英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

Evidence of hostility to a theory of cross-cultural communication in English Language Teaching

Hywel Evans
Brian S. Berning

Keywords: Language and Culture, Universalism, Local Context, Instruction

Abstract

The desire for effective cross-cultural communication motivates second and foreign language learning. Theories that relate to communication across cultures, a central concern of both teachers and students, must be expected to play an important part in language teaching research and methodology. It is suggested here, however, that professionals and researchers in the field have been, and continue to be, slow to acknowledge this. Evidence is presented here of traditional resistance to any theory that impinges on communication between cultures, whether this theory arises from the fields of sociocultural second language acquisition theory, cultural psychology, cross-cultural psychology, cross-cultural or intercultural communication. It is assumed here that language is the most salient element of culture. In this regard, evidence is presented to challenge the widespread and unsubstantiated view that use of student language (L1) in English language teaching necessarily reduces second language (L2) output, an example of knee-jerk hostility to a culture-based understanding of local reality. It is shown that SLA doctrine -- minimizing L1 use delivers maximal L2 output -- is severely flawed. The findings show that, when students are given only L2 support, the written output of L2 was statistically significantly less than for students who were given full L1 support.

Introduction

Feldman (2008) suggests that, while science remains unable to explain basic facts surrounding human cognition, certain unfounded assumptions continue to hold ground in the absence of any convincing supporting evidence. Feldman (p. 273) offers the example of unfounded belief in the “autonomy of syntax”, the notion that formal, abstract syntactic rules are “biologically and logically independent” of other aspects of language and thought. Feldman suggests that this idea has endured, in the absence of supporting evidence (Evans, 2014, 172-174), largely because linguists are comfortable with the idea that language is uniquely important and that only they have ownership of all the means of investigating it. Hence, this stance could well be understood not as an actual theory of language but rather as a comfortable preference. This, then, may be characterized as the cozy autonomy of the field of linguistics, insulated from findings in other disciplines. Such a bias is highly likely to have undesirable results.

It is argued here that something similar is going on in the related field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and more

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

broadly in research relating to English Language Teaching (ELT). In settings where English is taught as a second or foreign language, of course, students' culture and language are factors that must be negotiated by the teacher if teaching methods are to be successful. Failure to understand how students' culture impinges on communication strategies, for example, will necessarily make successful teaching difficult to achieve and such difficulties will impinge on countless classrooms and students around the world (Dinsmore, 1985).

In global business, for example, it would be preposterous to deny that effective cross-cultural communication depends on an effective understanding of cultural differences and the communication strategies relating to these differences. Studies in cross-cultural communication (Norales, 2006; Reynolds, Valentine, & Munter, 2010) or cross-cultural psychology (Berry & Poortinga, 2011) make very clear the need to improve our understanding of how cultural differences affect communication strategies. It is extremely difficult to imagine anyone seriously claiming that culture is not worthy of serious formal study in attempting to solve problems in the business or more general social domain. However, this is precisely what has happened in the field of SLA.

Standing precariously on universalist ground shared with mainstream linguistic theory (Chomsky, 1965), SLA attempts to make itself immune to refutation while clinging to certain comfortable foundational beliefs. The most important of these very widely held beliefs, fundamental to cross-cultural communication, will be examined below.

It should be noted that the failure to embrace culture in SLA is now widely acknowledged. Hymes (1966) was early to point out the importance of social knowledge in communication. A major challenge to traditional, universalist SLA autonomy has recently emerged from the sociocultural domain (Lantolf, 2000), which suggests that research related to cross-cultural communication is likely to become increasingly influential in SLA studies in the future. However, even sociocultural SLA fails to embrace the most salient element of culture that most directly connects culture with communication: the individual's first language. Hence, one may expect SLA research to continue to attempt to insulate itself against the impact of the importance of cultural context, at least so far as this is concerned with students' first language.

In order to test widely held claims warning against the use of student language (L1), we examined the benefits of employing L1 (the most salient feature of culture and the most powerful and precise tool mediating second language learning) to generate output in the target language (L2). Clear evidence was discovered that these claims are misleading. This, in turn, suggests that even research emerging from the sociocultural wing of SLA may not be above suspicion and may, ironically, be selectively hostile to research related to culture and local context, particularly where this is focused on L1.

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

Unless one denies that "language symbolizes cultural reality" (Kramsch, 1998: 3) then L1 must be understood as a potentially important tool, mediating L2 development in a way that connects to the roots of students' everyday felt experience. As proponents of the use of L1 in L2 learning grow in number, it is worth considering the theoretical and historical background relating to factors that have led to L1 falling out of favor in SLA.

The fragmentation of SLA

Reflexive hostility to culture-related theory in SLA receives perhaps its clearest expression in Long's (2007) passionate arguments against allowing "unscientific" sociocultural theory to make inroads into studies related to language learning. An early focus of Long's polemic against "theory proliferation" is the Chomskyan (1965) hypothesis regarding the existence of an innate linguistic endowment, Universal Grammar (UG). The UG hypothesis postulates that certain structural rules are innate to humans and do not need to be learned the way we learn everything else. Also, because of this linguistic biological endowment, the way we go on to learn specific languages, as a form of *acquisition*, is different from the way we learn everything else. This belief justifies global, "naturalistic" solutions that minimize the use of L1 in language instruction.

If certain rules of UG are really hard-wired into our brains at birth, one expects human beings to possess knowledge of certain elements of syntax prior to the process of learning one language or another. Evidence of this sort would, of course, be quite startling and might well justify a very high opinion of Chomskyan linguists. Unfortunately, as will be seen, there is no compelling evidence of this sort.

Certain SLA researchers (Eubank, 1996; Vainikka & Young-Scholten, 1996) have taken the radically Chomskyan position that functional features, generally available in UG, may not be initially accessible in the very early stages for L2 learners. These researchers suggest that beginner language learners' failure to produce the full range of tense and agreement patterns in the target language may be taken as evidence that UG access to these functional features is not available to L2 learners. This is known as the so-called Minimal Trees hypothesis because it implies that only part of the syntactic tree is innately available to L2 learners. L2 learners, then, will project "lexical" structure such as verb phrase and noun phrase but no "functional" structure such as agreement phrase and tense phrase.

Note that another, more prosaic, hypothesis might be that UG simply does not exist and that beginner language learners lack knowledge of the target language just because they are beginners. Explanations for certain related "puzzles" might then instead be sought in the sociocultural domain, with respect to how learners actually use L2, often influenced by L1, to communicate with other L2 speakers who come from a different cultural background.

However, ignoring the simpler explanation for beginners' lack of knowledge of L2, Long (2007) remains fully committed to

UG-based SLA research in spite of the fact that the author was writing at a time when it was already clear that even Chomsky (2005: 10) himself was expressing profound doubts about UG, at least understood in its strong sense of a modularized innate endowment delivering a system of syntactic principles (O'Grady, 2008).

To be fair, competing UG proponents, such as Schwartz and Sprouse (1996) and Lardiere (1998), have quite correctly pointed out that the mere fact that beginners make grammatical errors (from a native speaker's prescriptive point of view) obviously does not necessarily imply the total absence of potential, underlying syntactic knowledge. As suggested above, the commonsense, obvious assumption is that beginner learners simply do not know anything about the L2 because they are beginners. These researchers justifiably claim that there is no real reason to doubt that the full range of potential grammatical knowledge *is* available to the beginner L2 learner. This is called the Full Transfer/Full Access hypothesis. In support of this, Lardiere points out that mature (so-called fossilized or final state) Chinese learners of English often have full control of English grammar (and might be expected to communicate perfectly well in the L2) apart from the failure to manifest features connected with agreement and tense. Clearly, however, such commonsense-based evidence does not offer any support for the UG hypothesis, because L2 learners do indeed eventually develop a full range of grammatical ability while the UG account would predict failure to project basic sentential structure in the absence of functional features.

This actually constitutes fairly strong evidence *against* the need for functional (as opposed to lexical) features in the projection of phrasal structure. However, although the evidence falls out strongly against UG, Long (2007) makes no reference to competing theories of grammar that are not committed to UG and functional features (e.g. Pollard & Sag, 1994) in his discussion. Instead, Long (2007) holds up the UG/SLA debate as a "scientific" model, despite the fact that it reaches no clear conclusion, is not motivated by anything unexpected given normal everyday commonsense assumptions, and actually provides evidence *against* UG theory.

In fact, the resolution to this "puzzle" would seem to be rather straightforward with reference to a different set of pre-theoretical issues. The absence of tense and agreement among mature Chinese learners of English may initially just be a matter of transfer from L1 (Odlin, 1989). Even after noticing the difference between L1 and L2 with regard to tense and agreement, final state learners might not regard these differences as important given that they have become able to communicate perfectly well in the target language. This lack of motivation to align with native speaker prescriptivism, therefore, might well reduce to a matter of identity and can probably be better explained with reference to the sociolinguistic/sociocultural domain. Furthermore, one might note that the evidence of transfer from L1, where L1

syntactic structure is often retained so long as it does not interfere with communication, strongly suggests that L2 learning is naturally mediated by L1.

It should also be obvious that any reference to UG in this context is entirely unmotivated and unhelpful. However, Long reaches the opposite conclusion. Long's conclusion, rather astonishingly, is that the "scientific" (statistical manipulation of abstract cognitive and linguistic variables) UG-centered debate is desirable but the "unscientific" sociocultural approach, situated in ordinary reality, should be banned outright. This can be understood as reflexive hostility to cultural-context based explanations, highly revealing of the conservative mainstream SLA theoretical dynamic. L1 (a manifestation of local culture) is rejected as a straightforward explanation in favor of universalist explanations (that fail to stand up).

The crisis

Of course, Long's (2007) arguments were deluded and doomed. Zuengler & Miller (2006) were already talking about two parallel worlds in SLA, mainstream UG SLA and sociocultural SLA. In spite of the theoretical preference among certain researchers for universalist solutions, there is no doubt that SLA/ELT must embrace the importance of cultural context even as it attempts to minimize its theoretical significance. The most hardened UG proponent must acknowledge the importance of context in communication (Austin, 1962; Grice, 1989; Levinson, 1983) in which social and intercultural factors cannot be ignored (Hymes, 1971, 1972; McConachy, 2017; Remillard & Williams, 2016; Wierzbicka, 2003). Indeed, ELT is widely acknowledged as having reached a *post-method* phase (Harmer, 2003; Kumaravadivelu 2006; Pennycook 1989; Prabhu 1990), in which it becomes increasingly necessary to adapt methodology to cultural context (Bax, 2003).

This means that there is in fact no SLA methodology in the absence of local adaptation. However, this situation gives rise to a tension such that vested interests in ELT come under pressure to dismiss research in language learning and use that invokes culture as an important consideration from a formal theoretical perspective (Dash, 2003; Guest, 2002; Sowden, 2007) rather than an anecdotally informal one.

The denial of cultural differences as a central theoretical concern helps to justify global solutions. For example, Chen, Warden, & Chang (2005) provide an interesting account of how the motivational model employed in ELT, presumably applicable in the English-speaking centers, is preposterously at odds with local realities in the periphery. At the same time, studies that are of potential relevance in local contexts (Nicholls, 1899; Parsons & Goff, 1978; Sue & Okazaki, 1990) are ignored. Pressure to promote the global narrative is strong, of course, particularly when it comes to the continued and lucrative production of all-English textbooks. The client-pleasing (Harmer, 2003) tendency to claim that monolingual teachers are paradoxically better because they *do not understand* the

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

student's first language and culture (and hence will necessarily resort to naturalistic teaching methods) fits this self-serving paradigm. Once an understanding of culture is acknowledged as theoretically important, the universal value of ELT-related theory comes directly into question (Block, 2003; Dinsmore, 1985; Thomas, 1998).

The biggest threat to universalist accounts of L2 learning is, of course, the potentially successful use of L1. The use of student language, the most salient element in specific cultural contexts, is actually in the process of becoming a centrally important issue in ELT (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Cook, 2010; Laviosa, 2014; Malmkjaer, 2004; McMillan & Turnbull, 2009). Globalization and the need for better cross-cultural communication implies diversity, not standardization and it may well be that we are arriving at a tipping point of sorts. *Translanguaging* (Garcia & Wei, 2013; Lewis et al, 2012) approaches, in particular, promise to deliver more efficient forms of L2 output from L1 input. However, ostensible adherence to official English-only policies, at least as an ideal, still often obscures a reality in which L1 support is indispensable at least to successful classroom management (Macmillan & Turnbull, 2009). For ELT, the sociocultural reality must be ignored to claim validity for lucrative global solutions.

The emergence of Sociocultural ELT (Lantolf, 2000) makes this particularly obvious and underscores the influence of divergence in linguistic theory (Masuda et al, 2015). It becomes increasingly difficult to ignore culture in a theory of language emergence in communication (Bates & MacWhinney,1988; Bybee, 1998). Similarly, it is impossible to ignore the psychology of culture (Nisbett, 2003; Zuengler & Miller, 2006) in a theory of symbolically mediated mental development. The desire to ignore cross-cultural communication as a central theoretical concern in language teaching can therefore be understood as a wish to insulate against progress threatening to undermine a global agenda that serves narrow interests. This explains the wild tendency, all evidence to the contrary (Stevenson & Stigler, 1994), to dismiss *all* cultural references as necessarily ethnocentric (Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009).

Rather, ethnocentric attitudes (Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Liu, 1998), particularly towards students, may be more sensibly traced to a failure to grapple with the question of culture as a subject of theoretical interest (Thorne, 2000). Inadequate theoretical categories may be examined seriously and refuted or improved (McSweeney, 2002). However, students are often reflexively blamed and essentialized in ways that have no formal basis when it would be better to confront the failure of flawed teaching methods that require homespun "theories" to justify them.

For example, Evans (1990, 1991) shows that the characterization of Japanese students as "passive" and western teachers as "active" receives no theoretical justification yet serves to reassure the teacher that unresponsive classes are inevitable. Indeed, one could point out that,

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

recently, there have been successful practical solutions to such problems emerging from outside the English-language centers (Martin, 2014) and that these appear to address fundamental practical problems situated in the domain of monolingual cross-cultural communication.

The central importance of L1

However, while the emergence of sociocultural research in SLA has shed important light on a range of serious problems, there is still cause for concern. If we expect researchers to attempt to insulate themselves against inconvenient aspects of reality, this is also expected to apply to sociocultural ELT. There is every reason to believe that sociocultural research emanating from the centers will seek to downplay the importance of L1 in language learning. This is because researchers in the periphery are obviously far better placed to conduct such research. For example, the seminal reference works in sociocultural SLA (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014) make no reference at all to L1 as a pedagogical tool. This is rather peculiar given the centrality in sociocultural theory of signs in the mediation of mental development in social activity (Vygotsky, 1980). One might propose that a fundamental concern for any theory of cross-cultural communication is how L1 mediates the development of communicative competence in L2 and how L2 emerges from L1.

Statistical evidence is presented below to directly refute the highly pervasive yet unsubstantiated view that use of student language in ELT necessarily reduces L2 output (Krashen, 1985; Macaro, 2011; Sato, 2015), a position that we take as an example of knee-jerk hostility to a culture-based understanding of reality. It is assumed that Cheng (2013) is correct in assuming that maximal exposure to the target language is important. However, it is denied that we are playing a zero-sum or strictly competitive game (Binmore, 2007; Berning & Evans, 2017) in this regard. To take the example of simultaneous translation, creative production of a target language is mediated by and increases exponentially with input in a different language. We demonstrate that a widely held belief in ELT -- minimizing L1 use necessarily delivers maximal L2 output -- is incorrect.

Methods

This experiment was designed as a quantitative test of how best to generate maximal English output in an EFL context academic writing classroom. The hypothesis to test is the long-held idea that using English-only methodology will in fact produce a greater amount of L2 output via writing from the students compared to students that are offered various amounts of L1 support. To do this we attempted to answer the following guiding question.

> Q. Can the use of varying levels of written L1 support produce greater quantities of targeted L2 written output compared to L2 only support when describing a picture?

Participants

This study consisted of 75 first year English major students from a Japanese

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

TOEIC / Support Condition	L2 Only	L1 Limited	L1 Full Support
Means	474.8	481.4	478.2
SD	83.4	85.7	79

University. The students were divided into three different groups using their current TOEIC scores which were obtained at the start of the academic year. An average TOEIC score of 478 with a SD of 2.7 between the groups was achieved allowing for statistically comparable groups. With three groups of 25, each group was assigned a different support level: L2 support, L1 limited support, or L1 full support. Each student was given exactly the same picture to describe with one of the three support conditions on the task worksheet (fig. 1). Instructors gave no instructions to the students other than to follow what was written on the task worksheet, and when to start and stop writing.

Task

The task involved the students writing a detailed description of a picture in the L2. Three different support conditions were given to answer the guiding question. The L2 only support condition gave students only the picture with the task instructions in the L2. The L1 limited support condition gave the instructions for the task in the students' L1. The third condition L1 full support gave the instructions in the L1 as well as a sample writing in the students' L1. Students worked alone on the assignment, were limited to 15 minutes as directed in the instructions and could use dictionaries. It is important to note the picture selected was meant to be of a familiar environment that fit the physical and cultural environment of the students.

Data Collection

Table 1

Data collected for this study consisted of the students' TOEIC scores, and the written L2 descriptions of the picture task. TOEIC data was used to create generalized groups with similar TOEIC levels equivalent to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) A2 level (Table 1). The written L2 output was analyzed by two native English professors relating to both objective and subjective data points. All measurements were averaged between the two raters who were trained to follow the guidelines set in the task instructions, as well as given several practice papers to ensure each rater followed the set guidelines. Before the two rater's measurements were averaged, interrater reliability was measured with a paired t-test and Pearson's correlation coefficient and no significant difference was found between the raters.

The students' written data was analyzed for three objective data points and one subjective measure. The three objective data points include: word count, descriptive units, and ability to follow instructions. Word count is simply the total L2 output of the student in word units. Descriptive units were counted when the student described some element in or directly related to the picture using adjectives and/or prepositions. The following instructions data point is based on the instructions given on the task paper and is divided into five units: paragraph formatting, descriptive adjectives,

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

prepositions, the presence of topic-supporting-concluding sentences, and indentation with double spacing. As for the subjective measure this was based on the professor's professional opinion and practice papers to calibrate how they would grade the papers using a four-point scale, four being the highest achievement level and one the lowest. These four data sets were then analyzed with a one-way ANOVA test for significance.

Subjective / Support Condition	L2 Only	L1 Limited	L1 Full Support
Grade Means	2.68	2.7	2.64
Grade SD	.37	.37	.30

Results

Table 2

The objective data showed a significant difference in two of the three data points

Objective / Support Condition	L2 Only	L1 Limited	L1 Full Support
Instruction Means	3.16	3.36	3.76
Instruction SD	0.98	0.92	0.65
Word Count Means	66.92	67.48	96.12
Word Count SD	27.39	19.30	24.05
Descriptive Unit Means	10.16	10.28	17.8
Descriptive Unit SD	2.42	3.36	3.11

(Table 2). When the three measurements were taken from the instruction sets and compared with a one-way ANOVA test a p value of .055164 is found which is not significant with significance at $P < .05$. The data for word count does show significance with a p value of .000037 with significance at $P < .05$. Descriptive units also showed a significant difference with a p value of .00001 with significance at $P < .05$.

Table 3

The subjective data shows no significant difference between the three states (Table 3). With a p value of .833479 the three conditions are not significantly different at $P < .05$.

Analysis

With four different data points we found a significant difference in half of our findings. The findings showed that, with full L1 support, students did produce a significantly greater amount of L2 output compared to L2 only or L1 limited support. The data also showed that, when using L1 limited support compared to L2 only, no significant difference is found. This shows that L1 did not interfere in the production of L2 in this written task. By going further and adding full L1 support, students could produce a significantly greater amount of L2 output. In both word count and descriptive units, students who were given full L1 support wrote more in quantity (word count) and wrote more of the targeted grammatical forms (descriptive units). These findings also show that just limited L1 support as in L1 instructions does not make a significant difference. As for following the instructions, while no significant difference was found between

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

the 3 support states, the L1 full support group did produce the highest average of 3.76 units compared to 3.36 and 3.16 for L1 limited support and L2 only respectively. This is of interest as there is no difference between the L1 limited and L1 full support groups task instructions. The extra support paragraph could have given these students a clearer idea of what the instructor required. While the difference in objective grades is not significant, one might point out that L1 was offered as support and was not meant to improve the quality of the students output. Rather it was focused on increasing L2 output, which it did. These results suggest the need for further study into how to improve not only quantity but quality of student L2 output as well as how L1 support affects learners at lower and higher ability levels (CEFR A1/C1).

Discussion

The study investigated the effect of first language support on written output and found that this support has a significant impact. Therefore, it can be stated that the use of varying levels of written L1 support may indeed produce greater quantities of targeted L2 written output.

The results clearly indicate that L1 use is of great potential value in language teaching tasks. It should be noted that this is by no means an extraordinary claim, given general acceptance of the need for appropriate support in language learning. The experiment was of fairly simple design and yielded results that are intuitively not unexpected, particularly given the wealth of literature lauding the benefits of L1 use. One must conclude, therefore, that there is strong reason to believe that principled use of L1 may be beneficial. Therefore, this study represents a significant contribution.

Of particular interest, perhaps, is the possibility that full L1 support yielded the best results because the students then had the clearest idea of what was expected of them. Significantly, this is in keeping with research on uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010) that suggests that Japanese people are more likely to be relatively (compared to American or British people, for example) uncomfortable with ambiguity. Introducing an extra level of difficulty with regard to understanding L2 instructions is highly likely to increase potential levels of uncertainty. This clearly indicates that SLA should embrace research from cross-cultural psychology. It would seem that, for the moment, popular assumptions in the field of SLA are diametrically at odds with culture-related research.

There is good reason to believe that L1 use in tasks has been resisted with some determination and that research in this regard has been neglected. Blind faith in universalist, “naturalistic” approaches to language learning is dependent on an unexamined belief in innate language-specific abilities and research has resisted culture as an explanatory factor. Just as researchers in linguistics have shown a preference for autonomy, justified by belief in discrete language abilities, researchers in SLA have downplayed the relevance of other disciplines in language learning while clinging to the notion that

UG justifies a dogged adherence to naturalistic approaches. This state of affairs has helped to shore up the conviction that "all-English" approaches are to be preferred and this conviction has dovetailed with the self-interest of native speaker teachers. Even SLA theories focused on culture and tool use fail to acknowledge the use of L1 as an important mediating tool.

Given this state of affairs, we certainly do not expect any sudden paradigm shift towards L1-mediated tasks. However, as culture is slowly accepted as being important in language learning, we are long overdue for a reappraisal of the value of L1 use, in task design in particular and in language learning in general. As second language ability is foundational to cross-cultural communication, this study is a significant cross-theoretical contribution.

Conclusion

Effective language learning is foundational to improving cross-cultural communication. We need not labor the point that the existence of a common language generally leads to greater potential with regard to cross-cultural communication. As the importance of local context takes on greater acceptance in (particularly sociocultural) SLA, there will undoubtedly be greater opportunities for research in cross-cultural communication to make a contribution in ELT. However, the tendency to seek to insulate SLA research against inconvenient reality is unlikely to disappear so easily. One very inconvenient reality at the heart of such matters relates to the question of optimal L1 use in SLA. It is a simple reality that researchers outside the localities have a severe disadvantage when it comes to investigating students' culture and language and are likely to be resistant to embracing these. However, it would be considered ridiculous to ignore such factors in other fields concerned with cross-cultural communication. In business, where successful cross-cultural communication is an economic imperative, it is fully accepted that research on local culture must be taken seriously from a theoretical point of view. In contrast, one might fear that L1 will continue to be ignored because its more effective use is likely to benefit only students and classroom teachers rather than prestigious researchers and corporations. Even so, it may be that we stand at a crossroads and that we will see a move towards a view of reality in which effective language learning is motivated by our desperately pressing need for better cross-cultural communication. Anticipating change, we offer evidence that the reality of the beneficial use of L1 is diametrically opposed to centrally sanctioned dogma.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Bates, E. & MacWhinney, B. (1988). What is functionalism? *Papers and reports on child language development, 27*, 137-52.

Bax, S. (2003). *The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching*. English Language Teaching Journal, *57*(3), 278-287.

Berning, B. S. & Evans, H. (2017).

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

Cultural identity and student language support in oral productive tasks: Questioning the "zero-sum game" mentality. *Tsuru Bunka Daigaku Kenkyuu Kiyo, 86, 93-106.*

Berry, J. W. & Poortinga, Y. H. (2011). *Cross-cultural psychology: research and applications*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Binmore, K. (2007). *Playing for real: A text on game theory*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Books.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Georgetown, WA: Georgetown University Press.

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. A. W. (2009). *The bilingual reform. A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Berlin, Germany: Narr Studienbucher.

Bybee, J. (1998). The Emergent Lexicon. *Proceedings of the 34th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society: The Panels*, 421-435.

Chen, J. F., Warden, C. A., & Chang, H-T. (2005). Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(4), 609-633.

Cheng, X. (2013). Research on college English teachers' classroom code-switching: Beliefs and attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(6), 1277-1284.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (2005). Three factors in language design. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *36*, 1-22.

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Dash, P. (2003). Culture rejected as an individual difference in the SLA process. *Asian EFL Journal* 5(2). Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june2003subpd.php

Dinsmore, D. (1985). Waiting for Godot in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, *39*(4), 225-34.

Eubank, L. (1996). Negation in early German-English interlanguage: More valueless features in the L2 initial state. *Second Language Research, 12*(1), 73-106.

Evans, H. (1990). Orientalizing the Japanese student. *The Language Teacher*, *14*(7), 27-29.

Evans, H. (1991). Defenders of the faith. *The Language Teacher*, *15*(6), 33-36.

Evans, V. (2014). *The language myth: Why language is not an instinct*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Feldman, J. A. (2008). *From molecule to metaphor: A neural theory of language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Garcia, O. & Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London, England: Palgrave Pivot.

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Guest, M. (2002). A critical 'checkbook' for culture teaching and

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

learning. *ELT Journal*, *56*(2) 154-161.

Harmer, J. (2003). Popular culture, methods, and context. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *57*(3), 288-294.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Software of the mind: intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Holliday, A., & Aboshiha, P. (2009). The denial of ideology in perceptions of 'nonnative speaker' teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(4), 669-689.

Hymes, D. (1966). Two types of linguistic relativity. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 114 – 158). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Hymes, D. (1971). On linguistic theory, communicative competence, and the education of disadvantaged children. In M.L. Wax, S.A. Diamond & F. Gearing (Eds.), *Anthropological perspectives on education* (pp. 51-66). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Hymes, D.H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). London, England: Penguin.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London, England: Longman.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Problematizing cultural stereotyping in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 709-19.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*, 59-81.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. & Poehner, M. E. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative in L2 education: Vygotskian praxis and the research/practice divide*. London, England: Routledge.

Lardiere, D. (1998). Case and tense in the "fossilized" steady-state. *Second Language Research, 14*, 1-26.

Laviosa, S. (2014). *Translation and language education: Pedagogic approaches explored*. London, England: Routledge.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18* (7), 641–654.

Liu, D. (1998). Ethnocentrism in TESOL: Teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL student. *ELT Journal*, *52*(1), 3-10.

Long, M. H. (2007). *Problems in SLA*. New Jersey, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Macaro, E. (2011). The teacher's code switching and the learner's strategic response: Towards a research agenda and implications for teacher education. *Paper presented at the JACET 50th Commemorative International Convention, Fukuoka*.

Macmillan, B. & Turnbull, M. (2009). Teachers' use of the first language in

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

French immersion: Revisiting a core principle. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 15-34). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Malmkjaer, K. (2004). *Translation in undergraduate degree programs*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Martin, P. I. (2014). English language teaching in the Philippines. *World Englishes*, *33*(4), 423-532.

Masuda, K., Arnett, C. & Labarca, A. (2015). *Cognitive linguistics and sociocultural theory: Applications for second and foreign language teaching*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

McConachy, T. (2017). *Developing intercultural perspectives on language use: Exploring pragmatics and culture in foreign language learning*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: a triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, *55*, 89-118.

Nicholls, J. (1989). *The competitive ethos and demographic education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nisbett, R.E. (2003). *The geography of thought*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Norales, F. O. (2006). *Cross-cultural communication: Concepts, cases and challenges*. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge Applied Linguistics.

O'Grady, W. (2008). Innateness, universal grammar, and emergentism. *Lingua, 118*(4), 620-631.

Parsons, J., & Goff, S. (1978). Achievement motivation: A dual modality. *Educational Psychologist*, *13*, 93-96.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *23*, 589-618.

Pollard, C., & Sag, I. A. (1994). *Head-driven phrase structure grammar*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method – Why? *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*(2), 161-76.

Remillard, V. & Williams, K. (2016). *Human communication across cultures: A cross-cultural introduction to pragmatics and sociolinguistics*. Sheffield, UK: Equinox.

Reynolds, S., Valentine, D., & Munter, M. M. (2010). *Guide to cross-cultural communication*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sato, R. (2015). The case against the case against holding English classes in English. *The Language Teacher*, *39*(5), 15-18.

Schwartz, B. D., & Sprouse, R. A. (1996). L2 cognitive states and the full transfer/full access hypothesis. *Second Language Research*, *12*(1), 40-72.

Sowden, C. (2007). Culture and the 'good teacher' in the English

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

language classroom. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *61*(4), 305-310.

Stevenson, H. W., & Stigler, J. W. (1994). *The learning gap: Why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education*. New York, NY: Touchstone Books.

Sue, S., & Okazaki, S. (1990). Asian American educational achievements: A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 913-920.

Thomas, M. (1998). Programmatic ahistoricity in second language acquisition theory. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *20*, 387-405.

Thorne, S. L. (2000). Second language acquisition theory and the truth(s) about relativity. In J. P. Lantolf. (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 219-243). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Vainikka, A., & Young-Scholten, M. (1996). Gradual development of L2 phrase structure. *Second Language Research*, *12*(1), 7-39.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Zuengler, J. & Miller, E. R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 35-58.

英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン・EibunOnline・都留文科大・英文オンライン

Figure 1

Pictures used under license from "www.bigstockphoto.com"