

The Treatment of the Contact-Clause as an Index to Changing Trends in Grammar Teaching Reflected in Junior High School English Textbooks in Japan

Norihiko Kochi

Abstract

本研究の目的は、日本の中学校英語教科書における文法教育の傾向と、その傾向の裏に存在する考え方を明らかにすることである。特に近年、接触節という概念を中心にした文法事項の提示順序に大部分の教科書で改変があり、教科書によってその扱いに差があることに着目し、それが学習指導要領の方針とどのように関わっているかを論じる。結論としては、接触節が先行導入されるのは、「関係代名詞節とは別のものとして考える」（「中学校学習指導要領解説（平成10年12月）—外国語編—」）こととし、また、関係代名詞を「理解の段階にとどめる」とした学習指導要領の影響が大きいと考えられる。また、日本の英語教育が大きくコミュニケーション中心主義に影響を受けてきたなかで、頻度が高く便利に見える接触節が先行導入されるようになってきたと推測される。各教科書の扱いのばらつきが見られるのは、それぞれの教科書が文法や学習指導要領に対して異なった立場を取っているためだと説明される。最後に、接触節を独立した文法項目として扱うことには問題があり、分詞の後置修飾、関係節とともに、関係節を中心とした一本の流れで統一的に扱うべきではないかと提案した。

Key Words: junior high school English textbooks, grammar, contact-clause, presentation order, Course of Study

1. Introduction

This article is intended as an investigation of the presentation of grammatical items in junior high school English textbooks in Japan. Specifically, it aims to examine changes in presentation order concerning the contact-clause. The study also attempts to illuminate what kinds of ideologies have existed behind these changes.

This study aims to focus on English textbooks used in junior high schools throughout the country, because, among a myriad of teaching materials, textbooks authorized by the Ministry of Education are arguably the most widely-used and influential. Few would dispute that textbooks

are one of the most influential factors determining the teaching content. In fact, according to Ogushi (2011), the three factors determining the teaching content of each subject are the Course of Study, schools and teachers, and textbooks authorized by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

Whereas many more studies on textbooks seem to be conducted in terms of vocabulary than grammar, grammar is no less important in research into junior high school textbooks. Today's textbooks basically consist of lessons based on the grammatical syllabus though often complemented by skill-oriented sections in between. Indeed, Matsumura (2009) maintains, "There is no doubt that textbooks of comprehensive English in junior and senior high schools are based on the grammatical syllabus as grammatical goals are set in each section or unit and presented." (p.36; my translation)

One of the main goals of this study is to discuss the reasons for the contact-clause being treated as an independent item in the Course of Study, and eventually in the majority of junior high school textbooks. It is equally concerned with various differences among textbooks in treating this grammatical feature.

But why the contact-clause of all the grammatical items? The teaching of English in Japan has been increasingly influenced by the ideas of Communicative Language Teaching, and so has the Course of Study. The compartmentalization of the contact-clause seems to epitomize this trend in the teaching of English in Japan over the recent years.

This study also attempts to demonstrate that the authors of each textbook have slightly different attitudes toward the educational policies of the Ministry of Education and that these disparities are revealed in their textbooks.

2. Historical and Institutional Background

2.1 Popular Methods in the History of English Teaching in Japan

In the 1960s and 70s, the most popular method in teaching English was the Oral Approach or Pattern Practice as is more commonly known in Japan. The Oral Approach was developed after World War II on the basis of the teaching method employed in the American army during the war. The theoretical backgrounds of this method are behaviorist psychology and structural linguistics, and it advocates repeated oral work called pattern practice. It places special emphasis on the differences between the target language and mother language. It regards language learning as habit formation in which learners respond to stimulus and the response is reinforced.

As the Oral Approach came to be denounced as not leading to communicative competence, the Communicative Approach achieved popularity. As the name suggests, the Communicative Approach is the general term for teaching methods emphasizing communication. It came into

existence in Britain in the 1970s out of applied linguistics. In this approach, more importance is placed on developing communicative competence than on learning grammatical rules. Among its distinctive characteristics are the use of authentic materials and interactive, content-based tasks. It assigns a higher priority to function than to form, to use than to usage and to fluency than to accuracy.

2.2 Transitions in the Course of Study

The first Course of Study was produced in 1947, followed by the Suggested Course of Study in English for Lower and Upper Secondary Schools created in 1951. Imura (2003) questions the influence of these two suggested versions of the Course of Study on the post-war teaching of English in Japan, dismissing them as “pie in the sky.” He argues that it is the 1958 version of the Course of Study that has determined the direction of English language education in Japan over the last half century. It was created by Ryohei Shishido (1914-99), Senior Specialist for Curriculum, who was involved in revisions of the Course of Study seven times over a 26 year period. Although he created it in consultation with the board of collaborators, his own personal ideologies were deeply reflected. (Imura, 2003)

Imura (2003) compares the 1958 version with the current version in order to grasp some major shifts during the half century after World War II and notes the following three points:

1. The contents have been considerably reduced.
2. Emphasis has been shifted from language materials to language activities.
3. The allocation of language materials to each grade has been abolished.

(p.113; my translation)

The Course of Study has assumed legal binding force since the 1958 version. This version designated language materials and learning activities for the first time.

In the 1969 version of the Course of Study, learning activities were revised into language activities. According to Imura (2003), “This is considered to be something epoch-making in the history of revisions of the Course of Study in that it extricated itself from the traditional grammatical syllabus.” (p.119)

The 1989 version aims to foster “a positive attitude toward communication”. Ogushi (2011) regards this version as outstanding in its message in the history of revisions of the Course of Study.

In the 1998 version of the Course of Study, there is an explicit aim to develop students’ “practical communication abilities”. As for grammatical items, the 1989 version ceased to refer to

exclamatory sentences, and the 1998 version began to consider what had been treated as the future tense form to be “future formed with, for example, auxiliary verbs”. Imura (2003) points out that these amendments were not due to any political intentions but to the positions of grammatical theories.

The new Course of Study announced in 2008 and to be implemented from 2012 abolished some restrictions on grammatical items. The relative clause, the to-infinitive and the gerund used to be limited to “basic” and the passive voice to “the present form and the past form.” These restrictions have been eliminated.

3. Comparison of the Contact-Clause Treated in Textbooks

3.1 Definition of the Contact-Clause

The term contact-clause was first adopted by Jespersen in (1927, §§7.1-8; 1933, §34.3). It refers to “[r]elative clauses without any connecting word” (Jespersen, 1933, p.360), “because what characterizes them is the close contact in sound and sense between the clause and what precedes it”. One example Jespersen gives is “He has found the key you lost yesterday.”

In school grammar, this structure has traditionally been treated as omission of relative pronouns. Neither *Eibunpo Kaisetsu* (Egawa, 1991) nor *Roiyaru Eibunpo* (Watanuki et al., 2000), which are possibly considered to be among the representative grammar books in Japan, treats this construction as a contact-clause.

In grammar books in Anglophone countries, this form is often treated as the zero relativizer or relativizer omission. According to Biber et al. (1999), for example, “Speakers and writers can opt to omit the relativizer altogether in restrictive relative clauses, thereby avoiding the choice among relativizers. This alternative is possible in Standard English whenever the gap is not in subject position.” (p.619)

3.2 History of the Contact-Clause

The contact-clause is an ancient expression with its history dating back to the distant past. According to Jespersen (1927), “Contact-clauses have probably been extremely common in everyday speech for at least six or seven hundred years.” (p.135) More specifically, the contact-clause which is common in contemporary English and is discussed in this paper appears to have emerged in the Middle English period. “[I]t is not till the ME period that the types that survive till the present age came into existence, especially those in which the relative pronoun, if put, would have been an object.” (p.133)

Historically, the contact-clause is not regarded as omission of relative pronouns. Jespersen (1927) argues:

It is customary in these cases to say that the relative pronoun *who* (*whom*) or *which* is “understood” or “omitted”, and the clauses are called elliptic. But here as so often in grammatical disquisitions these terms really explain nothing. I very much doubt whether anyone without any grammatical training would think that anything is left out in the sentences mentioned above. If we speak here of “omission” or “subaudition” or “ellipsis”, the reader is apt to get the false impression that the fuller expression is the better one as being complete, and that the shorter expression is to some extent faulty or defective, or something that has come into existence in recent times out of slovenliness. This is wrong: the constructions are very old in the language and have not come into existence through the dropping of a previously necessary relative pronoun. (pp.132-133)

3.3 Treatment of the Contact-Clause in the Course of Study

This section discusses how the contact-clause has been treated in the Course of Study with relevant citations (All underlines are by the author).

The Course of Study announced in 1977 does not regard the construction as the contact-clause but as omission of relative pronouns. It stipulates: “Restrictive uses of the relative pronouns, *which*, *who*, and *that* (including the cases in which these are omitted.)”

The Course of Study produced in 1989 limited the treatment of relative clauses to the basics: “Basic restrictive uses of the relative pronouns, *that*, *which* and *who* used in the nominative case and *that* and *which* used in the objective case”. Although it does not explicitly refer to the contact-clause, the term appears in the annotated version. It states: “Accordingly, such contact-clauses can be used at any time as the need arises.” The annotated Course of Study also mentions treatment of relative clauses: “treatment should only extend to understanding”.

The Course of Study revised in 1998 basically inherited the previous version as to its treatment of the construction: “Basic restrictive uses of the relative pronouns, *that*, *which* and *who* used in the nominative case and *that* and *which* used in the objective case”, “treatment should only extend to understanding”. However, the annotated Course of Study set out a clear-cut position toward the contact-clause. It declares: “Furthermore, the contact-clause is thought to be a lighter burden in learning in that there is no need to use different pronouns according to the antecedent and therefore should be regarded as something different from the relative clause.”

The Course of Study announced in 2008 and implemented from 2012 appears to be more flexible about how to treat the contact-clause in the classroom. The annotated version states: “Also, it is possible to teach the contact-clause alongside the relative pronouns.” The new Course of Study abolished the restriction; the word “basic” vanished. It states: “Restrictive use of the

relative pronouns, “that,” “which” and “who” used in the nominative case, and “that” and “which” used in the objective case”.

Furthermore, the new Course of Study stipulates: “the differences between English and Japanese as found in word order and modifier usage should be taught”, and “[f]or students to attain a good understanding of the special attributes of the English language, order and coherence to the grammar points introduced should be taught.” According to Hirata, Y. (Ed.). (2008), these stipulations refer to, among other items, forms of post-modification, which, of course, include the contact-clause.

3.4 Treatment of the Contact-Clause and Related Items in Textbooks

This section attempts to illuminate treatment of the contact-clause and related items in each of the textbooks. Presentation orders of the contact-clause, the relative clause, and the post-modification of present and past participles are shown in Table 1.

NEW HORIZON

1966-2006	participles → contact-clause → relative clause
-----------	--

NEW CROWN

1987-2002	relative clause → omission → participles
2006	participles → contact-clause → relative clause

SUNSHINE

1987-1990	participles → relative clause → omission
1993	contact-clause → relative clause → participles
1997	relative clause → omission → participles
2002-2006	participles → contact-clause → relative clause

TOTAL ENGLISH

1977-2006	participles → relative clause → omission
-----------	--

ONE WORLD

1987	participles → contact-clause → relative clause
1990	participles → relative clause → omission
1993-1997	relative clause → omission → participles
2002-2006	participles → contact-clause → relative clause

COLUMBUS

1993	participles → relative clause → omission
1997	participles → contact-clause → relative clause

Table 1: Presentation Orders of the Contact-clause and Related Items

3.4.1 Treatment in *TOTAL ENGLISH*

TOTAL ENGLISH has invariably presented the relative clause before the contact-clause, which it basically regards as omission of relative pronouns.

TOTAL ENGLISH 3 TEACHER'S GUIDE (2002, pp.209-210) explains the contact-clause in relation to the relative pronoun as follows: Relative pronouns can be omitted if they are directly followed by nouns (pronouns). If they are followed by verbs, they cannot be omitted.

It gives three ways of explaining the omission of relative pronouns. The first explanation is that relative pronouns of the objective case can be omitted. This account can explain the two examples below:

- a. The people [(**that**) we met yesterday] were very kind to us.
- b. The movie [(**that/ which**) I saw last week] was very interesting.

The second explanation is that relative pronouns can be omitted if, when they are omitted, the antecedent is directly followed by [subject + object]. The application of this rule can explain the three examples below in addition to a. and b.

- c. He's not the man (**that**) **he was** when I knew him first.
- d. He told us something (**that**) **I thought** was interesting.
- e. The chance **that**, unfortunately, **he missed** last time would never come again.

In c., *that* is the complement of *he was*. In d., *that* is the subject of *was interesting*. Therefore, both of them can be omitted although they are not the objective case. In the meantime, in e., *that* cannot be omitted even though it is the object of *he missed*, the reason being that the antecedent (*the chance*) is not directly followed [subject + verb] (*he missed*) owing to *unfortunately* being inserted.

The third explanation is that relative pronouns can be omitted if they are followed by nouns (pronouns). This rule can apply to all the five examples and also possesses the utmost simplicity and straightforwardness. All that learners have to do is confirm whether the relative pronoun is followed by a noun (pronoun) or not.

TOTAL ENGLISH 3 TEACHER'S GUIDE (2002) observes that the selection between these three is left to the judgment of each teacher. Since sentences like c., d., and e. are not supposed to

appear in junior high school, students can make the right judgment whichever explanation they choose. Nevertheless, the teacher's guide finishes by stressing again that the third explanation is the best in terms of the ease of judgment.

Moreover, the authors of this textbook dispute the notion of regarding the contact-clause as something different from the relative clause. They assert:

Only a small group of people claim that the contact-clause is different from the relative clause and that the former is easier to acquire. We cannot deny that there is something strange about that idea being presented in a document like the annotated Course of Study. Furthermore, provided that it is "something different from the relative clause", is the contact-clause excluded from "items whose treatment should only extend to understanding"? (p.214; my translation)

3.4.2 Treatment in *NEW HORIZON*

Since its first publication in 1966, *NEW HORIZON* has consistently introduced the contact-clause prior to the relative clause. The *NEW HORIZON 3 Teacher's Manual* (1975) gives five reasons why the contact-clause is presented first. First, it is frequently used in colloquial speech. Second, if the contact-clause is to be presented after the relative clause, some linguistic forms, which seldom occur in speech (ex. *the man whom I saw*), need to be introduced before more colloquial forms (ex. *the man I saw*). This can result in an unnecessary burden on learners. Third, the adjective clause is words which post-modify nouns, and it is the contact-clause that demonstrates this function most clearly. If the contact-clause is given initially, learners can confirm this function without worrying about the selection of relative pronouns. Fourth, the contact-clause shares a common trait with the post-modification of present participles and past participles in that it post-modifies without being led by a special word. Fifth, the case in which the relative pronoun is the object of a preposition (*the club which I belong to*) can be treated as an extension of the contact-clause. (This word order "noun + relative clause...+preposition" is more commonly used than "noun + preposition + relative clause..." in colloquial speech.)

The first four reasons were inherited until the 1990 version. Today, *NEW HORIZON* still presents the contact-clause prior to the relative clause. This presentation order has remained the same ever since its first publication more than 40 years ago.

3.4.3 Treatment in *SUNSHINE*

SUNSHINE has repeatedly changed the presentation order of the relative clause, the contact-clause, and the post-modification of participles even to the point where the authors'

attitudes to these grammatical items are considered to be inconsistent.

The first edition of *SUNSHINE* published in 1987 presented the post-modification of participles first, then the relative clause, and the omission of the relative pronoun. This presentation order was inherited by the 1989 edition. In the 1992 version of *SUNSHINE*, however, things began to change. It presented the contact-clause first just like *NEW HORIZON*; the difference is that it presented the post-modification of participles after the contact-clause and the relative clause. In the next edition published in 1996, the post-modification of participles was still presented last, but the contact-clause was again treated as omission of the relative clause and thus presented after the relative clause. The 2001 version of *SUNSHINE* changed the presentation order again: this time, the post-modification of participles was first presented, followed by the contact-clause, and finally by the relative clause. This presentation order has been handed down to the current version.

Let us now examine in more detail how the contact-clause is treated in several versions of *SUNSHINE* with reference to the teacher's manuals and speculate, if possible, about the reasons for the changes in presentation order.

The 1993 version of *SUNSHINE*, which first treated the phenomenon as the contact-clause suggests the following approaches in *SUNSHINE 3 Teacher's Manual* (1993). The first approach is to contrast it with the post-modification of the prepositional phrase (such as *the water in the tub*). The second approach is to explain the contact-clause by combining two sentences:

This is *the tape*. I used *it* yesterday.

This is *the tape* I used yesterday.

The manual says, "At this point, you should explain that *it* is omitted when combining two sentences because *the tape* and *it* refer to the same thing." (p.64)

Both the first and the second approaches seem problematic. The first approach merely points out the similarity of the two structures; that is, they both post-modify a noun phrase. Compared to this similarity, the relative clause and the contact-clause have much more in common. Therefore, it seems plausible to emphasize the similarities between the relative clause and the contact-clause and teach these structures together. The second approach is similar to one of the traditional approaches to introduction of the relative clause. In this respect, the approach itself seems not so problematic, and even much better than the first approach; it teaches how to make this form. Nevertheless, a fatal defect in the second explanation is "*it* is omitted when combining two sentences because *the tape* and *it* refer to the same thing." This is perplexing, because, when students learn the relative clause shortly thereafter, they will know that omission is not mandatory;

it becomes *that* or *which* and needs not to be omitted. Furthermore, the reason that omission is possible is not that “*the tape* and *it* refer to the same thing” but that *the tape* is the object of *used*. Without a sufficient understanding of the concept of case, learners will have difficulties making this structure.

In the next edition published in 1997, the contact-clause, which had preceded the relative clause, was again treated as omission of the relative pronoun and thus presented after the relative clause

In the 2002 version of *SUNSHINE*, the contact-clause preceded, followed by the relative clause. This alteration is considered to be the result of the amendment in the Course of Study, which regarded the contact-clause something different from the relative clause. In fact, *SUNSHINE 3 Teacher’s Manual* (2002) quotes a passage from the annotated Course of Study. The manual also argues, “The contact-clause is convenient because it can be used without awareness of the kind and case of the (objective) relative clause.” (p.138; my translation) Still, only with clear understanding of the case can learners truly make use of this construction. Furthermore, the following explanation seems more likely to baffle than foster students’ comprehension of the structure:

In order to prevent students from saying *the book I bought it yesterday*, it is acceptable to see that *it*, which is vaguer, is deleted because *the book* and *it* refer to the same content and therefore should not be repeated. (p.138)

This explanation will surely perplex learners when they study the relative clause shortly thereafter.

Overall, it seems safe to conclude that *SUNSHINE*’s attitude toward the contact-clause has been extremely inconsistent and that this inconsistency is manifested in its treatment in the textbooks.

3.4.4 Treatment in *NEW CROWN*

In contrast to *SUNSHINE*, *NEW CROWN* was extraordinarily consistent in treatment of the relative clause, its omission, and the post-modification of participles for a long time. From its first publication in 1987 to the second latest version published in 2002, this textbook presented the relative clause first, then its omission, and finally the post-modification of participles. Not only the presentation order but the approach to teaching these constructions equally seems reasonable.

The distinctiveness of *NEW CROWN* in its approach lies in its attempt to treat them uniformly in one sequence with the relative clause at the center. Especially, the treatment of the post-modification of participles in *NEW CROWN* should be noted. Roughly speaking, it is like

this: In structures <noun + relative pronoun + be-verb + v-ing> or <noun + relative pronoun + be-verb + past participle>, <relative pronoun + be-verb> can be omitted (or the omission does not change the meaning.)

In the current edition, however, *NEW CROWN* appears to have dismissed this approach. Like many other textbooks, it presents the post-modification, the contact-clause, and the relative clause in this order.

According to *NEW CROWN 3 Teacher's Manual* (2006), *NEW CROWN* boasts three principles as underlying its treatments of sentence patterns and grammatical items. First, it gives priority to systematicity. For example, it presents the past tense of regular verbs prior to that of irregular verbs. Likewise, it introduces perfect forms ahead of contractions. Second, it seeks to firmly introduce students into the fundamentals. For example, it generally presents affirmative sentences, interrogative sentences, and negative sentences in this order. It presents *that* prior to any other relative pronoun. Third, it sees to it that grammatical items are easy to understand and easy to teach. It basically follows the rule from the general to the particular, the basic to the applied, and from the easy to the difficult. It presents the post-modification of present and past participles and the contact-clause ahead of the relative pronoun.

It should be noted that the treatment of the grammatical items at issue is determined by the third principle instead of the first. It may be inferred from this that straightforwardness outweighs systematicity concerning these grammatical items. Otherwise, the relative clause would still precede the contact-clause.

3.5 Treatment of the Contact-clause in Textbooks under the New Curriculum

In the textbooks which will be in use under the new curriculum, several tectonic shifts can be observed concerning the treatment of the contact-clause.

NEW HORIZON continues to initiate with the contact-clause also in the new version. However, the section for summary on grammar suggests that the contact-clause is not completely different from the relative clause, or even a rather similar structure. In this respect, the long-held attitude of *NEW HORIZON* toward this construction as a contact-clause may be said to have softened.

SUNSHINE, which, in the current version, treats this linguistic structure as the contact-clause and thus presents it prior to the relative clause, now treats it as omission of the relative pronoun in the new version. Therefore, of course, it introduces this form after the relative clause.

As we have seen earlier, the Course of Study announced in 2008 and implemented from 2012 appears to be more flexible about how to treat the contact-clause in the classroom. The annotated version states: "Also, it is possible to teach the contact-clause alongside the relative

pronouns.” This new treatment in the Course of Study seems to have affected the ways the contact-clause is presented in these textbooks.

4. Discussion

4.1 Reasons for Initial Introduction of the Contact-Clause

One of the greatest reasons why five out of six currently used junior high school English textbooks present the contact-clause prior to the relative clause is the stipulation in the annotated Course of Study that the contact-clause is something different from the relative clause. Another relevant reason is that no further treatment of the relative clause is mandatory than receptive comprehension by the Course of Study.

One of the greatest reasons underlying the change is considered to be the high frequency in colloquial speech as is raised in the teaching manuals. According to Biber et al. (1999), “Relativizer omission is...proportionally most common in conversation.” (p.611) More specifically, “[a]bout 25% of all relative clauses in conversation omit the relativizer.” (p.620)

In addition to the influence of the Course of Study, there must be some influence from trends in English teaching methodologies. As noted by Ogushi (2011), one of the factors determining the contents of textbooks is trends in pedagogy. The dominant methodology in English language teaching over the last several decades has advocated communication: the Communicative Approach. It can be inferred from these that the ideas of the Communicative Language Teaching and the Course of Study affected by it have had something to do with the initial introduction of the contact-clause. It may be that the contact-clause came to be presented prior to the relative-clause because it looks convenient and is conducive to communication. In this sense, the contact-clause is a grammatical item that epitomizes the trend in the teaching of English in Japan over the recent years.

4.2 Reasons for Disparity in Treatment of the Contact-Clause in Textbooks

The different treatments of these grammatical items are owing to the difference in the attitude of each textbook toward the grammatical items and the Course of Study. Such attitude reveals itself in the presentation of grammatical items, and more clearly in the teacher’s manuals.

Despite the treatment of the contact-clause in the annotated Course of Study, which have probably prompted five out of the six current textbooks to present the contact-clause ahead of the relative clause, *TOTAL ENGLISH* still presents the contact-clause after the relative clause and treats it as omission of relative pronouns. Whereas some of the teaching manuals quote the statement in the annotated Course of Study, using the quotation as rationale and justifying the presentation of the contact-clause, *TOTAL ENGLISH 3 TEACHER’S GUIDE* (2002), on the

contrary, casts a doubt on it, challenging the idea of regarding the contact-clause as something different from the relative clause.

4.3 Implications

As we discussed in 3.2., the contact-clause is a linguistic structure which has existed since the Middle English period and is not a construction arising from carelessness or ellipsis. However, this does not immediately provide any teaching implications. Of course, historical developments of grammatical items, if applied appropriately, can be helpful for understanding. However, it is also true that that is not always the case. In fact, Kotera (2004) argues that there is no need to regard the contact-clause scientifically or academically from the educational point of view and points out the possibility of regarding it as omission of the relative clause *that*. Moreover, he proceeds to suggest that that is more rational as explanation.

One of the criticisms against regarding it as omission lies in unnaturalness. True it does not seem very natural to assume something that is not there (the relative pronoun) and omit it. It seems that the notion of omitting the relative pronoun parallels an additional line in geometry. An additional line is a line which does not appear in the original diagram but can be added to it for convenience. No voices have been heard condemning additional lines as unnatural. Additional lines do help; so does the notion of omitting relative pronouns – to understand the structure.

The approach that *NEW CROWN* used to adopt to teaching the relative clause, the contact-clause, and the post-modification of participles is straightforward. This textbook treated them uniformly in one sequence with the relative clause at the center. It treated the contact-clause as omission of relative pronouns and the post-modification of participles as omission of <relative pronoun + be-verb>. Of course, this teaching method is problematic in its own way. The present participles in the post modification do not represent the progressive aspect. All things considered, however, the present paper proposes the treatment of the relative clause, the contact-clause, and the post-modification of participles uniformly in one sequence with the relative clause at the center.

Also, despite its superficial simplicity, the introduction of the contact-clause at the initial stage has many problems as mainly discussed in 3.4.3. One would suppose that, unlike the relative pronouns which are difficult to use with all the variations, the contact-clause is user-friendly and that students would have less difficulty with it. However, as we have seen, without a sufficient understanding of the concept of case, learners will have trouble making the contact-clause. Moreover, if the instruction is flawed like the examples we saw, students will be extraordinarily confounded when confronted with the relative clause later. Although the annotated Course of Study declares the contact-clause to be a lighter burden in learning, this interpretation

remains to be doubtful.

These findings lead us to the conclusion that the treatment of the contact-clause independently as a different concept from the relative clause is highly problematic. The softened attitudes of the Course of Study and some textbooks under the new curriculum toward the contact-clause can be considered to be indirect evidence of this conclusion.

5. Conclusion

The treatment of the contact-clause independently as a different concept from the relative clause is a result of the Course of Study affected by a teaching methodology aiming at fostering communicative competence. The contact-clause came to be introduced prior to the relative clause possibly because it looks convenient and is conducive to communication. In this sense, the contact-clause is a grammatical item that epitomizes the trend in the teaching of English in Japan over the last few decades. In response to the Course of Study, most current textbooks treat this construction as a contact-clause, except one textbook: *TOTAL ENGLISH*. The differences in treatment in textbooks can be explained by different attitudes of each textbook toward grammatical items and the Course of Study. Yet, the treatment of this structure as a contact-clause is highly problematic. Therefore, this article finishes by advocating treating the relative clause, the contact-clause, and the post-modification of participles uniformly in one sequence with the relative clause at the center.

References

- Baba, T. (2009). *Chugakko eigo kentei kyokasho ni okeru bunpo komoku no hairitsu junjo* [Presentation order of grammatical items in the junior high school English textbooks]. *Bulletin of Tokyo Gakugei University. Humanities and social sciences. I*, 60, 209-220.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., Finegan, E., Johansson, S., & Leech, G. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Egawa, T. (1991). *Eibunpo kaisetsu* [An explanation of English grammar]. Tokyo: Kaneko Shobo.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erikawa, H. (2008). *Nihonjin wa eigo o do manande kita ka: Eigo kyoiku no shakai bunka shi* [A socio-cultural history of English language education in Japan]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Hirata, Y. (Ed.). (2008). *Chugakko shin gakushu shido yoryo no tenkai* [Development of the new Course of Study for lower secondary school]. Tokyo: Meiji Toshoh.
- Imura, M. (2003). *Nihon no eigo kyoiku 200 nen* [Japan's two centuries of English language instruction]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Inamura, M. (1986). *Showa eigo kyoiku shi* [The history of English education in the Showa period]. Tokyo:

Kairyudo.

- Ishikawa, S. (2008). *Eigo kopasu to gengo kyoiku* [English corpus and language education]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Jespersen, O. (1927). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. (Part III) Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Jespersen, O. (1933). *Essentials of English Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kanatani, K. (1992). *Gakushu bunpo ron* [On school grammar]. Tokyo: Kagensha.
- Kotera, S. (1996). *Eigo kyokasho to bunpo kyozai kenkyu* [Investigation of English textbooks and grammatical materials]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Kotera, S. (2004). *Iwayuru sesshokusetsu ni tsuite* [A study of contact clauses in English]. *Memoirs of Osaka Kyoiku University. I, Humanities*, 53(1), 17-29.
- Matsumura, M. (2009). *Eigo kyoiku o shiru 58 no kagi* [58 keys to know English education]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Ministry of Education. (1989). *Chugakko shidosho: Gaikokugo hen* [The annotated Course of Study].
- Ministry of Education. (1998). *Chugakko gakushu shido yoryo kaisetsu: Gaikokugo hen* [The annotated Course of Study for foreign languages]. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2008). *Chugakko gakushu shido yoryo kaisetsu: Gaikokugo hen* [The annotated Course of Study for foreign languages]. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
- Ogushi, M. (2011). *Eigo kentei kyokasho* [Authorized textbooks of English]. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Quirk, R. (1957). *Relative clauses in educated spoken English*. *English Studies*, 38, 97-109.
- Saito, Y. (2007). *Nihonjin to eigo* [English and the Japanese]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Watanuki, Y., Miyakawa, Y., Sugai, T., Takamatsu, N. (2000). *Tettei reikai roiyaru Eibunpo* [Royal English grammar with complete examples of usage]. Tokyo: Obunsha.

Textbooks

- Ota, A. et al. (Eds.). (1966, 1969, 1972). *NEW HORIZON ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Ota, A. et al. (Eds.). (1975, 1978). *NEW HORIZON English Course 3 REVISED EDITION*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Ota, A. et al. (Eds.). (1981). *NEW HORIZON ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Ota, A. et al. (Eds.). (1984). *NEW HORIZON English Course 3 REVISED EDITION*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Ota, A. et al. (Eds.). (1987, 1990). *NEW HORIZON ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Asano, H. et al. (Eds.). (1993, 1997). *NEW HORIZON ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Kasajima, J. et al. (Eds.). (2002, 2006). *NEW HORIZON ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.
- Nakamura, K. et al. (Eds.). (1978). *THE NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES*. Tokyo: Sanseido.

- Nakamura, K. et al. (Eds.). (1981). *THE NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES NEW EDITION*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Nakamura, K. et al. (Eds.). (1984). *THE NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES Revised Edition*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Nakamura, K. et al. (Eds.). (1987). *NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Nakamura, K. et al. (Eds.). (1990). *NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES NEW EDITION*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Morizumi, M. et al. (Eds.). (1993). *NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Morizumi, M. et al. (Eds.). (1997). *NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES NEW EDITION*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Morizumi, M. et al. (Eds.). (2002). *NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Takahashi, S. et al. (Eds.). (2006). *NEW CROWN ENGLISH SERIES New Edition*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
-
- Sato, T. et al. (Eds.). (1987, 1990). *SUNSHINE ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
- Shimaoka, T. et al. (Eds.). (1993, 1997). *SUNSHINE ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
- Matsuhata, K. et al. (Eds.). (2002). *SUNSHINE ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
- Sano, M. et al. (Eds.) (2006). *SUNSHINE ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
-
- Nakajima, F. et al. (Eds.). (1978). *NEW TOTAL ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Nakajima, F. et al. (Eds.). (1981). *TOTAL ENGLISH 3*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Nakajima, F. et al. (Eds.). (1984). *TOTAL ENGLISH REVISED EDITION 3*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Nakajima, F. et al. (Eds.). (1987). *TOTAL ENGLISH NEW EDITION 3*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Nakajima, F. et al. (Eds.). (1990). *TOTAL ENGLISH SECOND EDITION 3*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Nakajima, F. et al. (Eds.). (1993). *NEW TOTAL ENGLISH 3*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Horiguchi, S. et al. (Eds.). (1997). *TOTAL ENGLISH 3*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Horiguchi, S. et al. (Eds.). (2001). *TOTAL ENGLISH 3*. Tokyo: Gakko Tosho.
- Horiguchi, S. et al. (Eds.). (2002). *TOTAL ENGLISH NEW EDITION 3*. Tokyo: Gakko Tosho.
- Horiguchi, S. et al. (Eds.). (2006). *TOTAL ENGLISH 3*. Tokyo: Gakko Tosho.
-
- Hasegawa, K. et al. (Eds.). (1987). *ONE WORLD ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.
- Hasegawa, K. et al. (Eds.). (1990). *ONE WORLD ENGLISH COURSE NEW EDITION 3*. Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.
- Sasaki, T. et al. (Eds.). (1993, 1997). *ONE WORLD ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.
- Sasaki, T. et al. (Eds.). (2002). *ONE WORLD ENGLISH COURSE NEW EDITION 3*. Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.
- Matsumoto, S. et al. (Eds.). (2006). *ONE WORLD ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.

Togo, K. et al. (Eds). (1993, 1997, 2002, 2006). *COLUMBUS ENGLISH COURSE 3*. Tokyo: Mitsumura Toshō.

Teacher's Manuals

NEW HORIZON 3 Teacher's Manual (1975, 1978, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1990, 1993, 1997, 2002, 2006)

NEW CROWN 3 Teacher's Manual (1987, 1990, 1993, 1997, 2002, 2006)

SUNSHINE 3 Teacher's Manual (1993, 1997, 2002)

TOTAL ENGLISH 3 TEACHER'S GUIDE (2002, 2006)

THE COURSE OF STUDY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Ministry of Education. (1958). THE COURSE OF STUDY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Ministry of Education. (1969). THE COURSE OF STUDY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Ministry of Education. (1977). THE COURSE OF STUDY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Ministry of Education. (1989). THE COURSE OF STUDY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Ministry of Education. (1998). THE COURSE OF STUDY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2003). THE COURSE OF STUDY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

