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I. The politics of English study in Japanese education: impact on the higher education English curriculum

The realities of globalization and economic interdependency are salient factors in any serious discussion of English language study in Japan (Bainbridge, 2002). Beale (2002) notes that despite an enormous allocation of resources towards the teaching and study of English in Japan, there remain widespread criticisms, both within and outside Japan in the English using world, that 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 language certification.

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 while McConnell (1999: 49) maintains that studying English “opens up Japanese society.” 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 (e.g. 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, Beale argues, 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 and it is therefore necessary for Japanese to adapt to foreign (i.e. American) ways of thought and action. Beale (2002: 2) quotes McConnell (1999: 49) who says that,

Western norms and expectations gained through conversational fluency are necessary for Japan and its people) to join the international community as an equal..

Beale (2002) also contends that the definition or interpretation of internationalization through the study of English can be considered a hidden form of linguistic imperialism. Such an interpretation can also, in my estimation, be a veiled way of Japan comparing and contrasting its national self-identity with
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“others”. The self-identity comparison and contrast 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). In English study, students can, says McVeigh (2002) experience their unique Japaneseness at the expense of learning to use (English) language 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: 168) 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.

The main problem is that without discussing or considering the non-economic reasons Japan and its people need to study and learn English, it will be difficult for the planners to understand why they feel that English proficiency is necessary, and how any implementations will affect Japan’s national culture and identity.

Neither of the above two definitions or interpretations 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, questions the uncritical continuation of status quo economic, social, or political educational arrangements with regard to a socio-culturally useful role and responsibility of English language study and learning in Japanese university and 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 may help to clothe nationalism in more acceptable thought and practice(s) (McVeigh 1992; Law, 1995).

Language programs still 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 (1986, 1991) contends. There may still be, as Mohan argues, little if any attempt on the part of language educators to view or practice language learning other than as a focus on the language itself as a content area, and/or an unspecified general language learning communicative approach neither of which clearly spells out what will be communicated, and/or how language study contributes to knowledge engagement and interrogation. Mohan (1991) also notes that formal education intentionally adopts practices and assumptions which separate language teaching from content teaching.

Any compartmental separation of language—in particular English—study as a discrete part of higher education, distinct and apart from content and knowledge teaching and learning, whether intentional or not, impacts on the overall coherence and cohesion of the whole higher education curriculum. Lange (1994: 1) 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 discussion of what each course contributes to the total department program, engendering discussion of the knowledge to be taught, its organization and delivery, student assignments, and student evaluations.

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 and I agree. Lange also believes that the focus of foreign language curricula should be to develop student competence to comprehend and use language, a focus on language comprehension and use, which, Lange maintains, connects the study of language to the content of almost any discipline, as well as to the student-learner’s integrated school, personal, social, and political contexts.

Higher educators need to constantly wonder and carefully consider why language study and learning
is important, and what the language requirement is for. Analysis of language or any approach which treats language study as isolated compartmental subject or communication learning, is not sufficient to justify the inclusion of language in a specialized content-area higher education such as sociology or economics. 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. (2004: 4)

II. The socio-historically-rooted non-communicative, emblematic, and sorting-certification conception and practice of English study in Japan

The way(s) in which a society has (had) contact with (an) "other" language(s) has serious consequences for how that language is seen in the wider society and studied in societal structures such as higher education institutions. Looking at Loveday's (1996) typology of language contact, some generalizations can be made about the English language contact situation in Japan and at the university where this writer teaches and researches, Kwansei Gakuin University in its Sociology Department. Japan and Kwansei Gakuin University would most likely be an 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 (i.e. Kwansei Gakuin University and/or its Sociology Department) 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, certification, or emblematic promotion of educational provision.

More and more universities in Japan are beginning to recognize differences between “other” languages and English as a LWUC, and English’s position as the most prominent LWUC in a wide number of areas of social life world-wide such as education, sports, business, information technology, politics, and media and entertainment. Difference(s) in worldwide use of English, compared with/to other prominent international languages such as Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Spanish, or (in the East Asian context at least) Korean, are not reflected in course offerings at many universities in Japan including Kwansei Gakuin. At Kwansei Gakuin University and many other universities English study continues to be viewed and practiced as any “other” foreign language—subject study about (the) language and/or non-specified general language use communication study.

A major contributing factor to a continued subject study view and practice of English language at university is pointed out by Cowie (2006), who 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, where the focus is basically on form, and the study of a second language, 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 and knowledge engagement. In this social-cultural setting students, argues Cowie, need to passively read, listen and learn from the language knowledge expert, and persevere in that process. Students are thus socialized into certain ways of learning (and knowing) a language which, states Cowie, are ideologiocal and political in nature.

In order for university students in Japan 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, according to Lin (1999: 394),

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.

Cowie (2006) 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 solely or primarily in terms of (1) how well they learn about the language, and (2) how much effort they put into that passive learning.

Bruen (2005) has argued 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 Kwansei Gakuin University and its Sociology Department there is at present no stated mission or decision-making structures with regard to the study and learning of and/or in English language. There is very strict separation of English LWUC study and L1 (Japanese) specialty-area discipline study. The former is provided almost exclusively in general education courses (in years one and two only) of the curriculum. It is taken for granted that these courses need not be taught in English though some are, depending on individual teacher preferences. Specialty-area study sociology courses are, for all practical purposes, exclusively managed and taught only in the Japanese L1. In English language study itself there are two separate streams of pedagogy: subject study learning about English, and unspeciﬁed missionless content communication study, each stream largely disconnected from the other (Brady, 2006).

A university-wide language policy ought to deﬁne a 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, argues Bruen. Policies should also deﬁne and 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.

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 that this is an issue strategically related to the broader educational goals of the institution in the context in which that institution operates. English study at Kwansei Gakuin and in Sociology is neither an integral part of the curriculum in terms of its usefulness connected to the discipline, nor is it a coherent or cohesive discipline in and of itself. 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 for general purposes) than they are in guiding students to incorporate study and use of the English LWUC in the context of a specialty-area content knowledge-building socio-educational experience.

This attitude of faculty detachment and specialty-area disinterest can be evidenced by a mass retreat of Kwansei Gakuin University departmentally-hired English language faculty into an autonomously isolated language and culture center and attached independent graduate school over the past 10-15 years. This “English language faculty retreat” from specialty area (e.g. economics, sociology) departmental LWUC English responsibilities could lead students to believe that the LWUC, although prestigious to study and know about in general, is not communicatively useful within study communities (classrooms, the environment outside the classrooms) in the departments or in the institution as a whole.
Ⅲ. The benefits of a LWUC English study at university that go beyond enhancing language proficiency and content support.

English language higher study has the potential to help sociology students develop a more flexible and critical approach to their study, and can help students 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 of the Oppressed* 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 communicative 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 according to the Transferable Skills in Modern Languages Project (2002: 5) 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.

Language learning also 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, they argue can be sensitized to cultural difference which reduces ethnocentric bias using creative activities conducted through the L1. Bruen (2005: 245) contends that, in the increasingly intercultural 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 (2005). 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.

**IV. A starting point for a mission for language university English study**

Littlejohn (2004) 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 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 where,

> 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. (2004: 3)

Childs (2000: 16) refers to the importance of language study as *experiential growth* and remarks that,

> A language teacher will be successful to the extent that his or her students are gripped by experiences in the target language. The teacher will be unsuccessful to the extent that the students approach the language from outside as an object of study.

What Childs says is true of language study is also true of knowledge study. Teachers and their teaching will be unsuccessful to the extent that students approach knowledge, and what they can learn about themselves, others, and the world using that knowledge, as an outside object to be intellectually analyzed and operationally utilized. Success in teaching and learning can more appropriately be measured in terms of how students feel about what they come to know, and are personally engaged in constructing their knowledge rather than being spectators of others’ knowledge construction.

Present constructs and practices of English language study at the Japanese university treat this language of wider use and communication (LWUC) as a self-contained subject/object taught and learned for vague general purposes (EGP), rather than for clearly specified academic, occupational, or citizenship-communication developmental purposes. In addition, views and practices of “other”—i.e. non-Japanese—language study in Japan, resulting from Japanese society’s and people’s history of passive and indirect language contact—seem to prioritize non-communicative use(s) of “other” language study in general, and English LWUC in particular, instead focusing on and directing it’s use(s) for emblem, sorting, and certification (e.g. university entrance and required TOEIC examinations).

The result of a discrete non-communicative subject study approach is that university English courses, remain detached from (1) students’ specialty-area higher study (e.g. sociology, economics) and consequently (2) teaching/learning efforts that aim to empower Japanese to be academically bilingual or multilingual. A re-conceived view and differently practiced role and responsibility of English study at university can help to re-orient English language learning away from its potentially dysfuntional and compartmental “added-on to the curriculum” role and responsibility.

This change in conception will require (1) closer collaboration between language and area-studies’ content faculty, (2) that LWUC classes be primarily taught in the LWUC and focus on knowledge
engagement and learning, and (3) the re-positioning of English language study in the mainstream curriculum from general study to specialized support study. Evans and Squires (2006) report that English study for specific rather than for general purposes will soon become the norm not the exception in Japanese universities. University faculty engaged in the teaching and researching of LWUC English will need to re-position and re-define themselves as a result of this changing norm.

The writer, who is still stereotypically viewed as an English subject faculty teacher and researcher in the Kwansei Gakuin University Sociology Department, has, especially in the past three-five years, been developing a higher study mission for English that combines English language confidence and competence building with (1) sociological knowledge engagement, inquisitiveness, and reconstruction on the one hand, and (2) the nurturing of a civic awareness and citizenship building of classroom society as that society relates to the everyday concerns of the instructor and students in their teaching/learning and studies at Kwansei Gakuin in general. This tripolar focus has, for the most part, been favorably received by students judging from end-of-term feedback on teaching and instruction. In a future paper I will outline in detail the guiding principles and practices of this tripolar approach.

V. A new paradigm of English language university study: integrated knowledge engagement and language communication

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 collectionism, and faculty autonomy and freedom within very 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 based on collaboration, coordination, and an integration of content and language study can conflict with courses of study based on a view and practice of autonomous, uncoordinated, invisibly accountable, compartmental education. The result of any such conflict is bound to have repercussions for any design and implementation of whole English language study serving as a medium of learning and communication for (inter) discipline-area content higher 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 thus become more important than goals or mission.

Interests are important but so are goals and a clear mission for university LWUC English study at university. An explicit integration of language and content study at university can help put into place specific higher learning goals and a mission for LWUC English in specialty-area departments such as Sociology at universities such as Kwansei Gakuin. The framework for this integration, following Littlejohn (2004) and Childs (2000) in particular, should adopt a phronetic, experiential, and one-world ontology pedagogical approach as advocated by Flyvbjerg (2001), and Bollinger et al. (2003). The mission for LWUC
English integrated with, for example, sociology and knowledge-building, thus focuses on teachers and students dialogically engaged in examining and discussing (1) what they value in their study and life inside and outside the classroom, (2) how their individual and shared experiences relate to their co-constructed and re-constructed knowledge, and (3) how their communication has an immediate impact on their shared knowledge-building.

In order to realize an integration of language and content, students will need to work with complete and authentic English language content texts that do not focus on either a language subject study and/or unclear communication skill study approach. An effective integration of language and content study should also not focus on, for example, disconnected sentences, utterances or paragraphs. Blanton (1992: 291) 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

Blanton and Murphy (1996) believe that a theme-based whole language approach, unlike a traditional multi-themed “language subject” discrete skills’ approach, allows students to become knowledgeable, curious, and inquisitive about something of interest and importance. As this knowledge base grows, Blanton 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, and she says,

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)

The concept of “content” needs to be clarified to avoid curricular confusion. “Content” can easily—and perhaps also exclusively—refer to and be defined in terms of exclusionary and limiting disciplinary academic knowledge study such as in sociology, economics, psychology, management studies, or education. For the purposes of argumentation in this paper I suggest that we differently 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 (re) discover 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 perhaps taken for granted sociological matters (e.g. social theory, mass-media, political sociology), but will also have implications for how sociology and or economics or psychology, can be conceived and practiced more expansively and experientially, including inside the classroom study society.

The design and implementation of a more expansive view and practice of disciplinary and interdisciplinary-content study in a LWUC L2 (English) will only be possible, however, if students have sufficient LWUC general language skills, and enough confidence and motivation to use these skills before they begin specific purposes LWUC English study. For example, students will first need to be exposed to and learn what Evans and Squires (2006: 17) call “carrier” content (e.g. the language and forms of
comparison and contrast) before they study (inter)disciplinary “real” content (e.g. the vocabulary and rhetoric of the social world).

If content based learning (CBL) is introduced into English language study 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 Andrewes, 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 strengthen; neither content not L1 competence suffers.

Language, Lange (1994) says, is a “key to understanding the student’s world and is not just another technology to be learned or used” (1994: 5). According to Genesee (1994), second language learning when integrated with instruction in academic content is more effective than teaching language in isolation. He contends 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. (1994: 2)

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

Evans and Squires (2006) also note:

1. the importance of combining ongoing students’ integrated language content needs analysis with program evaluation,
2. building general language skills before beginning any explicit ESP study,
3. using assessment that reflects real-life content and language requirements - such as in social work or economics.

Kinoshita (2006) cautions that English for specific, as opposed to general, study purposes is much more than simply teaching the forms or vocabulary of specialist language to meet the expectations of the discourse community. She adds that,

the ultimate goal is not merely a slavish copying of style but being able to gain a foothold from which to introduce new ways for viewing the world

A re-conceptualized, differently practiced integrated LWUC English study at university is necessary so as to re-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 cognitive and affective development beyond knowledge-giving and/or skills-training. Such a focus requires commitment to an integrated higher educational content-knowledge and language-communication learning, and the collaboration of language and content study faculty to define and implement an English LWUC content study mission that can modestly support and enhance the mainstream content curriculum. But, as both Holliday (1994) and Bernstein (1971) recognize, this collaboration depends on both the willingness and ability of university
socio-culture and its practitioners to embrace whole integrated structures of learning as opposed to discrete collection-oriented structures.
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