamentals remain the same.

Euphemisms. Communication in Japan is strongly influenced by a variety of social factors, such as gender, age, status, and familiarity. These factors generally manifest
themselves in the register of language communication. The Japanese aversion to
directness, which is displayed in language and behaviour, is also in contrast to many
western cultures and languages (Shoebottom, 2013). This aversion is revealed in the
use of loanwords as euphemisms (Honna, 1995). As Rebuck (2002) points out,
loanwords are often used in Japanese, for reasons of delicacy, to soften the impact of
sexual terms or body parts. In other instances they may be used because they appear
less confronting than Japanese words of similar meaning. While the use of English as
euphemism allows Japanese speakers to adhere to linguistic and social mores, it also
provides the opportunity to subvert them. Modes of expression, such as cursing or
the language of romance, which tend to be rather stilted in Japanese, are more easily
rendered using loanwords and code-mixing.

In brief, the changes which loanwords undergo, whether phonological,
morphological, or semantic, are closely related to the functions which they perform
within the language. Generally, those words which fill a lexical gap undergo the least
change, while those which perform more complex roles, as in the case of
euphemism, may undergo significant, occasionally indecipherable changes. Such
patterns suggest that if students are able to understand the function which a word is
performing they may have a greater chance of making informed decisions about how
L1 knowledge can be applied in an L2 context. Similarly, although loanwords
undergo a variety of phonological, morphological, and semantic changes, many of
these changes follow patterns which could be taught to learners and utilised to
enhance language learning.

Much of the literature discussed previously, in terms of the scope of
loanwords and the functions they perform, strongly suggests that English loanwords
play an extremely important role within the Japanese language. Despite the
difficulties which the process of naturalisation may cause, in terms of learners harnessing loanwords to facilitate language acquisition, the literature also suggests that loanwords may have an important role to play in the teaching of English in Japan (Nation, 2001; Daulton, 2008).

**Loanwords and the public.** Daulton (2008) also discusses what he terms “*Gairaigo and the Public*” (2008, p. 36): loanwords as they “are used throughout Japanese society as part of the native language” and their dissemination into society. As part of this discussion, Daulton examines loanwords from three perspectives: “acceptability, comprehension and use” (p. 36). The issue of the intrusion of English words into the Japanese language remains a sensitive topic in contemporary Japan (Stanlaw, 2004). Foreign academics such as Milward (1994) claim that loanwords serve to impoverish the Japanese language, while Sheperd (1995, p. 5) is concerned that “ordinary Japanese may lose their appreciation of the beauty and richness of their own language” due to their overuse. Amongst other things, Sheperd (1995, p. 5) claims that “the current emphasis on loanwords may be out of control”, that “the usage is often meaningless, even foolish”, that reliance on loanwords may “weaken and cheapen the Japanese language” and that this may lead to “intellectual and cultural malaise”. Results from student surveys conducted for this study indicated that many students also believed that there were too many loanwords in Japanese.

What Stanlaw (2004, p. 269) terms “the problem of pollution” has long been a point of discussion amongst Japanese natives as well, although he argues (2004, p. 299) that “the presence of English (*loanwords in Japanese*) is neither a marker of language pollution nor an indication of cultural colonization”. While Daulton’s assertion (2008, p. 37) that there are only “occasional, isolated outcries against *gairaigo*” may understate the case somewhat, he indicates that while “opinions for
curbing their use are voiced, only natural attrition effectively limits the loanword lexicon” (2008, p. 37). Loveday (1996) and Daulton (2008, p. 36) refer to the “two determinants of an individual’s disposition to loanwords”, these being “youth and profession”. Both claim that young people and certain groups of professionals not only have a greater understanding of loanwords than the average Japanese person, but are also more favourably inclined towards them.

Regardless of one’s beliefs about the integration of English loanwords into Japanese in a cultural sense, the sheer extent of the integration makes the role of loanwords an important avenue of enquiry. Although Japanese borrowing from English is a notable example, the borrowing of linguistic features from English is common to many other languages as well. The next section looks at some of those linguistic contexts.

2.3 Loanwords and Second Language Acquisition

Section 2.2 illustrated the significance of the presence and integration of English loanwords within the Japanese language. This section reviews how loanwords have been used in other linguistic contexts, such as Spanish, to assist language acquisition. These contexts differ from Japanese in terms of the quantity, and nature, of linguistic borrowings from English, but they also cast light on the broader nature of the loanword phenomenon.

Although empirical studies (Lado, 1972; Ard & Homburg, 1983; Palmberg 1985) have shown that loanwords contribute positively to second language learning, there have been “few pedagogically oriented studies on the use of cognates” (Otwinowska, 2016, p. 85) aimed at analysing the connection. Rodriguez (2001) in his study of cognates to teach English to Spanish speakers found that loanwords allowed teachers to take advantage of what speakers already know. He advocated a
meaning-based approach to learning, whereby cognates are utilised to scaffold students’ learning, “by focusing on what the students already know about English” (p.746) as well as allowing students to make educated guesses about new vocabulary items. Comesana, Soares, and Lima (2010) also found that loanwords were easier to learn than non-loanwords and that “the sentence processing of new words in novice learners is mediated by the lexical representations of the L1” (p.203). Solak and Cakir (2012) in their study of Turkish learners of English, similarly concluded that “cognate based material (sic) mediate listening and reading comprehension and language use in English” (p.433).

Not all studies have been as positive. For instance, Swan (1997) points out that viewing loanwords purely as “a sure source of positive transfer is an obvious oversimplification” (Otwinowska, 2016, p.86). One major reason for this belief is the presence of “false friends”, words that look or sound similar in two separate languages, but which differ significantly in meaning. What Lado (1957, p.849) terms “sure-fire traps”; Reid, “Deceptive Demons” (1968); and Sheperd (1996), “pitfalls”, have obvious disadvantages for a learner. Not only do these false friends cause errors, they can create mistrust in all loanwords as mediating tools.

Another source of difficulty is identified by Rubin (1987), in the need for students to be trained in identifying and utilising cross-linguistic similarities: “if they are not explained, many students never see the relationship of these cognates to words in their own language” (p. 16). Holmes and Ramos (1993) have also claimed that teachers who do not share the learners’ first language are unable to assist learners in taking advantage of loanwords.

The resistance on the part of some stakeholders to cross-linguistic borrowing is also evident in an examination of loanwords and English language teaching in
Japan. Attitudes towards loanwords in a cultural sense seem to affect attitudes towards loanwords in English language education. In the Japanese context, Schmitt (1997) found that teachers and students who did share an L1 considered checking for loanwords was a very unhelpful strategy for learning vocabulary.

2.4 Loanwords and EFL teaching in Japan.

The arguments for and against the positive impact of loanwords are not only linguistic in nature, or confined to the sphere of language learning. The widespread presence of loanwords within Japanese has led to arguments about social, cultural and linguistic purity, and linguistic imperialism. According to Otwinowska (2016, p. 34), “social values, purist attitudes…and loyalty…are responsible for certain resistance trends to borrowing foreign language words and patterns”.

In the view of Barrs (2012) such negative attitudes towards loanwords have “hindered the development of contextually-appropriate language teaching and learning materials” (p.102) and contributed significantly to The Modern Tragedy of English Teaching and Learning in Japan (Barrs, 2012). He also argues that negative attitudes towards loanwords, in a social and cultural sense, have negatively impacted on the possibility of incorporating loanwords as tools for English acquisition, although admits that younger generations may have less conservative attitudes.

Barrs (2012) has argued that negative cultural perceptions of loanwords have impacted on the willingness of teachers to utilise loanwords as a learning resource. Daulton’s (2011) study strongly supported this claim, and clearly showed the stark differences between students’ attitudes towards loanwords, and those of their junior and senior high school teachers. Daulton surveyed 113 students at a large Japanese university, in an attempt to reflect their experiences throughout junior high-school and high-school. Using a 4-point Likert scale, in response to the statement “My
junior high/senior high school teachers often mentioned gairaigo”, more than 70% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. In response to the statement “My junior high/senior high school teachers thought gairaigo helped us learn English” more than two thirds of respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly, while only 6% agreed with it. For this population, at least, when loanwords were mentioned at all it was overwhelmingly in a negative manner.

Contrastingly, in Daulton’s study, students’ attitudes towards loanwords were far more positive. In response to the statement “I use lots of gairaigo”, far more respondents (n=81) agreed than disagreed (n=9). In response to the statement: “In learning English, gairaigo is an obstacle” almost twice as many students disagreed as agreed (n=44 to n=24). In response to the statement “I’d like to hear more about gairaigo” more than four times as many agreed than disagreed (n=62, n=15). These data supported conclusions reached by Loveday (1996) and Uchimoto (1994) that not only do “Japanese between the ages of 18 and 29 have the most affinity with gairaigo” they are also “among its heaviest users and innovators” (Daulton, 2011, p. 9).

These results reveal a stark disparity between the attitude of educators and students towards the loanword phenomenon. While English loanwords play an important part in the modern Japanese language and within Japanese linguistics, the extent and speed of their integration has undoubtedly caused some cultural friction, and the transformations which they undergo present particular challenges for the teaching of English as a foreign language in Japan. The “constant changes due to complex intra-linguistic…and extra-linguistic factors” (Otwinowska, 2016, p. 31) that languages such as Japanese are undergoing, mean that these challenges will likely remain for some time. An acceptance that cross-linguistic borrowing also leads
to linguistic similarities, that can be utilised in L2 acquisition, may ameliorate some of the difficulties in meeting these challenges (Otwinowska, 2016). The term *affordance* is also used to describe the complementary relationship, including both the positive and negative aspects within it, that exists between loanwords and second language acquisition.

**2.4.1 Loanwords and language acquisition.** Sheperd (1995) summarises the attitude of many teachers in Japan to the applications of loanwords to language acquisition. In short, Sheperd argues that loanwords “can cause no end of trouble for Japanese students struggling to master English” (p. 2). Simon-Maeda (1995, p. 1) while more restrained in her negativity, also refers to the “vexing problem” of the “misuse of English loan-words”, in terms of pronunciation, usage, and meaning.

Unlike Sheperd and other researchers who have seen this as an insoluble problem, Simon-Maeda does attempt to provide a pedagogical solution. She makes reference to Webb’s (1990) guide to Japanese loanwords, originally written for native English speakers living in Japan and confronting the “many words [that] have acquired colloquial meanings which are quite different from the meanings given in dictionaries (e.g. *burando* (brand), *foroo* (follow), *yankii* (Yankee), etc.)” (p. 8). She also sees possibilities in the use of such a tool for Japanese learners of English. Here is an example of an entry from that dictionary.

**naisu-midoru** (nice-middle)

well-dressed, attractive middle-aged man

*Furansu ryooriten ni wa wakai onna no ko o tsureta naisumidoru ga imashita.*

*In the French restaurant a young girl brought by a nice-middle was there.*
There was an attractive middle-aged man with a young woman in the French restaurant.

(Webb’s acceptable English translation).

It is Simon-Maeda’s contention that “providing many more examples of the correct adjectival function of this word…students would come to an ‘awareness’ of the proper usage” (1995, p. 6).

Although there are many instances of divergence, and a variety of ways in which these manifest, it would be misleading to ignore the thousands of examples of English loanwords which retain remarkable phonological, semantic, and grammatical similarities in Japanese. Ishikawa and Rubrecht (2008, p. 313) found that by far the greatest incidence of loanword usage they observed (761 of 1202 instances; 63%) was of direct borrowings. The word *business*, which has only undergone orthographical change (pronounced *bi-ji-ne-su* in katakana) and associated phonological change is such an example.

Other teacher/researchers, while admitting the problems associated with the misuse of English loanwords in EFL acquisition, also reach quite positive conclusions. Olah (2007, p. 177) sees loanwords as “a means of improving spoken English ability”; Van Benthuysen (2004, p.173) claims they are a “latent resource that has the potential to help students rapidly expand their vocabularies”; and Daulton (2008, p. 40) sees them not only as “a dynamic and integral part of modern Japanese” but also “a great resource for Japanese learners of English”.

In terms of the effect English loanwords in Japanese have on various aspects of English vocabulary learning, numerous studies have found that there is generally a very positive correlation. Yoshida (1978), in a case study of a young Japanese boy at
kindergarten in the USA found that loanwords helped enlarge his receptive vocabulary. Brown and Williams (1985), tested the aural comprehension of loanwords and non-loanwords (up to the 2000 word-frequency level) for Japanese EFL learners, and found a higher level of comprehension for the former. Uchida (2001) revealed that Japanese junior high-school students were able to identify L1 connections with about half of the unknown loanwords they were confronted with, and Olah’s analysis (2007) found that “teachers of English should make every effort to use LWs in their lessons, and that the students will positively welcome such teaching methods” (p.187).

Daulton (2003b), in his pilot study on the effect of Japanese loanwords on written English production, affirms that English loanwords in Japanese assist the learning of English, and are generally easier to use productively. He also argues that it is important for English teachers to be aware of the English loanwords in Japanese if they are to effectively facilitate acquisition. With the degree of positive correspondence between naturalised loanwords in Japanese and the original English, one might expect that loanword knowledge would have a positive effect on vocabulary acquisition and word knowledge, in terms of both breadth and depth, and that strategies such as the one outlined by Simon-Maeda (1995) may alleviate some of the difficulties that loanword transformation can cause the learner.

Many of the phonological and morphological changes loanwords undergo when integrated into Japanese are consistent and display common elements. These strong positive correlations should not be ignored merely because there are some inconsistencies within the patterns of changes that they undergo. It may be possible for educators to draw on these patterns to provide clearer learning strategies for Japanese learners of English, to help them utilise their loanword knowledge to
facilitate English language acquisition despite the exceptions to these patterns and the inevitable confusion that can arise for students.

Another issue which has puzzled researchers has been the failure of learners to recognise cognates. Banta (1981), who examined German native speakers, and Palmberg (1987), Odlin (1989), Hammer and Giauque (1989), Holmes and Ramos (1993) in other linguistic contexts, have all noted, with surprise, this failure of recognition. Banta blames educators for not alerting students to cross-linguistic similarities. Researchers such as Van Benthuysen (2004) and Stanlaw (2004) have made reference to the issue of loanword recognition in relation to Japanese learners of English. They note that it is important for students to realise the linguistic connection between loanwords and their origin if loanwords are to become useful tools of acquisition. They also emphasise the role that teachers should play in facilitating this. Daulton (2008, p. 103) pinpoints three barriers which have a negative effect on recognition of loanwords: “the differing scripts of Japanese and English; the vagaries of English spelling; and the irregularities of transliteration and pronunciation”, barriers which all became apparent in data analysis for this study. These factors serve not only to make loanword recognition more difficult, they can also decrease the levels of confidence in drawing comparisons between words. This mistrust has been perpetuated by the attitude towards loanwords within the wider Japanese community and specifically within the English education system in Japan which has emphasised differences rather than embraced similarities. As Banta (1981, p. 129) noted and queried in his analysis of English speakers’ problems in recognising loanword cognates in German, “One is sometimes astonished at the inability of some students to recognise even...obvious cognates and common borrowings. Or is it inability? Is it perhaps mistrust?”. For Japanese learners, where
loanwords are clearly delineated by the use of the katakana script, it would appear that mistrust is a more likely cause than inability.

2.4.2 Loanwords and vocabulary acquisition. Much of the research outlined above suggests that teachers have an important role to play in making students aware of loanwords, and unpacking the cross-linguistic difference in order to facilitate language acquisition. With a strategic focus on loanwords which harnesses pre-existing vocabulary knowledge, and an environment which encourages the use of this knowledge and fosters confidence in doing so, this may become possible. For many years in the wider field the pivotal role that vocabulary knowledge and acquisition plays in EFL learning and teaching has been strongly affirmed by theoretical and empirical research. “While without grammar little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed.” (Wilkins, 1972, p. 111).

Regardless of the differing methodologies applied to classroom teaching, one aspect of English learning which has often been overlooked in Japan is vocabulary acquisition, and in particular the advantages afforded Japanese students by the presence of thousands of easily identifiable English loanwords in common usage. In terms of vocabulary breadth, Laufer (1998, p. 255) has claimed that “the most striking differences between foreign learners and native speakers is in the quantity of words each group possesses”, while Lewis has argued that “the single most important task facing language learners is acquiring a sufficiently large vocabulary” (2000, p. 8). In terms of vocabulary breadth and usage, Singleton claims that “the major challenge of learning and using a language - whether as L1 or as L2 - lies not in the area of broad syntactic principles but in the ‘nitty-gritty’ of the lexicon” (1999, p. 4). This contention is supported by Hunt and Beglar (2005, p. 2), who state that “the heart of language comprehension and use is the lexicon”.

45
Researchers such as McCarthy (1990); Schmitt and McCarthy (1997); Singleton (1999); Nation, (2001); and Meara, (2002), have examined different areas of vocabulary theory and pedagogy, including vocabulary breadth and depth, the concept of vocabulary knowledge, and vocabulary learning strategies. Their work suggests that building vocabulary knowledge can lead to more productive language learning.

The very idea of “word knowledge” as outlined by Nation (2001, p. 27) and summarised in Table 3.2, highlights the various aspects of knowledge that vocabulary knowledge incorporates. Nation divides word knowledge into three broad areas: Form; Meaning; and Use, and then into two further categories, encompassing receptive and productive knowledge.
Table 2.2: What is Involved in Knowing a Word? (based on Nation, 2001, p. 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Spoken</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>What does the word sound like?</th>
<th>How is the word pronounced?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What does the word look like?</td>
<td>How is the word written and spelled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word parts</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What parts are recognizable in this word?</td>
<td>What word parts are needed to express the meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Form and meaning</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td></td>
<td>What meaning does this word form signal?</td>
<td>What word form can be used to express this meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts and referents</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is included in the concept?</td>
<td>To what items can the concept refer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What other words does this make us think of?</td>
<td>What other words could we use instead of this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Grammatical functions</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td>In what patterns does this word occur?</td>
<td>In what patterns must we use this word?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocations</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What words or types of words occur with this one?</td>
<td>What words or types of words must we use with this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on use (eg. register)</td>
<td>R P</td>
<td>Where, when, and how often would we expect to meet this word?</td>
<td>Where, when, and how often can we use this word?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(R = receptive, P = productive)

This extensive definition of vocabulary knowledge goes far beyond the scope of a layman’s understanding of the term. It focuses on passive or receptive knowledge as well as active or productive knowledge in terms of phonology, semantics, and lexis. As outlined in Section 2.2, English loanwords in Japanese retain many aspects of these facets of the original English. This suggests that
Japanese learners already have significant knowledge of many English vocabulary items.

In terms of pedagogy and teaching strategies, the recent consensus (Hunt & Beglar, 2005; Laufer, 2005; Nation, 2005) seems to be that a combination of implicit and explicit learning strategies is most effective in enhancing vocabulary acquisition. Nation (2005, p. 585) argues that “every course should involve some deliberate attention to vocabulary as well as opportunities to meet the words in meaning-focused use”. Explicit strategies could involve dictionary usage, praxis study, and focus on affixes, whereas implicit instruction could involve extensive reading and listening activities which encourage language in use.

Following on from his work on vocabulary breadth, Nation (2008, p. 100) devised the following table to assess the extent of a student’s learning burden when acquiring vocabulary. The table is once again broken down into the three broad categories: Meaning; Form; and Use.

Table 2.3: Discovering Learning Burden (based on Nation 2000, p. 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Form and meaning</th>
<th>Is the word a loan word in the L1?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concepts and referents</td>
<td>Is there an L1 word with roughly the same meaning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Does the word fit into the same sets as an L1 word of similar meaning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form</strong></td>
<td>Spoken form</td>
<td>Can the learners repeat the word accurately if they hear it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written form</td>
<td>Can the learners write the word accurately if they hear it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word parts</td>
<td>Can the learners identify known affixes in the word?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only does this table point to the learning burden associated with particular words, it points to specific aspects of word knowledge which need to be addressed to teach English in an effective manner. Significantly for the purposes of this study, five of the nine questions posed in the table refer specifically to L1 (Japanese) usage. Is the word a loan word in the L1?; Is there an L1 word with roughly the same meaning?; Does the word fit into the same sets as an L1 word of similar meaning?; Does the word have the same collocations as an L1 word of similar meaning?; Does the word have the same restrictions on its use as an L1 word of similar meaning?

Nation (2008) contends that vocabulary knowledge is a broad concept, incorporating phonology, semantics, and morphology. He also claims that the presence of loanwords in an L1 can reduce the learning burden associated with mastering each of these aspects of knowledge. If we are to accept these contentions then the presence of English loanwords in Japanese, and building on these cross-linguistic similarities, should assist Japanese students in acquiring both passive and active vocabulary knowledge. Furthermore, if we are to accept Nation’s belief that vocabulary knowledge is a central component of language acquisition, then loanwords should play an important role in English language-learning in Japan.

Daulton notes (1998) that simply making students aware of the loanword resource they possess increases confidence in their intuitions about new English
vocabulary. Such practice first requires awareness-raising, as to the scope of loanwords within the language, and the possibilities this offers. Nation (2003, p. 5) states that “encouraging learners to notice this borrowing…is a very effective vocabulary expansion strategy”. As Daulton (1998, para 6) suggests, “students should be made aware of the loanword resource that they possess. They should learn to have more confidence in their intuitions about new English vocabulary.”

Researchers as far back as Topping (1962, p. 287), and more recently Daulton (2008) and Otwinowska (2016), have also encouraged teachers to familiarise themselves with loanwords in their students’ native language, so that awareness of the resource encompasses both learners and teachers.

Yoshida (1978), Brown and Williams (1985), Kimura (1989), and Daulton (2008) have all noted this reduced learning burden and the positive influence of loanwords on English vocabulary acquisition. However, because loanwords have “rarely been included in mainstream teaching materials or in classroom” there is a “wide-open field of possibilities for the application” (Daulton, 2008, p. 123) of them in this context. This study, which involved some teachers who had very positive experiences with loanwords as tools for L1 acquisition, provided an opportunity to examine these possibilities.

Nation (1990) notes, “The more the teacher or the course designer draws attention to the similarities and patterns (between L1 and L2 vocabulary), the greater the opportunity for transfer” (p. 49). Van Benthuysen (2004, p. 174) also concludes that “imaginative, creative and judicious use of this resource by EFL teachers could be of great benefit to their students and its potential should not be overlooked”.

Uchida (2003) and Ringbom (2007) have stressed the importance of introducing cross-linguistic similarities at the early stages of language development.
For Cruttenden (1981) this introduction should begin with item-learning, discreet individual words, and move on to system learning, the relationships between words. For Nation (2001), learning should begin with the explicit learning of high-frequency vocabulary, leading to the teaching of learning strategies, which draw attention to the similarities apparent between loanwords and L1 vocabulary. Uchida (2001) also argues that teaching individual high-frequency words should eventually lead to more sophisticated loanword checking strategies. This focus on high-frequency vocabulary was of particular relevance in the context of this study, which involved many learners of low English proficiency.

Recent studies have looked at the most effective ways to use loanwords to assist EFL teaching. Inagawa (2014) and Otwinowska (2016) have stressed the importance of instruction that draws explicit attention to the existence of loanwords, and also the similarities and discrepancies between the two languages.

Much of the research outlined here has focused on the transfer of word meaning. Nation’s table (2000) on discovering learning burden (Table 2.3) also gives attention to the spoken and written form (Can the learners repeat the word accurately if they hear it? and Can the learners write the word accurately if they hear it?). Brown (1995, p. 7) has also encouraged the use of texts “built up around the many words that have been borrowed from English into Japanese” as “effective tools in the development of English vocabulary among Japanese university students”. Such a process involves moving beyond what Nation terms “meaning and form” (2008, p. 100) into language in use.

Nation’s theories on vocabulary learning (2008) for both L1 and L2 learners, provide evidence of an underutilised resource, and a model on which language-learning strategies can be based, incorporating pre-existing knowledge in the L1. The
work of other researchers (Daulton, 2008) also suggests that loanwords may be able to be used as a medium to enhance confidence and motivation, and second language acquisition. Particularly through teacher interviews, this impact became apparent during data collection for this study.

This section has focused on vocabulary but it is important to stress, as Nation does (2008), that vocabulary knowledge goes far beyond the learning of discreet items. In a broader understanding of the term, vocabulary learning becomes an integral component of all language learning, and enables students to understand language and to use it productively, whether in writing or speaking. By using vocabulary as a basis for enhancing productive learning of a language, a process that harnesses loanwords as a medium seems an important avenue of enquiry and one which is yet to be fully exploited. This process was an important component of the rationale for this study. Although some practitioners, particularly in the tertiary sector of Japanese English education, have attempted to apply the knowledge of loanwords to enhance SLA, there remains significant work to be done to understand how best to harness that knowledge and implement strategies which will utilise it most effectively in language learning. To begin with, to quote Banta (1981, p. 34), “probably the most useful fact we can tell our students about loan words is that they exist”.

2.5 The teaching of English in Japan

English loanwords have been evident in the Japanese lexicon for a considerable period of time, yet there is little evidence of these words being drawn on productively in the teaching of English. The nature of English education in Japan has historically been an intellectual pursuit rather than a communicative one (Stanlaw, 2004, p. 56). Even following the growth in English education subsequent to the end of World War II, an understanding of English literature has often been
seen as the most important goal. In recent years, as the importance of English communicative skills has been recognised, the goals of English education have changed, and the number of Japanese people who study English has dramatically increased. English education in high schools is now almost universal and private English conversation schools have become prominent.

While curricula in Japan differ from prefecture to prefecture, and indeed from public to private schools, “control over curriculum rests largely with the national Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)” (Ellington, 2005, p. 1). This has meant that the content and style of English language teaching in Japan, particularly within the secondary school system, has been relatively homogenous, with little opportunity for communicative tasks, and focus on written entrance exams (for the purposes of higher study) and internationally recognised tests such as TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication).

The policies of a powerful, national body such as MEXT can have a widespread impact on a country such as Japan, resulting in strict control over examinations, curricula, and teaching approaches. Given the centralised control of education practices, certain approaches, particular SLA theories, and specific scholars have tended to dominate the English language landscape. These include the grammar-translation approach, the direct method, the audio-lingual method, the work of Krashen, and more recently Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). These remain part of the English educational landscape in modern Japan.

**2.5.1 English language teaching and learning approaches.** While there have been a number of approaches adopted for learning English within the Japanese education system, the most common and popular approaches to language teaching and learning have been structural, functional, and interactional. Only those teaching approaches
that have been popular in Japan are discussed in this review. These methods are: the
grammar-translation approach, to a lesser extent the direct approach, and more
recently, Communicative Language Teaching (Richards & Rogers, 1986).

**Grammar-translation.** The importance of grammar-translation within Japanese EFL
teaching is well established (Rowberry, 2012). As Rowberry notes, (2012, p. 131)
“English language teaching in Japan, particularly at junior high school and high
school level, has traditionally been based on grammar-translation methods with
classes conducted mainly in Japanese and focusing on texts, vocabulary and
grammatical structures often beyond the students’ natural stage of English
acquisition.”

As one of the oldest and most well-known teaching approaches, grammar-
translation approach is based on behaviourist theories of learning and emphasises
learning through the translation of large amounts of texts, analysis of structure and
grammatical forms, and the memorisation of vast amounts of vocabulary. The
approach is most clearly exemplified by the traditional teaching of languages such as
Ancient Greek and Latin. Central to the approach is that little emphasis is placed on
oral communication, that the language acquisition is a scholarly, academic pursuit,
with classes often conducted in the native tongue and with an intensive reading focus
(Brown, 1994, p. 18).

Typified by an instructor as the source of knowledge and the source of
correction, grammar-translation is an approach which sat very comfortably within the
social and educational hierarchy from the 17th- mid 20th centuries. This remains the
case into the 21st century in many Asian countries with a Confucian education
tradition, such as Japan (Ellington, 2005, p. 1-2).
In line with this approach, students would be required to translate a text, (from Homer, Pliny, or Cicero for example) into the native language, analyse the grammar, and deconstruct the text. Exams would generally take the form of seen and unseen translations, supported by comprehension tasks and distinct grammar questions. Often these would be complemented by tasks requiring students to translate from the native language back into the target language. Generally little attention was paid to content; more to form, precision, and meta-linguistic knowledge, with constant reference to the native language (Brown, 1994, p. 19).

Notwithstanding the derision with which grammar-translation is often viewed, there are still those who maintain a slightly more neutral stance. Cunningham (2000, p. 1) admits that “while there may indeed be some negative effects from using translation, there is a place in the learning environment for [it]. Translation can contribute to the students’ acquisition of the target language at all levels”. Austin (2003, p. 131) also points out that instead of having to “use simple language and familiar phrases to communicate in the target language”, grammar-translation allows a teacher to “talk about the grammar and vocabulary” (p. 133) that is being taught in the first language. Communication between teacher and student, conducted in their native language, is quick, particularly within the secondary school environment dominated by native Japanese speakers. The fact that English oral fluency is not required is a significant advantage.

On a more practical level, students can be easily assessed based on test performance (often multiple-choice or short-answer items). This type of quantitative testing is relatively simple, particularly in comparison to the rating of speaking tests (Brown, 1994, p. 19). In Japan grammar-translation remains a “familiar method and is regarded as the safest method to ensure good results in university entrance
examinations” (Kato, 2007, p. 119). Naturally this type of method remains dependent on examinations and test items which reflect and reward the approach. Factors such as these are behind the historical dominance of the grammar-translation method and its popularity in teaching second languages in general.

However, as Richards and Rodgers claim (1986, p. 4), the grammar-translation approach “is remembered with distaste by thousands of school learners, for whom foreign language learning meant a tedious experience of memorizing endless lists of unusable grammar rules and vocabulary, and attempting to produce perfect translations of stilted or literary prose” and that it “is a method for which there is no theory…no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics” (1986, p. 5). According to Ellis (1991, p. 103), in a Japanese context the dominance of the grammar-translation approach partly explains why a society which has spent a vast amount of time studying the English language, has achieved little in terms of communicative competence or confidence in their use of it. Although grammar-translation does incorporate the memorisation of vocabulary lists as an important component, this component remains mechanical rather than interactive, and does little to suggest how derivatives of loanwords could be used productively in English communication. Further, the approach does not assist in comprehending how the words could be harnessed to add to the repertoire of English structures, or become part of a learning system which promotes communicative competence. Hence, though grammar-translation is still a preferred approach in many classrooms in Japan, there is little evidence that loanwords are used within it as a basis for enhancing English language acquisition.

**Direct method.** In contrast to grammar-translation, the direct method, (originating in structuralism and appearing in France and Germany around the turn of the 19th and
20th centuries), focuses almost entirely on oral fluency and uses the target language as the sole source of instruction. Franchises such as *Inlingua* and *Berlitz*, use variations of this approach. This approach significantly contributed to the idea of using L2 as the sole form of instruction in an ESL/EFL classroom (Harbord, 1992; Pennycook, 1994).

The premise of the direct method approach is that second-language learning mirrors first language acquisition, with a focus on oral interaction, little grammatical analysis, and no translation. Although the direct method would be discredited when it failed in the public education system and revealed little transfer to real world communicative competence (Brown, 1994, p. 44), it has had a lasting influence on ESL/EFL classrooms. In Japan the approach has been particularly prevalent in the private sector, and the “L2-only” policy, which exists today in many Japanese private universities, has its roots in this approach. The idea of L2 as the preferred mode of teaching has also been largely responsible for the massive influx of native English-speakers into Japan over the past few decades, and the way they are utilised within the education system.

The weakness in the direct method is its assumption that a second language can be learnt in exactly the same way as a first language, when in fact the conditions under which learning occurs are often very different. While L1 learners subconsciously develop language ability, L2 learners develop this knowledge by utilising conscious and cognitive efforts (De Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor, 2005, p. 7). The direct method pays little attention to this conscious process, and has no explicit focus on the teaching of vocabulary. In the Japanese context, it pays little attention to important features of the Japanese language, specifically the presence of loanwords, or how using that knowledge, and building on it, may enhance learning.
2.5.2 Current policies and developments. To some extent, the teaching of English as a foreign language within the Japanese education system has been influenced by wider changes in the field, although it would be fair to say that teaching methodologies have been slow to change and often lagged behind contemporary SLA theories. For example, Communicative Language Teaching, which became very popular in the 1980s, and is typified by interaction in the target language to achieve communicative competence, has only recently gained favour in Japan (Imura, 2003).

The idea that language is a creative and social phenomenon, rather than a simply habit-based one, led to many of the communicative-based teaching approaches which are currently widely accepted and adopted throughout the western world. Ideas about learner participation and, in particular, language as a communicative activity, rather than an academic exercise, have radically changed the practicalities of classroom teaching.

In response to concerns that English teaching remained in a methodological time-warp, there was a concerted effort by MEXT to reform the English education system in Japan. In 2003, the ministry established an action plan to cultivate “Japanese with English abilities”. This document set out expectations that students should be able to “hold normal conversations” in English. It also attempted to standardise the approaches to teaching that would take place in schools, specifically that the medium of instruction should be English and that there should be opportunities for students to produce rather than simply study the language.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), as the name suggests, stresses the importance of communication to facilitate communicative competence (Savignon, 2008). Berns (1990) summarises some of the core tenets of the theory as follows:
1) Language as communication

2) Culture as an important role in shaping communicative competence

3) No single methodology

4) Learners engage in using the language in a variety of ways

The extent to which these expectations have translated into changes in classroom teaching practices in Japan is debatable. Recent research published independently by Taguchi (2005) and Ruegg (2009) casts an interesting light on actual teaching approaches in Japan over the last decade.

Taguchi (2005) examined the perceptions and practices of junior high school and high school teachers throughout Tokyo, with reference to the communicative approach to teaching English. She found that while Communicative Language Teaching is the approach currently espoused by the government and Ministry of Education, English lessons are still overwhelmingly teacher-centred. She noted that almost all of the English spoken in the classroom was either “between a student and teacher or students (speaking in unison) and the teacher” (Taguchi, 2005, p. 4). Grammar was the focus of more class time than other skills, with listening accounting for the least.

Ruegg (2009) conducted research into the teaching approaches at 15 junior high schools, and high schools throughout Japan. She concluded that “the most important aspect that became apparent through this research was the lack of enjoyment of English classes” (p. 424). While she found that “CLT certainly is suitable for Japanese junior high school and high school students” (2009, p. 424) there were numerous factors which limited its use and effectiveness. These factors included: lack of confidence in teachers’ English; the belief that Japanese students are ill-equipped to learn in a communicative manner; students’ lack of confidence
and/or ability to communicate effectively in English. The belief that in-depth grammatical knowledge is required to pass university entrance exams also reduced the belief in the appropriateness of a communicative approach to teaching.

Furthermore, Ruegg found that an understanding of CLT on the part of educators was often lacking, and that oral communication often involved reading or repetition rather than communication in any real sense.

Further, Mulligan (2005, p. 34) confirms that a “major barrier is the entrenched culture that stigmatizes as ‘uppity’ those teachers who dare to use English in the classroom. Oftentimes a new teacher, full of hope and enthusiasm, attempts to use English in the classroom and is castigated by his or her colleagues (and students as well) until coerced into conforming to the status quo”. Such a culture is obviously counter-productive to encouraging communicative classroom teaching. As became evident in Mulligan’s research, “even virtually bilingual teachers opted to use Japanese to create and maintain good rapport with students” (p. 34).

The work of researchers such as Mulligan, Taguchi, and Ruegg points to the underlying tensions between the social, cultural, and linguistic factors at work in English-language classrooms in Japan. In other words, teachers generally try to find approaches to teaching that are most suitable to the culture in which they are teaching. While some students, and some teachers, may desire a different style of teaching from the norm of their native culture, we should not assume that all teachers will be able to adjust to this, or indeed all students benefit from a Western-style, communicative, more autonomous approach.

While Guest (2000, p. 30) claimed that “the image of the hapless Japanese English teacher, still believing that the grammar-translation method is current and effective, is quickly becoming an outdated stereotype”, many junior high and high
school teachers still complain that, “while they would like to devote more time to communicative activities, the reality is that they must focus on preparing students for entrance examinations. These examinations are extremely competitive and carry a huge burden of responsibility for the teachers and their students. Under such pressure it is little surprise that productive language skills, which are rarely formally assessed, are neglected so that attention can be focused on ‘learning’ the discrete structural items which are likely to come up on the test” (Rowberry 2012, p. 131).

**Krashen and beyond.** In terms of its effect on English teaching in Japan, Krashen’s research on second language acquisition within the Communicative Approach has been among the most significant. His ideas, introduced in several articles (1977a, 1977b, 1978) and expanded on in later books (1981, 1982, 1985), can be broken down into five main components: The Acquisition-Learning hypothesis; The Monitor hypothesis; The Natural Order hypothesis; The Input hypothesis and The Affective Filter hypothesis.

The Acquisition-Learning hypothesis remains the most fundamental aspect of Krashen’s theory, and draws an important distinction between two inter-connected, but independent aspects of language acquisition: an acquired system and a learned system. According to Krashen (1987), the *acquired system* occurs when meaningful interactions take place in the target language. Krashen’s *learned system*, as the term suggests, relates to formal language instruction, typically taking place in a classroom setting.

From a teaching perspective, Krashen’s contrast between meaningful communication, or attention to form, has been very influential “especially among foreign language teachers who saw it as an explanation of the lack of correspondence between error correction and direct teaching…and their students’ accuracy of
performance” (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 45). Mitchell and Myles (2004, p. 45) highlight the third person singular in English, as an example of a rule which is consciously known by students but is applied poorly in conversation. To use Krashen’s terminology, although the rule has been learnt it has not been acquired.

Until fairly recently in Japan, a focus on grammar and form, and teaching methodologies and testing instruments which support such an approach, has typified much of the English education landscape. The generally poor return of the approach, in terms of linguistic competence of students, has undoubtedly encouraged many foreign, and Japanese, teachers to embrace Krashen’s hypothesis and focus more on meaningful communication and a communicative approach to language teaching.

However, while Krashen is certainly not alone in his belief that the acquired system is a more effective way of both absorbing and retaining language, it remains a contested aspect of his theory. With particular focus on vocabulary acquisition, an important element of second language acquisition, researchers such as Nunan (1991) and Hall (1992), and more recently Nation (2008) and Daulton (2008), have all provided evidence that conscious attention to vocabulary, and form, can enhance acquisition, retention, social skills, and the ability to deal with unpredictable situations, as often faced in real-life communication. Other researchers, such as McLaughlin (1987) have also challenged Krashen’s claim that learned knowledge and acquired knowledge are essentially different to the extent that they can never form a unified knowledge base. Regardless of the ongoing debate about the applicability or validity of this hypothesis, it has been highly influential in changing teaching practices and educational policies in countries such as Japan.

Since the early 1980s a number of second language theories have challenged Krashen’s hypotheses. Long’s Interaction hypothesis (1981) and Swain’s Output
hypothesis (1985, 1995) have been particularly dominant and developed over an extended period of time. These theories have been influenced by advances in related fields, such as psychology and linguistics.

Long (1981) argued that in order to fully understand the importance of input in second language learning, as outlined by Krashen (1987) in his hypothesis, more attention needs to be given to the interactions in which learners are engaged. According to Long (1981), these interactions should not simply be viewed as one-directional input, and that through interaction and negotiation, more meaningful and targeted input could occur.

Merrill Swain (1985) in her studies with French immersion students in Canadian schools also challenged Krashen’s belief that input alone can lead to learning. She found that although the comprehension skills of these students were very high, their productive skills were comparatively weak. She claimed that tasks which require productive output are necessary for the effective development of vocabulary and morphology in a second language, and that tasks that can promote opportunities for practice are required to substantiate input.

Another criticism leveled at Krashen’s work (1987) has been that it places emphasis on psycho-linguistic processes with input as new learning “ahead of the learner’s current developmental stage systematically affecting the learner’s underlying second language system” (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 200). More recently, socio-cultural theories as well as developments in neuroscience have helped shape an understanding of how language itself is learnt, and how this relates to the acquisition of second languages. In particular, recognition that “social interaction within institutions and communities” (Renshaw, 2002, p. 7) is an essential part of language learning has broadened the concept. Despite ongoing arguments, the work
of researchers such as Krashen, Long, and Swain, and their continued presence in SLA discussions, has forced institutions such as MEXT to revise their curricula and English education policies.

While the desire for a more communicative approach to language teaching in Japan on the part of many academics, both foreign and native, seems evident, the practicalities of merging these beliefs, and the stated philosophy of MEXT, with classroom practice have been problematic. Although rather slow to adapt, the English education system in Japan has attempted to incorporate teaching approaches, and theories of language acquisition which have developed in other parts of the world. Both at a policy-making level, and at the institutional level, there is recognition that previous approaches, such as grammar-translation, have been deeply flawed, and largely failed to promote linguistic competence.

Despite MEXT advocating communicative teaching approaches that could incorporate social and cultural factors, the teaching of English in Japan still relies largely on outdated methods as outlined in section 2.5.1. What these methods fail to incorporate is the social and cultural context of Japanese learners, and their linguistic background that is heavily influenced by the presence of English loanwords. If we are to accept that view that language is historically, socially, and culturally situated, we must look beyond traditional approaches to English learning and look specifically at the Japanese context, drawing upon socio-cultural theory as advocated by researchers such as Lantolf (2000). This study identifies a significant problem with current approaches to English teaching in Japan, and builds on the work of researchers such as Daulton and Nation in identifying loanwords as tools to facilitate English language acquisition.
2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a review of relevant literature pertaining to the scope, nature, and function of the English loanword phenomenon in Japanese. It has critically examined second language acquisition teaching approaches and contemporary classroom practices relevant to the English education system in Japan and revealed the shortcomings of those approaches in terms of teaching vocabulary and the possibility of utilising the in-built loanword lexicon. Challenges, such as a bias against loanwords and their misuse, have also been identified. The importance of teachers’ L2 proficiency, in terms of being able to identify loanwords, was a significant initial concern of the researcher. Ultimately however, it seemed that while awareness was important, it was not sufficient. Teachers also needed to accept loanwords as mediational tools as well. This was not always the case.

Researchers such as Daulton have extensively analysed the significance of English loanwords within the Japanese language. Erich, Eriko, Aya, Kathy and Naoko (2005) in their study on primary school children learning English have suggested that loanwords could provide a rich resource to develop children’s communication skills” (p. 37)

However, to date, the gap in the literature has been that no theory has been employed to adequately explain how loanwords could be effectively harnessed in SLA in Japan. There has also been very little examination of how loanwords may operate as a tool for language acquisition if a socio-cultural approach to teaching and learning is undertaken. This study aims to bridge that gap.

The following chapter outlines the theoretical framework which underpinned the research. The chapter reviews socio-cultural theories, particularly CHAT, and
argues that these provide a suitable basis for examining the presence of loanwords within Japanese and analysing how this phenomenon could be utilised in the teaching and learning of English in Japan. These theories help to explain the socio-cultural aspects of learning a language by examining how teachers and students engaged with the loanword phenomenon in an interactive mode of construction and co-construction.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

Chapter Two reviewed the phenomenon of loanwords within the Japanese lexicon and the current and historical nature of English language education in Japan. It also demonstrated that English loanwords in Japanese are not only a linguistic construct, but also a complex cultural and social phenomenon. The review illustrated how the English language teaching approaches adopted within the Japanese education system have failed to take account of the complex social and cultural practices that impact on how language is received and used. The socio-cultural approach to language teaching draws on the belief that learning is a socio-cultural practice, and examines how historical, social, cultural, and institutional processes influence language teaching and learning.

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework through which the data from this study were analysed. This framework draws on socio-cultural theory (SCT, henceforth), and the development of successive generations of cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) to explore loanwords as tools of mediation in the teaching of English. This study adopts a socio-cultural approach to attend to the complexities of learner engagement, the contextual aspects of language learning, and language as a meaning-making activity. Following Lantolf (2000), the primary objective of this chapter is to illustrate how the teaching context is driven by historical and cultural aspects that provide a purpose to language teaching and learning, and the place of loanwords within this context.

SCT is based on the idea that language is essentially a social activity, and that language learning is a mediated process. CHAT provides a means of conceptualising
how this learning takes place in a socio-cultural setting. This theoretical perspective
is used to provide a lens through which the teaching and learning context can be
analysed. With many of the teaching approaches employed within the Japanese
education system to this point, there has been little productive harnessing of English
loanwords for the teaching of English. This study examines the teaching, learning
activity currently in place in a university in Japan to argue that the socio-cultural
approach to language learning is required if various cultural tools are to be
productively adopted. By examining tools, techniques, and teaching approaches that
can harness these words, an effort can be made to illustrate how loanwords can
productively and effectively support the learning of English.

This chapter begins with an outline of socio-cultural theories and how they
have been applied to language learning, with particular reference to mediation and
internalisation. This is followed by a review of the developmental stages of CHAT,
describing the first, second and third generations of the theory, and examines how
these have been adopted to inform educational research. Finally, the chapter
examines the implications the theoretical framework has for the research design and
methodology, and provides a justification for the suitability of third-generation
CHAT for this study.

3.1 Socio-cultural theory

The term socio-cultural incorporates two aspects. The social aspect
emphasises the interdependence and interaction necessary to learn (Lantolf, 2000;
Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). The core tenet of SCT, as it relates to second language
acquisition, is that learners acquire language through interaction and collaboration
with others (Lantolf, 2000). The cultural aspect of the term refers to the dynamic
processes of acting and behaving that might be unique to individuals and
communities (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). As Gutiérrez and Rogoff (2003) observe, the cultural aspect of SCT emphasises the importance of cultural tools such as language that illustrate how culture operates in a context.

The origins of SCT can be traced back to the work of the Belorussian/Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky in the 1920s and 1930s, and his contemporaries. The socio-cultural approach to learning is characterised by an understanding of the “dynamic interdependence of social and individual processes” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p.192) and provides a means of examining this relationship in terms of language learning. This dynamic process becomes apparent in two major themes of Vygotsky’s: 1) the social origins of individual development; 2) mediation in this development through the use of tools (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996).

The first of these processes stresses that all human development begins with a state of dependence. An individual relies on older, or more competent, individuals to develop. Over time the individual is able to take on increasing independence for and begins to participate more constructively in joint activity. By participating in an activity, and “internalizing the effects of working together, the novice acquires useful strategies and crucial knowledge” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p. 194). This development is characterised by mediation, in which tools mediate the actions of an individual and connect the internal consciousness with the external world. These mediational means may take the form of “language; various systems of counting; mnemonic techniques; algebraic symbol systems; works of art; writing; schemes; diagrams, maps and mechanical drawings; all sorts of conventional signs and so on” (Vygotsky, 1981, p. 137). As products of socio-cultural evolution, these tools of mediation are taken on by individuals to engage in activities of practice within their communities. As Wertsch (1994) argues, this idea of mediation is central to
understanding Vygotsky’s approach to learning, the development of SCT, and how “human mental functioning is tied to cultural, institutional and historical settings…In this approach, the mediational means are what might be termed the ‘carriers’ of socio-cultural patterns and knowledge” (p. 204).

Lantolf (2000) confirms that “the distinguishing concept of SCT is that the highest forms of human mental activity are mediated” (p. 80). Just as people use physical tools to interact with their physical environment, they also use symbolic tools, or artefacts, such as language to engage with others and interact socially. These symbolic tools are also used by individuals to mediate between themselves and the environment in which they live. In this way, Vygotsky originally attempted to understand how “human social and mental activity is organised through culturally constructed artefacts and social relationships” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 80).

This study contends that English loanwords are used as culturally-constructed artefacts by Japanese speakers to communicate with each other, and that these constructions can be harnessed to facilitate English language acquisition. Chapter Two outlined the numerous roles English loanwords perform in the Japanese language: to describe new cultural artefacts; to differentiate between Western and Japanese versions of known artefacts or concepts; and to serve as euphemisms. These are all ways of using loanwords as mediational tools to engage with others and achieve a communicative objective.

One important form of this type of mediation is regulation, whereby learners gradually develop the ability to “regulate their own activity through linguistic means” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 200). This form of mediation proceeds through three stages. The first stage, object-regulation, involves the use of objects to regulate activity. The second stage, other-regulation, requires the assistance of a more
knowledgeable other, such as a parent or teacher. The third stage, self-regulation, refers to the “ability to accomplish activities with minimal or no external support” (p. 200). This stage is reached through a process of internalisation, when the direction or assistance of others has become “internally available to the individual” (p. 200).

Vygotsky’s (1981) initial proposition was that the internalisation of social and cultural artefacts, particularly language, served to mediate activity. This study considers this proposal in terms of second language acquisition.

3.1.1 Applications to second-language learning. While Vygotsky’s main focus was in the realm of child development, later researchers such as Warshauer (1997) have looked at computer-mediated communication through a similar lens, and how this form of communication shapes the type of activity undertaken within it. Central to this research are studies that have incorporated Vygotsky’s original ideas and contexts into contemporary situations, in particular to the study of language teaching (see Lantolf, Thorne & Poehner, 2015; Storch, 2017). Since the mid-1980s, particularly with the work undertaken by Lantolf (2000), second-language acquisition research incorporating SCT has become increasingly prevalent. This approach has provided a means of examining the interdependent relationship between individual and social processes in terms of language learning.

As a theory through which researchers view second-language learning, one of the main tenets of SCT is that “social interactions and cultural institutions, such as schools, classrooms, etc. have important roles to play in an individual’s cognitive growth and development” (Donato & McCormick, 1994, p. 453). In such settings, where the learner is seen constructing knowledge, tools such as Nation’s model of vocabulary learning (2001), and techniques for using those tools, can be employed to
make learning interactive and help create a dialogic process of learning where the teacher and student engage in co-constructing knowledge.

Another aspect of the learning process within SCT is the idea of private and inner speech. Just as young children indulge in private dialogues, Vygotsky claims that this eventually becomes a means of regulating internal thought processes amongst adults, without the need for external expression. Researchers such as Anton and DiCamilla (1998) note the role of L1 as a tool for regulating thought processes in an L2 context, as an example of collaborative interaction resulting in learning through the use of such inner speech. In a Japanese context, researchers such as Ohta (2001; 2017) have noted the use of private speech to help learners internalise target language in the L2 (see also Wang, 2017).

Another aspect of SCT is the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Vygotsky (1978), exploring child psychology, defined ZPD as: “The difference between the child’s developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 85). According to Vygotsky (1978) ZPD is the sphere in which the most productive learning can occur, either through mediation, or with scaffolded help. In the field of second language learning Nassaji and Swain (2000) examined methods of corrective feedback, and reported a positive effect for students who were given feedback that took account of the ZPD (see also Aimin, 2013; Ohta, 2017; Rezaee & Azizi, 2008). Their findings verified those of Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994). Ohta (2001) also noted that some learners were able to provide peer-feedback that exhibited sensitivity to this concept.

Vygotsky’s concept of the ZPD has drawn comparisons with Krashen’s i+1 hypothesis, although Dunn and Lantolf (1998) have strongly argued that the concepts
are “Incommensurable constructs; Incommensurable theories” (p.411). While Krashen’s hypothesis focuses on language itself, Vygotsky is more concerned with social and cultural aspects of language and learning. Furthermore, Krashen’s hypothesis “is not testable, while predictions based on ZPD are testable on the grounds that what individuals are able to do with negotiated mediation is a glimpse of what they will be able to do in the future without mediation” (Lantolf & Beckett, 2009, p. 465). This study draws on that Vygotskian tradition of socio-cultural analysis.

Within that tradition, the ZPD explores the possibilities that can be achieved with competent assistance, as compared with what can be accomplished as an individual. Vygotsky uses the example of parents engaging conversationally with a child at a level towards the limits of the child’s competence to illustrate this. Parents adjust their language, and recast formulations, so that children can gradually learn to function independently (Conner, Knight & Cross, 1997; Gauvain, 2001).

As depicted by the three concentric circles in Figure 3.1, the ZPD lies between the inner circle of independent performance level, and the outer circle of currently unattainable performance, with or without assistance by a more knowledgeable other. This outer circle is limited only by a student’s ultimate potential. The inner circle increases commensurately with the student’s developmental level, and pushes the ZPD closer to this limit.
Within this framework, the idea of the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) has traditionally been thought to constitute anyone with more knowledge or ability in a particular sphere of learning or endeavour (Dahms et al., 2007). However, more recently, the idea of the MKO has been expanded to incorporate non-human learning objects which can mediate at higher ability levels than the learner (Attwell, 2010). Ideas which incorporate the ZPD, and the sum of more knowledgeable others, into a framework called the Personal Learning Environment (PLE), have expanded on this view, so that artefacts can be seen to include information or knowledge that is accessed through a learning environment.
Within the framework of the ZPD, specifically in terms of the current study, teachers may take on the role more of facilitators than of imparters of knowledge. In a language-learning environment that attempts to utilise first-language knowledge, providing access to artefacts or information, such as Nation’s (2001) tables on word knowledge and learning burden, may be an important mediational tool. When teachers are not fluent in their students’ native language, and lack an understanding of loanword forms and functions, this may become a primary form of mediation.

The breadth of ZPD research, and application to a variety of cultural and linguistic contexts, strongly suggests that SCT is a suitable lens through which to analyse second language acquisition. In the context of this study, the theory allows the perspectives of learning as social practice, and language as a cultural artefact to be explored. It also provides a means of exploring how loanwords as a tool of mediation in an L1 may also be used as a tool to mediate second language learning.

As Cross (2010, p. 449) observes, “a sociocultural theoretical perspective on teacher practice provides the basis for a systematic, comprehensive, and theoretically robust framework that accounts for the social dimension of thought and knowledge. In this study, SCT helps explain how interactions between the teachers and students occur within the Japanese context, how knowledge gaps in English language learning are addressed, and how the knowledge of loanwords is internalised by the learners. As Vygotsky (1981) observes, the mediational tools of human action are significant, and studying how the interactions with these tools occur enhances an understanding of how learning occurs.

To sum up, the two key concepts of ZPD and mediation explain how social and cultural factors are integral aspects of learning and, in this study, how teaching and learning is constructed and co-constructed by teachers and students. The
contextual nature of language teaching and learning is further comprehended through CHAT, as discussed in the following sections.

Although Vygotsky did not explicitly deal with CHAT, his writing directs us to consider it (Lantolf 2000; 2002). In drawing from a cultural and historical perspective, CHAT advances the notion that activities are contextually and historically situated. An important proposition of activity theorists generally is that an event occurs within a contextually, historically situated context. Mediating cultural artefacts, such as loanwords as tools to enhance English acquisition within a collaborative context, is understood in this study as enabling language learning. Coughlan and Duff (1994) have employed the theory to analyse SLA tasks. Roebuck (1998) also used CHAT to examine reading and recall in L1 and L2. Lantolf and Genung (2002), in a Chinese-language context, analysed classroom experiences through the lens of CHAT to understand how the objects and goals of an activity can change through the activity process. Van Lier (2004) incorporating aspects of SCT, CHAT, mediation, and ZPD, examined the ecology and semiotics of language learning Gibbes and Carson (2014) examined project-based language learning through CHAT. Specifically, these approaches argue that language learning and language use are part of a unified process, with the teacher performing a mediating role.

Within the socio-cultural setting, CHAT views mediated actions as part of dynamic system, influenced by a variety of cultural and individual factors. It allows an integrated investigation of a system, in this case the social, cultural, and linguistic phenomenon of English loanwords in Japanese, to be undertaken. For this reason CHAT has been incorporated within the overarching socio-cultural framework for this study. The term CHAT is used as it is pertinent to the research aims of this study.
Other researchers have used the term AT (activity theory), and in some cases used the terms interchangeably. When referring to the work of these researchers the original usage is maintained. The following section outlines the theory and its applicability in more detail.

3.2 Cultural-historical activity theory

Within the greater framework of socio-cultural theory, CHAT can also be traced back to Vygotsky’s (1978, 1986, 1989) early work. The basic tenet of the developed theory is that “the human mind emerges, exists, and can only be understood within the context of human interaction with the world; …this interaction, that is activity, is socially and culturally determined” (Kaptelinin, Nardi, & Macauley, 1999, p. 28). The theory, where the central focus is on “revolutionary practice” (Engestrom & Miettinen, 1999, p. 3), attempts to provide an appropriate means of analysing this complex relationship between internal consciousness and the wider external environment.

Vygotsky set the framework for the theory with his seminal work on mediation as the site for human activity. For Vygotsky, collaborative activities and tools that are culturally situated lead to productive action. The development of this theory has since been divided into three distinct generations. The first generation is best characterised by Vygotsky’s work (1978) on mediation. The second generation expands on this work to focus more on social aspects (Leontiev, 1981; Engeström, 1987), while the third generation develops these ideas so as to encompass multiple interacting activity systems. The insights of scholars such as Kuuti (1996), who saw activities as “nodes in crossing hierarchies and networks” as opposed to “isolated units” (p. 34) has been instrumental in inspiring such developments. Although third generation theory will become the major focus of the review and framework for this
study, an overview of each generation, outlining the differences between them and extensions to earlier models, provides a broader and more complete frame of reference.

3.2.1 First-generation activity theory. Vygotsky’s concept of mediational means and mediated activity is central to an understanding of first-generation CHAT. In the triangular representation of first-generation theory, provided in Figure 3.1, these mediational means may be either a physical tool (such as a hammer or spear), more sophisticated machines (such as an automobile), or a symbolic, conceptual tool (such as gesture or language). The subjects of the system are typically individuals, but may also incorporate pairs (dyads) or groups of people. The object, or motive, of the activity is transformed into an outcome through the subject’s use of these mediational means.

![Figure 3.2: The Original Model of Activity Theory (Leontiev, 1978).](image)

Using this model in the context of a language learning activity, where the object is to understand the meaning of a decontextualised word in a second language, a student (the subject) may use a dictionary (a physical tool) or loanword knowledge (a symbolic tool or mediational means) to facilitate a greater understanding of that word (the outcome).
Importantly for Vygotsky (1978) these tools fundamentally influence, that is mediate, the thought processes and actions of the subject. The interactions between the aspects of the system (subject, mediational means, and object) move in all directions, so that “the use of artificial means, the transition to mediated activity, fundamentally changes all psychological operations just as the use of tools limitlessly broadens the range of activities within which the new psychological functions may operate” (p. 55).

The choice of mediational means is also significant. In the case of dictionary versus linguistic knowledge as the means of mediation, this results in either an action (consulting a dictionary) or a thought process (recalling knowledge to apply to the problem) which in turn will be reflected in the nature of the outcome. This interconnectedness remained central to subsequent generations of the theory and through this lens loanwords can be examined in relation to the language in which they have been adopted, and by which they have been transformed.

Although not explicitly addressed in the first-generation model of CHAT as depicted in Figure 3.2, Vygotsky does point to social interaction, rather than individual thought processes, as the primary realm of learning. From his socio-psychological perspective Vygotsky (1981) looks specifically at parent-child interactions rather than teacher-student interactions to illustrate his theories.

Any function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, or on two planes. First it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as an intrapsychological category. (p. 163)
Other aspects of Vygotskyian Activity Theory have undergone expansion, adaptation and development. One of the shortcomings of the first-generation approach was that mediated action is not just one process, as Vygotsky claims, it is a succession of processes combined (Engeström, 2001). Furthermore, the problem of internal/external dualisms could not be reconciled within this rather limited framework. An attempt to address these problems is undertaken in later expansions of this theory, by researchers such as Ilyenkov (1977, 82) and Leontiev (1978) through whom second-generation CHAT becomes an extension of Vygotsky’s work.

3.2.2 Second-generation activity theory. Vygotsky’s contemporary, Aleksei Leontiev (1978), and later the Scandinavian researcher, Yrjö Engeström (1987), are amongst those who have expanded on this original, first-generation model of CHAT. Leontiev, for instance, stresses object-oriented activity that includes the subject, object, action, and the social and historical context within the activity.

According to this view “the individual could no longer be understood without his or her cultural means; and the society could no longer be understood without the agency of individuals who use and produce artefacts” (Engeström, 2001, p.134). The social and communal elements of the system are stressed over the purely individual, and the addition of these elements, results in the more complex representation shown in Figure 3.3.
The object here is circled to indicate that “object-oriented actions are always, explicitly or implicitly, characterized by ambiguity, surprise, interpretation, sense-making and potential for change” (Engeström, 2001, p. 134).

The top-half of this new structure, incorporating tools, subject, object and outcome remains essentially the same as that outlined in first-generation theory (Figure 3.2). The lower-half of the structure, now incorporates the added elements of rules, community and division of labour. These additional components mediate between other aspects of the structure. The rules, which mediate between the subject and community, are the “explicit and implicit norms and conventions governing social interaction” (Westberry, 2009). In a Japanese language-learning context they may include class rules or cultural conventions which govern teacher-student interactions in the classroom. In turn the community, represented by individuals and groups who interact with the subject and object of the activity, is mediated by the division of labour within the system, that is: “the explicit and implicit organization of a community as related to the transformation process of the object into the outcome” (Issroff & Scanlon, 2002, p. 78).
The mediational means (tools) of first-generation theory is replaced by the new terminology, mediating artefact and the definition expanded somewhat. Whereas physical tools mediate outside the subject, symbolic or inwardly oriented tools mediate the internal thought processes. Later, Cole and Engeström (1993, p. 6) mark the differentiation between these as “outwardly oriented” or “inwardly oriented” artefacts. Thus “outwardly oriented” (a physical tool such as a dictionary) or “inwardly oriented” (language or loanword knowledge) (Cole & Engeström, 1993, p. 6) tools become the mediating artefacts of second, and third-generation theory. This differentiation allows loanwords to be viewed in relation to the language into which they are absorbed, and also helps explain how they impact on that language and in turn are impacted by it, phonologically, grammatically and semantically.

What Engeström sees as the main limitation of the first-generation model, “that the unit of analysis remained individually focused” (2001, p. 134), is overcome by these additions, as illustrated by Leontiev’s dramatisation of the “primeval collective hunt” (Leontiev, 1981, p. 210-213). Whereas in the earlier Vygotskyian model the hunter was working alone with the help of his tools, he now becomes part of a collective, a community, subject to the rules of that community and, working within that in an ascribed role, to achieve a mutually desired outcome. In Leontiev’s example, this collectivity helps create the distinction between operation, action, and activity, where “the uppermost level of collective activity is driven by an object-related motive; the middle level of individual (or group) action is driven by a conscious goal; and the bottom level of automatic operations is driven by the conditions and tools of the action at hand” (Engeström, 1987, p. 78).

The activity, the search for food, is carried out by a group of hunters. There are numerous actions that are performed to achieve the outcome. Some hunters may
lie in wait, armed with bows; others may beat drums to startle prey or lead it in the direction of these other hunters. These are construed as actions. While not all actions, in and of themselves, might seem to be associated with the activity in question (for example, the beating of drums and the search for food), when seen as part of a wider collection of actions, their role becomes obvious. Operations, such as lying in ambush, or beating the drums are also transformed by conditions, such as the terrain in which the hunt is taking place, or the type of drum that is being used.

Leontiev (1981) takes the above examples to illustrate his theories. For this study, the framework allows us to draw similar analogies in an educational context. Here, the activity or object is the search for improved English competence in Japanese learners through the harnessing of loanwords. This activity involves examining parts of word-blending (wasei eigo), mixing, back-clipping, and integrating of parts of a word or compounds. Within this activity system there are students and teachers, the subjects, performing different actions, and using a variety of tools (loanword dictionaries, classroom materials) to achieve the desired outcome. In turn, these subjects are subject to various linguistic, cultural, or institutional rules and form various communities of learners, teachers, or combinations of those within the classroom. Through object-oriented, mediated activity, there are divisions of labour required of subjects. For teachers, that may involve articulating learning strategies and setting tasks; for students, participating in classroom activities and completing assigned tasks.

Ilyenkov (1977, 1982) further emphasised the inter-connectedness of this activity system (see Figure 3.3) by stressing the importance of the interactions between these elements. Note that all of the elements: tools; rules; division of labour etc. impact on the object and eventual outcome, and in turn evolve and are
transformed by it. They also impact on each other, an interconnectedness that can lead to tension and conflict within a system of activity. This idea of conflict and contradiction as dynamic forces within activity systems, and the focus on group actions over the purely individual, are the most important developments of second-generation theory (Engeström, 2001).

One initial source of concern about the second-generation model, is the possibility that the objectives of subjects within one system in this context may differ significantly. In the first generation of the theory, as illustrated through Leontiev’s depiction of the primeval collective hunt, although the roles undertaken by subjects may differ, the objective remains a collective one. This may not always be the case in a classroom setting, where a variety of internal and external motivations may lead to a range of differing, and sometimes conflicting or even contradictory, objectives. In terms of language learning, these concepts shift the focus away from an individual learner to a community of learners, most typically embodied by a physical classroom. These differences were exacerbated in the context of this study, because the setting in which students were observed was a compulsory language course. While for some students the object was to learn the language, for others simply doing the minimum required to pass the course was the sole objective.

Conflict may be apparent not only in terms of the objectives and outcomes of activity, but also within the system itself. A subject or sub-group of subjects may be in conflict with the division of labour, or community, or rules of the system. Tensions between teachers and students, particularly regarding divisions of labour, and the expectations of each emerged in this study. CHAT is useful in understanding how these conflicts may occur, and how they impact on other aspects of a particular system. Introducing a new mediating artefact, such as English loanword language as
a means to enhance English language learning for example, will directly impact the community and subjects of the system, and indirectly, every other aspect. How this conflict and development manifested itself became apparent through the process of data collection and analysis.

The limitations of this second-generation of CHAT for the current research lie in the inherent multiplicity of activities within loanword usage, and language learning in a university context in Japan. By definition, loanwords relate to two different languages - two symbolic tools. Similarly, a teacher-led classroom, particularly in an EFL learning environment, may often involve social interactions between a teacher and student who do not share a common language or cultural heritage. The existence of an English language centre within a Japanese university, with perhaps a very different educational philosophy and objective, may present similar difficulties. These instances point to challenges which can only be understood in terms of interacting activity systems and the “questions of diversity and dialogue between different traditions or perspectives” (Engeström, 2001, p. 135) which arise when they meet. Kuuti’s observation (1996) that “activities are not isolated units but…are influenced by other activities and other changes in their environment” (p. 34) encapsulates this limitation of second-generation theory, which led to further expansions on the theory. These relationships are explained by third generation CHAT.

3.2.3 Third-generation activity theory. The main difference between third-generation activity theory and earlier models is the conceptualisation of two, or more, systems interacting with each other to create new objects and outcomes.

Central to this new conceptualisation is the idea that within an activity system, or between interacting systems, “tensions, disturbances, and local
innovations are the rule and the engine of change” (Cole & Engeström, 1993, p. 8). These tensions may be apparent within one aspect of the system, such as the tension between a subject and the rules with which s/he is expected to conform, or indeed between two or more different activity systems. In terms of teacher feedback and error correction these tensions and disturbances played out in this study in all cases.

Figure 3.4 reveals how this expanded unit of analysis can be envisaged. Essentially, we can still see the first-generation CHAT model in the top-half of each of the triangular structures, and the second-generation in either full triangular structure on the left or right of the figure. Here, the main point of difference is in the specific objects of two, or more, activity systems coalescing to achieve secondary (Object 2) and tertiary objects (Object 3). This adds a new layer of complexity to earlier models.

Figure 3.4: Two Interacting Activity Systems (adapted from Engeström, 2001, p. 136).

In this model, with two triangles as mirror images, the primary object of an individual system, Object 1, becomes a secondary object, Object 2, through dialogue with a separate, but inter-connected system. This expansion approaches both objects
and outcome in a partial overlap. “In this crossborder object ‘exchange,’ a new Object 3 appears that gives rise to a ‘seed of transformation’. In other words, the newly-appeared ‘third object’ gives rise to a driving force for the transformation of the original activity system by feedback to the respective activity systems” (Yamazumi, 2007, p. 26). In this way, the third-generation of CHAT provides the ability to “focus research efforts on the challenges and possibilities of inter-organizational learning” (Engeström, 2001, p. 133), or indeed inter-system learning.

In some cases, the primary object of two activity systems may be the same.

![Diagram of Health Center and Children's Hospital](image)

*Figure 3.5: Contradictions in children’s health care in the Helsinki area* (Engeström, 2001, p.145).

Here the single object of both the Health Center and the Children’s Hospital is moving children between primary care and hospital. Within this system of joint activity, tensions and contradictions arise not from divergent objects but from other aspects of the system; specifically the rules of cost-effective care that may mediate
the shared object. In this case, the patient’s family is viewed as part of a separate system. However, Engeström also makes it clear (2004, p. 8) that the patient’s family could be viewed as part of a system of three intersecting and interacting activity systems. In the case of the patient’s family, the object, which differs from the shared object of the medical institutions, is to care for a chronically ill child with multiple problems. Contradictions between interacting systems may also arise when their objects to do not completely overlap.

Furthermore, individual systems may exhibit complex and multifaceted objects.

*Figure 3.6: The interdependent activity systems of homecare and its client* (Engeström & Sannino, 2010, p. 6).

Figure 3.6 depicts the subject of a home care worker, whose object is oriented at home care, a list of routine tasks to be completed during a home visit, and the maintenance of life of the patient. The objects of activity of the subject of the intersecting system, an old person, are the maintenance of a dignified life, to counteract threats such as loneliness and reduced physical capacity, and to effectively manage their own resources. These objects are the source of some tension that through an expansive learning process can lead to the generation of a partially shared object, or objects. In this instance, these objects are the execution of standard chores, activation of the client’s resources, and co-ordination of services.
Therefore, in relation to this study, we can envisage one system as encompassing English language teaching in Japan, and a second encompassing the Japanese language, including the use of English loanwords in the Japanese lexicon. The first system involves the community of Japanese language speakers as a whole and the part that English loanwords play in that language, and is characterised by rules of phonology and morphology through which loanwords are included in the language, and the functions that they perform. The second system involves the community of English language teachers and learners in Japan, a system that has generally employed tools of mediation as in the approaches to language teaching outlined in Chapter Two. Drawing on Daulton’s research (2008), these two systems can be perceived as currently interacting only on a superficial level. By studying the two activity systems it was possible to examine how teachers and students approached the social, cultural, resources of language present in the first activity system. This study observed how teachers approached activities and whether the inclusion of loanwords within these was intended as a meaningful tool or occurred coincidentally.

Through dialogue, the primary concerns of these two systems and the contradictions apparent between them are transformed into secondary objectives involving compromise and necessitating change. This collective effort eventually forms a tertiary objective, via the process of “expansive transformation” (Engeström, 2001, p. 137) when “the object and motive of the activity are reconceptualised to embrace a wider horizon of possibilities than in the previous mode of activity” (Engeström, 2001, p. 137).

Cole (2006) theorised that activity is constituted of multiple activities and cultures and that interactions between these lead to new activities. Vital to an
understanding of third-generation CHAT is this centrality of networks of activities that occur within an activity system and the stresses and tensions which occur through these interactions, and in turn, transform the original systems. The following paragraphs discuss how tensions, disturbances and contradictions are viewed within CHAT.

As noted above a central concept of activity theory is the notions of tensions and contradictions that result within an activity or as a result of interactions between various stakeholders. According to Engeström (2001), these tensions and contradictions are sites that promote dialectical transformation. The concept of contradiction is central to CHAT, however, there has not been adequate focus on it and as Engeström and Sannino (2011, p. 368) state, there is a danger of contradiction being interpreted as a “fashionable catchword” that has little theoretical significance. As Engeström (2005) notes, an activity system is a "disturbance and innovation-producing machine" (p. 95) and “contradictions generate disturbances and conflicts, but also innovative attempts to change the activity” (p. 95). Within an activity system there are constant changes which lead to tensions and contradictions that then demand resolutions. These resolutions are ongoing, as new outcomes result and new contradictions emerge when “two messages or commands…deny each other” (Engeström, 1987, p. 174).

The significance of contradictions lies in their ability to bring about change and through it progress, development, and a change in direction (Engeström, 2001). As Engeström, (2001) states:

As the contradictions of an activity system are aggravated, some individual
participants begin to question and deviate from its established norms. In some cases, this escalates into collaborative envisioning and a deliberate collective change effort. An expansive transformation is accomplished when the object and motive of the activity are reconceptualized to embrace a radically wider horizon of possibilities than in the previous mode of the activity. (p. 137)

There are four types of contradictions noted by Engeström and Sannino (2011). These are dilemmas, conflicts, critical conflicts, and double binds. Dilemmas are an “expression or exchange of incompatible evaluations” (p. 373). These could occur within the discourse of the person or between interactions. In this study dilemma was constantly present for teachers as they attempted to meet the demands of the curriculum, and institutional policy, and to teach effectively. Conflicts are often present through “negation, denial or rejection expressed with a ‘no’ and can be terminated through submission, third party intervention, compromise, stand-off and withdrawal” (Engeström & Sannino, 2011, p. 374). In this study conflicts were often present through denial of a teaching approach, and were solved through compromise and submission to the traditional system of language learning. Critical conflicts are situations that raise “inner doubts” in individuals and for which resolution takes place through “negotiating a new meaning for the initial situation” (p. 374). In this study, teachers who faced such inner doubts negotiated new approaches in their teaching. Double binds are “processes in which actors …face …unacceptable alternatives in their activity system” (p. 374). The language learning programs offered at the university placed teachers in a double bind, and individual measures were often not successful in solving the issue of implementing an effective language learning program. The double bind requires a collective action, here, a collective
action by all teachers towards incorporating a socio-cultural approach to language teaching.

However, as authors (Engeström, 1993; 2001; Murphy & Rodriguez-Manzanares, 2008; Nelson, 2002) argue, contradictions need not lead to change, positive transformations, or even be visible and readily accepted as being present within a system by stakeholders. In this study, for example contradictions, while indicating meaningful changes, were often not noted or considered visible enough to be handled.

In this study, teachers focusing on materials beyond the routine teaching program would be constituted as creating an imbalance or disturbance. Secondary contradictions would include the belief that loanwords are useful for learning English, but also the perception that they are part of the popular culture, hence little emphasis is placed on providing support in a formal learning context. A third level of disturbance occurs when through trial and error or through adopting a range of teaching practices, a new model of activity is produced. A further contradiction could arise when the new model of learning language might be different to the traditional modes of teaching practiced within an institution, thereby reducing the new activity to a radical approach that contradicts previous teaching. Such a perception could lead to the disturbances to be easily overlooked, as often occurred in the teaching sessions that were observed.

3.3 Applications of CHAT

By adopting CHAT as an approach it is possible to focus on particular individuals or social groups, or societies. It is also possible to focus on particular tools or means used by those subjects. Specific outcomes can be researched by focusing on the inter-relationship between these. To come to any meaningful
conclusions, it is necessary to be able to observe each aspect of the system independently, but also in terms of its interconnectivity with other nodes in the hierarchy. Engestrom’s model of third-generation activity theory (2001, p.136) provides a visual representation of this interconnectivity. The lens through which these aspects are viewed must be able to magnify or reduce these images; to see them as independent, or part of a greater whole. Finally, the tensions created by these relationships can be examined to reveal inter-activity objects. This understanding was applied within this study to illustrate how the application of CHAT, along with SCT, could be employed as an overarching theory.

3.3.1 Activity theory in research. In an educational context, numerous researchers have examined CHAT (Gillette, 1994; Issroff & Scanlon, 2002; Yamagata-Lynch, 2003), and used it to perceive language learning in different ways. The theory has been used to conceptualise learning in educational settings, with Cole’s (2006) 5th Dimension project being an important example of how the theory can be used to re-design learning programs, while Lantolf and Thorne (2006) have examined the importance of language-mediated communication in second language acquisition.

Researchers have applied the theory in second language learning to examine a wide range of themes. Kim (2001) examines second language Motivational Self-System through the CHAT framework. McCaffery, Roebuck and Wayland (2001) apply CHAT to examine vocabulary acquisition. Behrend (2014) applies CHAT to examine the complexities of academic activities, in particular writing assignments, while Gibbes (2014) applies it to reflect on project-based language learning noting how there were contradictions in the activity system along with inequitable divisions of labour. Feryok (2009) examines teacher learning and development using the AT
lens. However, there are no studies that have examined CHAT and language learning in Japan.

Jones, Dirckinck-Holmfeld, and Lindström (2006) in their review of issues relating specifically to computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) activities, mention three different levels of activity sets - the micro, the meso, and the macro. In particular, they focus on the affordances of a meso-level approach to design which can reveal connections between the micro and macro levels of activity. They define meso-level activity as that which “could be thought of as a level that was intermediate between small-scale, local interaction (micro-level activity) and large-scale policy and institutional processes (macro-level activity)” (p. 37, my italics).

Applying their research to this study, levels of activity would provide a link between individuals or small groups of students (the micro), with the institution (the meso) and policy-making boards such as the Ministry of Education (the macro).

3.3.2 Analysing loanword mediation through activity theory. To date, most of the research that has focussed on loanword mediation has viewed these words simply as linguistic phenomena. Teacher/researchers such as Yoshida (1978), Brown and Williams (1985), and Daulton (2003a/b) have all looked at these words as mediational means, without explicitly referring to them as such. Researchers such as Simon-Maeda (1995), Sheperd (1995), and Daulton (2008) have also explored the social and cultural nature of the phenomenon. However, to date, no study has examined loanword mediation from the perspective of CHAT and explored the possibilities and tensions which this involves.

Adopting Engeström’s model for this research, the two activity systems that appear in the title of this study: a) English loanwords and b) the teaching of English in Japan, occur as follows.
Activity System A: The Loanword Phenomenon

The subjects of this activity system are Japanese language speakers. From this viewpoint, loanwords are simply one aspect of the Japanese lexicon used in everyday speech between Japanese speakers. The primary object of the system, communicative competence, is revealed by the functions that English loanwords perform in Japanese. Predominantly, these words fill a lexical gap by describing an object or idea that is new to the Japanese consciousness or that diverges from the Japanese definition of an object or idea in some way. Secondary objects include the special effects and euphemisms that loanwords provide. Although these words have an English origin, their use, or the activity towards which they are directed, is not concerned with communicating with English speakers, or with speaking English. The basic purpose of incorporating these words into the Japanese language is to provide a broader means of communication between Japanese speakers.

Within this system, loanwords are the tools that mediate the object. The subjects within this system, the community of Japanese language speakers, generally share a similar objective; to communicate more effectively with each other in a way that can adequately explain the changing face of Japanese society and the world at large. However, some groups within the wider community, such as the elderly and the less educated or literate, may be marginalised or constrained by this activity. In some cases, the adoption of loanwords into a particular lexical sphere may even specifically attempt to exclude members of the wider community, typified in Japan by teenage use of English slang that is unintelligible to authority figures such as teachers and parents.
The divisions of labour within the system involve the roles that members of the Japanese language-speaking community play in incorporating and using English loanwords in Japanese discourse. As discussed earlier, academics, members of particular social and cultural groups, and the popular press, play a significant role in introducing and transforming English loanwords into Japanese. These roles also involve demarcations of power and status that can cause conflict within the system. Often these demarcations occur unintentionally; occasionally they are overt attempts to define membership of a particular social group, or to exclude and marginalise some part of the community. Finally, there are explicit rules that regulate the incorporation of English loanwords into Japanese. These were outlined in Chapter Two, and include the phonological and morphological changes that loanwords undergo. There are also implicit rules that regulate when and to whom these words are used.

When visualising this activity system it is important to remember that it exists almost completely independently of English language education in Japan, or, once the initial borrowing has occurred, from the English language itself. This is a system moulded by the community of Japanese language speakers: a system made in Japan to fulfil Japanese language objectives.

The contradictions within this system emerge primarily through the differing beliefs and experiences of individuals within the community, and through certain social groups who question the effects of the pervasiveness of English loanwords on modern Japanese both culturally and linguistically. As discussed previously, this source of conflict has existed from the earliest stages of English/Japanese language contact, and is likely to continue. How these contradictions manifest themselves
amongst the current generation of Japanese university students became clearer throughout the course of this study.

**Activity System B: Teaching English in Japan**

The *subjects* of this system are the teachers and students of English in Japan. Ostensibly, the *object* of the system is to enhance English language acquisition, although for some students, and perhaps teachers, more prosaic objectives such as the fulfilment of course requirements, teaching obligations, or test specifications have also been fundamentally important.

To date, the *tools* that have mediated these objects have been the teaching and learning approaches to English education in Japan, typified by the grammar-translation approach to language learning. This study examined if the introduction of a relatively new tool of mediation, English loanwords in Japanese, could transform the system as a whole, or lead to transformation in some part of that system.

The *divisions of labour* within the system are initially quite clear, involving the teachers, including curriculum and materials developers, and students. The divisions of status within this aspect of the system are less obvious. The introduction of a tool with which students are more likely to have facility, Japanese words adapted from English, and with which some teachers may have very little knowledge, is likely to disrupt this. It is possible that Japanese-speaking students are better positioned to discover how loanwords may be used to enhance English acquisition, and that teachers may be used in this capacity more as facilitators than in their traditional role as imparters of knowledge. The *rules* that regulate the actions in this system are complex. They incorporate the traditional teaching and learning approaches to English language in Japan, the implicit norms of student/student and
student/teacher interaction that exist within the Japanese education system, and the
expectations of Japanese students and Japanese/non-Japanese teachers who
participate in the system.

3.3.3 Relevance of Engeström’s model. This study examined whether
transformations occur within either of these systems when English loanwords are
introduced as a tool of mediation in the teaching of English in Japan (Activity
System B). It also examined the tensions and transformations that result from this.
The third-generation CHAT model provides a way of comprehending how language
teaching and learning occurs in this context.

Engeström (2001) summarises this model, by outlining five fundamental
principles, which are present in this study as follows:

1) The essential unit of analysis is a network of two or more
interacting activity systems, each of which is mediated by
artefacts and focused on a primary object. In this study the
primary objective is to understand how English language
learning in Japan might be enhanced through loanword
mediation. It considers two interactive systems, A and B, as
outlined.

2) Activity systems are multi-voiced. They consider the positions
and interests of a variety of individuals and communities. This
characteristic leads to conflict and change through negotiation.
In this study, this conflict may arise by the introduction of a
relatively underused tool of mediation.

3) Activity systems display historicity, as they change over time
and can only be understood by examining the local and broader
issues that have shaped them. The introduction of loanwords into Japanese language, as well as the teaching approach to English teaching in Japan, displays this characteristic, as subjects’ own experiences and beliefs impact on their actions.

4) Contradictions are the primary source of change and development of activity systems. The adoption of a new mediating artefact, such as loanword knowledge in a language learning context, leads to conflict with other aspects of the system, and may lead to innovations.

5) Activity systems hold the possibility of expansive transformation, in which the initial object of the activity is reformulated, through the appearance of contradictions leading to “a collective journey through the zone of proximal development” (p. 137). In this study expansive cycles of learning are outlined in Table 3.1.

Engeström (2001) incorporated these principles to investigate the Finnish healthcare system, to seek ways of understanding the different objectives of stakeholders within that system (politicians, healthcare professionals, patients), and transforming the practices within that. A similar framework can be used to examine the tensions and contradictions apparent in a language learning context, when allied with Engeström’s four key questions for learning theorists,

(1) Who are the subjects of learning, how are they defined and located?

(2) Why do they learn, what makes them make the effort?

(3) What do they learn, what are the contents and outcomes of learning?
(4) How do they learn, what are the key actions or processes of learning?

(Engeström, 2001, p. 133)

Engeström (2008) incorporates these ideas into a matrix for the analysis of expansive learning outlined here.

Table 3.1. Matrix for the Analysis of Expansive Learning (adapted from Engeström, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who are learning?</th>
<th>Activity system as unit of analysis</th>
<th>Multi-voicedness</th>
<th>Historicity</th>
<th>Contradictions</th>
<th>Expansive cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interconnected activity systems, Japanese learners of English, teachers of English to Japanese students</td>
<td>Voices of Japanese learners of English, teachers of English to Japanese learners</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ exposure to L1 and L2 Change over time</td>
<td>Previously learnt, and new, approaches to language learning. New affordances and constraints</td>
<td>Affordances and constraints leading to new modes of learning or reaffirmation of previous modes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do they learn?</th>
<th>Multi-voicedness</th>
<th>Historicity</th>
<th>Contradictions</th>
<th>Expansive cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging pressures of an under-performing English-education system</td>
<td>Contradictions between new object and available tools and rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do they learn?</th>
<th>Multi-voicedness</th>
<th>Historicity</th>
<th>Contradictions</th>
<th>Expansive cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new pattern of activity, how to utilise English loanwords in Japanese to enhance English</td>
<td>Existence of any correlation between English loanwords in Japanese and their origins, and ways to use these</td>
<td>Struggle between old/new concepts of approaches to English language</td>
<td>Expansion of the object Enhanced use of loanwords and English language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do they learn?</th>
<th>Multi-voicedness</th>
<th>Historicity</th>
<th>Contradictions</th>
<th>Expansive cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue between students/teachers, students and their peers, access to non-human MKOs</td>
<td>Contradictions lead to realignment of learning approaches</td>
<td>Learning actions from questioning to analysis, modelling, examining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopting Engeström’s model, these principles of expansive learning point to the complex nature of activity systems and the corresponding contradictions in the cycle of language learning. These contradictions could be envisaged as follows:
primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary contradictions involved in the expansive learning process, prior to reaching the objective of consolidation of new forms.

The principle of contradictions as a transformative force within activity systems is central to Engeström’s educational philosophy (Engeström, 2008), and is evident in Activity System B: The teaching of English in Japan. The subjects of the system, and the objects towards which they direct their activity, are likely to face cultural and philosophical conflict in terms of teaching/learning styles and expectations. The addition of loanwords as a tool of mediation in this system is also likely to cause conflict, as it deviates from normal practice and may upset the power/status relationships between the subjects. In turn, this has the potential to result in contradictions in terms of explicit and implicit rules of activity and the division of labour within the system.

As noted earlier, although Engeström focuses on the potential for contradictions such as these to transform activity, he does not assume that it will always occur (Engeström, 2008), or that if it does, it will necessarily have a positive transformative effect. A positive transformative effect is dependent on whether or not contradictions can be recognised and resolved.

Examining contradictions can enable language teachers to locate problems in language learning. Thinking through contradictions becomes significant as these then provide new resources and artefacts as well as show how the labour and its divisions are reformulated. Through the activity system the contradictions that arise internally can be attended to leading to a more productive system.

CHAT is well suited to this research. It assists in examining how learners engage in learning drawing on their social and cultural practices and how mediational tools, such as loanwords or the lack of use of loanwords, influence the
activity of language learning. As Cross (2009, p. 27) notes, “the cultural-historical level of analysis is …concerned with how tools and other mediatory artefacts have come to ‘landscape’ the broader sociocultural domain for human activity”. Further, CHAT, as Wilson (2014) notes, focuses on the “collective social practices” (original emphasis, p. 20) and explains how activities are situated within complex relationships, mediating artefacts and behaviours (Wilson, 2014). As Engeström (2001) observes, the ongoing process of activity which brings about change also leads to expansive learning as well as contradictions. The contradictions are a significant aspect in this study as these reaffirm the challenges and constraints that were faced. However, contradictions are also sites for learning (Avis, 2009) and as demonstrated in Chapter 7, could be a base to develop language learning moments. Drawing on all these aspects, CHAT became the most suited theoretical framework for analysis in this study.

3.4 Summary

This chapter outlined CHAT, its evolving status through three generations, and its applications to this study. It has explored how inquiry, based on the socio-cultural aspects of learning a language through examining loanwords, can occur by engaging in expansive learning. In the study, the possibility of enhancing English language acquisition is examined through teaching strategies that focus on specific aspects of loanword functions and forms, with mediation as the impetus behind language acquisition. CHAT provides a lens through which to view relationships between individuals and communities, the rules and objectives that constrain and drive them, and the contradictions and tensions that can result through these complex interactions. Given this analytical lens, the theory is well suited to explore the relationship between teachers and learners of English in Japan, the social and cultural
influences on these relationships, and the tensions caused by the use of innovative tools, such as loanwords. The methodological implications of this are examined in Chapter Four.
Chapter 4: Research Design

This chapter provides an explanation of the research design for the study. It outlines the methodological implications of CHAT, the rationale for case study as a method of analysis, the assumptions underlying that decision, and the impact this decision had on the outcome of the research. The chapter also provides a description of the research site, research participants, data collection methods, modes of analysis, and ethical considerations.

This study aimed to understand the phenomenon of English loanwords within the modern Japanese language, and the pedagogical approach to the use of loanwords as tools for the teaching of English in Japan. As an approach to research “that facilitates exploration of a phenomenon within its context” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 544), and supports the use of a variety of data sources to achieve this, case study seems well suited to the task. By providing multiple perspectives on a phenomenon in context this approach has been used to answer the main research question: How do English loanwords contribute to English language teaching in Japan? and the sub-questions for this study: How do Japanese university students perceive and use English loanwords? Why?; How do teachers of English perceive and use loanwords in teaching English to Japanese university students? Why?; and What is the potential of loanwords to enhance English language teaching in Japan?

First, the methodology and methodological implications are outlined, as well as a description of the research site, participants, and data collection methods. This is followed by a section on data analysis and validity. The chapter concludes with a discussion of ethical processes and considerations.
4.1 Case study methodology

Case study is a form of inquiry that lends itself to descriptive analysis of the features and processes of a phenomenon. It relies on various sources of information and avenues of inquiry to add richness and scope to the data being collected. Research into case study design has been heavily influenced by the work of two researchers, Robert Yin (1988), and Robert Stake (1995) who approach case study from slightly different perspectives. Yin (2003) describes case study as the investigation of “a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context” (p. 14), while Stake (2003) understands it as less a “methodological choice, but a choice of what is to be studied. By whatever methods…” (p. 134). According to Brown (2008, p. 79), “the perspectives of these foundational writers are in agreement on the fundamentals of case study”, but “there is little consensus on what constitutes a case study or how this type of research is done” (Merriam, 1998, p. 26). Case study researchers have tended to place themselves within the Stake “camp” or the Yin “camp”, although some such as Merriam, a researcher in the field of higher education, also offer a practical understanding of case study strategy from a primarily qualitative perspective, which she terms “descriptive case study” (1998, p. 50), that attempts to strike a balance between the two.

Stake (1995) has viewed case study from a more interpretative perspective, in which the studies are “epistemologically in harmony with the reader’s experience and thus to that person a natural basis for generalization” (Stake, 2000a, p. 20). Such a view accentuates the importance of personal perspective in the interpretation and analysis of data, and could be termed a constructivist position, in which not only “commonplace description” but “thick description” (Stake, 1995, p. 102) of situations are important. Drawing on Geertz’s work (1973), for Stake (2010) such
thick description requires “direct connection to cultural theory and scientific
knowledge” (p. 49). Depicted as the philosophical counterpoint to Stake, Yin focuses
on a very systematic approach to case study design, which accentuates careful
attention to each stage of the research that is both “substantive and methodological”
(Platt, 1992, p. 46).

The research of Stake and Yin encompasses more than two decades of work,
and their philosophical standpoints have undergone revisions during that time. Stake
(2008) for example has affirmed the possibility of using both qualitative and
quantitative research methods within case study, and Yin (2005), while he has
remained consistent in his more scientific approach to research design and
documentation, admits that case studies “provide both descriptive richness and
analytic insight into people, events, and passions as played out in real-life
environments” (p. xiv) and has acknowledged the possibilities provided by more
interpretative methods of analysis.

Perhaps the number of diverse fields in which case study has been employed,
and the flexible use of data collection and methods of analysis, may explain these
points of differentiation. These fields include sociology (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg,
1991), social work (Gilgun, 1994), education (Simons, 1996), medicine (Mitchell,
2000), and law enforcement (Hatch, 2002). As Heck (2006, p. 373) notes however, it
is the “appropriate application of an approach…rather than the approach itself”
which is of most importance, and a “coherent argument for inclusion of varying
research methods” (Luck, Jackson & Usher 2006, p. 107) rather than the methods
themselves which contributes to the success or failure of an approach. Brown also
outlines the opportunity for “a new paradigm of choices” (Brown, 2008, p. 9) which
acknowledges the benefits of both approaches and the possibility of incorporating
elements of both within case studies, while Bennett and Elman (2006, p. 474) stress the possibilities of “a new phase in social science methodology” which admits the “complementarity of alternative methods”.

For the purposes of this study which examined the significance of English loanwords in terms of English language teaching and learning in Japan, an holistic methodology, typified by the “thick description” of Stake’s approach (2003, p. 140) seemed appropriate. To allow the phenomenon of English loanwords to be examined in greater depth, multiple cases were selected for this study, as “the intent [was] to gain insight and understanding of a particular situation or phenomenon” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 550). Stake also recommends this approach, which he refers to as collective case study (2003). Other terms for the approach include cross-case studies, comparative case studies, multiple case studies, and contrasting cases (Merriam, 1998). The fundamental element of collective case study is that it involves more than one case “in order to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition” (Stake, 2000b, p. 437). For Yin, incorporating multiple cases provides a more “compelling” and “robust” study (2003, p. 46).

Data collection techniques for case study may also vary, depending on the issues being addressed. For example, transcripts from classroom interactions (e.g., Barab et al., 2002); individual interviews (e.g., Peruski, 2003); observations (e.g., Fahraeus, 2004); surveys (e.g., Dippe, 2006); and group interviews (e.g., Basharina, 2007), have all been used in this study to obtain detailed information about social, cultural, and linguistic aspects of certain phenomena. In line with Merriam (1998) this study relied primarily on qualitative data collection methods, supported by some quantitative data, to achieve scope and richness of description. This approach helped
to support the validity of the study, and also allowed a broader and deeper analysis of the loanword phenomenon and the teaching of English in Japan.

4.2 Methodological implications

The decision to undertake a case study approach was based on the literature review and theoretical framework. The literature review focussed on two main areas; English loanword usage in Japanese, and the socio-cultural approach to teaching language. To explore the complexity of these areas required an approach that allowed provision for surveys, interviews, and the study of teaching practice through observations.

A case study methodology was also well-suited to the theoretical framework adopted for this study. With the understanding that CHAT is “primarily a descriptive tool rather than a prescriptive theory” (Jonassen, 2000, p. 110), there are several methodological implications for using the theory within this study. CHAT focuses on whole systems of activity, rather than looking at individuals in isolation, and attempts to understand individuals within the activity systems in which they are involved. Firstly, the need to examine systems of activity in real-world situations requires methods and techniques which enable us to describe and understand those situations over a period of time. Barab et al. (2002) refer to the value of CHAT in gaining insights into the dynamics of the activity system of a course, rather than examining its components in isolation.

Researchers have noted the compatibility of case study to examine activity systems, including either single case studies (Hardman, 2005) or multiple case study designs (Russell & Schneiderheinze, 2005). These studies have varied in length, from a number of years (e.g., Barab et al., 2002), to one semester or one course (e.g. Fahraeus, 2004; Berge & Fjuk, 2006). The number of participants may differ
markedly, although Stake (1995) argues that four cases should be a minimum requirement for multiple case studies, as fewer than this limits the ability of the researcher to draw conclusions based on complex phenomena. For this reason, four cases were developed in this study.

Although research within a CHAT framework has traditionally relied more on qualitative data collection techniques to provide “thick description” (Stake, 2003, p. 140), quantitative methods have also been used. For example, Dippe’s (2006) study of contradictions used both quantitative and qualitative methods to analyse a distance education program for teachers. Reflecting that diversity, this study also incorporated a variety of methods to explore the complexities of the cases.

4.3 Research site

This research took place at a language institute, officially titled an International Learning Center, within a private university in Japan where the researcher is employed. The university is primarily science-focused, and is comprised of five faculties: Pharmaceutical Sciences; Engineering; Computer Information Systems; Fine Art; Biotechnology and Life Science. While the learning center does not function as a discrete faculty, it does deliver compulsory English courses to all first and second-year students, elective academic English courses to third and fourth-year students and graduates, TOEIC courses, and classes for Japanese professors and staff.

The learning center, established in 2010, incorporates classroom teaching, self-access learning, and computer-mediated learning to improve students’ communication skills and promote the use of English throughout the university (https://kandaeli.com/2010/09/24/silc/).
Students undertake compulsory English Communication (EC) courses within the center for the first two years of their studies, covering four semesters (EC 1-4). Students are streamed within faculty groups, based on results from the Oxford Online Placement Test (https://www.oxfordenglishtesting.com), a standardised test that measures general English ability. The average English proficiency level of the classes ranges from A1 (beginner) to B2 (upper-intermediate) according to CEFR divisions based on this test. The enrolment for each course is approximately 800 students, currently staffed by 14 lecturers (all non-Japanese nationals with English as L1), three learning advisors (two of whom are Japanese nationals), and three auxiliary staff (all Japanese nationals).

The decision to take this site for study was based both on suitability and logistics. A separate centre within a Japanese university, dedicated to the teaching of English communication, provided a perfect site in which to conduct multiple case studies. The large number of English teachers, and English classes, within the centre also provided scope for selecting participants from a range of backgrounds and with a range of experience. The difficulty in conducting research outside one’s own workplace in Japan also meant that conducting research at the site at which I was working was far simpler in a practical sense.

Nevertheless, I remained keenly aware that working with participants from within the same workplace would present challenges, and that potential conflicts of interest with colleagues and students could arise.

**4.4 Participants**

Four cases were examined for this study, each case being a university class, incorporating one teacher and a group of students. The participants for the study thus fell into two categories, teacher participants and student participants. The four
lecturers who participated in the study reflected a range of nationalities, teaching experience, and Japanese proficiency. The classes also reflected the range of faculties and English proficiency of students within the institute.

I intended to use insider knowledge, as one of three senior lecturers at the learning center, to select participants who reflected a broad range of backgrounds, experience, language proficiency, and pedagogical approaches. I believed such a selection would provide richer data than a more homogenous group of participants. This intended selection was also based on my belief that the Japanese proficiency of lecturers, and the English proficiency of students, would have some bearing on the ability to incorporate English loanwords in Japanese into teaching and learning approaches. I initially sent an email to all teachers within the center, briefly outlining the nature of my study, and seeking expressions of interest to participate in it. I quickly received six replies, four from teachers who were keen to participate fully in the study, and two from teachers who felt able to assist with piloting interviews or classroom observations. I was very fortunate that the range of attributes of these respondents very closely aligned with my initial hopes. Once we had discussed in person the full nature of the study, and the participants had more formally agreed to take part, these initial respondents became the eventual participants. I was fortunate to achieve such a well-balanced group of participants and remain very grateful for their assistance and support.

At the same time I remained aware that apart from Adam and one participant in pilot-interviews (also senior-lecturers at the center) the other participants were more junior colleagues. I made it clear to these teachers that neither their participation in the study, nor their withdrawal from it at any stage, would have any bearing on our professional relationship. I also made sure that every interaction
related to the study was recorded, conducted in a relatively formal way, and that no discussions related to the study were conducted outside this context, either with the participants themselves, or with anyone else.

4.4.1 Teacher participants. To provide a different perspective, I was very keen to include a native Japanese-speaker as one of the teacher participants. Unfortunately, during the period I had set aside for data collection, neither of the Japanese learning advisors within the learning center was teaching a course on campus, and, therefore had to be excluded.

The four teacher participants all held an MA in Applied Linguistics, or related field, as required by MEXT. They were from different countries: Adam (Case One) from the United States; Alice (Case Two) from New Zealand; Emma (Case Three) from the United Kingdom; and Barry (Case Four) from Australia. The teachers had spent between six and twelve years teaching in Japan, primarily at the university level.

The teacher participants ranged in competence, based on the Japanese Proficiency Level Test (JLPT), from JLPT Level 2, defined by the website http://www.jlpt.jp (2013) as “the ability to understand Japanese used in everyday situations, and in a variety of circumstances to a certain degree” to JLPT Level 4, “the ability to understand basic Japanese”. More information on each participant is provided in the following chapter, which examines each case in detail.

Although all teachers were recruited from the same workplace, I expected to find differences in the manner in which they approached language teaching, the manner in which they approached the class activities, and their attitude towards loanwords. Each case was an attempt to comprehend the activity of language teaching. Case study allowed the researcher to observe, describe, and analyse how
teaching occurs in a Japanese language centre. As an insider researcher, the case study was relevant due to the multiple modes it offered for analysis of activity systems. The rich descriptions of each teacher and their activity of teaching assisted in making teaching practice visible in multiple ways.

4.4.2 Student participants. The student participants were drawn from first and second-year students enrolled in classes taught by the teacher participants within the learning center. Total enrolments for 1st and 2nd year students at the university are about 1600. Class numbers range from 20-33 students. Based on demographic information provided by the university, most students are 18-19 years old, and have completed at least 6 years of English study at junior high school and high school. Approximately 70% of the students are male, although individual classes range from 30% -100% males. Once again, more specific information on student participants is provided in the following chapter.

Three percent of the students are non-Japanese and all but one of these is from mainland China. Of the Japanese nationals, more than half are from Kumamoto prefecture, and only 20 students are from prefectures outside Kyushu (which includes Fukuoka, Kagoshima, Nagasaki, Saga, Miyazaki, Oita, as well as Kumamoto prefecture) and Okinawa.

All classes within the institute are streamed, with English the primary language of instruction. According to institutional research, based on the Oxford Online Placement Test taken by all students at the beginning of their first or second year within the institute, proficiency levels within the student population range from A0 to C1 (pre-beginner to advanced) on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) although some
classes exhibited average levels of proficiency at the A1 (beginner) level, other classes at the B1 (intermediate) level.

The student participants were contacted by their own classroom teachers to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study, and availability. They were kept informed of the nature of the research and the commitments involved. Participation information forms were distributed to gain consent before engaging in data collection. The students who were involved in the research process were provided with the anonymous opportunity to indicate non-participation at each stage of the study.

4.5 Data collection methods

Ethical clearance for the study, and data collection, was granted by the QUT Human Ethics Advisory Team in 2014 (Ethics Number: 1400000346), and by the researcher’s university in Japan. The following table outlines the timeline for the data collection.

Table 4.1: Data Collection Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearance granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student survey</td>
<td>Back-translated and amended</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Opened July 3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed July 27th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
<td>2 pilots</td>
<td>4 initial interviews</td>
<td>1 follow-up interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions adapted</td>
<td>3 follow-up interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Questions adapted</td>
<td>All interviews conducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson observations</td>
<td>2 pilots</td>
<td>4x90 minutes</td>
<td>Presentations observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation form adapted</td>
<td></td>
<td>2x90 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.1 Student survey. Although typically qualitative in nature (Dornier, 2007), case studies may often incorporate quantitative data collection instruments (Verschuren, 2003) such as tests, surveys, or questionnaires. The first instrument outlined here, the student survey (Appendix A), is ostensibly a quantitative instrument, and reflects the nature of case study, as not so much a specific technique “but rather a method of collecting and organizing data so as to maximize our understanding of the unitary character of the social being or object studied” (Dornyei, 2007, p. 152).

The survey was based on two instruments, developed specifically for Japanese learners of English, initially conducted in Japanese but also translated into English. The first of these, from Sakui and Gaies (1999), was designed to investigate Japanese junior high-school and high-school learners’ beliefs about language learning. Items based on this instrument included item 3: “In order to learn to read and write English very well, English education at school is enough”, and item 21: “If I learn to speak English very well, it will help me get a good job”. The second instrument on which was survey was based was developed by Daulton (2011), and was designed to investigate Japanese university learners’ beliefs and experiences with loanwords. Items based on this instrument included item 49: “Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English” and item 54: “My high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English”. These two instruments were adapted, and combined, to form one 55-item survey.

The student survey used here was initially peer-checked, by one native English-speaking lecturer and two native Japanese lecturers, to ensure the translation was precise and all items unambiguous. Subsequently the survey was modified and piloted with a class of students not involved with the study, to gauge how long the survey would take to complete, to check for any technical issues that may arise, and
identify any areas of concern for students. Following this pilot, instructions and
definitions of important terms were included in the final version.

The survey was made available to all students within the language institute in
Japanese (Appendix B) and completed by over 95% of them (n=1336). It was
administered to all student participants to help form an understanding of this “unitary
character”, including educational experiences relating to loanwords, attitudes
towards loanword usage, and more general attitudes towards English language
learning.

The survey was delivered using the online Key Survey program, made
available through QUT, and utilised a 4-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree, 2-
disagree, 3-agree, 4-strongly agree). The 4-point scale is often used in Japanese
educational surveys to alleviate problems with large numbers of students electing to
“sit on the fence” (Brown, 2000, p. 1). Students were given time during class to
access the survey through the university’s course management system, and for those
who were absent, the survey remained available on that system from July 3rd to July
27th 2014. Data were collated through statistical applications available on Key
Survey, including simple calculations such as mean and standard deviation, and used
in analysis as descriptive figures. Results were only available to the researcher and
were stored appropriately.

4.5.2 Interviews. Interviews are regularly used in applied linguistic contexts (Block
2000; Richards 2003), primarily “to obtain descriptions of the life world of the
interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena”
(Kvale, 1996, p. 5). The purpose of the interviews was to establish the views of
teachers and students regarding loanwords, and their experiences with them both as
teachers and learners. The interviews also sought to reveal participants’ approaches
to loanwords as socio-cultural phenomena and how they viewed learning as a socio-cultural practice.

Interviews began in June 2014 and continued through August 2014. These were recorded, in all but one case, and stored appropriately. Copies were made available to interviewees for member checking. All other data were available only to the researcher.

**Teacher interviews.** The four teacher-participants in the study took part in multiple interview sessions (two or three, depending on availability), broadly conforming to a semi-structured interview model. That is, there was a set of pre-prepared questions and prompts, although the interviewee was given the freedom to elaborate on responses and move the interview in her desired direction (Dornyei, 2007).

The interviews were spaced throughout the academic semester, so as to allow sufficient time for the interviewer to prepare a more detailed interview guide for subsequent sessions, and for interviewees to consider initial concerns more deeply and to elaborate on them more fully. Although these interviews took place across a period of some months, they were not an attempt to engage in a longitudinal interview study, rather to arrive at a more complete account than would be possible with just a single session. Having finalised ethical issues related to the process, I piloted an initial interview plan to ensure that the questions and process would elicit the richest possible data.

The initial interview sampling plans, which became the primary research instrument after piloting and modification (Appendix C), addressed experiences and attitudes towards loanwords as both teacher (e.g. item 9. How often do you pay explicit attention to loanwords while teaching?) and language learner (e.g. item 4. As
Student interviews. These interviews attempted to expand on and to confirm the data collected during student surveys. It was also hoped that they would provide some background to the type of language-learning taking place in classrooms, specifically with regards the application of loanwords, prior to class observations, as well as providing information on the in-class experiences.

A total of ten students were interviewed. Three students from Case One (Adam’s class) took part in an individual interview, one in English, one in a combination of English and Japanese, one entirely in Japanese. This final interview was not recorded at the request of the interviewee. No students from Case Two (Alice’s class) were willing to be interviewed. Three students from Case Three (Emma’s class) were interviewed individually in English. Four students from Case Four (Barry’s class) were interviewed, in a combination of English and Japanese, as a group, as requested by the students.

The initial interview sampling plan was adapted for the primary research and incorporated questions and prompts (see Appendix D). Many of the questions attempted to address the same constructs as outlined in the student survey in section 4.4.2, (e.g. item 8. Do you think loanwords can be harnessed as a productive resource to promote language learning? And item 9. How often do you use loanwords when speaking Japanese/English?). Many of the questions were similar to those asked of teachers (see Appendix C).

Interviews were translated by the researcher, if required, then transcribed. The raw data were then carefully read through, coded, and categorised. These data
were used to outline each of the cases examined in Chapter 5, as well as the cross-case analysis undertaken in Chapter 6.

4.5.3 Observations. As Stake remarks (1995, p. 62), observations let “the occasion tell its story”. Unlike the previous research methods which primarily investigated knowledge, as well as beliefs, experiences, and attitudes, which are essentially self-reported, observation provided direct information and remains “one of the three basic data sources for empirical research” (Dornyei, 2007, p. 178). Classroom observations served to provide much of the direct information for this study, and provided important data relating to the use of loanwords within a classroom environment, and the applications for using loanwords to enhance language learning.

Although video-taping the observations would have been preferable, institutional requirements, which include the permission of all students to engage in classroom recording, made this difficult. Consequently, the observations were audio-recorded and the sessions required extensive field notes and the use of an observation scheme. An initial pilot observation was conducted to assess the adequacy of the observation form (see Appendix E), as well as to test audio recording equipment. Revisions were made to the observation form (see Appendix F) based on this pilot and trialled during a second pilot observation. The revised form was a significant simplification of the original version, due to the lack of time available during an observation to complete a transcript of teacher talk during the observation, or fill out AT and Pedagogy codes for instances of loanword use. The revised form relied heavily on recording the time of an important interaction, with space for noting the context of a loanword’s use if time allowed. Ultimately, observation forms were generally completed after the observation, with reference to the audio recording.
Each class was observed for at least one 90-minute lesson following the initial lecturer interview. Lessons which involved minimum student-student or student-teacher interaction, such as testing, silent reading, or timed-writing, were unlikely to provide sufficient suitable data, so careful liaising with teacher-participants was required to ensure that observation lessons were more likely to provide potentially rich data.

Observations were conducted in August 2014. Field notes and recordings were stored appropriately. Observation notes were shared with participants as requested.

4.6 Data analysis

Data analysis for this study was a lengthy process, in which data collection, categorisation, analysis, and reviews of relevant literature were often occurring simultaneously. Simons (2009) refers to two aspects of analysis: “data sets that can be categorized, ordered and examined for connections, patterns and propositions that seek to explain the data”; and a researcher’s “intuitive grasp of the data and the insights they reveal” (p. 117). In a similar way, Punch, (2005, p. 48) notes the importance of “the link…from data to concepts”. These interconnected processes of analysis and interpretation, and re-analysis were central to this research project.

Initially, the development of two data collection instruments, a student survey and a semi-structured teacher interview, assumed the importance of certain data: students’ experiences with loanwords, and teachers’ Japanese proficiency, for instance. Other instruments, such as observations and post-observation interviews, served to test these assumptions and reveal new avenues for analysis. In this instance, students’ experiences with loanwords remained an importance focus of the study,
while teachers’ Japanese learning experiences, rather than their proficiency, ultimately emerged as a more important theme.

Data analysis began by looking at student survey data and identifying items with which students had agreed or disagreed most strongly. These items were then categorised into thematic groups. Building on themes that emerged from these, data were reanalysed with reference to transcripts from student and teacher interviews, and notes from classroom observations.

At each data collection point, data were coded into themes, compared and contrasted with existing ones, and examined for connections and points of difference. Research questions, survey items, and interview questions were all sources of initial themes. These were constantly referred back to and revised as new data came to light.

Eventually, three main themes emerged: external influences; teachers’ and learners’ knowledge, experience and beliefs, related to loanwords; and teaching and learning practice.

Research questions and themes were modified during analysis. Gaps in the data were checked and data from observations and initial teacher interviews were discussed in post-observation interview so that teachers could provide their own interpretation of interactions.

Finally, to integrate themes within a socio-cultural framework and with reference to AT, I referred back to the literature review and finalised the themes that are discussed in the cross-case analysis in Chapter Six of this study.

4.7 Validity

Maxwell (1992), in his analysis of validity in qualitative research, refers to five separate components: 1) descriptive validity, which relates to the accuracy of the descriptions and accounts provided by the researcher; 2) interpretive validity, which
relates to the quality and insightfulness of interpretations based on observed phenomena and collected data; 3) theoretical validity, which relates to the appropriateness of the theoretical framework used to analyse the phenomenon being studied; 4) generalisability, which relates more to “generalizing within the community or institution observed” than “to generalizing about other institutions” (Dornyei, 2007, p. 58); and 5) evaluative validity, which relates to the researcher’s ability to effectively and accurately evaluate the study.

To strengthen the claims of the validity of the study, measures that address these concerns were put in place, and steps were taken during the research process to ensure or enhance that validity. Firstly, the study focused on providing a detailed and contextualised account of all procedures, and data collection and qualitative data which were “transparent so that the scrutineers of the research can assess the appropriateness of the researcher’s choices” (Holliday, 2004, p. 732) and pass informed judgement on “the trustworthiness or goodness” (Angen, 2000, p. 387) of the findings. As discussed in section 4.5, data collection continued for a period of six months, and involved numerous observations. It also included triangulation of methods and member-checking, so as to maximise the potential for gathering useful data, and the ability to make stronger claims of validity based on this cross-referencing.

All data related to interviews and classroom observations were recorded and transcriptions were made available to participants. In follow-up interviews with teachers, clarification was sought on aspects of teacher-researcher or teacher-student interactions that may not have been initially clear. These measures sought to ensure that the analysed data were as credible as possible.
4.8 Ethics

The Belmont Report (DHEW, 1978) outlined three main principles that must be adhered to when considering the ethics of research: Respect for persons; Beneficence; Justice. Despite more up-to-date interpretations, from Vanderpool (1996) and Shore (2006) for example, these principles remain fundamental. For the purposes of this study I have broadly interpreted these principles as: a) a moral obligation to the respondents or participants in a study; b) a legal obligation to respondents and participants, and associated institutions, if applicable; c) a moral and legal obligation to readers and fellow authors. These principles were adhered to throughout the course of the study.

The first, and primary, concern of a research study should be that no form of harm, either intentional or otherwise, is inflicted on participants as a result of taking part in the study. This concept of “do no harm” (Simons, 2009, p. 96) is the principle that “overrides all other considerations” (Dornyei, 2007, p. 67). In an educational context, as opposed to a medical context for example, one would hope that research participants are in little danger of encountering physical harm. However, the possibility of academic or mental harm is certainly present, particularly in a study such as this, which sought to draw out personal beliefs and experiences. The research also partly involved interactions between a lecturer (the researcher) and colleagues and university students of the institution at which I am employed, with whom I may have daily contact, and over whom I may have some academic control or professional authority. With this proximity in mind, I was very aware that justice should not only be done, but also seen to be done.

The most obvious way in which the conflicts inherent in these relationships can be ameliorated is through informed consent. The ethical procedures that are
required to be adopted are stipulated by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC). Based on these guidelines (2015) the most important aspects of this include informing potential respondents of the following:

- The possible consequences of participating in the research.
- The aims and purpose of the research.
- The types of tasks which respondents will be engaged in.
- The extent to which responses will remain confidential.
- The right to withdraw from the process at any stage, without repercussion, and further, to withdraw consent to use any responses given prior to withdrawal, if the study is longitudinal in nature.

(Adapted from Dornyei, 2007, p. 69)

The research study was granted ethics approval (Approval number: 1400000346) after the application was reviewed by the Queensland University of Technology Low Risk Ethics Committee. It was confirmed as meeting the requirements of a low risk study as outlined by the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

Consent forms in this educational context included a Japanese translation, as well as a clear outline of the information detailed above.

Although the right to withdraw research consent, or to withhold it in the first place, may seem obvious and inalienable, in practice it may prove difficult and cause a great deal of stress. Reducing this difficulty, or at least alleviating the stress involved, should be a serious concern for the researcher. Several methods, most of which have been used in previous research projects, were used in this study to minimise this concern.
When practical, the researcher was not involved in handing out consent forms, or retrieving them. Those who were involved in handing out consent forms and retrieving them (usually class teachers) were asked to emphasise, in English and Japanese, the entirely elective nature of participation.

Consenting students were given an email address of a non-teaching Japanese staff member, to whom they could address any concerns about the research anonymously, ask questions anonymously, or withdraw their consent at any time, without giving a reason. Students taught by the researcher were not involved in the study.

Although non-participation and late withdrawals can interfere with research goals and interrupt data analysis, it was hoped that such considerations would further strengthen the idea of truly informed consent, and reinforce the moral obligation which a teacher/researcher owes his or her students.

The second ethical concern refers to the adherence to the legal and institutional obligations of the research. In this study that involved the Australian university through which the research was supervised, the language institute (research site) in which the research took place, and the Japanese university of which that is a part. Throughout the course of the study the institutional requirements of both universities were adhered to.

The third ethical concern relates to researcher integrity, particularly with regards the relationship between the researcher and the reader or potential reader, authors who are referenced throughout the study, and colleagues in the academic field. Once again reference is made to NHMRC guidelines:

Educational researchers must not fabricate, falsify, or misrepresent authorship, evidence, data, findings, or conclusions.
Educational researchers must not knowingly or negligently use their professional roles for fraudulent purposes.

Educational researchers should attempt to report their findings to all relevant stakeholders, and should refrain from keeping secret or selectively communicating their findings.

This study aimed to contribute not only to research in the field, but also to do so in a manner which adhered to the three ethical principles as outlined.

I approached teachers to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study, and availability. I kept them informed of the nature of the research and the commitments involved. Participation information forms were distributed to teacher participants to gain consent before engaging in data collection. These teachers then passed on consent forms to student participants who were also given the opportunity to anonymously withdraw at each stage of the study.

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the research design of this study. The methodology, and the reasons behind that choice, has been explained, as have the participants and data collection methods and modes of analysis. As described, consistent efforts to ensure validity of data have been maintained, as have means to address any ethical concerns. The following chapter describes the four case studies that informed the study. Each of these cases casts light on the English loanword phenomenon in the teaching of Japanese and explores the phenomenon in a teaching and learning context. Through the use of a variety of data collection techniques, these studies focus on analysing the features of the loanword phenomenon and its applications in terms of second language acquisition.
Chapter 5: Cases

Chapter Four outlined the case study methodology and this chapter presents the four cases, comprised of a teacher and a class of students. Each case study details the perceptions, and teaching and learning strategies of the teachers; Adam, Alice, Emma, and Barry (pseudonyms), and their students, in relation to the research questions.

This chapter first provides a portrayal of each teacher based on the interviews undertaken. A rich description of the teacher’s class along with students’ course of study, gender, and general English proficiency follows. Students’ English proficiency is based on the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) focussing on reading, writing, speaking, and listening proficiency. The reference levels are divided into three broad divisions, A (Basic User), B (Independent User), and C (Proficient User). Data from student surveys and student interviews are provided to illustrate the importance of loanwords based on students’ perspectives, beliefs, and practices. Lesson observations and researcher reflections are also included to substantiate the interview and survey data.

SCT and CHAT are applied to the cases where a socio-cultural perspective illustrates how concepts of mediation and regulation reveal resistance by some teachers and students to the use of loanwords, and acceptance by others. SCT’s insistence on the significance of the social context as a “source of mental development” (Swain & Deters, 2007, p. 821) explains how practices that were conducive to the use of loanwords produced meaningful learning and social interaction for the students. The teachers who enabled “participation in culturally
organised activity” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 214) through L1 loanwords as a tool found learning to be meaningful.

CHAT assists in explaining how and why teachers select, design, and use particular teaching and learning artefacts and tools such as use of students’ L1 and loanwords in the classroom, and the tensions that arise from these choices. It also helps in explaining the contradictions that emerge from a variety of sources, including the different objectives students and teachers perceive activities to entail, such as the pursuit of oral fluency or grammatical accuracy. Another source of tension that emerges is caused by the expectations of the division of labour that teachers and students have within a learning environment. This tension becomes most apparent in the differences between the timing, amount, and nature of teacher-feedback that students expect from an activity, and the feedback that teachers feel is appropriate to provide. These aspects of CHAT were documented and applied to each individual case.

As mentioned in Chapter Four, the site of the study is an International Learning Center within a private university in Kyushu, Japan. Within the center, English communication classes are conducted for all first and second-year students at the university.

5.1 Adam’s class

Adam’s class comprised 26 first-year students (14 females, 12 males) from the Department of Pharmaceutical Science. Based on the Oxford Online Placement Test (OOPT) the class was rated as above average for the institution. All students were rated within the A2 (elementary/pre-intermediate) CEFR band, and the class was described by Adam as “very motivated” in terms of their English language learning, “engaged and cohesive…a pleasure to teach.”
Adam had taught English in Japan for over 15 years in both language schools and universities. Most of these positions involved teaching communicative English courses. He admitted he was happy to use and accept almost “anything at [his] disposal” to facilitate communication within these courses and has drawn on numerous second language acquisition theories, and a variety of pedagogical tools, to structure his teaching. These tools included the students’ L1 (Japanese), particularly to “give instructions or explanations”. He also focused “on content that may be interesting to [his] students”, thus tailoring “instruction according to the individual traits of [the] learners and the characteristics of the local context of the school, the student’s family and the community” (Mize & Dantas-Whitney, 2007, p. 24). Significantly, Adam also encouraged the use of gairaigo (loanwords) to draw on learners’ knowledge. Each of these pedagogical tools demonstrated a socio-cultural approach to language teaching, from dialectical inter-relationship with students (Lantolf, 2000), ZPD, and its emphasis on participation, collaborative meaning-making, and the use of mediational tools such as concepts and referents that exist in the Japanese language, to comprehend and acquire English language.

Adam’s bilingualism, as a speaker of German/English, had a positive impact on his ability to adapt to the Japanese language-learning environment. Before coming to Japan he studied Japanese through informal lessons with a native Japanese acquaintance, and his knowledge of German and English was, as Cummins (2000) notes, the conceptual knowledge of L1 that helped him learn Japanese. During these lessons he noticed the large number of English and German loanwords used in Japanese and saw this as a “clear advantage” in learning the language. Adam indicated that since moving to Japan his Japanese had “improved significantly”, as had his knowledge of loanwords. He also came to appreciate the “obvious
advantages” the large number of English loanwords in Japanese gave his students in acquiring English. The advantages mentioned by Adam are supported by Nation’s (2008, p. 100) research, that found a significantly reduced learning burden if a vocabulary item is also a loanword in a student’s first language.

Adam’s exposure to using katakana pronunciation with English words, even when unsure if they were actually a loanword, had often resulted in comprehensible Japanese. This led him to believe, along with researchers that have demonstrated the usefulness of loanwords for Japanese learners of English, (Brown & Williams, 1985; Daulton, 1998, 2008) that loanwords were a valuable resource, as he saw Japanese speakers acquiring English “in terms of being able to pick up things and remember them easily” (pre-observation interview). Adam’s standpoint is supported by Nation’s argument (2008) that similarities between the oral forms of words in different languages enhance the ease of acquisition.

In his work on the use of English loanwords in teaching German vocabulary, Banta (1981, p. 129) suggested that one of the most useful ways to assist students in acquiring a new language is simply to inform them of the existence of loanwords. He saw the failure to do so as “robbing students of a readily available tool for vocabulary building”. In a Japanese context, Nation (2003, p. 5) has also claimed that “encouraging learners to notice this borrowing” is an effective language-building and confidence-building strategy. Echoing these beliefs, Adam felt that drawing attention to the origin of certain words helped students relate to the loanwords available in their own context. He indicated that although he did not think he often based lessons around loanwords, he often paid “explicit attention to them in class” when they were raised in conversation. This was borne out from the classroom observation when Adam often brought students’ attention to English loanwords in Japanese that are
very similar to the original English, for example, the words for table, door, television, and computer.

Adam commented: “I often explain the origin of certain words…I think maybe more than the typical teacher. I’m really interested in a lot of the cultural aspects, for example where the word comes from, or how the word might be…used in Japanese [even if] the meaning is slightly different” (pre-observation interview). Just as Nation (2008, p. 100) noted that loanwords with “roughly the same meaning” or “similar meaning” in the L1 are useful associations, Adam felt that some divergence in form or meaning is not a barrier to acquisition. Adam also remarked that “many Japanese students don’t know these are loanwords. They don’t really think about where they’re from”. Just as Banta (1981, p. 129) was “astonished at the inability of some students to recognize even …obvious cognates and common borrowings”, Adam noted that the advantages for students in simply recognising the connections between words would be significant, “especially in terms of pronunciation and semantics”. As a tool for becoming “better English speakers” Adam noted that, for Japanese learners of English, loanwords were akin to a “grammatical pattern or structure that…students can learn and apply in a variety of different situations” (pre-observation interview).

Adam was the only one of the four teachers of these case studies to mention the rules and patterns that generally govern the phonetic and semantic changes that English loanwords undergo when used in Japanese. This understanding, of the regularity of loanwords, contributed to his willingness to use them as tools for communication and consideration of their wider application as tools for language acquisition. However, he felt that despite his efforts in explaining their origin and significance, loanwords were often “looked at [by students] in isolation…oh, that’s
an English word” rather than as a phenomenon that could be exploited.

In terms of the process of self-regulation (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), where students learn to become independently proficient users and learners of a language, Adam was faced with the complex issue of assisting students to internalise the linguistic rules embedded in loanwords. While he hoped to help his students perceive the grammatical patterns in these words and apply the patterns, in appropriate contexts, to become more proficient in English, this was a lengthy process. From the perspective of SCT Adam’s classroom language would be viewed as dialectical, as meaning-making occurring through dialogue between the students and the teacher. Although Adam was attempting to “create conditions of learning that may give rise to specific forms of development in the future” (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006, p. 207), to assist students in internalising tools of acquisition such as loanwords, he was frustrated at the pace of this development.

5.1.1 Student survey. In response to the first 45 items of the student survey that aimed to assess student beliefs about foreign language learning, students’ responses indicated a strong commitment to learning English (see Appendix G). Students also indicated a strong preference for English language learning being enjoyable (item 2), communicative approaches to language learning (items 11, 15, 6), and the intrinsic importance of English ability for future job prospects (item 21). These results supported Adam’s belief in his students’ engagement with the course and their “motivation to speak better English”. Student responses indicated that “internalization…entails an active, and frequently creative…process” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 209) by noting that a formal environment is insufficient to achieve active and passive proficiency (item 27).
Whilst items 1-45 of the student survey related more generally to English language learning, data relating specifically to students’ use of loanwords, experience of the use of loanwords in an educational context, and attitudes towards them, were collected through items 46-55. These items included: I use a lot of loanwords (item 47); Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English (item 49); My high-school teachers often mentioned loanwords (item 51) and I would like to learn more about loanwords (item 55).

The four items with which respondents disagreed most strongly (items 50, 51, 53, 54) related to whether students’ junior high-school/high school teachers had often referred to loanwords or believed they were helpful in assisting English acquisition. It became apparent that these students’ junior high and high school English teachers had rarely discussed English loanwords and generally saw them as a negative or unproductive resource in terms of language acquisition.

Numerous researchers have noted the impact teachers’ negative beliefs about loanwords may have on their students. Topping (1962) encouraged all language teachers to familiarise themselves with loanwords, and observed increased confidence amongst students whose teachers had drawn the connections between the students’ L1 and the target language. Banta (1981, p. 129) felt that teachers did “not [do] nearly enough” in making it “sufficiently clear to students that… [certain vocabularies] are close relatives” and claimed this “insecurity on the part of the teacher” disadvantaged students. Daulton (1998, para 6) has also discussed the active discouragement of loanword use within secondary school classes in Japan and draws a connection between this philosophy and the lack of confidence students have with their intuitions about English words. It is not unreasonable to assume that six years of
discouragement, from students’ secondary school teachers, may not be completely
turned around by four months of encouragement from Adam.

In contrast to their junior high school and high school teachers’ beliefs, these
students viewed loanwords more positively. The students displayed some negativity
with regards to the place of loanwords in the Japanese lexicon, but were more
accepting of the possibility of their use as a productive resource for English
acquisition, and were willing to learn more about them (items 52 and 55). However,
some hesitancy to accept loanwords as legitimate tools for acquiring English became
apparent in the student interviews. These results are also supported by Olah’s study
(2007) that reported student negativity towards the number of loanwords in Japanese,
but recognition of their value as a learning tool.

5.1.2 Student interviews. Three students from this case agreed to participate in
individual interviews.

Student 1.1: The interview with this student was recorded and conducted
entirely in English. The student had studied English from an early age, for six years
at a private language school with native Japanese teachers, and for six years at junior
high school and high school with native-Japanese teachers and native-English
assistant language teachers (ALTs).

Student 1.2: The interview with this student was recorded and conducted
primarily in English. The student briefly studied English in elementary school with a
native-English teacher and for six years at junior high school and high school with
native-Japanese teachers.

Student 1.3: At the request of the student, this interview was not recorded and
carried out entirely in Japanese. Interview notes were taken and subsequently
translated by the researcher. This student had studied for three years at a private
language school with native-English teachers while studying at junior high school/high school for six years with native-Japanese teachers.

Only one of the three students could remember loanwords being discussed in classes prior to university, and indicated that loanwords were seen as a “big problem” by the teacher. The three students stated that they regularly use English loanwords when speaking Japanese; and they perceived them to be “just like Japanese words”. These students were less sure about how often they used loanwords when speaking English, and two students mentioned that some loanwords were different to others. This statement testifies to Haugen’s belief, (cited in Hoffer, 2002), that loanword is a very imprecise term, incorporating a variety of borrowings. Loanwords like door or table that differ only slightly, included under the same umbrella term as wasei eigo (Japanese-made English) such as deeto-kissa (a coffee-shop suitable for a date), lead to confusion.

Student 1.1 was the most positive in terms of viewing loanwords in Japanese as a tool for English acquisition. He found that loanwords in this context were English words he could “understand well” and indicated he used them frequently when speaking or using English. He stated that he thought they were “quite useful” for English acquisition. Student 1.2 did not find them helpful and specifically tried not to use them when speaking English. Student 1.3 mentioned that although she often used loanwords, she was sometimes unsure in what context a loanword could be used. She saw the “meaning” of loanwords in Japanese as a “big problem” and would sometimes not use loanwords when speaking English because of that uncertainty.

Although Adam had promoted loanwords as mediational tools, some students’ beliefs and conceptions, such as those expressed here, seemed to hinder the
process of internalisation. As outlined in Chapter Two, the historical context of learning English in Japan has been typified by methodologies that have largely ignored social and cultural factors. These methodologies have precluded the use of loanwords, often due to perceptions of cultural and linguistic impurity. These ideas may well have impacted on students’ perceptions in this case and throughout the study.

Adam viewed loanwords as an effective tool that could facilitate language learning. However, as some students’ previous teachers had either ignored loanwords as a possible tool for assisting acquisition or actively denigrated them, their previous learning experiences in language acquisition differed to that offered by Adam and some students were not yet able to appreciate how he was using loanwords to facilitate their learning. Although Adam saw the advantages in teaching his students about the origins of English loanwords in Japanese and the connections between the words, his students were reluctant to do so: “I think they feel it’s just extra information…not really applicable to learning.” The disparity between Adam’s beliefs, and those of his students, pointed to certain tensions within this particular teaching and learning context. A lesson observation provided the opportunity to assess how this apparent dichotomy of belief played out in practice.

5.1.3 Classroom observation. The observed lesson in this case was titled: “Accommodation - describing housing, rooms, and furniture”. Initially, relevant vocabulary was brainstormed by the class and written on the board by Adam. Students then wrote about their current living conditions, their dream house, and discussed these in pairs and small groups. Primarily because of the nature of the topic, the majority of the vocabulary items were English loanwords in Japanese, including
18 of the 20 words elicited in the preceding brainstorming session (*apartment, mansion, room, living, dining, kitchen, toilet, sofa*, for example).

Initially students pronounced many of these words in katakana Japanese, which Adam then correctly pronounced in English. The students were then able to repeat the words correctly. Later usage also suggested that they were able to correct their initial mispronunciations. As a phonetic script, katakana transposes loanwords in a consistent manner with which all students are aware. To pronounce a loanword correctly all that students required was a reminder that katakana was not appropriate in this instance. During the lesson the words “toire” (toilet), and “apaato” (apartment), were used by students in response to questions from Adam. Adam asked “How do we say this in English?” Students once again were able to pronounce the words correctly. Such differences became the focus of a short discussion, conducted mainly in Japanese, on the phonetic/syntactic differences between many English words and their loanword equivalents in Japanese. The differences in the ways abbreviations are structured in Standard English and Japanese (loanword) English were also discussed. One student mentioned “paso-com”, personal computer, a method of back-clipping that Adam pointed out would be very unusual in English as using the full term would be preferable.

In terms of the pedagogical process, Adam’s mediation moved from seeking “immediate imitative responses to communicative utterances” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 204) to delayed imitations (Saville-Troike, 1988) in an attempt to contextualise and generalise through a collaborative process. That is, by drawing students’ attention to loanwords, Adam was promoting the transfer of knowledge from the inter-psychological (between people) to the intra-psychological (internalising) aspects of learning. Specifically, by drawing attention to the patterns
of abbreviation or phonetic differences, rather than individual instances of such, Adam was providing students with adaptable tools for acquiring language independently.

In the post-observation interview, Adam stated that “these students all know how to pronounce these [words] in English. I think they’re just embarrassed to do so in front of their peers”. Krashen’s Affective Filter (1985) was mentioned by Adam during the post-observation interview, demonstrating he recognised the non-linguistic factors such as lack of confidence or anxiety that could impact on his students’ pronunciation and general language acquisition. Adam also felt that students needed time to understand comprehensible input from the teacher, time to assimilate it, and time to be able to use that knowledge productively. His willingness to raise such issues with students, by referring to his own inhibitions as a Japanese speaker, indicated his appreciation that part of his role as a teacher was to alleviate those inhibitions.

Apart from pronunciation, all of the loanwords discussed in this lesson were almost semantically identical to their English counterparts, insofar as western and Japanese living and dining rooms are similar in concept, if not appearance. Only one loanword used during the lesson, “mansion” (almost identical in pronunciation in English and Japanese) diverges semantically, in the false friend of loanword terminology. In Japanese it refers to a residence in a high-rise apartment block. This was raised with the students and commented on by Adam as “the only example today of a word like this”.

From a CHAT perspective, the division of labour was not always well balanced between the teacher and students in this case study. The choice of accepting loanwords as a tool rested with the students, hence even when Adam promoted a
strong belief in the efficacy of loanwords as a learning tool, students did not always reciprocate, with some students considering them merely an interesting diversion.

5.2 Alice’s class

Alice’s class comprised 30 first-year students (24 male, six female) from the Faculty of Computer and Information Science. This gender imbalance is typical of the faculty, with 88% of the overall students being male. As revealed through English language proficiency testing, the class was rated as above-average for the institution and included the top 30 first-year students from the faculty. Twenty-eight students were rated within the A2 (elementary/lower-intermediate) CEFR band, the other two within the B1 (intermediate) band.

Alice had studied some Japanese at university before first coming to Japan more than 20 years ago. She spent long periods in Japan over the next two decades, studied both independently and in formal settings, passed official Japanese language tests to upper-intermediate level, and described herself as “very much an autonomous learner”. Alice initially recalled having to “learn katakana and…the rules for how to phonetically transform an English word into a Japanese word”. However, she noted that a “particularly important realisation” had occurred for her only after she moved to Japan.

This case is developed from an analysis of the data obtained from the 55-item student survey, two semi-structured teacher interviews, one class observation, and one presentation given by Alice to colleagues as part of her institutional research requirements.

Alice’s own experience of learning Japanese exposed her to loanwords as a means to achieve competence in the second language. Her realisation that “pronouncing what I thought were English words…with Japanese pronunciation
meant that I was understood” led her to comprehend the significance of English loanwords in Japanese. As a Japanese language learner, she came to appreciate the “great advantages” of being a native English speaker. “Due to the large number of words that you can Japanesify (sic) I realised I already had a Japanese vocabulary” and “if you are looking out for words that cross over you find millions (sic) of them and it’s been really helpful” (pre-observation interview). Through self-regulation, that Lantolf (2000) describes as processes where individuals internalise external forms of mediation, Alice became a proficient user of Japanese. Alice felt that this experience had been important in transforming her teaching practice, especially with regards her focus on loanword pronunciation. Through her own language-learning experiences she had come to realise that loanwords were also effective tools for teaching, particularly as an efficient means of “maximizing the relevance of the available input” (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 210), particularly for low-level learners.

These experiences mirrored those of Adam and reinforced Nation’s (2003) ideas on the positive effect loanwords can have on second language acquisition. From Nation’s perspective (2003) the process of loanword utilisation begins with a moment of realisation and awareness, leading to “vocabulary expansion” (2003, p. 5) and culminating in enhanced communicative competence. From Alice’s comments, a similar growth was evident in her use of loanwords both as a learner and a teacher.

Alice stated that she often paid explicit attention to loanwords during class, “mainly because…it’s an easy thing to focus on, and can result in very quick improvements” in communicative competence. Although her appreciation of the usefulness of loanwords had developed independently, this had only occurred while she was speaking regularly within native speakers in Japan. She felt that as “one of the only native speakers these students are likely to be in contact with all year”, her
role was to encourage loanword use if it contributed to communication between her and a student. Due to the nature of the lesson observation for this case these beliefs could not be supported by observational data, but remain as anecdotal evidence.

Alice made it clear that she felt loanwords were a very productive resource, especially when students “start realising they’ve got all these words available…and they start thinking that their katakana words are English”. She said that giving students the confidence, and the knowledge, to make these words comprehensible in English was an “extremely important, reasonably simple, and very effective use” of her time as a teacher. Daulton (2008, p. 4) supports this statement by asserting that the linguistic similarities between Japanese and English “reduce the time needed to develop…comprehension…enhance motivation and confidence.” Here Alice demonstrated how she recognised that loanwords can act as mediational tools that allow learners to “make more efficient use of …energy” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 199), in terms of the time and effort expended on learning English, and her belief in the importance and utility of loanwords.

According to Alice, her approach to using loanwords as a productive resource is as follows: “I like to highlight words that …[students] know in English, but might not realise it’s English, to build their vocabulary. I’m talking about motivation, attitude, and identity… if they now want to sound like a native speaker I’ve given them the tools”. Alice felt that because Japanese students already had a “pronunciation template” for loanwords: “the way these words are rendered in katakana”, that students tended to rely on this when pronouncing these words in English. “I think it’s important to try to disassociate the word from the katakana phonology.”
As a teacher in an EFL context, she felt that it was incumbent on her to give “students this sense of an ESL environment”, where English is the mode of communication, and communicative competence “is given primacy”. She often referred to “providing” students with “tools… knowledge” and “opportunities within which to put them to use”. Alice’s focus on production, and output, aligned with the theoretical perspective outlined by researchers such as Swain (1985). Building on Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1981, 1982, 1985), Swain argued that although input is essential, without a similar focus on output, productive communicative competence will not result. Because Alice’s contact with students was limited to 90 hours of class time over the course of an academic year, she realised that an efficient way to assist her students with English acquisition was to encourage self-directed learning.

Alice saw her teaching role primarily as providing tools, such as loanwords, with which students could achieve their own personal learning objectives, rather than imposing her objectives onto the whole class. This approach was borne out during the lesson observation.

5.2.1 Student survey and interviews. From students’ most positive responses to items 1-45 of the survey (see Appendix H) two dominant themes emerged – these related to students’ beliefs about how English learning should be conducted, and their view of the importance of spoken English ability for future job prospects (item 21, 100% agreement). There was a very strong belief expressed by these respondents that English language learning should be enjoyable (item 2, 100% agreement) and that repetition and practice (item 11, 100% agreement) were important in language learning. Generally, there was a strong disagreement with the statement that English education within a formal environment is sufficient to achieve active and passive
proficiency (item 27, 12% agreement), with a slightly positive response (item 45, 56% agreement) with educational experiences related to English.

In analysing this data, I identified that this group of students clearly believed in the importance of English language education and was motivated to acquire English, as they could foresee many opportunities to use English in the future (item 17, 92% agreement). However, confidence in ability to speak English well (item 4, 40% agreement) was lacking. Data relating to students’ use of loanwords, experience of them in an educational context, and attitudes towards them, revealed that students’ junior high-school/high school teachers had not often referred to loanwords and did not believe they were particularly helpful in assisting English acquisition.

Item 46 (72% agreement) suggested that students agreed with the statement that there are “too many English loanwords in Japanese”. Although students tended to disagree with the idea that “loanwords are an obstacle to learning English” (item 49, 40% agreement) nor did they believe they were particularly helpful (item 52, 44% agreement). While they did not find loanwords particularly difficult to understand (item 48, 60% agreement), they felt that they did not use many (item 47, 56% agreement) but expressed slight interest in learning more about them (item 55, 67% agreement). The data revealed that these students’ junior high school/high school teachers had rarely discussed loanwords with them, and generally saw loanwords as a negative or unproductive resource in assisting language acquisition (items 49, 50, 53, 54). The students displayed more positivity towards the use of loanwords as a productive resource for English acquisition.

Although all students from the class were given the opportunity to take part in an interview with the researcher, either individually or in a small group, none were
willing to do so. The reasons for this remain unclear, although Alice suggested that “exam pressure” may have been a contributing factor.

5.2.2 Classroom observation. Semi-structured interviews were held with Alice and, at a mutually suitable time, an observation lesson was organised. Alice supplied an initial lesson plan that provided significant opportunities for verbal interaction between teacher/student and student/student. On the day of the observation this lesson plan was replaced with a very different outline, which required students to primarily work in pairs. Interaction between the teacher and students was limited to instructions, the discussion of task types, monitoring, and support when required.

The lesson was entitled “Stamp Rally” and involved students completing six activities (of 12 minutes) each, in pairs. The activities incorporated a variety of tools and resources, such as dictionaries and online programs. Activities were organised to take place at six stations: speed reading; extensive reading; an online vocabulary program; speaking on a selected topic; reading comprehension; and extensive listening. After twelve minutes, students moved on to the next station. After completion of each task, Alice required students to record their enjoyment of the task, and their view of the utility of the activities on a scale of 1-5. Alice indicated she used a similar lesson plan at least twice a semester. At the pre-observation interview, she expressed the belief that “these are all learning activities” that provide different avenues to learning, with different aims that suit different types of learners. “I make it clear to students that these are all activities they can do by themselves, outside of class, when their formal English education has finished.”

In terms of language teaching, from a socio-cultural perspective, Alice displayed her belief that mediation is of central importance. This belief was illustrated not only by her focus on “face-to-face interaction and shared processes,
such as joint problem solving and discussion” (Mitchell & Myles, 2004, p. 195) but also by her initial regulation of activities that she hoped would lead to self-regulation. This process of scaffolding did not incorporate loanwords during the observed lesson.

However, in the presentation she gave to English teaching colleagues, Alice stressed the importance of loanwords, their pedagogical significance, and how she scaffolded loanword use to focus students’ attention on key phonological features that they could autonomously incorporate as a language-learning strategy. The presentation related specifically to pronunciation and in particular the differences between katakana, the phonetic script in which loanwords are written, and English. This presentation showed that while Adam was concerned with explaining to his students the morphological rules that generally govern loanword transformation, Alice was more concerned with imparting phonological rules and asking students to employ them productively. Critics of loanwords as acquisition tools, such as Sheperd (1996) and Olah (2007, p. 180) have characterised mispronunciation, specifically katakana pronunciation, as the most “significant impediment” for Japanese speakers of English. Alice’s focus on phonological issues suggested that she also felt it was a significant issue. One point of focus in the presentation related to one of the most common sounds in English, the schwa; “which Japanese students have trouble recognising and producing mainly because they don’t have it in their language. A lot of words end with the sound schwa with a “sh” in front “shn”, for example: communication, vacation, relaxation, tradition. These come up in classes quite a lot as part of our speaking topics. So, I also have a cute way of practiseing “shn” by using one of my humorous hooks.” (Alice, pre-observation interview)
Alice’s teaching approach, as outlined by her in this presentation, illustrated her understanding of linguistic and non-linguistic impediments to language acquisition. Her very positive belief in the usefulness of loanwords as a productive resource, which initially emerged through her experiences as a language learner, was displayed through her discussion of the techniques she mentioned during her presentation and during interviews. These techniques were simple, efficient, and apparently had been effective; not only in terms of improving pronunciation, but also in providing students with the tools to grow independently and autonomously if they wished to do so.

5.3 Emma’s class

The class (n=26) involved in this case (18 females, eight males), were second-year students from the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences. Fifteen of the students had been assessed at CEFR Level B1 (intermediate), nine at Level B2 (upper-intermediate), and two at C1 (advanced). Based on these criteria, all students would be classified as independent users, some of them proficient users and, in certain specific contexts, quite sophisticated users of English. Most of the scholarship holders within the faculty were part of this class, and a high proportion expected that after their six-year undergraduate degree they would either be going on to postgraduate study or seeking employment internationally – both paths which require a high-level of oral and written English.

At the time the data for this case were collected, Emma had been in Japan for more than eight years in a variety of teaching positions, primarily in rural and regional Japan. This had included periods at private language institutes and universities. With very limited knowledge of the language upon arrival, she found herself in quite an isolated part of the country, living with “Japanese roommates for
about two years [who] didn’t speak much English…using [English] loanwords meant that we could communicate.” Emma referred to this experience extensively in interviews and confirmed that many of her teaching practices had been shaped by it. Her experiences as a language learner were initially closely connected with her cultural and social assimilation into Japanese society and deeply influenced the evolution of her views about teaching English to Japanese students.

Emma displayed a strong preference for a socio-cultural approach to language learning and teaching. According to Emma, “Anything that allows students to communicate, and feel like they’re getting their message across, is useful…and for many of my students that’s an English loanword” (pre-observation interview).

Having come to Japan with only a rudimentary knowledge of Japanese, and with limited communicative competence, Emma felt that loanwords had similarly enhanced her ability to communicate and gain confidence in using the Japanese language. Socio-cultural theory suggests that “developmental processes take place through participation in cultural, linguistic, and historically formed settings such as…peer group interaction (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 197). In Emma’s case, learning processes, including loanwords as tools for acquisition, were formed and internalised through engagement in such an environment and were a result of Emma’s relationship with her social environment and the organic connection between that environment and her mental activity (Winegar, 1997).

Over the ensuing years, Emma gained Japanese language qualifications to intermediate level and came to feel that “in Japanese, proper Japanese, formal Japanese, [loanwords weren ’t] used as much, and that her reliance on loanwords in “getting [her] message across” became “kind of an issue”. Numerous scholars, such as Sheperd (1996) and Simon-Maeda (1995), have raised similar concerns, and often
equated loanwords with language pollution and linguistic imperialism. Although Emma did not use this terminology, she referred to “proper Japanese” on a number of occasions, and felt that on occasion, loanwords were a somewhat weak substitute. However, she felt that because loanwords are more prevalent in contemporary Japanese, amongst younger generations, and within the most frequently used words, utilising them with young, or lower-level learners was a particularly beneficial tool to enhance English acquisition. As discussed in Chapter Three, an important concept of socio-cultural theory is the emergence of the individual through social interaction. This emergence was reflected not only through Emma’s experiences as a language learner, but also in her class, where a co-construction of knowledge, incorporating students’ knowledge of loanwords in Japanese, was evident.

In Emma’s case she had initially, and autonomously, come to appreciate the usefulness of English loanwords as a tool of mediation to interact socially. The developmental processes of Emma’s own Japanese language acquisition, emerged through “language use…[in] peer group interaction” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 197). As a consequence of this interaction she began to value English loanwords as a tool and to apply similar techniques in a “more formal teaching context…in the classroom” (post-observation interview). The value she placed on loanwords as a tool of mediation in this process was evident in her statements of belief, and also became apparent as enacted in her teaching. Despite her concerns that English loanwords may not be an effective learning tool for all Japanese speakers, Emma remained generally very positive about the influence that the loanword connection between Japanese and English provided. From the first semi-structured interview with Emma, focusing primarily on her Japanese language learning and teaching
background, she made it clear that loanwords had played an important role in promoting her understanding of the connections between English and Japanese.

When I first came to Japan and worked in *eikaiwa [private conversation schools]* … as my Japanese understanding increased I started to learn more about loanwords and rely on them a bit more because we weren’t allowed to speak anything apart from English, not even to give instructions, so I used loanwords so my students could understand me. (Emma, pre-observation interview)

Emma maintained that initially loanwords had assisted her in developing her Japanese communication skills; “even if it wasn’t exactly the right word, or sometimes was used differently…at least I knew it existed in Japanese, so in terms of communication this was very useful.” This experience as a learner translated into a belief that loanwords were particularly important for lower-level Japanese learners as a productive tool for acquiring English. She remarked that when a low-level student is trying to speak English and they use “something that is a loanword in Japanese that has a slightly different meaning, or pronunciation, in English but, it’s going to work…I wouldn’t interject. I think it can be counter-productive to correct at this stage when it’s difficult to get some students to speak at all.” Daulton’s quantitative research (2008) into gairaigo and language acquisition led him to reach similar conclusions, where a “clear indication of the data…[was] that low-level proficiency Japanese learners of English will prefer borrowed words to…substantial degrees at all levels.” (p. 74). He also agreed that “error paranoia” amongst teachers has led to “smothering the sole factor more fundamental than L1 learner motivation.” (p. 124)
Emma’s view of language teaching and learning as a socio-cultural phenomenon, and the importance of a communicative approach to language teaching, is a perspective that has only recently begun to emerge in Japan (Imura, 2003). She encouraged students’ use of loanwords to draw out from Japanese those words that have infiltrated from English, enabling creolisation to be made productive. This encouragement was evident during the lesson observation when loanwords such as alcohol, vegetable, and diet were discussed. Emma’s outlook and mode of teaching also exhibited an implicit understanding of the need for mediation to be adjusted according to students’ levels of language development. In terms of ZPD, outlined in Chapter Three, Emma understood that the amount and type of mediation she provided was critically important. She also displayed an understanding that the ability of students to function independently is a gradual process (Gauvain, 2001), and that this movement from regulation to self-regulation and internalisation of resources may differ from student to student.

Emma felt that at an early stage in a learner’s language growth, communication of any sort was more important than precision; “For the level of student we’re teaching anything that allows them to communicate and feel like they’re getting their message across is useful. So, if they’re going to use a word and the only reason they know it is - that it’s a loanword in Japanese, that’s fine, that’s no problem.” This approach to language teaching acknowledges that the creolisation of language can result in more productive output, as was apparent in Emma’s observed lesson. The acceptance of loanwords as mediational tools, inherent in the approach, not only involves their immediate facility as tools to support communication, but also their more general facility in changing how the mental function of language acquisition for Japanese students of English could evolve.
From an instructional perspective, Emma presented herself as the provider of knowledge who considered learning as socially mediated by drawing on popular resources, here loanwords, and engaged in a communicative approach to teaching. In the context of an English Communication course, loanwords were one of these resources. This communicative approach allowed the students to gain knowledge of the language with loanwords as one tool of mediation. This approach mirrors Swain’s (1985) beliefs outlined in the input/output hypothesis, where loanwords as tools and resources are part of the input, the learners comprehend the input as a loanword, identify the English aspect, and once they have comprehended the linguistic form, attain a deeper command over English output. However, as Emma’s own Japanese proficiency improved so did her concerns about her over-reliance on loanwords. “I’ve always had the impression that in Japanese, proper Japanese, formal Japanese, loanwords aren’t used as much…because I relied so much on them in getting my message across that became an issue.”

Emma compared her dependence on loanwords, when speaking Japanese, with English speaking children learning the “-ed” ending for past tense verbs, and then “applying the pattern…with everything or just applying it randomly”. She felt although this dependence was “alright with casual conversation”, and that she was readily understood, it was inappropriate “in a formal context…I came to over-rely on them and felt this stopped me learning the proper word for something, and that…this limited the situations and the contexts I could use Japanese in.” Her experience in the use of loanwords through her development as a learner of Japanese, was reflected in her outlook on students using loanwords to learn English. Emma’s belief that with an English loanword you “can’t assume that it will work just because a lot do” reflected research by Rogers, Webb, and Nakata (2014) that states that although learning
cognates is easier and benefits language learning, for Japanese students using these in contexts is difficult. With lower-level learners Emma had encouraged students to embrace loanwords without much regulation on her part in terms of error correction. With higher-level learners she was more concerned with pointing out semantic and phonological inconsistencies, and assisting students to refine their loanword usage and contextual appropriateness. These approaches stemmed from her very positive experiences as a low-level learner of Japanese with English loanword usage, and her concerns as her Japanese proficiency developed.

Emma spoke of her belief that the usefulness of loanwords diminished as her Japanese proficiency increased. In light of Daulton’s findings (2008) that the presence of English loanwords in Japanese decreases proportionate to their infrequency, this is understandable. Daulton observed that English loanwords are most evident in the most commonly used Japanese words, and that they were therefore of greater utility for lower-level students of English. Emma However even for these students, loanwords remained a tool for scaffolded learning, with interaction between Emma and her students activating their ZPD, allowing time for internalisation to occur, and eventually leading to independent language development.

Although the streaming for this class was based on English proficiency alone, there was also a very high correlation between this proficiency and their academic rating for subjects such as chemistry and mathematics related to their core course of study, based on entrance exam results and first-year academic performance. This was quite clearly the most proficient class of English speakers within the institute based on testing, and a group of students who foresaw a path of high-academic and
vocational achievement ahead of them. In this educational context, such characteristics made this class an interesting case to research and observe.

Unlike some other groups within the institution, most of these students could see “a clear connection between their departmental studies and their future career” would “complete all in-class and homework assignments, and use English when participating in class activities” (Emma, pre-observation interview). They displayed and spoke about their focused and thoughtful approach to English and how, and in what contexts, they understood English could be used as a tool to achieve career goals. “Many people [in this class] want to be pharmacists for international companies or Pharmacy professors. We need not just normal (sic) English but also Pharmacy English. We know that.” (Student 2, interview). In the context of a communicative English course, these dual objectives created some tensions and contradictions in terms of students’ acceptance of a more communicative approach to learning, with their desire to be precise with the language at all times (survey item 6, 92% agreement). Schmidt (1994) discusses this issue and supports the idea that error correction should promote “awareness of a rule or generalisation” (p. 18), the type of mediation that Emma was more inclined to provide.

Emma noted that this class was quite demanding in terms of the type of teaching they expected and specifically the type, and timing, of feedback they desired. She mentioned that at times her students’ focus on grammatical or phonological precision was at odds with her objectives for a lesson or particular task within that lesson. These different expectations surrounding the rules, division of labour, and objectives of activities, and the tensions they raised, will be explored through the lens of CHAT throughout the development of this case.
5.3.1 Student survey and interviews. Initial analysis of data from the student survey (n=24) revealed some strong and consistent attitudes in relation to English language learning (see Appendix I). Further themes, and points of significant interest to the study, arose during the three separate interviews that were conducted with students prior to the classroom observation.

Strong agreement with the importance and efficacy of a communicative approach to learning (items 6, 15) was shown by many students, as was support for an enjoyable learning environment (item 2). At the same time repetition, practice, and concerted effort outside of a classroom environment (items 11, 27) were considered to be vital “in order to understand and speak English well”. The extrinsic motivation of achieving English proficiency for future career prospects (item 21) was also apparent. These data again pointed to two quite distinct learning objectives – communicative competence, and technical, academic competence in the field of pharmaceutical science. Emma felt that these dual objectives created some tension in terms of her role, and the expectations of her students. As a teacher of English Communication, she felt that the students’ desire to “be corrected at all times” was somewhat counter-productive in this context. Although she appreciated that a different approach would be required if students’ assessments were academic presentations or research papers, she felt that focusing solely on form and accuracy was not appropriate here.

During all three student interviews, conducted one-on-one with the researcher in English, the English fluency of the students and confidence to discuss issues was apparent. As Emma had suggested, this was a very “conscientious and …homogenous” group of students who spoke of a common sense of purpose in terms of their career paths and the role of English in the pursuit of those. “Most of us know
what we want to do…”. This was not just a community of Japanese people, or even of English-speaking Japanese; it was a community of future Japanese pharmacists and pharmaceutical scientists who appreciated English as a tool, and English loanwords as a particularly useful tool, in achieving a career objective.

According to Emma, in terms of career paths, many of these students were interested in either working for an international company in Japan or overseas or undertaking post-graduate studies where presentations and publications would be in English. Both these paths demand a very high level of specific English proficiency that these students could achieve given that they had entered the program with a reasonably high level of proficiency. However, although their proficiency had since improved, they remained concerned how this more general English communicative competence would allow them to address the specific requirements of their future careers. Students in this class were completing their third of four semesters of compulsory English Communication studies and, after one more semester, would be entering a four-year program of English for Pharmaceutical Sciences, conducted by English-proficient native-Japanese professors from that faculty. Understandably, they felt that this pharmaceutically-specific program was extremely important for them.

In terms of English loanwords in Japanese, students were quite neutral about their usefulness in assisting language acquisition in a general sense (items 52, 55) but were far more positive when discussing them in terms of pharmaceutically-specific vocabulary. Katakana is used to write many of the technical and scientific words that Japanese has borrowed from other languages, but while loanwords predominate in the Japanese medical, chemical, and pharmaceutical lexicon, a significant number of them are derived from languages other than English, particularly German. To highlight the linguistic complexity involved, some metals known since antiquity,
such as gold (Au), copper (Cu), and iron (Fe), have distinct Japanese words. More recent discoveries, such as sodium (Na) retain the Latin, “natrium”. Compounds, such as methane, use the English term. An x-ray, “rentogen”, is derived from German. Highlighting this complexity, Student 3 commented: “In Japanese, silver is gin, gin-iro, maybe shiru-baa (laughs) – [the katakana pronunciation of the English]; in English it is silver; in science it is Ag, a metal. Different times…”.

5.3.2 Classroom observation. The observation lesson for this class was entitled “Health and Lifestyle – A Review”. The lesson began with a review of health-related vocabulary. A glossary of words, (such as vegetarian, fitness, diet, and lifestyle) had been created by the students in the previous lesson. This was projected onto the screen at the front of class, and students in groups of four or five were given about five minutes to think of English definitions for each word. Emma then asked individual students to explain to the rest of the class how they had defined a particular word. By asking students from different groups, Emma was able to elicit more breadth and depth than the initial definition may have provided. At one stage she pointed out that “diet is used both as a noun and a verb in English…not just what we eat, but also a specific program of eating designed to help us lose weight or get fit”, resolving any contradiction that could impede comprehension. The word “diet” is an English loanword in Japanese, and a student pointed out that it was also used in exactly the “same [way] in Japanese”.

From a socio-cultural perspective, in terms of ZPD and teacher-mediation, Emma was using students’ knowledge of L1 and L2 to encourage an understanding of the relationship between them, and by bringing these similarities to students’ attention, encouraging the development of explicit knowledge. Here students came to realise that in Japanese often the same word stems are used for nouns and verbs,
which is also the case in English. In terms of the division of labour, there is an equal contribution by students and the teacher, reflecting the relatively high-level of these students and the expectations Emma has because of this.

This concept-checking exercise was followed by the viewing of two videos by the whole class, of a patient talking to a doctor about his/her lifestyle. The videos ended with the doctor providing advice as to how the patient could lead a healthier life. This provided the context for the next activity, a lifestyle survey, in which students in their groups were given a list of ten questions (How often do you exercise? What do you usually eat for breakfast?, for example). Each student was then asked to give their answers to the group, and then the group had to decide “Who has the healthiest lifestyle in your group?”

One student from each group was then asked to report back to the class. Emma made a note of any pronunciation, lexical, grammatical errors and asked “Is there a better way we could say this?” Often students were able to self-correct, or other students could provide assistance. If not, Emma provided the correction. She had previously commented that with other groups of students she was very aware of the de-motivating influence of “over-correcting”, but felt that this group of students “expect and demand that I correct any errors.” In terms of teacher-mediation, these expectations occasionally led to conflict, with students seeking overt regulation, Emma attempting to push students to accomplish activities with more self-regulation and internalisation of language rules. In terms of the object of this part of the lesson, or the more general object of the activity between the student participants and the teacher, precision of use was emphasised. Unlike other areas of the lessons, when Emma was reticent to correct errors that may interrupt a communicative flow, she felt it was appropriate here.
This type of activity more closely resembled a short presentation, than the purely communicative activity that had preceded it. Subsequently, Emma adapted her approach to examine each aspect of learning difficulty and confusion, and resolved it. Here the community of learners and teacher were proactive in co-constructing meaning, echoing Vygotsky’s belief (cited in Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 207) that “learning collaboratively with others, particularly in instructional settings, precedes and shapes development”.

The lesson concluded with a class discussion of the factors involved in living a healthy lifestyle, and doctor/patient role-plays involving presenting symptoms and giving advice. The loanword vocabulary that emerged was more lay-terminology than scientific in nature (diet, alcohol, vegetarian, dance, influenza…) but throughout the students displayed complete confidence in using English pronunciation. It became obvious that these students were not embarrassed to pronounce English loanwords with English pronunciation, even to their peers, and that when speaking English they felt they had become part of a different community. This appeared to be partly due to their level of English fluency, partly due to their own sense of communal purpose as English language learners, and also because of the supportive environment that Emma had created to facilitate language learning. Perhaps this was also an indication that students had internalised the phonological rules governing loanword usage in Japanese and were able to produce these words independently. In the following case, with students of lower proficiency, students were only able to do so after teacher mediation.

The lesson broadly adhered to the structure of Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP) outlined by Harmer (2009). From the perspective of CHAT, the
three stages of this process involve different rules, divisions of labour, and objectives as outlined below.

The initial stage of a PPP lesson is generally an introduction by the teacher to raise awareness, or interest in the topic, where student involvement is quite minimal. The second stage focuses primarily on form, where items are practised in a controlled way and errors are corrected immediately by the teacher. The third stage focuses primarily on fluency, communicative activities, and often the personalisation of material. Error correction at this stage is rarely immediate, based on the assumption that “over-assistance decreases the student’s ability to become fully self-regulated” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 211). The gradual progression from teacher-regulation to self-regulation throughout the three stages recognises that the dynamics of activities must inform the nature of feedback (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).

In the post-observation interview Emma stated that her students felt very comfortable with the first two stages of the process, “the type of activity they are used to throughout high school…so they implicitly understand their role and the role of the teacher”. The objectives of these initial stages are to introduce a topic, focus on form, and practice that in a very controlled way. The role of the teacher is to inform and correct. The role of the learner is initially very passive - to listen, to absorb, and then to practice. Emma felt that students struggled with the changing nature of the objectives, rules and division of labour, of the third stage of the process. Here the teacher steps back and students are required to take the active role of producing language without much support from the teacher. It had taken students some time to become comfortable with the third stage of this process, and from Emma’s view required “some discussion with students that the aim of this type of activity meant that I wouldn’t be immediately correcting errors”. Here Emma was
displaying an implicit understanding of the principles behind CHAT, and the way mediation, and the tools of mediation, are not static. Instead they reflect, and are dependent on, the objectives of the activity. Students seemed more reluctant to accept that different types of activity also required more or less active participation on their part, and of the teacher, and that mediation would change because of this.

These students would soon be entering a field in which loanwords are very prevalent. This was a group of students who seemed quite comfortable in participating in numerous communities of practice - Japanese speakers, English speakers, pharmaceutical scientists. Emma commented that her objective with this class was not only to provide opportunities to enhance their accuracy but also to enhance fluency. Having surveyed all students earlier in the semester about their English language objectives, she found that they were relatively confident in their English communicative abilities, were keen for more opportunities to use them, but were very focused on achieving more accurate written and oral usage. The dual and sometimes conflicting objectives, of oral fluency and linguistic accuracy, created some tensions between the expectations of the students and objectives of the teacher. These tensions are outlined in more depth in Chapter Six.

5.4 Barry’s class

The class of first-year students (n=27) involved in this case study (ten females, 17 males), were from the Department of Nanoscience (11) and the Department of Biotechnology (16). All had scored within the A1 (beginner) CEFR band on the initial placement test and comprised the third of six tiers within the first-year Biotechnology/Nanoscience cohort.

At the time the data for this case were collected, Barry had been in Japan for about five years. He was initially involved in the Japan Exchange and Teaching
(JET) program. This exchange and teaching initiative is supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) and sponsors young English-speaking graduates to live and work in Japan as Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs). He has subsequently worked in a Japanese university as an English lecturer. Prior to coming to Japan, Barry studied Japanese at high-school and university and has Japanese language qualifications to the upper-intermediate/advanced level. In contrast to Adam, Alice, and Emma, Barry did not feel that the presence of English loanwords in Japanese had been advantageous for him in acquiring the Japanese language.

“Loanwords have become so integrated, and have been used in Japanese for so long, that essentially they are now Japanese words.” (Barry, post-observation interview). This quotation typified Barry’s beliefs about loanwords, and informed his approach to the use of loanwords in the teaching of English to Japanese learners. For Barry loanwords have become so integrated into the Japanese language that he does not see them as a particularly useful learning tool.

Despite having studied Japanese in classrooms with a variety of teachers, over many years, Barry could not recall “any specific instances of having classes on loanwords”, nor “any clear attitude one way or the other” that teachers displayed towards them as tools for language acquisition. He stated: “When they’ve come up it’s more looking at where they’ve come from, what words they’ve come from” rather than “trying to use them in any way.” As a teacher of English to Japanese students he agreed that his approach to loanwords mirrored that of his own teachers: “I don’t pay conscious attention to them but if… a student has used them, I’ve told them that’s an English word originally…just so they’re aware of it.” In terms of the place of loanwords as a tool for assisting acquisition, within English language teaching and learning in Japan, Barry felt that “the way they’re used … the way
they’ve come to be used in Japanese is not how we use them typically in English anyway. They’ve attained this separate meaning, a separate way of being used. So, for that reason I haven’t really found them” either as a student of Japanese or a teacher of English to Japanese students “to be an advantage in any way”. This view is contrary to Ringbom and Jarvis’s (2009) belief that “this built-in lexicon, gairaigo, provides a powerful tool for more effective learning” although it provides challenges for teachers (p. 115).

These comments revealed Barry’s more conservative and traditional teaching methodology and the rules that underpin such an approach. From his perspective, creolisation that differs in pronunciation, meaning, or nuance from the original is not seen as a productive resource. This approach to language teaching leaves little room for English loanwords to be used as tools of acquisition. Barry’s beliefs were more in line with scholars such as Hatch and Brown (1995), Yip (1995) and Williams (2017, p. 170) who observes that English loanwords are “often problematic crosslinguistically”. Barry’s experiences as a Japanese language learner, his approach to language teaching, and his beliefs about the efficacy of loanwords as a tool for second language acquisition, contrasted with those of the other teachers involved in this research. This contrast highlighted some of the points of contention that have surrounded the study of the loanword phenomenon in Japan, such as Sheperd’s analysis of the “pitfalls of cognates” (2006). Sheperd noted numerous instances of loanwords causing phonological or semantic confusion between native English speakers and Japanese speakers of English. He noted very few occasions where they produced a positive effect. Barry echoed these observations and stated that although he had an interest in “where loanwords have come from, what words they’ve come from” they had become “a part of modern Japanese”. Although he felt
they have become a very useful tool for Japanese speakers to communicate with each other, particularly for certain groups within the Japanese-speaking community (pop culture enthusiasts, sports fans and the like), he said that they were not a useful tool for Japanese learners of English and at times were a hindrance and source of confusion. Few would argue that this is not sometimes the case. However, this concern may be ameliorated and by their great strengths as tools of mediation “conducive to the accomplishment…of learning” (Lee, 1958, p. 58) and the “phonological and orthographic correspondences that arise through borrowing” (Daulton, 2008, p. 4). Daulton suggests that despite the occasional confusion that may arise through adopting loanwords as tools of language acquisition, the benefits of the approach significantly outweigh the disadvantages (see also Ringbom & Jarvis, 2009). In a sense, Barry was refuting Daulton’s claim that “a focus on errors is not an appropriate way to approach cognates and [the] strong evidence that the effect of gairaigo is predominantly positive on various aspects of English word knowledge” (2008, p. 64).

Barry gave three main reasons for his view. First, in terms of his own acquisition of Japanese and experience teaching English to Japanese students, he had not found loanwords to be useful tools; that many loanwords are from languages other than English; second, many loanwords have semantically shifted so dramatically from the English that they are a hindrance to language acquisition; third, many Japanese words that are written in katakana are not loanwords at all.

To illustrate his first point Barry mentioned the loanword “アルバイト” (arubaito) as an example, which means a part-time job in Japanese, from the German “arbeit” – “work”. This is a very common word in Japanese, particularly in the context of a university in which many students have part-time jobs. “I mean I find
quite a few of the loanwords are not necessarily from English, you know German or French, so even in German or French I don’t know the meaning so they haven’t really assisted me in understanding in that way.”

From his own perspective as a Japanese language learner, Barry felt that the presence of loanwords from languages other than English had not helped him acquire Japanese, and may even have been detrimental; he felt that his students could “not rely on loanwords” for a similar reason. Although recent research has suggested that up to 95% of loanwords used in modern Japanese are from English (Daulton, 2008), Barry felt the number of loanwords from languages other than English was a “big problem” especially since “a lot of students don’t give any consideration to where they’ve come from anyway”.

The following exchange illustrates Barry’s second point, regarding the semantic shift that some English loanwords undergo in Japanese.

I think because quite a few now actually have separate or diverged (sic) meanings from the original English I think they actually can pose a bit of difficulty for learners of Japanese because they’re not really what we expect them to be, or they’re not used in the way we expect.

When I asked Barry to clarify by providing an example, he responded:

One you hear semi-often, what was it …“skinship”. Japanese people like to use that…I guess it means physical intimacy. … It’s completely illogical English as well. It’s one of those classic examples of it sounds like an English
word, and I guess it is a loanword, but it’s taken on its own meaning. (pre-
observation interview)

Although this is less an instance of semantic shift (such as “handle”, handoru in Japanese, that has come to mean “steering wheel”) than wasei eigo (Japanese-
made English), here “skinship” (physical, if not sexual intimacy, such as hugging or holding hands) is not a word within the English lexicon. Barry maintained that this type of linguistic transfer posed a “significant problem” for learners. The variety of English that Barry refers to here is peculiarly Japanese-English (wasei-eigo) and demonstrates a problem for Japanese learners of English. Although studies have shown that this aspect of Japanese-English constitutes only a small percentage of overall loanword use, scholars (Daulton, 2008) many linguists (Kimura, 1989; Sheperd 1996; Uchida, 2003) have referred to its negative influence on the acquisition of English, particularly Standard English, in Japan. As Kay (1995) notes, loanwords which have strayed significantly from the original also known as false friends, (Daulton, 2008) do not only cause confusion for learners, but also reduce their confidence in applying loanword knowledge more generally.

Barry’s third point related to the connection between loanwords and katakana, the Japanese script in which they are written.

Particularly I find in songs or in TV ads, they’re always using, not always, often, there’s a lot of katakana use, when there doesn’t need to be, for like emphasis and that sort of thing. For me it’s more a katakana use thing…rather than a loanword thing. The use of katakana has been a lot more normalised, and for that reason maybe they…can’t tell or they don’t
differentiate between whether it’s a Japanese word being written in katakana or a loanword. (pre-observation interview)

Just as Barry was concerned with the presence of loanwords from languages other than English in the Japanese lexicon, he was concerned with katakana words that were not loanwords. Despite Daulton’s research (2008) that found loanwords from languages other than English accounted for significantly less than 10% of the total, and katakana usage of words other than loanwords a similar percentage, Barry maintained that this represented a significant problem for learners. In terms of socio-cultural theory, as Lantolf and Thorne (2006, p. 207) observe, only when “mediating processes are efficient can there be a potential to create conditions for learning”. However, Barry saw loanwords not only as ineffective tools for assisting English language acquisition, but also deleterious and negative ones. Because he did not recognise loanwords as a pedagogical resource, he was unwilling to make use of them as a pedagogical tool or to adapt his teaching methods to incorporate them into his lessons. As a native-English speaker with high Japanese language proficiency, and significant experience of teaching English to Japanese students, Barry raised issues which echoed the concerns of researchers such as, Oshima (1995), Sheperd (1996), and Cook (2002) who have discussed the pitfalls, and detrimental influence of English loanwords on Japanese learners. Other teachers, whilst acknowledging areas of confusion, were more willing to focus on the advantages of utilising loanwords, rather than the occasional inconsistencies.

Through analysis of survey, interview, and observation data it was found that students in Barry’s class was slightly more receptive towards loanwords as tools for facilitating English language acquisition than either their previous English teachers
(primarily native-Japanese speakers) or Barry, their current teacher. Despite needing some clarification as to what loanwords actually were, they admitted quite readily that they used them extensively within many different Japanese-speaking communities; friends, professors, parents, commercial interactions. At the same time, they were ambivalent about the advantages loanwords may hold for facilitating acquisition. During the interview, students mentioned differences in “はつおん” (pronunciation) and “いみ” (meaning) as areas that caused “confusion”. In light of interviews and observations these approaches to loanwords were important, and mirrored Barry’s concerns.

5.4.1 Student survey and interviews. Based on analysis of the student survey (n=25) (see Appendix J), it was found that the students from this class were generally very positive about English language learning (item 17) and their level of proficiency (item 7). They saw English communicative competency as something that could be beneficial in a social sense (item 17) rather than from a career perspective (item 21), perhaps because they had only just begun their university studies and were less sure of their career paths than students from Emma’s class. Although they were rather reticent about speaking with foreigners (item 44) they recognised the importance of a communicative approach to language learning (item 15) despite the need for more structured practice (item 11).

The interview for this class was conducted as a group with four students, both in English and Japanese. Students’ responses to the questions “Do you often use loanwords?”, “Who do you use them with?” were as follows:

“Yes, we use them all the time.” (Student 2)

“…with family” (Student 1)
“with friends” (Student 4)
“with Japanese professors” (Student 3)
“and Japanese professors use them all the time with us too (laughs)” (Student 2)
(all of this exchange in Japanese)

In terms of the usefulness of loanwords in assisting English acquisition the students were also quite positive. All four students mentioned pronunciation as the biggest barrier. Three students believed they were “very helpful”, while one student thought they were “very helpful but…sometimes confusing…because I think it’s Japanese word (sic)”. The occasional phonological or semantic discrepancy, between English loanwords in Japanese and their word of origin, may lead to this confusion and hesitance, particularly when they cause “memorable errors which can easily assume an importance in learners’ and teachers’ minds that is out of proportion” (Daulton, 2008, p. 107). Ringbom (2007) also stresses the importance of teachers in contributing to students’ confidence in loanwords, by pointing out similarities, rather than exaggerating the dangers.

In terms of vocabulary acquisition one student mentioned Praxis, an online ESL site, involving multiple items, focusing on discrete vocabulary items and listening activities…”in class and for homework, and I don’t know I know, but I know…it’s gairaigo. Easy for us.” (Others nodding in agreement). Although the students raised some of the same issues that Barry had mentioned, particularly differences in pronunciation, loanwords appeared to assist them here in ascertaining the meaning of previously unknown words in English. Students were unable to come
up with a specific example but had independently used loanwords in completing tasks in class and for homework.

Student survey responses (items 51, 54) indicated that Barry and their high-school English teachers had a similar attitude towards loanwords, as unproductive and often deleterious to English acquisition. One of the reasons that Barry resisted the use of loanwords was because he did not perceive them as a formal tool for language learning. Drawing on Stanlaw (2004), loanwords are often not seen as elite tools, particularly within the Japanese education system. Barry’s beliefs reinforced much of what this class of students’ teachers throughout high school had taught them, where loanword use was apparently frowned upon (items 53, 54). These beliefs lead to primacy being given to learning objects that are not part of the socio-cultural context of these students, leading to gaps forming in learning, and tools such as loanwords being ignored. In this case students had been, and continued to be, discouraged from drawing on their real-world knowledge to acquire language despite independent and successful use of loanwords as mediational tools.

The historical and social context of these words seemed to be impacting differently on Barry and his students, who related to the object, here the loanwords and conscious use of loanwords, in different ways. From the perspective of socio-cultural theory, mediational tools matter in terms of achieving objectives. Because Barry did not see loanwords as effective tools, the approach he took depended more on traditional resources and methodologies.

5.4.2 Classroom observation. This observation lesson was entitled “Fluency activities”. The lesson began with a speed reading activity, as it had for the previous 20 lessons – a program “designed to increase students’ reading fluency” (Barry). The activity involved students individually reading a 300-word text, answering five
comprehension questions related to it, and then recording their time/score on a spreadsheet. Although fluency was ostensibly the goal of the activity, the requirement to answer questions related to a text conforms to a more traditional approach to reading than an extensive reading activity.

Following this, the students brainstormed vocabulary related to daily routines (get up, have a shower, eat breakfast), that Barry wrote on the whiteboard; a review of the previous lesson. Barry then asked individual students to pronounce a particular word or phrase, corrected it for them if necessary, and asked for the Japanese translation. On five occasions students mispronounced a loanword “shower (pronounced sha-waa), coffee (ko-hi), lunch (run-chi), pizza, class”. Barry then pronounced the word in katakana-style and then asked “In English?” Invariably, students were able to do so. I mentioned this at the post-observation interview, to which Barry replied “That’s my point”. He felt that students were more likely to mispronounce loanwords because they had an in-built Japanese (katakana) alternative to the correct pronunciation, and that this needed to be corrected immediately. Without acknowledging it formally, Barry was drawing on the students’ learning through the use of loanwords, and gradually transforming his mediation from explicit corrections to “implicit leading questions” (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994) such as “In English?” Indirectly the activity drew on loanwords as the learning objective, although Barry smoothed over any apparent contradiction in the activity by portraying the learning of English through more standard forms.

Having reviewed the vocabulary, students took part in a paired running-dictation (in which one student physically ran to various texts, related to daily routines, that had been placed around the classroom, read them, and then verbally passed the message to their partner, who wrote them down). Students had ten
minutes to complete the task after which they corrected their scripts from the originals. This dictation was followed by a sequencing activity on daily routines, and the lesson culminated with students writing down five questions, of their own choosing, and asking numerous partners for their responses. (“What’s the first thing you do after getting up in the morning?”, “What do you usually have for breakfast?”). Barry’s role throughout was primarily as a facilitator, although he occasionally intervened to focus on specific issues that had occurred. These interventions were almost entirely related to pronunciation. He alerted students to these problems and then drilled them individually or with the whole class. From a socio-cultural perspective, this aspect of Barry’s mediation was an attempt to scaffold students’ zone of proximal development by focusing on the differences between katakana pronunciation and that of Standard English. Viewing this entire teaching/learning sequence through the AT lens provided insights into the various aspects of the system, and the tensions and contradictions apparent within it. The objects of concern to the subjects (teacher and students), as revealed through interview and survey data, seemed complementary - “to speak English well” (Student 3) and to “promote English fluency” (Barry). This object was exemplified by Barry’s use of tasks such as speed reading, and a running dictation, that emphasised fluency, but which were more traditional modes of learning.

Barry’s main objective for this group of learners, in the classroom environment, was to teach or review particular vocabulary sets, to drill the pronunciation of those words, and then have students use those words in fluency-building activities, either in pairs or small groups. As the classroom was probably “the only time these students speak English” he saw his role as providing information on meaning/semantics and then setting up activities in which students could practice
using those words through oral communication. This approach includes some components of the grammar-translation method of teaching referred to in Chapter Two, where the instructor is the source of knowledge and correction. However, it also places some emphasis on oral communication, as outlined by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) (2003) by giving opportunities for students to produce language as well as studying discrete vocabulary items.

This class had a willingness to communicate with the teacher, and each other, in English which pointed to the students’ acceptance of Barry’s rule of “English only” in the classroom, except when specifically asked to speak in Japanese (for example, in response to concept-checking questions). Although Barry felt that loanwords were not a useful tool of acquisition, their use throughout the lesson was apparent, as was the occasional use of Japanese to clarify or indicate understanding. Barry’s high-level of Japanese competence meant that the use of Japanese for clarification was a viable, albeit selectively implemented, tool for him to use. The use of loanwords as a mediating tool of communication, evident in other observed classes, was far less obvious here. Instead, Standard English and Standard Japanese were used to facilitate communication. This purist approach demonstrates Barry’s assumption that cross-linguistic influence has a predominantly negative impact both on language acquisition and languages themselves. This also reflects Daulton’s (2008, p. 62) view that often the “distinction between linguistics and social commentary is obscured”. It is also evident in Rollins’ (1999) belief that gairaigo not only impedes language acquisition for Japanese learners of English, and English learners of Japanese, but is also responsible for the dumbing-down of Japanese (see also Tomoda, 2005). Although Barry does not make this latter claim, both as a
learner or teacher he did not view loanwords as “an advantage in any way” in terms of language acquisition.

Barry provided other tools to students by Barry in the form of vocabulary items, their meaning and correct pronunciation, and texts which students could use to employ them communicatively. Barry provided knowledge and set tasks; students used that knowledge to communicate with each other in English. Tensions within the system became apparent in relation to the students’ attitudes towards loanwords, and that of their current and former teachers. Although students’ beliefs about the efficacy of loanwords as tools for acquiring English competence were not overwhelmingly positive, they were significantly more positive than their impressions of their previous teachers’ beliefs, or the beliefs Barry outlined during interviews. Students also revealed that they had only come to the realisation of the usefulness of loanwords through independent study, not through classroom interactions. This was not surprising given Barry’s stance on loanwords.

In summary, this case provided insights into the resistance of some people to the phenomenon of loanwords within Japanese. It also revealed how this resistance has informed pedagogic practice and ignored loanwords as effective tools of English acquisition. At the same time, this case illustrated how first-year university students are comfortable with loanwords as part of the Japanese lexicon, and confident in their usefulness for providing easy access to another language.

5.5 Conclusion.

This chapter has presented four case studies to explore the research focus of the role of loanwords in language acquisition. The four teachers demonstrated varying views about the use of loanwords as a productive teaching resource. Adam was particularly positive towards them, Barry quite negative. Emma used loanwords
productively, while Alice, although discussing the significance of loanwords as tools for vocabulary acquisition, did not focus on the use of loanwords in her class. The data suggest that the four teachers’ beliefs about loanwords corresponded with their perceptions about how loanwords had affected their own acquisition of Japanese, became increasingly obvious. Teachers’ own perceptions of, exposure to, and acceptance of loanwords impacted on their use of loanwords for teaching and the processes of ZPD established in the classroom.

From a socio-cultural perspective, when the teachers provided loanwords as mediating tools, productive learning and internalisation of rules could take place. However, Adam was frustrated by the slow pace of this internalisation by his students, and Emma also met with some resistance to her teaching strategies. Alice indicated an implicit acceptance of the importance of loanwords without a demonstrable approach in teaching made analysis difficult. Barry displayed a reluctance to accept loanwords within his pedagogy, and a more traditional approach to teaching language and emphasis on Standard English. Students felt that their teachers prior to university had either ignored loanwords or viewed them unfavourably. Students were generally more favourable than these teachers to the idea of loanwords as tools of acquisition, but their use or recognition of use was somewhat dependent on the teachers’ approaches.

In the next chapter a cross-case analysis of the key emergent themes is undertaken. Key themes and contradictions are drawn on to answer the research questions.
Chapter 6: Cross-case Analysis

The previous chapter discussed four separate case studies involving teachers and groups of students. These discussions outlined the backgrounds and beliefs, as well as the pedagogical and learning approaches, of the participants. In this chapter a cross-case analysis will be presented which, guided by the research questions, focuses on the key similarities and differences of the cases in terms of incorporating English loanwords within approaches to English teaching and learning in Japan. The chapter also discusses the impact of educational policy on teaching approaches and learning practice.

The case studies presented in Chapter Five are studied for the themes that emerged as a result of examining each case through different categories and aspects of language-teaching and learning beliefs of the participants, their teaching and learning experiences, the contextual socio-cultural environment, and the teaching and learning processes revealed through artefacts, curricula, and lesson designs.

CHAT and SCT are employed to identify the themes based on significant findings, including the use of loanwords as tools in some of the teaching and learning contexts, the division of labour in terms of teaching and learning, object-oriented learning, and factors that influenced teaching and learning objects. Further, themes are identified to illustrate the similarities and differences that were present in the beliefs and teaching and learning practices of participants.

The themes that emerged from the data analysis are as follows:

Theme 1: Influence of curricula and educational policy on teaching and learning practice.
Theme 2: Teachers’ and learners’ knowledge, experiences, and beliefs about teaching and learning language.

Theme 3: Teaching and learning practice with a focus on language resources, tools, and perceptions about learning objects.

6.1 Theme One: External influences

As noted in Chapter Two, the Ministry for Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) is the body that oversees English language curricula in Japanese schools, and sets the criteria for teaching methods and goals. Ministerial policies continue to impact the nature and focus of English language teaching throughout the entire Japanese education system. As discussed in that chapter, MEXT encouraged a shift away from the audio-lingual and grammar-translation methods as far back as the 1970s, and began prioritising communicative skills and teaching methods. However, English language education in Japan has been slow to adopt a more communicative approach to language teaching (Taguchi, 2005). Practical difficulties in adopting such an approach have been exacerbated by testing procedures that actively discourage it (Guest, 2000) and consequently make it difficult for teachers and students to move away from more traditional methods. Nevertheless, MEXT has considerable expectations and influence on English language education in Japan.

Most recently, MEXT has outlined objectives for each stage of English education: “To nurture the foundations for communication skills” in the final two years of elementary schooling; “To carry out simple information exchanges and describe familiar matters in English” in junior high-school; and “To nurture the ability to communicate fluently with English-speaking people” in high school (MEXT, 2014). How these objectives influence and are influenced by other aspects of the system is outlined through the following figure which provides an AT
representation of the system of activity associated with MEXT’s influence on English language education in Japan. Although educational policy was not an initial focus of this study, it became an implication and finding that emerged from the data collected.

Figure 6.1: MEXT Activity System
A close reading of the figure illustrates how there is one point of disconnection between the stated objectives of MEXT and the actual outcome for students. This disconnect is linked to the secondary outcome, relating to teachers’ inability or unwillingness to enforce policy objectives. This inability or unwillingness remains linked to two factors raised by Tahira (2012): first that many teachers are ill-equipped or not trained to implement a communicative curriculum; second that students are still required to pass exams that do not test communicative ability, and therefore teachers are forced to make a compromise between helping their students pass these exams and achieve the less quantifiable goals of communicative competence. Until an examination is put in place that reflects the philosophical goals that MEXT espouses it seems unlikely that educational outcomes will change. The limited ability of teachers to adopt a communicative approach leads to considerable challenges and contradictions both in the teaching methods adopted and in adopting the objectives set by MEXT.

Even if those changes are made, it is “essential that more support be given in order for (the native) teachers (of English) to become confident and capable of teaching in communicative ways” (Tahira, 2012, p. 6). Recent research has shown that many teachers have received only limited English training and lack the confidence to implement current directives from the Ministry (Fennelly & Luxton, 2011).

The disconnection between MEXT’s objectives and educational outcomes is further clarified by an examination of a wider system of activity. The following model outlines the objectives of the various stakeholders involved with English education in Japan, including teachers, students, and tertiary institutions that are directly impacted by the outcomes of secondary school English education in Japan.
The discussion following outlines the contradictions that arise due to conflicts both within and between these objectives. With such a system, when the students enrol in higher education programs, they remain ill-prepared to adopt the communicative approach. This gives rise to the dilemma for the native English teachers who find it difficult to balance the conflicting objectives of secondary school and tertiary education.

**Figure 6.2: Stakeholder Objectives**
Figure 6.2 reveals how the contradictions between the stated MEXT policies, and official tests, cause disturbances right throughout the system of activity, affecting both secondary school teachers, who are forced to prioritise one MEXT objective over the other, university teachers who are faced with students who have become used to a particular style of teaching and learning, and universities who may not be entirely aware of the difficulties in changing objectives, or succeeding in those objectives in a short period of time.

By imposing a new objective of promoting communicative competence, while maintaining the original objective of passing exams that reward a traditional grammar-translation approach to teaching and learning, supported by MEXT and private universities, tensions and contradictions have emerged. The nature of secondary school public examinations, and university entrance exams (heavily focused on grammatical knowledge), continues to limit this initiative (Ruegg, 2009). As Ruegg observed within these communities of practice, teachers and students are often forced to choose between two incompatible objectives, with very mixed results, and with traditional approaches to learning language maintaining primacy.

One of the contradictions that arose out of this policy is that even though some teachers and students appeared to have developed an understanding of language learning as a way of communicating, and some comprehension of how codes operate within language, this understanding was often marginalised by external examinations that distanced language from the cultural context of learning. In terms of the current socio-cultural context of teaching and learning, recent policies that recognise the significance of a communicative approach to language learning have demonstrated an important change in focus. However, at the implementation phase this approach is superimposed through familiar modes of teaching and learning. This
may be due to a variety of factors. Fennelly and Luxton (2011) and Tahira (2012) argue that the varied interpretations of CLT, and the “many interpretations and manifestations” of the approach (Brown, 2007, p. 45) have been confusing for Japanese teachers of English. As a result of this, teachers have often reverted to more traditional methods, such as “teacher-fronted grammar explanations, chorus readings, and vocabulary presentations” (Sakui, 2004, p. 157).

Nishino (2011) discovered that although high-school teachers held generally positive views about CLT, many “did not frequently use communicative activities”. This may be due to native teachers of English having a very low-level of communicative ability themselves (Anthony, 2016), or teachers’ lack of confidence in incorporating the approach and lack of training and support for teachers who have been asked to implement policy reforms (Tahira, 2012).

Furthermore, these policies are subverted by imposed testing objectives that remain at odds with this approach. Standardised exams have been shown to focus on “reading comprehension, translation ability, and vocabulary and grammar knowledge” (Tahira, 2012), so even teachers who are willing and able to implement a more communicative approach to language teaching and learning are forced to choose between these policy objectives and high-stakes entrance exams which remain the ultimate goal of many students (Kikuchi, 2006). The contradictions created by this dichotomy flow into the teaching and learning approaches observed throughout this study.

A communicative approach emphasises skills that assist students to communicate in a wide range of contexts. Terrell (1991) for example notes how within the communicative approach, grammar instruction is side-lined and a greater
focus is on the functional aspect of language. Richards (2006), in comparing grammatical competence with communicative competence, the goal of CLT, cites four major aspects: knowing how to use language in a variety of contexts; knowing how to vary language use based on context; knowing how to produce and understand a variety of texts; and knowing how to maintain communication.

An issue in adopting a communicative approach was illustrated by students who discussed how language approach was taken up by their junior high and high school teachers. According to them, their teachers focused strictly on the formal language approach. The teachers did not frequently draw on the English loanword resources existing in Japanese to build vocabulary and language awareness.

Table 6.1: Junior High School and High School Teachers and Loanwords (overall agreement percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1 Adam</th>
<th>Case 2 Alice</th>
<th>Case 3 Emma</th>
<th>Case 4 Barry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. My junior high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. My high school teachers often mentioned loanwords</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. My junior high school teachers thought that loanwords helped us learn English</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. My high school teachers thought that loanwords helped us learn English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Loanwords help me learn English.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table illustrates, students generally agreed that their junior high school and high school teachers (items 50 and 51) had not often mentioned loanwords. The majority of students believed that their high school teachers had not been particularly positive about loanwords in helping students acquire English (items 53 and 54, ranging from 21 to 36% agreement). For these two items there was little difference
between students’ reported responses by class or between junior high school and high school.

In contrast, students were significantly more positive (item 52) than their high school teachers about the positive influence of loanwords on English learning. So, in terms of a communicative approach, students appeared more willing to incorporate such tools, but without the guidance or support of their teachers, this uptake was minimised. This suggests that a gap occurred in the overall activity process that is essential to a communicative approach. Nevertheless, Adam (Case 1) mentioned that while he focused on loanwords, students seemed reluctant to “figure out and make use of the similarities” as he had done as a student. Students generally appeared neutral rather than negative towards loanwords, and this was typified by their reluctance to accept loanwords as tools for vocabulary acquisition and communicative competence. Contradictions arose due to these dissimilar approaches. Whilst some students mentioned the problems inherent with loanword use, such as semantic and phonological discrepancies, they were consistently more positive about loanword use than their high school teachers had been, a statement supported by Olah’s (2007) study. However, teachers’ lack of attention to loanwords meant that these were perceived only as an informal means to learn language. This highlights an important disturbance as far as students’ approach to loanwords was concerned.

While the socio-cultural context exposed them to a large repertoire of loanwords, by not being acknowledged in the formal teaching and learning context students were discouraged from not only incorporating individual vocabulary items, but also from using the loanword phenomenon as a whole as a learning tool.

Although students were sometimes positive towards loanwords, such inclination was undermined by the contradictory rules and learning objectives that
were set by their high school teachers. Students’ inclination to draw on loanwords as a socio-cultural tool was not acknowledged by their teachers, who had formed a firmly negative view about their use as a resource.

Students’ learning objectives, and the tools they adopted to achieve those, appeared influenced by those of their high school teachers, who in turn were subject to the requirements of institutions and forms of assessment that discouraged the use of loanwords. Students involved in these four case studies had not lived in an English-speaking country. In fact, Alice believed that she (like the other university English teachers) was the only native speaker her students had any significant contact with during their course of university study, and that their only prior contact had been with Assistant Language Teachers throughout high school. The three teachers (Adam, Emma, and Alice), who were particularly positive about the impact loanwords had on their L2 acquisition, came to this realisation while living in Japan.

Ruegg (2009) revealed how Japanese teachers of English in high school and junior high schools felt constrained by the need to prepare students for examinations. Ruegg’s study found that school examinations and university entrance tests were almost entirely focussed on grammar and non-loanword vocabulary, with no spoken component. Even teachers who were keen to incorporate communicative elements into their classes were constrained by institutional, parental, and student pressure to teach to the test all of which would constitute disturbances within the activity system of learning language.

Despite claims by MEXT that communicative competence is the goal of English education in Japan, a testing environment that imposes non-communicative objectives on its students has wide-ranging effects on the tools of mediation that are useful, and prioritised. Despite their strong presence in Japanese the importance of
loanwords is undermined by an ingrained system of testing and evaluation that places little emphasis on communicative competence, and has ignored the possibilities of a socio-cultural approach. Therefore, the process of communicative approach is never completed.

Findings indicate that the implementation of policies and curricula at the university level was also fraught with conflict and tension. Students often found it difficult to adjust to a learning environment in which they were required to engage more actively in the learning process. Contingent on the active participation of students, and English as the primary mode of communication, teachers take on more of a guiding role.

Adam, Alice and Emma displayed a close connection with the policy demands and the curricula. They all had scripted learning sessions where they used various tools, including loanwords, which engaged at the social and cognitive level of language learning- the affective dimension where they drew attention to the social aspects of language learning by focusing on the communicative, collaborative means of language learning. In these cases, the curriculum was realised in the study programs, often as a result of the assumptions teachers had about the practical goals of language learning. The university has its own activity system with goals, rules, and procedures, from which there are certain expectations and certain disturbances that arise. These will be examined in greater depth in section 6.3.

Through application of activity theory as a lens, the above discussion highlights how while there is a planned curriculum it is often re-designed by teachers due to contextual factors that reflect the teachers’ expectations of how to achieve the objective of learning.
All teachers involved with this study claimed to have communicative competence as a major objective for their students. However, as data demonstrated, they often drew from their own beliefs about language teaching and implemented these. Teachers also found that although students had spoken English in their high-school English classes this had generally followed an audio-lingual rather than communicative approach. Because of this, an immediate change to a purely communicative language classroom was often seen as extremely difficult, if not counter-productive, and an incremental movement incorporating students’ loanword knowledge (for Alice, Adam, and Emma) enabled this. However, as discussed later in this chapter, this incorporation sometimes produced its own contradictions and disturbances.

This section has illustrated how external influences, such as MEXT policies, have created contradictions and disturbances within many aspect of many activity systems - for secondary school teachers, to university teachers, to students, and also influenced how loanwords have been incorporated into teaching approaches.

6.2 Theme Two: Teachers’ and learners’ knowledge, experience, and beliefs

This section is divided into two sub-sections, the first focusing on teacher participants, the second on student participants in the study. Each of these sub-sections is viewed as an element of the activity systems, relating to the teaching and learning practice analysed in section 6.3.

6.2.1 Teachers’ knowledge, experience, and beliefs about loanwords. Numerous scholars have highlighted the positive correlation between a teacher’s proficiency in the L1 of their students and their ability to utilise loanwords as tools of acquisition. Ringbom (2007) notes the connection between L2 proficiency and a teacher’s ability to effectively incorporate loanwords into their pedagogy. Daulton (2003b) also stresses the importance for teachers to be aware of and understand English loanwords
in Japanese, while Otwinowska (2016) focuses on the need for teachers to at least familiarise themselves with loanwords if they are to become a mutual resource within a learning environment in a Japanese context as elsewhere. Without some L2 proficiency teachers are, as Uchida (2007) notes, unable to draw attention to “the link between L1 and L2 loanwords in learners’ mental lexicon, with due awareness of the differences between them.” (p. 21). As stressed by Daulton (2008, p. 109), “a growing awareness among teachers of the advantages offered by loanwords will likely result in growing confidence among students to exploit lexical transfer”.

Furthermore, teachers’ comprehension and awareness of linguistic tools, such as loanwords, is a distinct advantage in teaching an L2 effectively as it not only recognises the ZPD, it also enables teachers to be more effective facilitators (Daulton, 2015). Without this comprehension, the construction of meaning, a vital component of an individual’s language learning from this viewpoint, is limited, as is the teacher’s ability to function as a facilitator mediating between their students and their learning environment.

As Borg (2003) notes, teachers’ language learning experiences, teaching experiences, and pedagogical beliefs significantly impact their teaching practice. This insight is supported by more recent studies, (Borg 2006, Burton 2009, Otwinowska 2016). Based on the data collected through interviews the following table (6.2) compares biographical information on the four teacher participants in this study, relating to their Japanese language learning experiences and qualifications; teaching experience in Japan or with Japanese students in other countries; and beliefs about the effectiveness of loanwords as tools for language acquisition in those contexts.
Table 6.2: Teachers’ Language Acquisition, Teaching Experience in Japan, and Beliefs about Loanwords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Language acquisition</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Beliefs about loanwords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>No certification</td>
<td>10 years at universities</td>
<td>Advantages in terms of speed and ease of acquisition, and being a speaker of both English and German. Some concern with phonetic differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>N3 (intermediate) – Adam’s personal evaluation 14 years in Japan including 2 years of weekly lessons English spoken at home</td>
<td>1.5 years at a high school 2 years at a private language school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>N2 (upper-intermediate) Diploma in Japanese Studies from a foreign university 10 years in Japan, including 3 years on the JET Programme 2 years in an English/Japanese speaking household</td>
<td>10 years at universities 1.5 years at a high school 2 years at a private language school</td>
<td>Great advantages, particularly in terms of vocabulary acquisition and harnessing latent loanword knowledge. Concern with phonetic differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>N4 (elementary) - since data collection has attained N3 (intermediate) 40 hours of lessons before coming to Japan 9 years in Japan, including weekly lessons and 2 years in a Japanese-speaking household</td>
<td>4 years at universities 5 years at private language schools</td>
<td>Very useful, a powerful communicative tool, particularly for low-level learners. Concern with over-reliance on loanwords and subsequent problems with register as proficiency increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>N2 (upper-intermediate) 5 years at high-school/university before coming to Japan 6 years in Japan, including 2 years in the JET programme 3 years in a Japanese-speaking household</td>
<td>4 years at a university 2 years at high schools</td>
<td>No advantage. A fairly dismissive attitude. Concern with loanwords borrowed from languages other than English and semantic shift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on data collected, although each teacher had spent a different amount of time in Japan (ranging from six for Barry to fourteen years for Adam), the length of each teacher’s exposure to the Japanese language was more even; from eleven (Alice and Barry) to fourteen years (Adam). Consequently, lack of Japanese, or loanword knowledge, did not appear to be an impediment to teachers incorporating loanwords into a lesson. In fact there were only two occasions during lesson observations (Observation 1 of Adam, and observations of Emma’s classes) when students introduced a loanword of which the teacher was unaware.
In order to comprehend each teacher’s approach to language teaching and learning, an examination of their own approach to language learning was significant. Drawing on activity theory, the agency teachers had was shaped by historically mediated tools and practices. Borg’s observation (2003, p. 81) on teacher cognition or “what teachers think, know, believe and the relationships of these mental constructs to what teachers do in the language teaching classroom” were evident in this study. Learning as a cultural and historical process became evident as teachers illustrated how their own personal beliefs, their own learning experiences, experiences of living in Japan, and language teaching expectations, impacted on their teaching and classroom activities. Drawing on a cultural-historical approach it became apparent during these case studies that certain external factors, such as institutional requirements and students’ objectives, also impacted on teaching as an activity.

Of the four teachers involved in this study, only Barry had studied the language formally before coming to Japan (five years at high school and university), achieved certification (to the upper-intermediate level of the JLPT), and arrived in the country as a proficient user. Barry’s learning was situated in a classroom, with more focus on vocabulary acquisition, consolidation of grammatical rules, and kanji recognition. While Adam, Alice, and Emma had all undertaken a limited amount of formal Japanese study, most of their Japanese acquisition occurred more organically, through direct participation in a Japanese environment, supplemented by some formal class-work and autonomous study. For each teacher the experience of learning Japanese impacted on how they approached the activity of teaching English and appeared to dictate how they responded to the presence of loanwords as teaching and learning tools. The object of Adam, Alice, and Emma as learners of Japanese
was to achieve communicative competence and loanwords played an important role in helping them achieve this. Adam’s focus on loanword etymology, Alice’s focus on phonological differences, and Emma’s focus on semantic similarity all reflected their own learning experiences. Similarly, Barry’s learning experiences which more closely mirrored those of his students, both in the more traditional methods of learning and lack of focus on loanwords, were reflected in his teaching practice.

Applying the notion of contradiction (Engeström, 2001), it became apparent that the teachers related to the learning object differently and that their own understanding of language learning created tensions and disturbances in their approach to language teaching and learning. In the case of Adam, Alice, and Emma, this use of local resources also created some tension with students who were unfamiliar with their approach. For Adam, this tension resulted from examining loanwords where “the meaning is slightly different” (pre-observation interview); for Alice, this resulted from focussing on the “part of the word that’s different phonologically” (interview); for Adam in helping students understand that loanwords are “essentially a part of Japanese language…(but also) where they’ve come from” (pre-observation interview). Therefore in terms of the activity system, while the resource was appropriate, each teacher could only use it productively if they modified their use of it. These modifications, in terms of which aspect of loanwords teachers focused on, reflected each teacher’s belief about how best to adapt these tools to make them available to students and to support their learning. In some cases, loanwords as a resource were challenged by more traditional resources such as worksheets, due to these being more formal tools for language learning.

In Barry’s case, his teaching approach caused fewer tensions with students used to a style of teaching that provided more explicit error correction and this
approach was informed by the belief that “loanwords...pose problems for us” (pre-observation interview). Analysis of Barry’s case indicates that learning objectives were only partly met due to a lack of appropriate incorporation of local resources such as loanwords. During lesson observation when the students undertook the activity to Barry’s satisfaction, such as successful completion of a worksheet or activity that is reproduced with little incentive to enact out the curriculum objective of communicative approach, they were rewarded for such behaviour. In contrast in Emma’s class when the curriculum was enacted through an active incorporation of local tools to encourage communication, she felt there was alignment on the operational as well as the cognitive and affective levels. Here, loanwords were elicited from students, any semantic discrepancies attended to, and then students were encouraged to incorporate these words into communicative activities to follow.

6.2.2 Students’ knowledge, experience, and beliefs. Just as teachers’ knowledge, experience, and beliefs about loanwords emerged as an important theme, so did those of the students. This section outlines these elements and discusses the differences and similarities of the four cases.

Despite the differences in English proficiency of the students involved in the study, responses to survey items were generally consistent across the four cases. The most positive responses from each case related to the students’ desire for English learning to be enjoyable and communicative in nature (items 2, 11, 15). For these responses Adam’s class agreed most strongly with the proposition. Students from each class indicated that neither gender (item 16), nor mathematical ability (item 23) generally affected their ability to acquire English. Although students from each case felt that Japanese people recognised the importance of learning English (item 24) they also generally agreed that native Japanese speakers were poor language learners.
In each case, particularly with Alice’s class, the students felt that English language acquisition would be of significant use in their future academic and professional life (items 17, 21). This implies that many students were extrinsically motivated to study English by tangible benefits to their lives, but lacked the confidence in their ability to achieve these rewards. Alice’s approach of building confidence in her students’ abilities and confidence in the tools, such as loanwords, already at their disposal tapped into both these concerns.

These responses indicated how students viewed important social and cultural aspects of language learning. Certain aspects of identity, such as gender, were not perceived as impacting on the ability to learn a second language, while others, such as nationality, were. Furthermore, some students appeared to understand how language learning would impact on their future social identities, as employees or members of a global community. To this extent they understood that language learning is both an intellectual pursuit, and a means of social and cultural interaction; the extrinsic benefits of academic and career advancement, and participation in a more global community of English speakers.

The belief amongst many Japanese speakers that they are unusually poor language learners has often been remarked upon (see Daulton, 2008). Stanlaw (2004) suggests that this conviction is related not only to a Japanese belief in their innate shyness but also the idea that, despite evidence to the contrary, the Japanese language is so unique that it is unusually difficult to learn and similarly difficult for Japanese speakers to learn an L2. However, the less than positive response to item 45: “I am satisfied with the English education I have received” from these classes suggests that educational methods may have been responsible for the low levels of personal satisfaction (item 7) these students have had with their English progress. According
to these data, students have not been satisfied with the rules that have governed English learning, the teacher centred-approach that remains prevalent in Japanese secondary education (Ruegg, 2009), and the objectives of English language study in the Japanese educational system. Moving from a traditional grammar-translation approach to a communicative approach, which takes into account the social and cultural context, requires a transformative shift in thinking and behaviour. Some of the students were faced with a range of contradictions, stemming from the different objectives of their secondary and tertiary English studies, and the resulting contradictions these caused in other systems of activity, such as the division of labour within a classroom, the roles students were expected to play, and the rules which governed classroom interaction. Most teachers sought to overcome these issues by clearly establishing the new objectives and then explaining how these other aspects of activity needed to change to reflect these, including the incorporation of formerly unused tools such as loanwords.

The following table outlines data relevant to students’ experiences, beliefs and motivations related to English language learning.

Table 6.3: Students’ English Language Learning Experiences and Beliefs (overall agreement percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average student CEFR Level (English)</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1/B2</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Considering the amount of time I have studied English, I’m satisfied with my progress.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. If I learn to speak English very well, it will help me get a good job.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Japanese people are good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I am satisfied with the English education I have received.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All groups of students reported dissatisfaction with their personal progress. In terms of the education they had received, classes from the first three cases displayed slight satisfaction, with Barry’s class once again showing stronger overall dissatisfaction. Conversely, there was very strong agreement displayed by students in Cases 1-3, slightly less so in the case of Barry’s class, that proficiency in spoken English would be an important factor in future employment prospects. Data revealed how students were able to differentiate between former interactions that may have obstructed their personal objectives, and the importance and possibilities of current and future activities. Dissatisfaction, in terms of the activity of teaching and learning, stemmed from approaches which may have enabled them to pass examinations that did not evaluate communicative competence and also did not prepare them for a more communicative classroom environment or the linguistic environment outside of the classroom.

Survey results for items relating to loanwords were typified by generally neutral responses and a high degree of consistency among classes.

Table 6.4: Students’ Beliefs about Loanwords (overall agreement percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average student CEFR Level (English)</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1/B2</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I think there are too many loanwords in Japanese</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I use a lot of loanwords.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Loanwords are difficult to understand.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Loanwords help me learn English</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I would like to learn more about loanwords.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall there was slight agreement that the Japanese language incorporated too many loanwords, that students used many loanwords, and that they would like to learn more about loanwords. The response from Adam’s class, which claimed to use slightly fewer loanwords than other classes, was the only slightly different response amongst these items.

Students across three classes generally gave a neutral response to the item regarding the assistance loanwords could provide in learning English (item 52). Adam’s class generally disagreed with the proposition and was a notable exception. Most students also gave neutral responses to the item relating to loanword difficulty (item 48). However, Emma’s class, which included the most proficient students, indicated slight disagreement with this statement. As Emma mentioned, the adoption of tools and resources may differ according to levels of language proficiency and therefore these variations in responses may be evidence of that. Contradictions between the teaching approaches that students had experienced in high school and at university led to learning challenges for some students with regards to feedback, lesson objectives, and the types of tools used to achieve those.

Students’ experiences with, and cultural understanding of language learning seemed to conform to specific Japanese values that regulate teacher/student interaction (Stanlaw, 2004), and conflicted with more communicative and negotiable systems. Differences between experiences at high school and university, and the approaches of teachers within those contexts, sometimes led to learning contradictions. As Engeström (2001, p. 137) states, “an expansive transformation is accomplished when the object and the motive of the activity are reconceptualised to embrace a radically wider horizon of possibilities than in the previous mode of activity” and the “full cycle of expansive transformation is a collective journey
through the zone of proximal development.” Here, the productive use of cultural artefacts, the use of local loanwords for effective language learning, and different teaching and learning practices constitute this transformation. The implication is that any expansive transformation could only be possible as in the case of Emma’s class, and her teaching approach, if there was a positive response from her students, which was often missing. Further, when most of the teachers resorted to the traditional modes of teaching and learning, such expansive transformation could neither be visualised nor enacted upon, as happened in Barry’s class.

In summary the preceding discussion has illustrated how for teachers their own learning and their beliefs about teaching and learning impacted on their delivery of content. Historical factors impacted on their teaching approach and in particular their approach to loanwords as a useful tool. The socio-historical factors that impacted on students were their previous learning experiences, their own beliefs about learning language, and societal perceptions about the importance of English language. In brief, while the students clearly valued the social and cultural aspects of language use they often did not productively draw on the tool of loanwords.

6.3 Theme Three: Teaching and learning practice

The following section focuses on the third theme of this chapter, which analyses systems of teaching and learning practice. Throughout this section reference is made to the visual representation of an Activity System (Figure 6.1). The systems discussed here can be viewed as running parallel to each other, connected by outcomes and possibly mutual objectives, and also impacted by the external influences analysed in section 6.1. Particular attention is paid to the interconnected relationships between aspects of the system and the systems themselves. The sections following Figure 6.3 provide further explanation.
6.3.1 **Subjects.** The subjects of the activity systems relating to teaching practice are the four teachers involved with the study. Their knowledge, experience, and beliefs relating to the Japanese language, teaching Japanese students, and loanwords, and how these differ and concur, have been discussed at length in section 6.2. The effect these factors had on other aspects of the activity system will be analysed in the sections that follow relating to community, rules, tools, division of labour, and objects of teaching practice.

A summary of teachers’ methodology and practice, relating specifically to loanwords, is provided in Table 6.5.
Table 6.5: Teaching Methodology and Pedagogical Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching methodology (interview data)</th>
<th>Observed pedagogical practice incorporating loanwords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adam</strong></td>
<td>Socio-cultural approach&lt;br&gt;Strong focus on cultural aspects of language</td>
<td>Clear focus on loanwords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of rules relating to loanword syntax/ semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alice</strong></td>
<td>Socio-cultural approach&lt;br&gt;Strong focus on pronunciation&lt;br&gt;Concern with facilitation of autonomous/ lifelong learning</td>
<td>Minimal, due to the nature of the observed lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emma</strong></td>
<td>Socio-cultural approach&lt;br&gt;Concern with institutional requirements, student objectives</td>
<td>Clear focus on loanwords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of semantic similarities and differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barry</strong></td>
<td>More traditional approach&lt;br&gt;Focus on establishing vocabulary and structure&lt;br&gt;Concern with pronunciation</td>
<td>Some focus on pronunciation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects of the activity systems relating to learning practice are the four classes of students involved with the study. The nature of these classes, in terms of gender, course of study, English proficiency, beliefs about loanwords, and prior experience with English language learning and loanwords has been discussed in previous sections of this chapter and Chapter Five. How these students impacted on other aspects of the activity system will be further analysed in the sections relating to community, rules, tools, division of labour, and objects of teaching practice.

Activity systems relating to teaching practice representing each of the four cases are provided for reference in figures 6.4-6.7. Norman (1988, p. 9) defines affordances as “perceived and actual properties of the thing, those fundamental properties that determine just how the thing could be used” and later Hutchby (2001) observes that affordances also consist of cultural and relational aspects. These explanations of affordances can be applied to the cases of teachers in this study to explain how language teaching approach is relational in that it varies with each
individual. In terms of cultural affordances the beliefs, values, and teaching conventions also differed depending on the individual.

Furthermore, all teachers in the study are constrained by institutional rules (such as the requirement that English be the main language of instruction) and the top-down objectives of the language program they are involved with (such as the aim to improve students’ communicative competence in English). Therefore, undertaking a closer examination of the constraints and the contradictions that occurred in the activity system becomes paramount as these were the cause of disturbance in the pedagogical activity.

However, there are also notable points of difference between the four systems with regard to both teachers and students. It was evident from their planning that the teachers chose different tools that could accommodate their pedagogical orientations and beliefs. These were rationalised by the teachers through reference to the MEXT policy or to their previous use and success or failure thereof. Similarly, there were marked differences in the students’ objectives, the nature of the community and beliefs about language learning evident within them, and consequently the tools and rules used to achieve their different objectives. These differences became apparent in how objectives were realised and envisaged, and the reasoning behind these objectives in the first place. Differences also emerged from the impact of imposing, or ignoring, a social and linguistic tool, such as loanwords. These differences resonated throughout much of each system of activity, from the rules and division of labour, to the community itself. Although the figures only describe the nature of these activity systems in fairly broad terms, this should not be interpreted as downplaying their complexity, merely that the figures provide a lens through which to view and observe the various factors that impact on teaching and learning practice.
and learning outcomes; the social and cultural web of interconnected pressures, forces, and the frequent contradictions; how personal and institutional concerns are interwoven, and often negotiated, and in a constant state of flux.

**Figure 6.4: Activity System Case One (Adam)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural and pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and linguistic tools- loanwords</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object (HS English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To pass HS/University Entrance Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve English communicative competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object (Teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve communicative competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide tools for independent learning and linguistic background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object (Students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native-like fluency in pharmaceutical discourse and general English language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching practices/teaching resources, methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use English as primary language of instruction and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw on local presence of English and make it accessible as a learning approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to reach mutual objectives through collaborative learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st-Year Pharmacy students; the learning institution; MEXT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Provides information, error correction when deemed appropriate, tools to enhance independent learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as facilitator and co-structor of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Practice English communication, act on feedback, use Japanese knowledge (loanwords) in English; active ZPD oriented learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 6.5: Activity System Case Two (Alice)**

**Tools**
- Socio-cultural and pedagogical knowledge
- Social and linguistic tools - loanwords
- Worksheets

**Object (HS English)**
- To pass HS/University Entrance Exams
- To improve English communicative competence

**Object (Teacher)**
- To improve communicative competence
- To reduce affective filter and provide tools for independent learning, specifically rules of phonology

**Object (Students)**
- Native-like fluency in general English language

**Subject**
- Alice

**Critical reflection**
- Teaching practices/teaching resources, methods

**Rules**
- Use English as primary language of instruction and learning
- Draw on local presence of English and make it accessible as a learning approach
- Attempt to reach mutual objectives through collaborative learning
- Language learning should be enjoyable

**Community**
- 1st-year Computer Science students; the learning institution; MEXT

**Division of labour**
- Teacher: Provides information, error correction when deemed appropriate, tools to enhance independent learning
- Teacher as facilitator and co-constructor of learning
- Students: Practice English communication, act on feedback, use Japanese knowledge (loanwords) in English; active ZPD oriented learning
### Figure 6.6: Activity System Case Three (Emma)

**Subject**
Emma

**Tools**
- Socio-cultural and pedagogical knowledge
- Social and linguistic tools - loanwords, worksheets

**Object (Teacher)**
- To improve communicative competence, English related to Pharmacy
- To provide tools for independent learning and linguistic background

**Object (HS English)**
- To pass HS/University Entrance Exams
- To improve English communicative competence

**Object (Students)**
- Native-like fluency in pharmaceutical discourse and general English language
- To use English to communicate in future work/study

**Critical reflection**
Teaching practices/teaching resources, methods

**Rules**
- Use English as primary language of instruction and learning
- Draw on local presence of English and make it accessible as a learning approach
- Attempt to reach mutual objectives through collaborative learning

**Division of labour**
- Teacher: Provides information, error correction when deemed appropriate, tools to enhance independent learning
- Teacher as facilitator and co-structor of learning
- Students: Practice English communication, act on feedback, use Japanese knowledge (loanwords) in English; active ZPD oriented learning
- Mutual: Discuss and negotiate class objectives, tools, rules

**Community**
2nd-Year Pharmacy students; the learning institution; MEXT
6.3.2 **Community.** The community in these activity systems is defined as the groups of students taught, the institution they attend, and the Ministry of Education (MEXT). Four communities are analysed here, focusing primarily on: Adam’s class of first-year Pharmaceutical Science students (CEFR level A2); Alice’s class of first-year Computer Information Science students (A2/B1); Emma’s class of second-year

---

**Figure 6.7: Activity System Case Four (Barry)**
Pharmaceutical Science students (B1 to C1); and Barry’s class of first-year Biotechnology/Nanoscience students (A1). Within the systems of activity these communities impact on the subject as well as the rules, tools, division of labour, and objects of teaching practice.

6.3.3 Division of labour. The subject, object, and community itself, all influence the ways in which communities are organised, and the divisions of labour within them. These divisions may be the result of explicit organisation; in these cases from the teacher, or more implicit organisation that develops organically within the community. In a classroom setting these divisions are observable in the layout and seating arrangements (students in pairs or groups, for example), and in the manner of interactions between teacher-student and student-student. Data analysed here were collected from teacher interviews, as well as classroom observations, where the object of a specific activity or lesson impacted on how the roles of teachers and students developed.

Undertaking a case study on each teacher, and observing their pedagogical approaches, revealed that they shared a range of common goals. For example each teacher was concerned about quality teaching and achieving success in student learning; most wanted students to be able to access a range of tools and resources that could enhance the social and cultural understanding of language acquisition. However, teachers also displayed a desire to provide a range of different opportunities for language learning, often informed by their personal experiences of language acquisition.

One of the most noticeable differences was illustrated in the role teachers saw for themselves and the amount of time they felt the teacher should be the focus of students’ attention. There were also some differences between how teachers spoke of
the division of labour within their classes. The nature of these divisions became evident during lesson observations. In Adam’s case there were noticeable differences between the two observed lessons. The first was more teacher-focussed, with Adam imparting knowledge and providing cross-linguistic background to students. Although Adam saw himself as a facilitator, transmission mode was employed to confirm learner comprehension. The second lesson was more student-focussed, with students using language and Adam providing feedback on usage and phonology. In terms of the contradictions noted in Chapter 3, Adam addressed contradictions within the activity system by focusing on modelling language comprehension between previously learnt forms and illustrating phonological and morphological aspects of the target language.

In Alice’s case, the roles she outlined for herself during the observed presentation were quite different to the roles she played during the observation lesson itself. Some of these differences were the result of specific lesson objectives, others were due to differing teaching and learning approaches. She felt her role involved giving students “permission to (speak English) in the proper way” and providing them with the “tools…to do so”. Her engagement in the teaching activity involved engagement in meaning making of the resource of loanwords and helping students see how they relate to their context and to their L1 and in helping them form a bridge of understanding in terms of how language operates. Through experiential dimensions of language learning and the use of tools, the object of learning became more personalised and participation for students involved becoming meaning-makers, and more accountable for their own learning.

Alice’s observed lesson demonstrated her belief in the importance of establishing a lively, student-centred classroom. Alice saw class time as a way of
displaying to students the variety of tools at their disposal to learn language. Apart from setting up learning stations and giving brief instructions at the beginning of the lesson, Alice monitored activities, and maintained a strict timeframe for each one. In contrast to Adam’s first observed lesson, Alice focused on socialising students into the process of language learning, and developed authentic tasks to develop their knowledge. Her positioning as a facilitator, although with a tightly structured activity, built a comprehensive interacting activity system.

Adam’s first observed lesson revealed how he differed from Alice. Instead of providing a tool, he often discussed the “origin of certain words…cultural aspects…[how a loanword’s] meaning is slightly different”. To this extent, Adam saw his role as both a facilitator and imparter of knowledge. Adam positioned himself as providing academic knowledge of a generic type, and attempted to enhance the value of the learning as a resource for future learning. Participation was shaped by the value students placed on activities, particularly the interest shown in “cultural aspects” of words including their origins (pre-observation interview). Adam’s second observed lesson was not dissimilar to the observed lesson of Alice. The lesson, as preparation for a speaking test, involved students working in pairs, and discussing 10 separate topics for 3 minutes each. At the end of each session, based on his “eavesdropping” (post-observation interview) Adam would raise certain issues relating to pronunciation or semantics.

Alice’s observation lesson conformed to the PPP model of presentation, production, and practice. During the final stage of this process, Alice was happy to encourage students to use the target language, to elicit correct pronunciation of loanwords, and to review elements of the meaning-based stage of the process. Her very-structured lesson clearly defined her role as presenter and monitor, and students
as producers who practise elements of language. The close alignment between the
planning and the enactment in her case could be attributed to the interactions in the
teaching sessions and the feedback given during the learning activity by Alice.

Barry’s class was also very clearly structured, with a series of short content-
based tasks done either individually or in pairs. Barry’s pedagogical approach was
oriented to language as a discipline that led him to convey his own learning
experiences and methodology of learning. Structured worksheets, that enabled
students to reproduce knowledge, were used to enable students to comprehend the
rules of language and the skills to be acquired. Barry’s use of worksheets was his
way of helping students form a link between knowledge and skill acquisition. Barry
expected students to gain insights and used a transmission mode which implied that
Barry’s class rules prevented students from engaging in learning from each other.
Therefore, while MEXT theoretically allowed Barry to approach language from the
communicative viewpoint, the constraints on Barry due to the composition of the
class and his own pedagogical beliefs resulted in him modifying his approach. From
a socio-cultural perspective, as Storch argues, effective L2 learning is more likely to
occur when learners are presented with challenging tasks, that are beyond their
current level of development” (2017, p. 77) and this was not very evident in Barry’s
class.

Either at the end or during these tasks Barry provided feedback and corrected
errors. Once again, the role of students here was to produce language, Barry’s role as
the monitor and corrector was very evident. The roles that students were expected to
play within these lessons did not differ markedly. Students understood their role as
receptors with no intent to negotiate meaning, or collaborate to experience a shift in
understanding.
Entirely different to Barry, Alice and Adam, Emma positioned herself as a facilitator and co-constructor of learning. Having discussed objectives in previous classes with her students, Emma saw her role as provider of information, tools to enhance independent learning, and error correction when appropriate. Her students’ role was to practice English communication, act on feedback, and to actively use their Japanese knowledge of loanwords in English. This resulted in active ZPD-oriented learning, where students built on their existing knowledge with the assistance of the teacher. Further, although for curriculum processes, Emma had to adopt a communicative approach to language teaching, this did not deter her from also drawing upon the socio-cultural approach. Emma often drew on student experience with English language and where possible drew attention to loanwords.

How teachers’ roles were enacted - from the facilitator, the impartor of knowledge, to the presenter, to the corrector were more clearly differentiated.

6.3.4 Rules. The rules of an activity system, which mediate between the subject and community, are the “explicit and implicit norms and conventions governing social interaction” (Westberry, 2009). In a Japanese language-learning context they may include class rules or cultural conventions which govern teacher-student interactions in the classroom.

In terms of explicit rules, teachers and students were subject to similar expectations imposed on them by the International Learning Center. Many of these rules related to administrative issues, such as attendance, course evaluation, and homework. Others related to teaching and learning practice. Teachers were expected to conduct lessons "mainly in English", and to have students "often work in pairs and groups". Students were expected to "use English as much as possible with …teacher and classmates". The objectives of lessons were to "focus…on actually using
English" communicatively (SILC EC1-4 Course Outline, p. 1). All teachers and students I observed conformed to these expectations. With classes of lower English proficiency, although Adam and Barry used slightly more Japanese in their lessons than Emma or Alice, their lessons were conducted primarily in English, with Japanese used to clarify instructions or provide translation.

All three teachers of first-year classes mentioned that there had been some initial conflict between these institutional expectations and those of incoming students. For example, there were divergent understandings of what participation involved. These led to contradictions and disturbances within the learning object. For example, Alice noted the disparity between the relatively passive role students had been expected to play at high school, and the more active role they were expected to take on in this university setting. When teachers addressed the divergence through their activities the contradictions reduced. For example, Alice focused on establishing a positive learning atmosphere, and promoting experimentation with language use and pronunciation that, then led to conflict being alleviated.

Emma remarked on some conflict with her class of second-year students, relating to her approach to feedback and correction as well as the content of the EC3 curriculum. Although not evident during the observed lesson, she said that she had spent some time explaining to her students about the appropriate time for feedback and correction - and that she did not feel it was appropriate during the production stage of a lesson. Her students were used to more immediate correction after any linguistic error. This divergence in the focus of the lesson outcome led to contradictions in Emma’s class with the students seeming to have a tunnel vision of learning to the more expansive view held by Emma. Another source of divergence
was characterised by the different expectations the students held in comparison to the teacher. In terms of the curriculum, Emma’s students were also keen to focus more on English for Specific Purposes - specifically tailored to their major course of study, Pharmaceutical Sciences, whereas due to curriculum demands Emma had to focus on teaching communicative language skills. To resolve this contradiction, Emma added some specific scientific content to her lessons, while also dealing with required curricular components.

6.3.5 Tools. Whereas physical tools mediate outside the subject, symbolic or inwardly oriented tools mediate the internal thought processes. Cole and Engeström (1993, p. 6) mark the differentiation between these as “outwardly oriented” or “inwardly oriented” artefacts. Thus “outwardly oriented” (a physical tool such as a dictionary) or “inwardly oriented” (language or loanword knowledge) tools become the mediating artefacts of second, and third-generation activity theory. This differentiation allows loanwords to be viewed in relation to the language into which they are absorbed, and also helps explain how they impact on that language and in turn are impacted by it, phonologically, grammatically and semantically.

Whether, or how, teachers incorporated loanwords as tools within their system of teaching practice was dependent on a variety of factors, including their experiences as language learners and teachers, their beliefs and personalities, and the objects of their practice.

In line with Holmes and Ramos (1993), Daulton (2008), and Otwinowska (2016), my original assumption was that Japanese proficiency would have the most obvious impact on teachers’ ability to utilise English loanwords as tools for language acquisition. This assumption was challenged when it became apparent that Barry, the most proficient Japanese speaker, was least accepting of loanwords as a resource. It
also became apparent that teachers’ experiences as Japanese language learners had been more significant than their knowledge of Japanese and English loanwords within the language. My assumption had been that teachers’ ability to incorporate loanwords within an activity system would be a very prominent theme of analysis; ultimately their willingness to do so was more central.

Rather than Japanese proficiency, the more obvious distinction between the teachers appeared to be the time spent learning Japanese in “natural and educational settings” (Ellis, 2008, p. 288). To some extent all four teachers had experienced both. Admittedly, the assumption that institutional learning and learning in a natural environment are completely different is a generalisation (Krashen, 1976). However, environmental influences on L2 learning have been acknowledged for some time (Ortega, 2009) and these influences appeared significant in an analysis of these four cases.

Teachers’ knowledge of Japanese and teaching experience appeared to have little effect on their willingness to accept or promote loanwords as a viable learning strategy. Instead, as Johnson (1999) has noted, experience as students appeared to be the strongest influence on teachers’ willingness to use loanwords as tools of acquisition. As Bailey et al. (1996) assert, learning experiences, rather than teaching experiences, appeared to have the most profound effect on beliefs related to effective language learning strategies, teaching methodology, and teaching practice.

With the affordances of loanwords in mind Adam focused not only on item learning (establishing the connection between individual Japanese words and English loanwords) but also on discussing system learning (the broader relationships between Japanese and English). In particular he emphasised the deep connection between the katakana script and English. He believed his students were “actually very interested
in that”, and had never had the connection pointed out to them. He also believed that understanding the relationship could dramatically improve their English. However, he remained frustrated at students’ reluctance to accept and utilise the connection as quickly as he had. How could they “not realise that it was English?” he asked, when this Japanese script is a loanword script.

Just as the presence of English loanwords in Japanese had been a “great advantage” and “really helpful” for her as a language learner, Alice was very keen to impress on her students how quickly paying attention could loanwords could “build their vocabulary”. Similar to Adam, Alice noted that there are many “words that they [students] know in English, but might not realise it’s English” which she often highlights. When asked how often she paid explicit attention to loanwords in her classes, Alice indicated that she did so regularly. She was more concerned than Adam with Japanese students’ pronunciation of loanwords, seeing this as the biggest barrier to acquisition. Although she felt “some mild mispronunciation” was acceptable she concentrated on eliminating the most glaring differences between katakana phonology and English. In terms of passive recognition of words, or ability to be understood in English, Alice remained very focused on providing students with simple tools to quickly become more proficient at English; trusting the connections between katakana and English semantically, eliminating the most obvious phonological differences that may impede communication, and highlighting the importance of communication over phonological and grammatical perfection. Unfortunately the observed lesson with Alice did not provide the opportunity to observe this focus in action.

As a teacher, Alice also referred to some of the problems caused by attempting to productively use English loanwords as tools for English language
learning. She felt that the phonetic differences between English and Japanese were
the biggest stumbling blocks her students faced in incorporating English loanwords
effectively and that providing the tools to overcome such obstacles was an important
part of her teaching practice. To alleviate this issue she focused on pronunciation in
her classes. In terms of pronunciation she stated that she was “very specific on the
part of the word that is different” and indicated that she understood that very often
this aspect of a word was “interfered with by students’ Japanese version of it”, that
is, the katakana pronunciation. She stated that “a lot of drilling” on aspects of
phonology which students could incorporate easily was needed. Alice also indicated
that once students realise that they have loanwords available to them that they “start
thinking that all of their katakana words are English” and explained that it was
important to “spend a bit of time fixing the misunderstanding”. However, she felt
such correction should mainly occur only after students had gained confidence in
using loanwords in English communication. “Yes, there are irregularities, and
differences, and these should in time be mentioned”, but only after students have
realised the “great advantages of being a Japanese speaker learning English”. Alice
felt that students’ teachers had previously only focused on the differences between
English loanwords and their Japanese equivalents, rather than first consolidating the
commonalities.

In terms of CHAT, Alice was intent on introducing a new tool into the system
of English language learning activity, or at least re-explaining that loanwords could
in fact be an effective tool. This introduction revealed the contradictions between
previous systems of learning which had devalued loanwords as tools, and a new
system which presented them in a different light.
Much like Alice, Emma acknowledged phonological difficulties and semantic difficulties, particularly for Japanese speakers of English, in utilising loanwords. She compared the – ed suffixation rule of English verbs in the past tense, to her over-reliance on loanwords, and felt that this over-reliance may have limited her to casual conversations, resulted in errors, and adversely affected her ability to speak in more formal contexts. Emma thought that these issues, as well as the semantic and phonological irregularities between English loanwords and their origins, could also arise for more advanced Japanese learners of English.

Emma was also aware, as Daulton notes (2008), that loanwords tend to be among the more commonly-used words, and of their tendency to diverge semantically in specific fields such as pharmacy (the course of study for these students). With the likelihood that the students from this class would become pharmacists or academics, this is an important consideration. Because of Emma’s belief that these students were already confident in employing loanwords in English she felt comfortable in discussing divergences and irregularities with them. However, despite this awareness, Emma remained very positive about the role of loanwords in assisting language acquisition for Japanese learners, “because nine times out of ten they work”. Emma spoke of the dual objectives of her students, acquiring communicative competence and technical proficiency in the language, and the need for her students to recognise how English loanwords in Japanese can diverge semantically. Adam undertook to make his students aware of the origins of loanwords. All three teachers appeared to strongly agree with Nation’s contention (2001) that simply pointing out the existence of these words to students is a significant step in itself. By taking a socio-cultural approach to language learning, Emma was sensitised to the forms of meaning-making codes that were available to
her and her students as tools, and took to situated meaning making (Hawkins, 2010, p. 98) to impress this on her students.

Nation’s observation (1990, p. 49) that “the more the teacher or course designer draws attention to the similarities and patterns (between the first language and target-language vocabulary), the greater the opportunity for transfer” had initially led me to believe that increased L2 competence, and concurrent understanding of Japanese words with English loanword cognates, would commensurately increase the ability, and willingness, of teachers to do so. This belief was challenged by Barry’s reluctance to incorporate loanwords into his lessons, his assertion that they had not assisted his Japanese language development in any way, and his belief that they adversely affected his students’ acquisition of English.

While Alice, for example, had drawn on her students’ knowledge of loanwords, and provided phonological tools and rules that could build on this knowledge, Barry felt that students’ mispronunciation of English loanwords is Japanese was something that needed to be unlearnt before corrective measures could be taken. When Barry referred to loanwords during the lesson observation he felt that his interventions were important in helping students unlearn incorrect phonology or usage.

6.3.6 Objects. This section outlines the teaching and learning objectives of teachers and students, and the ways in which the participants sought to achieve these objectives. Admittedly, often observable practice seemed to be a compromise between what teachers hoped to achieve and how they sought to do that, and the lengths students were willing to accede to those desires. However, despite practical or institutional constraints, these objectives and the manner in which participants sought to achieve them were generally very clear.
Teachers’ experiences as learners of Japanese appeared to directly impact on, and closely mirror, their statements of belief about the efficacy of English loanwords in Japanese as tools for English acquisition. These beliefs also seemed to directly influence their English teaching practice. This section outlines the various goals of teaching and learning, as exhibited by teachers and students during lesson observations and revealed during interviews, and examines how these incorporated loanwords as tools of language learning.

As mentioned earlier, various interacting systems of activity can impact significantly on the goals of teaching and learning practice. In turn, these objectives can impact on the applicability of tools and how subjects interpret their usefulness. In the context of English in Japanese high-schools, for instance, university entrance exams that include no communicative element have been shown to significantly impact the objectives of teachers and students - to pass those exams - and the types of tools used to achieve that objective. For the four cases involved with this study, top-down objectives were also in place, in this instance the promotion of communicative competence, and speaking tests, that formed a large part of students’ course assessment. These objectives also impacted on the practices of teachers and students, although not always in consistent ways.

The figures, 6.4-6.7 incorporate three objects - the teacher’s objectives, students’ objectives, and the objectives of students’ prior English language learning in junior high-school and high-school. In terms of the structure of the figures, most facets of the system, and the systems themselves, impact on other facets. The only time when this is not the case appears in the top right of the figures, where the objects of school education, that chronologically precede the current objects of teachers and students, only flow in one direction. That is, although these objectives
continue to impact on the activity system of teaching and activity system of learning analysed in this study, they were not directly affected by it.

The figures refer to all four of the systems of practice analysed in this study, and reveal certain generalities about how interconnected systems can interact, and how different aspects of those systems, and the elements that comprise them, affect objects and outcomes and the place of tools (loanwords) within them.

6.4 Summary

These teachers’ experiences as second-language learners of Japanese were clearly shaped by the social context in which they occurred. The experiences also shaped their approaches to teaching English to Japanese students. For instance, Barry, who had studied Japanese primarily in a foreign-language setting, was concerned with the errors that semantically shifting loanwords may cause students to make. The other three teachers, who had learnt Japanese primarily in a second-language setting, were far more likely to focus on pragmatics, particularly the communicative usefulness of loanword cognates for low-level learners. Having found loanwords to be very useful in achieving their own learning objectives, these teachers were also very keen for their students to understand how beneficial loanwords could be, particularly by drawing attention to the significant semantic similarities between English and Japanese that provide a base of knowledge for all Japanese speakers.

The three teachers who had experienced loanwords as a positive influence on their own L2 learning were generally positive about the effect loanwords could have on their students’ English acquisition. Barry, who claimed to have experienced no positive influence from loanwords as a learner of Japanese, was generally very negative about loanwords’ usefulness for his students’ learning. Therefore, in terms
of the activity of teaching, Barry was unwilling or unable to employ loanwords as tools, and discouraged his students from accessing them in the activity of learning English.

The influence of learning experience on belief and teaching practice was not only evident in how these approaches enabled or limited their use of loanwords as tools for acquisition. The alignment was also exemplified by the different approaches that these teachers outlined or illustrated in their teaching practice. Teachers tended to focus on learning strategies that they themselves had found useful and to be concerned with areas that had caused them difficulty. That is the historical experiences of teachers directly impacted their classroom practice and those of their students.

Difficulties were particularly evident in the types of errors, or divergences, from Standard English that teachers found acceptable in students’ English production. The three teachers who had learnt Japanese primarily in Japan were far more likely to ignore slight differences that did not significantly impact on comprehension. Adam and Alice believed students’ previous teachers had focused overwhelmingly on semantic and phonological differences between loanwords and the original English, and that one of their roles was to give their students the confidence to use and explore these words. Barry was far more likely to draw attention to, and correct, and semantic or phonological differences.

The findings indicate that the relationship they had with the learning object was complex and influenced by their historical context of learning experiences. They made learning meaningful by drawing on their existing knowledge that often led to conflict. How they determined meaning to a learning activity often led to internal contradictions within the learning activity. Often teachers’ beliefs, for example
Barry’s view that loanwords were an ineffective tool, became a site for contradiction between the object of learning and the aims and purpose of learning.

All four teachers, as was confirmed by students’ survey responses, noted that their students were keen to improve their communicative English competence. Understandably, while teaching a course entitled English Communication, teachers also understood that this was not only a clear objective, but also a required one. In general, teachers felt that students were willing to accept their methods for trying to achieve this. Only Emma specifically mentioned some conflict between these communicative objectives and those of her students. She spoke of the difficulties in “completely changing the classroom environment…and the expectations placed on students” after six years of English education in a Japanese high-school. Students spoke of the differences between “Japanese teacher (sic) and foreign teacher (sic)” in terms of the amount of active participation required in the classroom. Just as students’ high-school teachers were constrained by the requirements to prepare students for university entrance exams (Ruegg, 2009), teachers within these cases were constrained by the requirements of their institution. These constraints involved preparing their students for speaking tests at the end of each semester of study, based on set topics such as university life, hometown, family, and future careers. Where the teachers did differ was in the teaching methods, underpinned by second language learning theories, which they utilised to achieve their objectives. Often central to these efforts was their attempt, or otherwise, to incorporate loanwords into the teaching and learning framework of their lessons.

Another common theme across all case studies was the instrumental nature of the learning with assessment and achievement being a central focus. Students undertook learning with a view to gain good individual marks and therefore there
were conflicts and contradictions between their view and the teacher’s expectations that students would collaborate and aim to gain collective understanding of language. Any student-engagement with their peers was more to promote their own understanding of tasks.

Students and teachers may have initially approached the activity with certain objectives, and particular tools and rules for achieving those. However, unlike other systems of interaction, a course of study (in these cases 90 hours of classroom contact over an academic year) is heavily interdependent and symbiotic, with the changing needs of students affecting teaching approaches. Although homework and lesson preparation plays an important role, a large amount of activity takes place in the classroom, where as Lantolf and Thorne (2006, p. 210) suggest “corrective feedback and negotiation are contextualized as a collaborative process in which the dynamics of the interaction itself shape the nature of the feedback and informs its usefulness to the learner”. Because of this, the provision of feedback within the Zone of Proximal Development (Aljafreeh & Lantolf, 1994) is a constantly evolving and negotiable process. This was present in all cases observed, particularly with Emma who spent some time negotiating the process with her students and explaining her thoughts regarding it.

The main difference here with Engeström’s (2001, p. 136) depiction is the simultaneous, interdependent impact that the evolving nature of tools of mediation, rules, and divisions and labour have on the objectives of the activity. Rather than these facets impacting on only one activity system and then creating a secondary objective, they impact on both systems simultaneously (particularly in the case of classroom interaction) creating a more symbiotic relationship than provided by the two-dimensional image of third-generation CHAT. In this instance the activity
systems were initially envisaged as comprising student participants and teacher participants, the subjects of the two systems. The tools, community, division of labour, rules, and ultimately the objectives of those separate systems were initially outlined in the student responses to the survey and the semi-structured interview responses of the teachers. The impact of prior learning and teaching experiences of these participants on beliefs and behaviour became apparent. Central to this new conceptualisation is the idea that within an activity system, or between interacting systems, “tensions, disturbances, and local innovations are the rule and the engine of change” (Cole & Engeström, 1993, p. 8). These tensions may be apparent within one aspect of the system, such as the tension between a subject and the rules with which s/he is expected to conform, or indeed between two or more different activity systems.

One final point of significance is the idea of Japanese linguistic exceptionalism (Daulton, 2008); the idea that Japanese is a unique language, unrelated to others in the way that the Romance languages may be. Certainly there are aspects of Japanese, such as the hiragana and katakana scripts, that are unique. However, the thousands of characters imported from Chinese alone make this proposition difficult to justify. Few would argue that despite phonological differences, this wholesale borrowing makes it significantly easier for Chinese speakers to acquire Japanese than for speakers of other languages. While Barry, some students, and reportedly many students’ secondary school teachers, contended that English loanwords in Japanese are simply Japanese words, such a belief denies the direct semantic link between many lexical items.

The four cases provided different insights into the significance of loanwords in relation to the teaching of English in Japan. Three of the teacher participants, and
many of the students, were very positive about their impact as effective and efficient tools for English acquisition. One of the teachers and some of the students were quite negative.

Some conditions became apparent. For teachers to effectively harness loanwords to facilitate acquisition, knowledge of Japanese was required. However, this in itself was not sufficient. Teachers also had to see loanwords as viable tools, and on evidence, to have independently come to see them as effective tools in their own acquisition of Japanese. This independent realisation seemed to have a significant impact on teachers’ willingness, or otherwise, to promote loanwords as tools for acquisition with their students. Students who have only learnt English in a classroom situation can be heavily dependent on their teacher, and the negative view of Japanese high school teachers (as stated by students throughout surveys) impacted on their willingness to engage with them as more than just tools for communication with other Japanese speakers.

A positive connection between teachers’ willingness to use loanwords as tools for English acquisition and their own acquisition of Japanese became evident in the analysis of the case studies. Teachers’ positivity towards loanwords had a positive impact on their students’ willingness to use them as tools for English acquisition.

The overall findings from the cross-case analysis were that teachers’ learning experiences influence their teaching practice and also their use of resources. Whether, or how, teachers incorporate loanwords in their teaching depends on a variety of factors, including their own learning experiences, but not necessarily their L2 proficiency. The benefits of using loanwords in English language teaching in Japan include the harnessing of a pre-existing resource, and quickly improving language
competence. The disadvantages of using loanwords include the semantic and phonological divergences they display, and the presence of loanwords from languages other than English.

These findings are explored in the next chapter which also discusses the model of contradiction provided by Engeström and adapted to this study.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

This chapter provides the conclusion to the study into English loanwords and the teaching of English in Japan. The study draws on the socio-cultural approach to language teaching and argues that this needs to be a situated meaning-making activity. As such, the study also proposes that in order to be socially and culturally situated, the activity of teaching requires a more expansive approach. The study revealed the part loanwords play within the Japanese language, and the findings indicate the significant potential of loanwords to enhance English language teaching and learning.

The chapter reflects on the research study from its inception; its development, findings, and limitations. It provides a brief overview of the preceding chapters, addresses the research questions and their significance, and discusses the implications of the study for educational policy, practice, and further research.

7.1 Introduction

To reiterate, the research questions for this study were:

*How do English loanwords contribute to English language teaching in Japan?*
*How do Japanese university students perceive and use English loanwords? Why?*
*How do teachers of English perceive and use loanwords in teaching English to Japanese university students? Why?*
*What is the potential of loanwords to enhance English language teaching in Japan?*

The study undertook, through these research questions, to explore the significance of English loanwords in the overall approach to teaching English as a second language. The study sought to examine loanwords and four teachers’ approaches to incorporating them in their teaching. Through the CHAT lens, a
Theoretical framework was developed to analyse the participation of these teachers in the pedagogical activity.

CHAT was central to the study. In terms of the loanword phenomenon and its applications to teaching English in Japan, CHAT proved particularly useful in uncovering themes, and identifying significant findings, and areas for future research. Use of this theoretical framework has assisted in drawing conclusions related to English language teaching in Japan, to recommend changes to teacher training in relation to language teaching: greater exposure to the possibility of the use of loanwords in language acquisition, changes to pedagogy; the implementation of teaching strategies that proved useful for these case study teachers; and a greater emphasis on communicative competencies and assessment of these skills being built into the assessment system.

The first section of this chapter presents a summary of the theoretical and methodological findings that align with main research question for this study: “What is the significance of English loanwords in relation to the teaching of English in Japan?” This question was raised primarily because of my personal experience that the presence of English loanwords in Japanese had been an important factor in allowing me to communicate with Japanese speakers in a Japanese-speaking environment. The second section identifies the limitations followed by recommendations for future research. Final comments are included in the conclusion.

7.2 Thesis overview

Chapter One outlined the study and gave background and context to the teaching of English in Japan, and the Japanese educational system. Chapter Two, the literature review, explored the scope, nature, and function of English loanwords in Japanese, and how these factors have influenced EFL teaching in Japan. Chapter
Three outlined the research design for the study. Chapter Four described the research methodology. Chapter Five introduced the four cases that made up the research. Finally, Chapter Six presented a cross-case analysis and identified emergent themes.

7.3 Research findings

A review of a corpus of linguistic studies revealed the nature, and extent, of English loanwords in Japanese (see Daulton 2008). There are more than 50,000 loanwords in Japanese. Approximately 95% of these are English loanwords, and they are generally among the most frequently-used words in English Japanese. Although almost all of these words display some differences (most commonly phonological), they remain a “dynamic and integral part of modern Japanese” (Daulton, 2008, p. 40).

Despite the two languages being “lexically wed by…ongoing massive borrowing” (Daulton, 2008, p. 40), this study revealed the very limited extent to which this relationship has been referred to, or utilised, in English education in Japan. According to the four classes of Japanese students involved in the case studies for this research, their secondary school English teachers had rarely mentioned loanwords at all. These students also claimed that when their teachers had mentioned loanwords they had generally viewed them as a negative influence on English language acquisition. On this point, these students’ perceptions were supported by a survey of over 1300 students from the same institution.

In contrast to their secondary school teachers, students surveyed in this study were more positive about the presence of loanwords in Japanese and their usefulness as tools for acquisition. Nevertheless, whilst more positive than their teachers, these students’ attitudes towards English loanwords remained relatively neutral. Student interviews revealed that any positive attitudes towards loanwords had developed independently - despite institutional educational experiences, rather than because of
them. The four teachers who participated in this study, as learners of Japanese in both their native countries and Japan, revealed that similar lack of attention to loanwords was evident in the teaching of Japanese to native-English speakers.

These teachers’ perceptions of loanword efficacy to support language acquisition were overwhelmingly positive. They recognised the influence loanwords had on their own Japanese acquisition, and the possibility of a loanword-focus being beneficial for their students learning of English. Although the significance of English loanwords, in terms of actual teaching and learning in Japan, appears to be minimal, these teachers generally recognised the potential for loanwords to play a more active role.

This dichotomy leads directly to the question of why it is important to examine English loanwords in this context. The most obvious answer to the question would be because the Japanese education system has, for various reasons, overlooked, ignored, or denigrated loanwords as acquisitional tools and English language teaching has not adopted the socio-cultural approach. However, throughout this study, survey results, student and teacher interviews, and observation data illustrate that there is little understanding or acknowledgement of this fact.

The key findings that emerged from the cases are divided into three main themes, relating to: the teaching of English in Japan; Japanese students of English; and Japanese school, universities and policy makers. The following sections outline these findings.

7.4 **Theoretical findings**

The findings illustrate the highly personal approach undertaken by the teachers and the significance of the teacher within the larger pedagogical activity of teaching.
From an activity theory perspective, there are purposeful outcomes for activities (Engeström 2008; Lantolf 2002, 2004; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). As noted by Engeström (2008), activities have subjects, objects, tools, and rules among other aspects; besides, the activity can be comprised of multiple minor goals that are expected to be achieved in the progress towards the final outcome. The goals are often mediated by the social and cultural contexts that determine the overall learning context (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). These are reflected in the following findings, which respond to the research questions.

1. A socio-cultural approach to language learning and teaching is beneficial. From the perspective of students, when there was greater interaction and the teacher acted as a facilitator, there was more productive use of English language and a greater focus on loanwords as a resource.

2. Pedagogical engagement is often influenced by an individual teacher’s orientation as well as their beliefs and values that shape it. The teaching plans were often shaped by teachers’ own theories about language learning. With all four teachers being experienced language learners themselves as well as experienced language teachers, it was expected that they would refer to diverse tools for teaching language. However, while some made reference to the tool of loanwords, some participants rarely acknowledged loanwords as tools. Where these were acknowledged they were incorporated into lessons.

3. Teachers’ explanations of their teaching approach are often based on the social and contextual environment of teaching English. The study demonstrated that the members of the community were aware of
loanwords as a valuable resource yet some thought of them as a limited tool in effective teaching. Their pedagogical decisions were an important factor in the use of the tool.

4. It was expected that given the considerable teaching experience of participants, the use of contextual resources would feature prominently in their teaching. Instead, teachers sometimes reaffirmed the modes familiar to the students, and resorted to more traditional approaches to language teaching. Their pedagogical activity was, therefore, often focused on achieving the immediate outcomes. The mere presence of loanwords as a functional affordance did not imply its ready application and where it was tried as in the case of Emma, it often was not fully explored.

5. Personal background and experience in language learning are significant in teachers’ pedagogical decision making. Teachers’ lessons, lesson objectives, and outcomes were based on their own perceptions about language teaching approaches. Often this was evident when there was any conflict between their goals and the perceived outcomes set by the institution. Each teacher had his or her own set of beliefs about loanwords, and these were brought to bear on issues confronting them in class, including the resources used and the teaching methodology adopted by them. This study has, therefore illustrated the historical factors that often determine what is taught and how it gets taught.

6. The activity system that is determined by the teachers is often interpreted differently by the students. The pedagogical community in this study was diverse and it was evident that the teachers had different
motivations to the students and even among students there were diverse understanding of the activity. This study illustrates how, though, the common concern was to learn language, the members of the learning community constructed different understandings, making the activity system dynamic and an ongoing process of meaning making.

The study has contributed by demonstrating the potential of applying CHAT to language learning research and, in particular, to L2 learning within the higher education context. CHAT provided a useful and analytic lens to perceive the context as integral to language learning. The socially situated, culturally contextual aspect of CHAT linked well with the socio-cultural approach to language acquisition and it assisted in illustrating the perspectives of individual teachers and their participation. It illustrated the important role teachers have to design tasks and promote a challenging learning environment (Thompson, 2015). Further, as Thompson observes, CHAT “examines processes of change as these actors encounter contradictions within problematic situations”. Importantly, the theory made it possible to highlight the challenges, contradictions, constraints that emerged in language teaching even as teachers attempted to provide effective tools. As a model that highlights instances of how activities were conceptualised, how some new ways were and can be learnt, CHAT becomes a theory active in practice. Drawing on Foot (2014), the three core concerns of CHAT: learning by doing; employing tools of all kinds to learn; and community became core points of examination to study how language teaching approaches operate.

The significant place of contradictions, disturbances, and constraints in this study led to illustrating how there was an “emergent opportunity for the activity’s development” (Foot, 2014, p. 337); that is, it suggests a capacity for the focus on
loanwords to grow and increase in the future. The capacity for contradictions to form a link between set ways of operating and new potential ways of acting, leads to “illuminative hinges” that in operation disclose new possibilities (Foot, 2014, p. 338). Utilising this concept, and taking the example of loanwords, this thesis proposes that a useful way to enhance language teaching might be as follows:

![Diagram](Figure 7.1: Interactive Language Learning, with focus on Loanwords)
The model is illustrative of the possibilities of employing CHAT to engage in meaningful teaching and learning. The contradictions outlined here, including those raised by Japanese forms of loanwords, the adoption of new tools and modes of practice, and processes of learning, are an important part of the findings and recommendations of this study. Language learning involves working through these contradictions, and questioning current modes of practice so that the contextual can become relevant to learning. Significantly, as the model illustrates, learning is typically based on identifying issues that might be based on the primary challenge of incorporating a socio-cultural approach; introducing stimulus in the form of drawing on contextual resources; through interaction with peers and the teacher, and through teachers modelling appropriate new forms; as a situated activity in which dialectical challenges between newly established models and traditional methods could lead to analysis and critical reflection on language learning and usage.

The primary contradictions in this study were the tensions that were apparent in class interactions when teachers attempted to question traditional modes of teaching. In the case of Emma, where there was an explicit move to adopt loanwords for teaching, there were visible and not so visible contradictions in terms of the curriculum focus on the communicative approach, Emma’s attempt to negotiate learning with students, and the students’ engagement with activities. Although all teachers promoted interactive learning, situated meaning was often not emphasised with the result that learning was more conventional and distanced from the social and contextual aspects of language learning. There were visible contradictions in the critical reflective stance undertaken by the teachers in that although in theory they understood the importance of the social-cultural approach, the tensions between adopting a new model and reaffirming the demands of the curriculum led to ruptures.
and clashes in terms of teaching approaches. Some adopted the ‘safe mode’ of language teaching focusing on grammar while others tried to experiment. A CHAT perspective offers a lens to see these contradictions not as failed attempts at adopting new approaches, rather as potential areas for development, as permitting new modes of language learning.

As Lantolf (2000) notes, socio-cultural approaches, where learning and development can progress through the concept of ZPD, attempt to integrate knowledge with social activity so that new learning can occur. In this context, students’ knowledge of English loanwords in Japanese, and collaborative participation with teachers and other learners, the relationships and artefacts mentioned previously, could lead to learning and development.

7.5 Significance and implications of the findings

These findings suggest that loanwords as tools for acquisition have been largely ignored. In light of the recent policy focus on developing Japanese students’ communicative English competence, this lack of awareness of a promising tool of acquisition is significant and perplexing. It also points to more ingrained structural issues with English teaching in Japan.

According to survey data very little time is spent discussing English loanwords in Japanese within the Japanese education system, and most discussions are less than positive. Students receive quite negative information from their high school and junior high school teachers about loanwords as part of the Japanese language, and as possible tools for achieving communicative competence.

Although the four English lecturers involved with this study did not recall their Japanese teachers referring to loanwords disparagingly, each one could also only remember at best one lesson that had broached the subject at all. The very
positive attitude that three of the four teachers displayed towards loanwords had come about through autonomous learning, as was the case for students.

There are significant implications of this study for all stakeholders involved with English education in Japan. These stakeholders include: native and non-native teachers of English in Japan; Japanese students of English, both at home and abroad; Japanese schools, universities, and policy makers; and researchers in the field of English acquisition in a Japanese context. All of these individuals and institutions are invested, to some extent, in the pursuit of English acquisition among Japanese learners of English.

The objectives of these individuals and groups are often constrained and subverted, both consciously and subconsciously, by elements beyond their control. These elements include the need to focus on school and university exams that rarely include communicative components; the need to achieve certain scores in TOEIC tests for employment opportunities that do not reflect communicative competence; the need to conform to curricular requirements that severely limit the recognition of loanwords within the Japanese language; and the way the built-in lexicon of English within the Japanese language has been largely ignored in an educational context. This understanding was emergent through this research and revealed the importance of further research into various related areas: assessment policy in language teaching; foreign language teaching in general; and broader education policy in Japan. Research in these areas could be undertaken to deepen understandings of the current contradictions and tensions within them, and discover how the objectives of all stakeholders could be achieved most effectively.

7.5.1 Teachers of English in Japan. The issue that all teachers of English in Japan must confront is that few countries have dedicated more time and money to a
language program with such limited results. This issue alone suggests that different approaches to English language education must be considered. Although the stated objective of the Japanese Ministry of Education remains the development of global speakers of English, many teachers are constrained by curricula, and examinations that make it very difficult to help their students develop in this capacity.

A secondary issue is the negative perception that many Japanese teachers of English have towards loanwords both as linguistic impurities and possible tools for English acquisition. It has focused more on the attitudes of Japanese learners of English and their teachers to the linguistic potential they provide. However, these two issues overlap when concerns with linguistic purity lead to the practicalities of modern Japanese being ignored.

Some teachers, and students, may feel concern about the proliferation of loanwords in Japanese and their impact on linguistic purity. However, this study has revealed the more positive implications this proliferation could have in terms of teacher training for native-Japanese, and foreign, teachers of English, in terms of students’ ability to achieve their language-learning objectives, and for policy-makers to realise their educational goals.

The case studies in this study about the English teachers illustrated how they were all similarly tasked with teaching English through a communicative approach. All had productive teaching sessions with similar resources available to them. Yet the diverse modes of planning and enacting showed how there is no common pedagogical sharing among teachers. The study illustrated numerous individual, policy and contextual factors impacted on how the approach to language was undertaken. There could be a pathway for a more contextual, socio-cultural approach to language learning in Japan if teachers could group together to discuss their past
and present approaches to language teaching: in short, if they had the opportunity to use the various aspects of CHAT and examine how a learning community operates, how rules determine content and approach, how contradictions arise, and how various tools could be drawn on for teaching.

7.5.2 Japanese students of English. The issues that affect teachers of English in Japan also have a significant impact on their students. Students are subject to the same curricular restraints as their teachers and are required to pass examinations, in order to enter institutions of higher education and be employed by companies, which currently place little emphasis on communicative competence.

Some students within this study, who were particularly interested in developing their communicative English competence, mentioned that they felt forced to supplement their English schooling with extra-curricular classes at language schools or with private tutors. These students were inclined to mention loanwords as significant factors in assisting communicative English competence, but had not found support for such tools within standardised school curricula.

In this aspect of language learning students’ experiences mirrored those of their English-speaking teachers, as students of Japanese. None of the participants interviewed during this study could recall more than one cursory lesson dedicated to loanwords. Anyone who had come to appreciate the connection between loanwords and the original English had done so autonomously. While communicative competence is ostensibly the goal of English education in Japan, the conclusion is that effective tools for achieving this objective remain underutilised.

An implication for practice is to provide agency to students as members of the learning community, and draw on their language resources so that the functional affordances of language could lead to cognitive affordances. Olah (2007) notes the
implementation of classes at Meiji Gakuin University in Japan, which focus on loanword pronunciation, as a positive example.

7.5.3 Japanese schools, universities, and policy makers. Within the Japanese education system, policy makers have an incredibly powerful influence over the direction that education takes. This influence extends through curricula, assessment, teaching qualifications, and the nature of education in both public and private institutions. The impact that Japanese schools and universities have on education is only slightly less significant. In terms of English language education, the nature of entrance exams is of pervasive importance. Currently, despite recognition of the importance of communicative competence, exams that do not test this aspect of language continue to undermine attempts by teachers and students to adopt CLT within the classroom, or to utilise the tools that would best serve this approach.

From 2020, The Ministry of Education is planning to extend compulsory English language education in Japan to begin in the first year of elementary school, when students are about eight years of age. This means that even before beginning university students will have received ten years of English language tuition. This measure is being implemented in order to improve students’ communicative competence. However, without commensurate changes to other aspects of the education system, such as the modes of assessment, it is unclear how this would happen.

As CHAT reveals, the objectives and structures of connected systems of activity significantly impact each other. Currently, despite rhetoric to the contrary, entrance exams that preclude communicative competence marginalise this as an objective for teachers and students at the high school level (Rowberry, 2012). It remains unclear what assessment for elementary school students might entail but an
obvious way to encourage communicative competence would be to have tests that prioritize this ability. Such top-down measures would also impact the objectives of teachers and students within the education system and the tools required to achieve those. Rather than communicative competence being of secondary importance, prioritising it by examining it would place it as a primary objective.

Nation’s research (2008) reveals the reduced learning burden that loanwords afford. Daulton’s research (2008) highlights the significant proportion of loanwords in high-frequency Japanese words. The findings, regarding the particular efficacy of loanwords for low-level learners, are supported by this research. For young Japanese learners of English, with appropriate methods of evaluation in place, recent policy developments could provide an excellent opportunity to introduce loanwords as tools for language development. These changing policies provide an opportunity to apply teaching and learning approach supported by loanwords. However, as research on the ZPD (Engeström, 2001) and this study reveal, students require the help of a significant other to make the leap from latent knowledge to knowledge that can be self-developed and incorporated as a tool for more autonomous learning. The findings show that simple phonological tools that can be learned, and then regularly employed, point to a way in which teachers could empower their students to understand the knowledge of English that they already possess, and very efficiently enhance their communicative competence.

7.5.4 Researchers. The study also raises significant issues for researchers and teacher-researchers in Japan, with regard to remaining abreast of recent developments in their field. Recommendations for further research include a detailed examination of the beliefs of teachers and students of English within the elementary and secondary school systems, with regard to loanwords. Although student-reported
data from this study pointed to quite negative beliefs about loanwords from the teaching fraternity, it was unclear on what basis these beliefs were founded. Similarly, it is unclear to what extent the fairly neutral beliefs of students were based on teacher’s beliefs or personal experience. Finally, observation of lessons dedicated to loanwords would provide richer data on how loanwords could be incorporated as tools of acquisition. Another study using AT to establish the relevance, utility, and significance of loanwords in the acquisition of language, even in a different linguistic context, would be a valuable contribution.

7.6 Limitations of the research

One of the limitations of the study is that it did not include a case study of a native Japanese teacher and his or her university class. This had always been my intention, but ultimately proved logistically difficult. Although the addition of such a case, or cases, may have added complexity to the study, it would also have enriched the data and provided scope for a broader analysis. Similarly, incorporating a high-school class would have added more depth. Once again, logistical and ethical concerns made this difficult. The vast majority of junior high-school and high-school teachers of English in Japan are native Japanese speakers, and not an insignificant minority of university lecturers. Although data were collected regarding students’ perceptions of these teachers’ beliefs, and their experience with these classes specifically related to loanwords, no direct data were gathered from teachers.

Another limitation of the research is that it was conducted at only one site, with only four teachers, and four classes of students. A study conducted across many educational institutions, and with a wider range of participants, would have given more strength and generalisibility to the findings made here.
In terms of data collection within the case studies, there were also limitations. More classroom observations would have been desirable, as would evidence of teachers dedicating classes to loanwords. More in-depth interviews with students, and perhaps interviews with a native-Japanese speaker, would have elicited richer data as well.

7.7 Future research

Every research project has limitations, some self-imposed, some that reveal themselves as a study progresses. Hopefully a research study also reveals certain avenues for future research. The phenomenon of English loanwords in Japanese has developed considerably even since this study began, and remains fascinating in and of itself. However, the study has also raised issues that were not of initial interest, such as the role of systems of assessment and teacher training, that, in the Japanese context at least, are closely linked. These are issues of real importance, with great scope for future work.

One particularly interesting course of research would be an examination of English language teaching as it is enacted within situations outside of the university environment: in private language schools, high schools, junior high schools, and elementary schools. With the upcoming expansion of language education in Japan into Third Grade classrooms, how this will unfold remains unclear but holds immense interest for the teaching fraternity in Japan. Following on from this study, it would also be worthwhile to extend understanding of the loanword phenomenon in these contexts, including through collaboration with researchers who are looking into loanwords from, and into, languages other than English and Japanese.

Another avenue of enquiry that has been touched upon during this study is the loanword phenomenon beyond the scope of English language education. As a social
and cultural phenomenon, loanwords have had a significant impact on the Japanese
language itself. Loanwords from other languages, such as Chinese and French, could
also be explored and compared.

7.8 Conclusion

This study has outlined the significance of English loanwords within the
Japanese language and provided evidence of how attention to this presence can
positively influence the teaching and learning of English in Japan. Data collected and
analysed for the development of the four case studies reveal evidence that loanwords
are an underutilised resource that has received little recognition within the Japanese
education system. Where the attempt to incorporate loanwords was attempted as in
the case of Emma, it was partially successful in drawing students’ attention to a pre-
existing resource.

The phonological and semantic similarities between English and the
loanwords incorporated into Japanese from English have been detailed. Although the
phonological and semantic differences are evident, statistical data have shown these
to be far less significant, and less common, than many educators have previously
believed.

In particular, this study addressed the research questions related to loanwords
and English language teaching in Japan. The findings indicate that there is a strong
and increasing presence of English loanwords within the Japanese lexicon. This
presence suggests that rather than linguistic issues, cultural concerns, conservative
teaching methodologies, and methods of testing that are at odds with communicative
competencies have been largely responsible for marginalising loanwords as a
linguistic resource. Cultural-historical activity theory reveals the impact that systems
of activity can have on each other, and how these systems, just as examinations in the
Japanese education system, can negatively influence an otherwise obvious resource. The theory also revealed the breadth and depth of interconnected relationships and objectives associated with phenomena such as loanwords, and their complexity.

This study was situated within one university in a mid-sized regional city. It is apparent from the findings that numerous structural changes to the system of English education in Japan would enhance the uptake of loanwords in this context. Japan is not alone in confronting the possible affordances of loanwords as tools for language acquisition. However, few countries dedicate as much time to English education as Japan. Few countries have an educational structure that gives such precedence to a particular foreign language with such limited results. No country has a syllabary dedicated to loanwords. This fact, and the beliefs expressed by participants in this study provides the basis for proposing the benefits that loanwords offer Japanese students of English.

In conclusion, this study emphasises the need for a more communicative approach to language learning in Japan: an approach that incorporates the latent knowledge of English that all Japanese speakers possess. The research has provided insights into the loanword phenomenon in Japan, an understanding of its potential as a resource, and provided further evidence of a rich resource that may benefit teachers and students in this country. Achieving this depends upon the pedagogical system embracing forms of interaction that draw on social and cultural factors to engage in productive language acquisition. The findings and recommendations from this study offer a way forward: an alternative that strengthens a communicative approach to learning English, is informed by social and cultural context, and enhances English language learning in Japan.
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Appendix A

Student Survey (English)

1. It is easier for children than adults to learn English.
2. English class should be enjoyable.
3. In order to learn to read and write English very well, English education at school is enough.
4. I believe that someday I will speak English very well.
5. It is useful to know about English-speaking countries in order to speak English.
6. You shouldn't say anything in English until you can speak it correctly.
7. Considering the amount of time I have studied English, I'm satisfied with my progress.
8. In English classes, I prefer to have my teacher provide explanations in Japanese.
9. It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in English.
10. If a person studies English by himself for one hour a day, how many years will it take to become fluent?
11. In learning English it is important to repeat and practice a lot.
12. I would feel embarrassed to speak English in front of other Japanese students.
13. If you are allowed to make mistakes in the beginning, it will be hard to get rid of them later on.
14. Learning English is mostly a matter of learning grammar rules.
15. Listening to CDs and watching English programs on television are very important in learning English.
16. Girls are better than boys at learning English.
17. If I learn to speak English very well, I will have many opportunities to use it.
18. It is easier to speak English than to understand it.
19. Learning English is different from learning other subjects.
20. Learning English is mostly a matter of translating from Japanese.
21. If I learn to speak English very well, it will help me get a good job.
22. It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it.
23. People who are good at maths and science are not good at learning foreign languages.
24. Japanese think it is important to speak English.
25. People who speak more than one language well are very intelligent.
26. Japanese are good at learning foreign languages.
27. In order to speak and understand English very well, English education at school is enough.
28. Some languages are easier to learn than others.
29. You can learn to improve your English only from native speakers of English.
30. Some people are born with a special ability which is useful for learning English.
31. Speaking and listening to English are more useful than reading and writing English.
32. Learning a word means learning the Japanese translation.
33. I studied English only to pass the entrance exam.
34. I can improve my English by speaking English with my classmates.
35. I make mistakes because I do not study enough.
36. To say something in English, I think of how I would say it in Japanese and then translate it into English.
37. I should be able to learn everything I am taught.
38. I want my teacher to correct all my mistakes.
39. If my teacher is a native speaker, he/she should be able to speak Japanese when necessary.
40. I study English because it is useful to communicate with English speaking people.
41. To understand English, it must be translated into Japanese.
42. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.
43. The longer I study English, the more enjoyable I find it.
44. If I heard a foreigner of my age speaking English, I would go up to that person to practice speaking.
45. I am satisfied with the English education I received.
46. I think there are too many loanwords in Japanese.
47. I use a lot of loanwords.
48. Loanwords are difficult to understand.
49. Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English.
50. My junior high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.
51. My high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.
52. Loanwords help me learn English.
53. My junior high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.
54. My high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.
55. I would like to learn more about loanwords.
Appendix B
Student Survey (Japanese)

1. 子どもの方が、大人より英語を習得するのが容易である。
2. 英語の授業は楽しくあるべきだ。
3. 英語を上手に読み書きできるようになるには、学校の英語教育だけで充分である。
4. 将来、自分は英語をとても上手に話せるようになると思う。
5. 英語を話すために、英語圏の国々について知ることは必要なことだと思う。
6. 正しく話せるようになるまで、英語を話すべきではないと思う。
7. 英語を勉強した時間を考えると、自分の上達度に満足している。
8. 英語のクラスでは、先生が日本語で説明してくれるほうがいい。
9. もし英語でわからない単語があったら、その意味を推測してもかまわない。
10. もし英語を毎日1時間ずつ勉強するとしたら、その人は何年で英語が流暢になると思いますか。（1=2年 2=5年 3=10年 4=決してそうならない）
11. 英語を習得するうえで、繰り返したり、練習をたくさんすることは重要なことである。
12. ほかの日本人の学生の前で英語を話すのは恥ずかしい。
13. もし初めの段階で、まちがいが許されたら、そのまちがいを後でなおすことは、むずかしいと思う。
14. 英語を習得するということは、文法をたくさん学ぶことである。
15. テープを聞いたり、英語のテレビを見ることは、英語を学習するうえでとても大事である。
16. 女性のほうが男性より英語を習得するのが上手である。
17. 英語がとても上手に話せるようになったら、英語を使う機会が数多くあると思う。
18. 英語を話すほうが、聞いて理解するより易しいと思う。
19. 英語の学習は、ほかの学科を学ぶこととは異なると思う。
20. 英語を習得するということは、日本語から英語に翻訳するということである。
21. 英語を上手に話せるようになったら、将来的仕事に役立つことになると思う。
22. 英語を読み書きすることのほうが、話したり聞いたり理解することより、
    易しいと思う。
23. 数学や科学が得意な人は、外国語を習得するのが上手ではない。
24. 日本人は、英語を話すことが大事だと思っている。
25. 外国語を話せる人は、頭がよいと思う。
26. 日本人は、外国語を習得するのが得意である。
27. 英語を上手に話せたり聞いたりするようになるには、学校の英語教育だけでは
    充分である。
28. 習得するのに簡単な言語と難しい言語があると思う。
29. 外国人の先生から英語を習ってのみ英語が上手に話せるようになる。
30. 生まれながらにして、英語を習得する才能を持っている人がいる。
31. 英語を話したり聞いたりすることのほうが、読書より役に立つ。
32. 英単語を習うということは、それに対応する日本語訳を習うということである。
33. 入学試験に合格するために英語を勉強した。
34. クラスメートと英語で話すことで英語が上達すると思う。
35. 英語を充分勉強しないから、間違えるだけだと思う。
36. 英語で話すとき、まず日本語でどういうかを考えてから英語に訳す。
37. 教えられたことは習得できるはずだ。
38. 自分の間違いは、全部先生に教わってほしいと思う。
39. 外国人の先生は、必要なとき、クラスで日本語を話せるべきだと思う。
40. 英語を話す人達とコミュニケーションをするのに役立つから、英語を勉
    強している。
41. 英語を理解するにはまず、日本語に訳さなければならない。
42. すでに外国語を話せる人のほうが、そうでない人より別の言語を習
    得するのは難しいと思う。
43. 英語を勉強すればするほど、楽しくなってきている。
44. 同じ年頃の外国人が英語を話しているのが聞こえたら、英会話の練習をするために、その人のところに行って、話しかけたい。
45. 今まで自分が受けた英語教育に満足している。
46. 日本語には外来語が多すぎると思います
47. 私は外来語をよく使う
48. 外来語は理解するのが難しい。
49. 外来語は英語学習の弊害である
50. 私の中学校の先生はよく外来語について話した。
51. 私の高校の先生はよく外来語について話した。
52. 外来語は英語学習に役立つ。
53. 私の中学校の先生は外来語は英語学習に役立つと思っていた。
54. 私の高校の先生は外来語は英語学習に役立つと思っていた。
55. もっと外来語について学びたい。
Appendix C

Teacher-interview Questions

1. Describe your language-learning background.
2. Based on that background, what has been your experience with loanwords?
3. What have been your language teachers’ attitudes towards loanwords?
4. As a language learner, what have been the advantages/disadvantages of loanwords?
5. As a language teacher, what have been the advantages/disadvantages of loanwords?
6. Where do you think your attitude towards loanwords stems from?
7. Describe your English language teaching background.
8. Based on that background, what has been your experience with loanwords?
9. How often do you pay explicit attention to loanwords while teaching?
10. How do you pay attention to loanwords while teaching?
11. Do you think loanwords can be used as a productive resource to promote language learning? Why/why not? If so, how do you think they can best be harnessed?
Appendix D

Student-interview Questions

1. Describe your language-learning background.

2. Based on that background, what has been your experience with loanwords?

3. How would you describe your language teachers’ attitudes towards loanwords?

4. As a language learner, what do you think is the biggest problem with loanwords?

5. Where do you think your attitude towards loanwords stems from?

6. In your current English class, how often do you talk about loanwords?

7. What form does that take?

8. Do you think loanwords can be used as a productive resource to promote language learning? Why/why not? If so, how do you think it can best be harnessed?

9. How often do you use loanwords when speaking Japanese/English?

10. Do you think you use loanwords differently when using English/Japanese? In what ways?
Appendix E
Initial Observation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of teacher observed (or participant number)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program/class name or number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue of session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items observed:</th>
<th>Teacher classroom talk</th>
<th>Activity Theory Code</th>
<th>Pedagogy Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of loanwords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of loanwords used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning of loanwords provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student response to use of loanwords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning discussion of loanwords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F

### Revised Observation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of teacher observed (or participant number)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program- class name or number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue of session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timer</td>
<td>Loanword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

**Student Survey Case 1 (n=24)**

*(strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1)*

OA = overall agreement percentage (strongly agree/agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>OA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>It is easier for children than adults to learn English.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>English class should be enjoyable.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In order to learn to read and write English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I believe that someday I will speak English very well.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It is useful to know about English-speaking countries in order to speak English.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>You shouldn't say anything in English until you can speak it correctly.</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Considering the amount of time I have studied English, I'm satisfied with my progress.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>In English classes, I prefer to have my teacher provide explanations in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in English.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If a person studies English by herself for one hour a day, how many years will it take to become fluent?</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In learning English it is important to repeat and practice a lot.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I would feel embarrassed to speak English in front of other Japanese students.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>If you are allowed to make mistakes in the beginning, it will be hard to get rid of them later on.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Learning English is mostly a matter of learning grammar rules.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Listening to CDs and watching English programs on television are very important in learning English.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Girls are better than boys at learning English.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>If I learn to speak English very well, I will have many opportunities to use it.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>It is easier to speak English than to understand it.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Learning English is different from learning other subjects.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Learning English is mostly a matter of translating from Japanese.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>If I learn to speak English very well, it will help me get a good job.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>People who are good at maths and science are not good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Japanese people think it is important to speak English.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>People who speak more than one language well are very intelligent.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Japanese people are good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>In order to speak and understand English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Some languages are easier to learn than others.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>You can learn to improve your English only from teachers who are native English speakers.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Some people are born with a special ability that is useful for learning English.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Speaking and listening to English are more useful than reading and writing English.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning a word means learning the Japanese translation.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am studying English only in order to graduate.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I can improve my English by speaking English with my classmates.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I make mistakes because I do not study enough English.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>To say something in English, I think of how I would say it in Japanese and then translate it into English.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I should be able to learn everything I am taught.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I want my teacher to correct all my mistakes.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>If my teacher is a native speaker, he/she should be able to speak Japanese in class when necessary.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I study English because it is useful to communicate with English speaking people.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>To understand English, it must be translated into Japanese.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The longer I study English, the more enjoyable I find it.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>If I heard a foreigner of my age speaking English, I would go up to that person to practice speaking.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the English education I have received.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I think there are too many English loanwords in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I use a lot of loanwords.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Loanwords are difficult to understand.</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>My junior high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>My high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Loanwords help me learn English.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>My junior high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>My high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I would like to learn more about loanwords.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H

**Student Survey Case 2 (n=25)**

*(strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1)*

**OA = overall agreement percentage (strongly agree/agree)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>OA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is easier for children than adults to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English class should be enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to learn to read and write English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe that someday I will speak English very well.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is useful to know about English-speaking countries in order to speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You shouldn't say anything in English until you can speak it correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Considering the amount of time I have studied English, I'm satisfied with my progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In English classes, I prefer to have my teacher provide explanations in Japanese.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If a person studies English by herself for one hour a day, how many years will it take to become fluent?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In learning English it is important to repeat and practice a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would feel embarrassed to speak English in front of other Japanese students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If you are allowed to make mistakes in the beginning, it will be hard to get rid of them later on.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Learning English is mostly a matter of learning grammar rules.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Listening to CDs and watching English programs on television are very important in learning English.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Girls are better than boys at learning English.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>If I learn to speak English very well, I will have many opportunities to use it.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It is easier to speak English than to understand it.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Learning English is different from learning other subjects.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Learning English is mostly a matter of translating from Japanese.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>If I learn to speak English very well, it will help me get a good job.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>People who are good at maths and science are not good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Japanese people think it is important to speak English.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>People who speak more than one language well are very intelligent.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Japanese people are good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>In order to speak and understand English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Some languages are easier to learn than others.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>You can learn to improve your English only from teachers who are native English speakers.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Some people are born with a special ability that is useful for learning English.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Speaking and listening to English are more useful than reading and writing English.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Learning a word means learning the Japanese translation.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am studying English only in order to graduate.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I can improve my English by speaking English with my classmates.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I make mistakes because I do not study enough English.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. To say something in English, I think of how I would say it in Japanese and then translate it into English.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I should be able to learn everything I am taught.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I want my teacher to correct all my mistakes.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. If my teacher is a native speaker, he/she should be able to speak Japanese in class when necessary.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I study English because it is useful to communicate with English speaking people.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. To understand English, it must be translated into Japanese.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The longer I study English, the more enjoyable I find it.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. If I heard a foreigner of my age speaking English, I would go up to that person to practice speaking.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I am satisfied with the English education I have received.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I think there are too many English loanwords in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I use a lot of loanwords.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Loanwords are difficult to understand.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. My junior high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. My high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Loanwords help me learn English.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. My junior high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. My high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I would like to learn more about loanwords.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix I

## Student Survey Case 3 (n=24)

(strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1)

\(OA = \text{overall agreement percentage (strongly agree/agree)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>OA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is easier for children than adults to learn English.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English class should be enjoyable.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to learn to read and write English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe that someday I will speak English very well.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is useful to know about English-speaking countries in order to speak English.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You shouldn't say anything in English until you can speak it correctly.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Considering the amount of time I have studied English, I'm satisfied with my progress.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In English classes, I prefer to have my teacher provide explanations in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in English.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If a person studies English by herself for one hour a day, how many years will it take to become fluent?</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In learning English it is important to repeat and practice a lot.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would feel embarrassed to speak English in front of other Japanese students.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If you are allowed to make mistakes in the beginning, it will be hard to get rid of them later on.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Learning English is mostly a matter of learning grammar rules.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Listening to CDs and watching English programs on television are very important in learning English.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Girls are better than boys at learning English.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. If I learn to speak English very well, I will have many opportunities to use it.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. It is easier to speak English than to understand it.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Learning English is different from learning other subjects.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Learning English is mostly a matter of translating from Japanese.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. If I learn to speak English very well, it will help me get a good job.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. People who are good at maths and science are not good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Japanese people think it is important to speak English.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. People who speak more than one language well are very intelligent.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Japanese people are good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. In order to speak and understand English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Some languages are easier to learn than others.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. You can learn to improve your English only from teachers who are native English speakers.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Some people are born with a special ability that is useful for learning English.</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Speaking and listening to English are more useful than reading and writing English.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Learning a word means learning the Japanese translation.</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am studying English only in order to graduate.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I can improve my English by speaking English with my classmates.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I make mistakes because I do not study enough English.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. To say something in English, I think of how I would say it in Japanese and then translate it into English.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I should be able to learn everything I am taught.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I want my teacher to correct all my mistakes.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. If my teacher is a native speaker, he/she should be able to speak Japanese in class when necessary.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I study English because it is useful to communicate with English speaking people.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. To understand English, it must be translated into Japanese.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The longer I study English, the more enjoyable I find it.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. If I heard a foreigner of my age speaking English, I would go up to that person to practice speaking.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I am satisfied with the English education I have received.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I think there are too many English loanwords in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I use a lot of loanwords.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Loanwords are difficult to understand.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English.</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. My junior high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. My high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Loanwords help me learn English.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. My junior high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. My high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I would like to learn more about loanwords.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix J

## Student Survey Case 4 (n=25)

(\textit{strongly agree} = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, \textit{strongly disagree} = 1)

\textbf{OA = overall agreement percentage (strongly agree/agree)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>OA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is easier for children than adults to learn English.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English class should be enjoyable.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to learn to read and write English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe that someday I will speak English very well.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is useful to know about English-speaking countries in order to speak English.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You shouldn't say anything in English until you can speak it correctly.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Considering the amount of time I have studied English, I'm satisfied with my progress.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In English classes, I prefer to have my teacher provide explanations in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's O.K. to guess if you don't know a word in English.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If a person studies English by herself for one hour a day, how many years will it take to become fluent?</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In learning English it is important to repeat and practice a lot.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would feel embarrassed to speak English in front of other Japanese students.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If you are allowed to make mistakes in the beginning, it will be hard to get rid of them later on.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Learning English is mostly a matter of learning grammar rules.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Listening to CDs and watching English programs on television are very important in learning English.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Girls are better than boys at learning English.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If I learn to speak English very well, I will have many opportunities to use it.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is easier to speak English than to understand it.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Learning English is different from learning other subjects.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Learning English is mostly a matter of translating from Japanese.</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. If I learn to speak English very well, it will help me get a good job.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. People who are good at maths and science are not good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Japanese people think it is important to speak English.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. People who speak more than one language well are very intelligent.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Japanese people are good at learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In order to speak and understand English very well, English education at school is enough.</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Some languages are easier to learn than others.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. You can learn to improve your English only from teachers who are native English speakers.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Some people are born with a special ability that is useful for learning English.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Speaking and listening to English are more useful than reading and writing English.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Learning a word means learning the Japanese translation.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am studying English only in order to graduate.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I can improve my English by speaking English with my classmates.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I make mistakes because I do not study enough English.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. To say something in English, I think of how I would say it in Japanese and then translate it into English.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I should be able to learn everything I am taught.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I want my teacher to correct all my mistakes.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. If my teacher is a native speaker, he/she should be able to speak Japanese in class when necessary.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I study English because it is useful to communicate with English speaking people.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. To understand English, it must be translated into Japanese.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The longer I study English, the more enjoyable I find it.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. If I heard a foreigner of my age speaking English, I would go up to that person to practice speaking.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I am satisfied with the English education I have received.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I think there are too many English loanwords in Japanese.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I use a lot of loanwords.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Loanwords are difficult to understand.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Loanwords are an obstacle to learning English.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>My junior high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>My high school teachers often mentioned loanwords.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Loanwords help me learn English.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>My junior high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>My high school teachers thought loanwords helped us learn English.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I would like to learn more about loanwords.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>