The Ambivalent Placement of a LWUN (Language of Wider Use and Communication) (English) in Content Study at University*

Alan BRADY**

the continued acceptance and practice of isolating communicative foreign/English language teaching and research from native language (Japanese) academic study bodes ill for the future and further development of the university in Japan
(Brady, 1997)

Introduction

This paper has five objectives as follows:

1. to review the politics of English as a language of wider use and communication study in Japan and at university,
2. to draw attention to a curriculum crisis in Japan's language higher education, and examine the ambivalence of societal "other" laanguage contact in Japan and at university,
3. to look at how English language study operates at university in Japan, and particularly at one university hereafter called "Shimada," and one of its faculties, sociology and social work,
4. to draw attention to research highlighting higher educational benefits to a university undergraduate being activley engaged in language learning,
5. to suggest a blueprint for the integration of content and language.

Littlejohn (2004) asks what language teachers should be doing in class to prepare students for the future. He suggests a "futures curriculum" to address important issues such as (my added ideas are in **bold**):

1. coherence, and whether there is a coherent topic over a lesson or series of lessons,
2. significant content and whether that content is worth knowing or thinking **and feeling** about,
3. decision-making in class and whether students are allowed or required to make their own decisions that help them shape lessons,
4. use of students' intelligences and whether class activities require thought **and feeling**,
5. cultural understanding and whether texts, **other materials**, and activities promote cultural understanding(s),
6. critical language awareness and whether students are asked to think about why language **and communication** is used in particular ways.

Littlejohn maintains that there is a particular responsibility for language teaching and language teachers. He says that teachers need to think about how they can help prepare students for the varied and complex demands that the future will make on them (Barnett, 1997, 2000) where they will need to make

quick decisions and adapt. Teachers, he says, will also need to look beyond the concerns of the language syllabus. A "futures curriculum for language teaching and teachers will be based on not only what students are likely to need in terms of their knowledge and skills' language development, but more importantly on a clear vision of how teachers and students would like or hope the future to be, and how teachers and students in discussion need to guard against dangers and shape the way(s) we live."

The politics of FAO English study in Japanese education

The realities of globalization and economic interdependency are salient factors in any serious discussion of English language study (Bainbridge, 2002). Bainbridge notes that English language continues to be more important as one significant factor influencing a nation's economic growth and stability. Beale (2002) notes that, despite an enormous allocation of resources towards the teaching and study of English in Japan, there remains widespread criticisms, both within and outside Japan in the English using world, and contends that these criticisms center on Japan's failure to have a realistic and culturally informed view of English education and what it ought to achieve in the name of national and citizenry development. Four main criticisms are aimed at English language teaching and study in Japan according to Beale:

a. Japanese society is insular and remote from the rest of the world
b. Japanese people, like a great many Americans and British but unlike many other English-using peoples in the world, are stubbornly monolingual,
c. Teaching programs and methods are rigidly conventional and are resistant to substantive innovation or change,
d. The main objective of English instruction in schools is to prepare students for non-communicative university entrance examinations.

Beale says that the "teaching of English in Japanese schools and universities is not a neutral endeavor" (p. 4), and notes that in the opinion of McConnell (1999), Japan can be accused of having "emptied out the cultural content of English in (its) educational programs" (p. 51). Beale further argues that the definition or interpretation of internationalization through the study of English can be considered a hidden form of linguistic imperialism. This definition or interpretation of English can, in my estimation, also be a veiled way of Japan comparing and contrasting its national self-identity with 'others,' which can or could result in an implicit, if not explicit, division of material culture into two mutually incompatible categories: Japanese and non-Japanese, a sort of "us" versus "them" mentality and mind-set as argued by Law (1995).

Explicit nationalism and the division of people into essentialist groups is not fashionable or acceptable states McVeigh (2002), so this mind-set is,

clothed in internationalism where people talk about world peace and cross-cultural understanding, but where, in a kind of hidden reality, internationalism and internationalization "draws attention away from nationalizing tendencies (e.g. English language study objectives for continued educational certification and sorting), so as to gain politico-economic advantage(s) in the increasingly globalizing world" (pp. 149–150).

In English study, students, contends McVeigh, can experience their unique Japaneseness at the expense of learning to use a LWUC (English, for example) for critical understanding of life and productive expression of who and what they are and can become as Japanese and Asians in a connected, not divided world.

Both Bainbridge and Beale maintain that the reasons for Japan and Japanese people learning English are not often discussed or considered in depth. Bainbridge (2002) acknowledges that it is generally accepted that learning English is of vital importance because "if a company, government, or country wants to ensure economic success in this global village, it seems imperative that the population acquire English quickly and proficiently" (p. 168). The main problem, she says, is that without discussing or considering the

reasons Japan and its people need to study and learn English, it will be difficult for the planners "to know and understand exactly why they believe English proficiency is necessary, and more importantly how any implementations will affect Japan's national culture and identity" (p. 168). Why does the Japanese government and its educational institutions invest so much in English language education, says Beale, when in fact English language use continues to occupy a minor place in Japanese society, its use not being necessary for Japanese citizens in going about the business of their daily life in Japan?

Both White (1987) and McConnell (1999) justify the teaching and study of English as a process of and for internationalizing the nation and its citizenry. In White's estimation English study results in "the creation of children who know how to work productively with foreign counterparts" (p. 173), while McConnell maintains that studying English "opens up Japanese society" (p. 49). But Beale notes that these and similar definitions or interpretations—such as, for example, that English language study helps people in Japan to further develop (Sano, et al, 1984)—that are offered to justify the enormous investment of time, money, and people in the teaching and learning of English are not value neutral. White assumes, says Beale, that Japanese people's foreign counterparts, in particular Americans as native speakers of English, are the primary if not sole "representatives of the dominant world culture" (p. 2), and it is therefore "necessary for Japanese to adapt to foreign (i.e. American) ways of thought and action." McConnell, argues Beale, sees "Western norms and expectations gained through conversational fluency necessary for Japan (and its people) to join the international community as an equal" (p. 2).

Neither of these two conceptualizations of English language teaching and study in Japan, (1) that it may serve as a cover for explicit nationalism or (2) serve as a means of "internationalizing" Japan and Japanese people—seem to question the uncritical continuation of status quo economic, social, or political educational arrangements with regard to the most beneficial role and responsibility of English language study and learning in Japanese society. English study is said to be international in that it helps Japan and its people to adapt to outside norms and values (White, 1987; McConnell, 1999). On the other hand, English study helps clothe nationalism in more acceptable thought and practice(s) (McVeigh 1992; Law, 1995). So long as Japanese higher education and educators continue to conceive of English language as a foreign language subject, it will not penetrate the egocentricity or ethnocentricity of Japanese people, or become a part of their wider regional and global identity. Is this really the direction in which the university wishes to go with its English language study provision given the realities of regional, global, and pluralistic uses of English in Asia and the wider world (Crystal, 1997), and the role of English language higher study for national, international, and citizenry development as advocated by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Technology, and Sports (MEXT)?

MEXT clearly recognizes the national and human benefits of teaching English thru the medium of English, and in fact recommends that schools do so, though this recommended policy and practice does not extend to higher education. MEXT's failure to actively encourage universities to adopt and practice English language pedagogy and learning as medium/management of communicative content study is unfortunate in that it tacitly allows higher education institutions in Japan such as "Shimada" to continue to avoid serious consideration or even discussion regarding the most beneficial role and responsibility of its higher education English language provision. MEXT also recommends explicit proficiency attainment standards for university graduates in English language study. The question remains whether any recommended changes have been soundly thought out or put forward with clear understanding of why English proficiency is needed by Japanese that can do more than contribute to the socio-economic development of the Japanese nation and its people.

The curriculum crisis of English study in Japanese content-area study

Lange (1994) states that although curriculum is not a new concept in higher education, it receives scant attention because the professoriate is largely autonomous. Seldom, he says,

are the contents of all courses brought together for an open discusssion of what each course

contributes to the total department program, engendering discusssion of the knowledge to be taught, its organization and delivery, student assignments, and student evaluations. (p. 1)

Lange maintains that curriculum (or the learning plan), and instruction (or the coupling of that plan to students as they learn), are both influenced by and influence students' conceptualization of the world. Curriculum and instruction, I believe, can and often also is influenced by and influences a society's or institution's conceptualization of the world. Lange believes that the focus of foreign language curricula now is to develop student competence *to comprehend and use language*, whereas earlier emphases on language teaching prioritized the *language content* of the curriculum. A focus on language comprehension and use, Lange maintains, connects the study of language to the *content of almost any discipline*, as well as the student-learner's personal, social, amd political contexts.

This broadened agenda of foreign language curriculum also "involves an interpretation of each individual's development within the process of (his or her) langauge learning or acquisition" (p. 2). Lange suggests that higher educators need to constantly wonder why language learning is important. What is the language requirement for? Analysis of language or an approach which treats language study as isolated or compartmental subject study is not nearly sufficient to justify the inclusion of language in a specialized content-area higher education. The proper orientation, Lange argues,

> must be toward a level of language use or proficiency where students use that proficiency to learn about themselves in the world (and) it is at this point that language learning becomes an important element in higher education.... The suggested principle only works if there is cooperation in other areas of the liberal or specialized curriculum to provide for language use. (p. 4)

Lange concludes his investigation of what he sees as *the* curricula crisis in foreign language learning by pointing out the holistic and integrated purpose of language learning. Language, he says, is a "key to understanding the student's world and is not just another technology to be learned" (p. 5). According to Genesee and Nicoladis (1995), second language learning when integrated with instruction in academic content is more effective than teaching language in isolation. They contend that,

> proficiency in the target language is not a prerequisite to academic development; rather language learning results from using language to perform authentic communicative functions. (p. 2)

In an integrated language and (for example academic) content curriculum language objectives can be systematically targeted along with academic objectives in order to maximize language *and* content learning.

Language programs continue to struggle to define appropriate frameworks (content and thinking areas) in which students can develop understanding and the use of English language, as Mohan (1991) contends. There may be, he argues, little if any attempt on the part of language educators to account for any appropriate content framework of teaching and learning other than a continued and outdated focus on the *language itself as a content area* and/or an *unspecified communicative approach* which does not clearly spell out *what* will be communicated. An intergation of content and learning, he states,

> can be broadly defined as mutual support and cooperation between language and content teachers for the educationaal benefit of students with a focus on the intersection of language, content, and thinking objectives. (1991, p. 6)

Mohan (1986, 1991) also notes that formal education often intentionally adopts practices and assumptions which *separate* language teaching from content teaching.

The non-communicative, emblematic, and appropriation conception and practice of English university study in Japan

Tsuda and Lafaye (2005) found that many Japanese people desire an indirect, neutral, and passive non-personal contact with English language rather than a direct and active interpersonal contact. Cowie (2006) argues that the cultural practices of many Japanese teachers of English are so deeply embedded that any distinction between the study of a foreign language (e.g. EFL), where the focus is basically on form, and the study of a second language (e.g. ESL) where the focus is on communicated messages and fluency, is largely irrelevant. The teacher's job in teaching language in Japan is to transmit and expose students to knowledge *about* the use of the language without they or their students necessarily having to use the studied language for communication—In this social-cultural setting students need to passively read, listen and learn from the language knowledge expert, and persevere in that process.

Students are socialized into certain ways of learning (and knowing) a language which, argues Cowie, are ideologiocal in nature (p. 32). University students in Japan have made it along the path to higher education entrance. In order for them to be successful in the system of *gakureki shakai*, or a society where educational attainment is highly valued—for example, passing difficult tests and getting into "good" schools -students must possess the right kind of what Bourdieu (1973) calls "cultural capital." Cultural capital is the "language use, skills, and orientations, dispositions, attitudes and schemes of perception that children are endowed with by virtue of socialization in their families and communities" (Lin, 1999, p. 394). Cowie maintains that Japanese students need to study language as an inert knowledge system of what the language looks like and how it *could* be used—including the many discrete language skills that *would* be necessary to use it—but are neither expected to use the language communicatively, nor have much of a desire to do so. Students' cultural capital is thus defined in terms of (1) how well they learn *about the language*, and (2) how much effort they put into that passive learning.

The way(s) in which a society has contact with a language of wider use and communication has consequences for how that language is seen and studied in the wider society, and in societal structures such as higher education institutions. Contact situations are dynamic in that they can alter their characteristics at any moment in response to social change. Following Loveday's (1996) typology of language contact, there are generalizations which can be made about the LWUC English language contact situation in Japan at "Shimada" University and in its Sociology/Social Work Department. Japan and "Shimada" would most likely be a good example of what Loveday calls the "distant or dominant non-bilingual setting" where members of the society and community are either monolingual or socially bi-or multilingual. In this situation the knowledge and use of one or more contact language(s) is not widely distributed, though there may be some individuals familiar with the contact language(s). The community maintains no community-wide relations with speakers of the donor language and the community has no social requirement for the acquisition or use of the language. Contact is usually limited to lexical borrowing.

Loveday notes that most nations provide its citizens with the chance of institutionally acquiring a LWUC thus helping them acquire enough motivation, confidence and competence to study and use the language for communication in professional-occupational and/or personal domains of social activity. But it may be the case in Japan and at "Shimada" that despite many recommendations by the government for the nation and its people to reach out to the wider world and others by learning English language, Japanese society and its ruling authorities are not really prepared to follow through on any study or learning that will actually help transform Japanese citizens from being monolingual and exclusive-minded to bi-lingual or multilingual and inclusive-minded. Alternatively, it may be the case that in spite of any lofty and ideal visions for the communicative teaching and use of English language in its educational institutions, MEXT is, for all practical purposes, just "going through the motions of convincing itself and others (e.g. its own citizenry, outside nations and peoples) that it wishes to be a more inclusive part of regional and world societies, when in fact it may not. The fact that there is no institutional motivation to

have English language contact at "Shimada" and Sociology/Social Work be anything other than a separate subject or goal-in-itself compartmental portion of the curriculum suggests that the distant dominant non-bi-lingual condition and setting is preferred.

LWUC policy at university in Japan: a case study.

To what extent have language policies been or not been developed by higher educations institutions or HIEs (such as "Shimada") and/or by university departments (for example, such as Sociology and Social Work) that might give evidence of any movement toward a communicative and integrated English language and content study? Policies would take the form of a document or documents which outline the languages (other than L1) offered at different levels (e.g. undergraduate and graduate) to both specialist and non-specialist language learning students. A university-wide language policy would define the language study/learning profile of a particular institution by presenting a considered view of the diversity of languages to be offered, to whom, and specific and clear reasons for provision. Policies would also define or describe the decision-making structures (e.g. committees) required to facilitate their development and implementation. Policies might also describe decision-making structures involving:

a. teaching and learning procedures designed to support/encourage language learning,
b. desired language learning outcomes,
c. monitoring and evaluation of student achievement and quality of language teaching and learning,
d. training and professional development of language teachers

Bruen (2005) argues that an explicit statement of a language mission is the first step necessary if a higher education institution (HEI) wishes to have a responsible and communicatively useful language study provision. At "Shimada" University and its Sociology/Social Work Department there is no stated mission or decision-making structures with regard to the study and learning of non-subject study English language. There is strict separation of language study and L1 (Japanese) specialty-area discipline study. English language study is provided almost exclusively in the general education portion of the curriculum where Japanese and/or English is used as medium of study depending on personal preferences of teachers, not any guidance from the university or department. Specialty-area study courses are for all practical purposes exclusively managed and taught in the L1. Within English language study itself there are two main possibly conflicting streams of pedagogy: subject study learning and communication study, each stream disconnected from the other. Every course and class within each course in departmental English study operates in an "ivory tower castle." The autonomous isolation of faculty and elements of Japanese societal and HEI socio-culture impact on the invisibility of English language study class instruction, not unlike the situation which exists also with specialty-area discipline study.

The "language question" is but should not merely be the domain of only those directly involved in its design and delivery/provision, Bruen (2005) argues. This issue is strategically related to the broader educational goals of the institution in the context in which that institution operates. English study at "Shimada" and in Sociology/Social Work is not a coherent or cohesive discipline. It continues to serve as a collection of disconnected and varied specialties taught and researched by a collection of disconnected and varied "specialists" who do not corporately put into practice any explicit mission for communication language study to enhance students' content and civic education study. English language study is a collection of courses, and a collection of classes within each course. English language faculty are in general, more interested in and committed to their own specializations (e.g. linguistics, literature, teaching English to speakers/users of other languages) than they are to guiding students to incorporating study and use of the language within the context of specialty-area content knowledge-building socio-educational experience. One hidden message may be that students' discipline-area study needs (e.g. sociology) need not be connected to communicative English language study on the "Shimada" campus or within discipline-area content faculties.

Many socio-cultural and political issues involving English language higher education in Japan and at "Shimada" have not been properly addressed. One of these issues is the actual use of English by teachers in English language study classes. MEXT is now clear on this point and states that English taught and studied for developmental and communication purposes must, at least for the most part, actually utilize English as the medium of learning and communication. In tackling the issue of improving English classes at all levels of education in Japan, MEXT (2003) states (pp. 3–4),

> most of the class is to be conducted in English and there will be many activities where students can communicate in English.... instruction mainly based on grammar or translation is not recommended.... teachers routinely conduct classes principally in English

The issue of whether or not English language study should be conceived and practiced as an isolated or connected subject in the overall school curriculum has clearly been addressed by MEXT: education for international understanding must be across the curriculum *in all subjects*. If English language higher study in Japan continues to plod on in an ambivalent and contradictory direction, as the evidence seems to show, then the winners will be those people in Japanese society who continue to view the prime benefits of English study as a sorting and certifying mechanism, and who believe that a LWUC such as English, will, as Harasawa (1978) feared, neither penetrate, nor need to penetrate, the egocentricity or ethnocentricity of Japan and its people. The losers will be those who view and wish to practice English language study as communication and in service to Japan's national, regional, and international development, and the development of its citizenry.

The benefits of a LWUC English study at university that go beyond enhancing language proficiency and content support

The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, and Technology University Council Report of 1998 recommends that universities help students develop a more flexible and critical approach to their study. The English language higher study provision has the potential to help sociology and social work students develop a more flexible and critical approach to their study, and can help them increase their awareness of society and their social roles as Prodromou (1992: 74–75) argues,

> ....what we teach and particularly the way we teach reflects our attitudes to society in general and the individual's place in society, and our own educational practice is an implicit statement of power relationships, of how we see authority in the classroom, and by extension in society outside the classroom.... Just as the mother tongue in Freire's *Pedagogy* becomes a process of increasing consciousness of one' society, so too may the teaching of a foreign language.

There are many educational benefits of undergraduate language study for students who may not have to use a LWUC in their career after university graduation that go beyond learning language as a self-contained goal. According to Cook (2002; 3) the goal of using a foreign language is only one reason for studying it. Research in cognitive processing shows that users of a second language think more flexibly and creatively, demonstrate increased awareness of the nature of language, and enjoy improved communication skills in their first L1 language (Cook, 2002: 7, 167, 333). Research findings also show those who have studied a second language find it easier to acquire an additional language in later life should they need to. For example, research done by Clyne et al. (2004) indicates that, when compared with L2 learners, L3 learners tend to be more effective and persistent language learners who are able to benefit from meta-linguistic awareness. Tudor (2004: 8) speaks of language learners as being "empowered by having transferable skills which go beyond the confines of a given level of competence in any one language."

Many transferable life skills can be developed effectively through participation in language learning:

presentation and negotiation skills, management of information, goal setting, time management. These "soft" skills are widely recognized as being essential in the knowledge-based society where,

> people are expected to be more adaptable and fluid in their transfer from one to another situation be it from learning to work to leisure (Transferable Skills in Modern Languages Project, 2002–5)

Language learning fosters broader values such as cultural awareness and tolerance, a process described by Williams (2004) as "cultural decentring" which he defines as the "engendering of a sense of an insider's experience of the **Lebenswelt** of other cultures" (p. 5). People such as Kramsch (1993) speak of the importance of being challenged or "unsettled" by the other as part of the process of language learning. Byram and Fleming (1998) stress the "reflexive impact of language teaching as it can result in a (renewed) focus on and critical reassessment of learners' own culture and not merely a view outward to other cultures. Byram and Fleming (1998) also argue language learning can and ought to lead to greater insight and understanding of the society/societies and culture(s) of speakers of other languages (other then Japanese for example) but also of learners' own society and culture and the relationship(s) between the two.

Phipps and Gonzalez (2004: 3) believe the study of modern languages can ideally lead to evolution of "intercultural being" or the understanding of the varied and multiple realities we are all part of; students can be sensitized to cultural difference which reduces ethnocentric bias using creative activities conducted through the L1. Bruen (2005) states (p. 245) that, in the increasingly inter-cultural environment in which Ireland finds itself, the education of genuinely open-minded, culturally-sensitive graduates, who have experience of being a stranger in a foreign language and culture as well as a deeper understanding of their own language and culture is of paramount importance. On a global scale intercultural understanding between individuals and nations has clearly not kept pace with scientific developments and advances, argues Bruen Thus, there is a case to be made for offering as many undergraduates as possible the opportunity to learn another language. Society needs critical thinkers who understand that most arguments are multi-faceted, who are open to others' views, who realize that the world is both complex and wonderful. These are the people who will build a more inclusive and connected society.

Concluding Remarks: a blueprint for language-content integration

In English education, argues Holliday (1994), a new paradigm built on integrated structures and practices can conflict with prevalent university academic professional culture, which according to Bernstein (1971) values faculty autonomy and freedom within strict boundaries of professional academic thinking, practice, and behavior. According to Bernstein (1971: 62), courses which promote integrated learning can weaken separated hierarchies of collection, and also alter the balance of power, where the entire structure and distribution of power has been determined according to a hierarchical and/or collection code of thinking and conduct. Courses of study which are based on collaboration, coordination, and an integration of content and language study can in fact conflict with courses of study based on a conception and practice of autonomous, uncoordinated, invisibly accountable, and compartmental education. The result of any such conflict is bound to have repercussions for any design and implementation of English language study having the opportunity to serve as a medium of learning and communication for discipline-area content study.

Heller (1982) says that at the departmental level individuals share goals related to autonomy and power, which results in members (i.e. faculty) helping to keep conflicts private, and to present a united front to those outside the department. Negative conflicting feelings are limited by discussing (if at all), and often deciding (if at all), sensitive issues in private, and censoring any justification given for administrative actions. The consequences, are (1) lack of knowledge of critical information, (2) institutional loyalty at the expense of competence, accountability and effectiveness, (3) competition among individuals who are dominated and constrained by strong faculties, and (4) a resistance to change. According to Meyer and

Zucker (1989) there is often the facade of change when in fact the heart of the educational process remains unaltered. Organizations, argue Meyer and Zucker, are places where there are competing interests, and where goal achievement is but one of those interests. Organizations may accept a state of more or less permanent stagnation or even failure owing to the pressures of various competing constituencies to avoid substantive change. Interests become more important than goals or mission.

The concept of "content" also needs to be defined to avoid confusion. On the one hand, "content" can easily—and perhaps also exclusively-refer to and be defined in terms of strict specialty academic "content" study such as sociology, economics, psychology, management studies, or education. However, for the purposes of argumentation in this paper I suggest that we conceive of "content" in a broader fashion to include any knowledge that contributes to the intersection of what Bollinger, Nainby, and Warren (2003) call a one-world ontology of communication and knowledge. In a one-world ontology of communication and knowledge, what people—for example, students and teachers/faculty—(come to) know or rediscover about the world is directly constituted in and also constitutes how they communicate with each other about the world. In this broader conceptualization of "content" what is communicated between students and teachers/faculty is not limited to strict sociological and/or social work matters (e.g. social theory, mass-media, political sociology), but will also have implications for how sociology and social work themselves can be conceived and practiced more expansively.

For example, strictly speaking social work, as it is conceived and practiced, relates/refers to individual/ social and/or institutional care of people who are in need of help such as the elderly, disadvantaged, the young, and those who are sick. A broader knowledge, concept, and communication of social work, however, can and ought to include educational, spiritual, political, economic or business care and how, for example, teachers and schools, or bankers and banking institutions, or politicians and political organizations do or do not adequately care for students, worshippers, voters and citizens, and their academic, economic and personal/professional and spiritual life-learning and life-enhacing needs. When we speak of an integrated LWUC English and sociology/social work we ought to be concerned with integrating all life knowledge and our language/communication about life knowledge that is, in the widest sense, a crucial part of the discipline.

Hagen (1991) argues for an integration of English language study and economics content study claiming that English learning can be enhanced through the study of economics. However, in order to realize an integration of language and content, students will need to work with complete and authentic English language content texts rather than disconnected sentences or utterances or paragraphs. Blanton (1992) contends that students need to work with whole language unit texts where:

a.　the units engage students' interests
b.　the units require students to meaningfully communicate
c.　the units surround students with language they can understand
d.　the units challenge the students to think and feel
e.　the units give students opportunities to interact with others
f .　the units require students to read, write, listen, and speak
g.　the units are both learning and content-centered
h.　the units increase students' self-confidence and self-esteem　　　　　　　　(1992: p. 291)

Blanton believes that a whole language approach, unlike a traditional "language subject" discrete skills' approach, allows students to become knowledgeable, curious, and inquisitive about something of interest and importance. As this knowledge base grows, she argues, vocabulary and other linguistic forms grow at the same time simply because knowledge has no way of existing or no means of expression without language and communication. Knowledge of ***something*** that is of interest must be built up as the class/course progresses, she says, arguing that,

As knowledge expands, along with the words and linguistic forms to go with it, the depth and sophistication of the academic and cognitive operations that can be performed within the content can, in turn, expand" (p. 289)

Moreover, if content based learning (CBL) is introduced into EFL (English as a foreign language) classrooms from the bottom up, the issue of possible attrition of one's L1 due to more time in the overall curriculum devoted to L2 content teaching will be less of a problem, says Andrewes (2006) The key, says Andrews, is using the learners' own cultural experience and identity, including where and when necessary some use of the L1, as a source of materials and content that would provide a more solid basis for learning *in* a LWUC such as English as Bainbridge (2002) argues The subject matter of, for example, a science class integrated with the LWUC English class results in the subject content not being hazy: what is learned in the science class (in the L1) is re-worked in the language class. Through this reworking, argues Andrewes, students are better able to absorb the subject matter content and make it their own. While students' subject knowledge is being consolidated, interlinguistic competence is strengthened, where neither content not L1 competence suffers.

Andrewes is pessimistic about the chances of a critical pedagogy or liberating education becoming a new orthodoxy of CBL and CLIL. I, however, am not so pessimistic. The integrating of content and language centered on a one-world ontology of dialogic engagement, rooted in the home culture but which reaches outward in discussion and conversation about inclusive values such as democracy, tolerance for dissent, and respect for diversity and difference, offers hope not for any *institutional* liberating education, but for a bottom-up teaching and learning approach that contributes to students' individual and collective civic responsibility. Flyvbjerg (2001) argues for a *phronetic* or values-laden approach to social science study with less concentration on operational skills' building or passive knowledge transmission and reception. There are four questions that a phronetic education focuses on:

1. Where are we going?
2. Who gains and who loses and by which power mechanisms?
3. Is the present direction desirable, and if so, why?
4. What should be done?

Imamura (1978) raises four related questions concerning the value of language study in higher education:

1. What is language study for?
2. Who benefits and how from such study?
3. What language(s) need be taught, why, and how?
4. How should language be studied?

Childs (2006) believes that an important principle in teaching the use of language to communicate with others about the world is to nurture a communicative attitude where people explore each other's minds and hearts about what they do and do not value in life. To nurture this attitude teachers must interact with their students from the very first minute of the first day of class using the—in this case LWUC English—language words, sounds, as well as facial expressions and gestures. The knowledge or content that is explored must also be understandable in terms of how people interpret its significance in their living a more quality life. An explicit connection between a LWUC and widely-defined and interpreted sociology and social work knowledge-content gives hope of greater concern for what teachers and students actually together talk about and why and how they do so.

According to Tudor (1997), the traditional classroom where students are dependent on teachers for knowledge and skills is a relic of an authoritarian and/or corporately protected study school dependency.

Christiansen, Garvin, and Sweet (1991), Ritzer (1995), and McVeigh (2002) are among a number of educator-sociologists who maintain that universities say they educate young adults but that they actually aim to enroll students in order to socialize them, sort them, certify them, or serve as a depository for them to be and/or become docile and obedient. McVeigh and Refsing (1992) say this is especially true of higher education in Japan, McVeigh going so far as to label higher education in Japan a myth. Christiansen et al. (1991) also argue that higher learning has become more isolated from the kinds of learning people require for their real life competencies. The main value higher education can and should impart to students is a pre-disposition to love to learn across the curriculum over and above any ability, for example, to passively bank knowledge that they are not themselves actively engaged in, or engage in a language-communication study that is not connected to their immediate study or life-growth concerns.

If a pre-disposition to learn across the curriculum and in an integrated fashion is not the main value of higher education, then institutions and their practitioners (i.e. faculty) have failed students intellectually and ethically, Christiansen et al. maintain. A re-conceptualized and differently practiced LWUC English study at university is necessary so as to emphasize language learning *not as a self-contained goal, or as a separate(d), disconnected, or isolated school subject, but as an important additional means and medium of life content learning*. Student growth is focused on a re-conceptualization of intellectual development beyond knowledge-giving and/or skills-training. This focus requires commitment to an integrated higher educational content-knowledge and language-communication learning, and the collaboration of language and content study faculty.

References:

Andrewes, S. (2006) CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. *Modern English Teacher (MET)*, 15, 1, pp. 49–52.

Bainbridge, S. (2002) Second Language Acquisition and Current Trends in Japan: *The Cultural Risks. The Journal of the College of Engineering*, Nihon University, 44(1): 167–177.

Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Buckingham: Open University Press and Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE).

————— (1997) *Higher Education: A Critical Business*. Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE), London: Open University Press.

Beale, J. (2002) EFL in Japan: Whose English is it anyway? *Babel*, Vol. 37: (2): 26–28.

Bernstein (1971) On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In Young, M.F.D. (ed) *Knowledge and Control. London*. Collier-McMillan.

Blanton, L. L. (1992) A holistic approach to college ESL: integrating language and content. *ELT Journal*, Vol. 46 (3): 285–193.

Bollinger, C., Nainby, K., and Warren, J. (2003) Articulating Contact in the Classroom: Towards a Constitutive Focus in Critical Pedagogy. *Language* and Intercultural Communication 3(3), 198–212.

Bourdieu, P. (1973) Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Brown (ed.), *Knowledge, education, and cultural change*, pp. 71–112. London: Tavistock.

Brady, A. (1997) English as an additional language: language policy and planning at university for non-language majors. *Kwansei Gakuin Sociology Department Studies*, 77, pp. 85–122.

Byram, M., and Fleming, M. (eds.)(1998) *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective: Approaches Through Drama and Ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruen, J. (2005) Educating Europeans? Language Planning and Policy in Higher Education Institutions in Ireland. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5, 3 & 4, pp. 237–247.

M. Childs (2006) New visions for language learning. *Daily Yomiuri* (Jan. 6, p. 14)

Christiansen, C. R., Gavin, D. A., and Sweet, A. (eds.) (1991) *Education for Judgment: The Artistry of Discussion Leadership*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Clyne, M., Rossi-Hunt, C., and Isaakidis, T. (2004) Learning a community language as a third language. The *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 1, 1 pp. 33–52.

Cook, V. (ed.) (2002) *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cowie, N. (2006) What Do Sports, Learning Japanese, and Teaching English Have in Common? Socio-cultural Learning Theories, That's What. *JALT Journal*, 28, I, pp. 23‒37.

Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed* again. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Genesee, F., and Nicoladis, E. (1995) Lanuage development in pre-school bilingual children. In E. Garcia and B. McLaughlin (eds.) *Meeting the Challenge of Lingusitic and Cultural Diversity in Early Childhood Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hagen, J. M. One Way to Learn English. *The Language Teacher*, xv, 11, pp. 13‒14.

Harasawa, M. (1978) The Ultimate Destiny of English Language Teaching in Japan. In Koike, et al. pp. 547‒557

Heller, M. (1982) *Language, ethnicity, and politics in Quebec*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Imamura, S. (1978) Criticism on TEFL in Japan. In Koike et al. *The Teaching of English in Japan*. Eichosha, Tokyo, pp. 15‒22.

Japan University Council Report (1998). Monbusho News (web page). A Vision of Universities in the 21st Century and Reform Measures: To be Distinctive Universities in a Competitive Environment. Online document at URL http://www.monbu.go.jp/Hakusy

Kramsch, C. (1993) *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lange, D. (1994) The Curricular Crisis in Foreign Language Learning. *ADFL Bulletin*, 25, 2, pp. 12‒16.

Law, G. (1995) Ideologies of English Language Education in Japan. *JALT (Japan Association for Language Teachers) Journal*, 17(2): 213‒24.

Littlejohn, A. (2004) Language Teaching for the Future. *Cambridge Connection*. Japan special edition, 2‒3.

Lin, A. (1999) Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 3, pp. 393‒412.

Loveday, L. J. (1996) *Language Contact in Japan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McConnell, D. M. (1999) Coping with diversity: The Achilles' heel of Japanese Education. In G. K. LeTendre (ed.) *Competitor or Ally? Japan's Role in American Educational Debates*. New York: Falmer Press, pp. 47‒55.

McVeigh, B. (2002) *Japanese Higher Education as Myth*. New York and London: M. E. Sharpe.

MEXT (2003) Action Plan. Online document at URL http://wwwmext.go.jp/ english/topics/03072801/html.

Meyer, M., and Zucker, L. *Permanently failing organizations*. Berevrly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Mohan, B. A. (1991) The Integration of Language and Content: Recent Research Issues. *The Language Teacher*, 11, 6‒8.

────── (1986) *Language and Content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Phipps, A., and Gonzalez, M. (2004) *Modern Languages: Learning and Teaching Modern Languages*. London: Sage.

Prodroumou, L. (1992) What culture? Which culture? Cross-cultural factors in language learning. *ELT Journal*, 46, 1. pp. 39‒50.

Refsing, K. (1992) Japanese Educational Expansion: Quality or Equality? In *Ideology and Practice in Modern Japan*, R. Goodman, and K. Refsing (eds.), pp. 116‒129. New York: Routledge

Ritzer, G. (1995) *The McDonaldization of Society*.

Sano, M., Takahashi, M., and Yoneyama, A. (1984) Communicative language teaching and local needs. *ELT Journal*, 38, 3, pp. 170‒177.

Transferrable Skills in Modern Languages Project (2002‒2005) Online document at http://www.skillsproject.tcd.ie.

Tsuda, S., and Lafaye, B. E. (2005) Japan's Experience of Language Contact: A Case Study of RADIO-I, a multilingual radio station in Japan. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5, 3 & 4, pp. 248‒263

Tudor, I. (2004) The challenge of the Bologna Process for higher education language teaching in Europe (draft paper).

────── (1997) Autonomy and the "traditional" classroom. *IATEFL Newsletter*, 10, 11, pp. 18‒19.

Williams, K. (2004) Modern foreign languages. In J. White (ed.) Rethinking *the School Curriculum: Values, Aims, and Purposes*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

The Ambivalent Placement of a LWUC (Language of Wider Use and Communication) (English) in Content Study at University

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on socio-political and socio-educational positions taken at one discipline-area study (i.e. sociology/social work), at university in Japan with regard to its language of wider use and communication (LWUC) English language provision. An explicit integration of a LWUC English study with Japanese L1 discipline-area and life-issues' content study is necessary (1) for Japan as a nation, (2) for Japanese people as a citizenry in an increasingly complex and connected Asian region and world, and (3) for the further regional and global development of the university in Japan. The neglect that has existed at one university named "Shimada" and its sociology and social work faculty in conceiving and developing an integrated language and content study reflects what Lindblom (1990) calls a half-hidden conflict. This conflict involves groups of disconnected language and content faculty who stubbornly adhere to preferred solutions regarding the placement and function of English language study in the curriculum. Possible solutions with respect to a more benefical higher education role and responsibility of a LWUC English language study at this particular discipline-area studies' university can only be approached if, as Lindlom maintains, inquiry and knowledge are brought to bear so as to alter misconceived notions and practices of integrated language and content study.

Key Wordss: ambivalent placement, language of wider use, content study