

# English as an additional language (EAL) : language policy and planning at university for non-language majors.

ALAN BRADY

## INTRODUCTION

English has been recognized as an international language for some time now and functions in Japan in educational settings both as a second language (ESL) where it is used for daily communication, and where there is widespread access to speakers who use English as the primary language of communication. More predominantly, English functions as a foreign language (EFL) where it is used in a limited range of domains and where opportunities are limited for interaction between native and non-native speakers. There is middle ground, however, where English can function as an additional language (EAL) of communication in educational domains, particularly at university.

With the increasing demands placed upon Japan and Japanese society for fuller integration into a wider community of nations, the university has the opportunity to take the lead in connecting Japan's economic and social prowess with academic achievement. Two obstacles to this are (1) the continued over-reliance on examinations as the driving force to English study, and (2) an approach to language study as an academic *end*, rather than as an academic *means* of learning. Prejudice continues against the ability to actually use the language purposefully and communicatively. Nowhere is this more evident than at university where the teaching of English continues to be marginalized and compartmentalized (Brady, 1995).

There seems to be no clear institutionally initiated or systematically motivated rationale for the teaching of communicative English at university. Witness the continued survival of "eikaiwa" or English conversation courses taught solely by "native-speakers." Witness the continued separation of ter-

ritory for Japanese and non-Japanese teachers on the one hand, and language and non-language teachers and researchers on the other hand (Brady, 1995). CLT (communicative language teaching) courses, usually elective, but in some cases required, are taught by native speakers, many of whom have very limited Japanese language or cultural proficiency or awareness. Required general education courses that focus on language as a subject are taught by Japanese who may have varying degrees of proficiency in the target language. The result is that language teaching and research, particularly in its communicative applications, remains separated from the everyday world of academia.

There are socio-political reasons for this separation and compartmentalization (Brady, 1995) that make it difficult to integrate language teaching and research and subject-matter instruction and research. This paper argues, nonetheless, that such an integration is necessary and offers specific guidelines for such a union, describing in some detail the efforts of teachers and researchers in a non-language department at a prestigious private Japanese university to work towards that stated goal.

So long as English continues to function primarily as a foreign language at university, it can not serve as a support medium of communication. In the words of Gika (1996), "the ideology of the term "English as a foreign language" does not fit with today's practices. The term itself is out of date." It may be more appropriate to consider English, in the words of L. E. Smith (1981), both as an international and intranational language, or as Kachru (1985, 1996) has commented, a language community "divided into three concentric circles: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle." Which is and which should be the real English in use at university, and to which function

should English aspire in order to more constructively function as an integral part of academic life?

Gika (1996) in reference to the use of English has also commented that single language dominance must be avoided for (...) it is not defensible on educational grounds. The same can be said of Japanese, for it now dominates university instruction and research and forces English and other languages into a goal-less function. There is no academic language policy or planning at university in Japan that clearly recognizes the importance of English or any other additional language as a real-time medium of school communication, or as an important part of academic life.

While it is true that the worldwide dominance of any particular language, or in fact of any norm thereof (Phillipson & Skutnabb, 1996), needs to be addressed, it is undeniable that English is a very important language in use in Japan and will increasingly become so in the foreseeable future. English can, and I will argue, should function as BOTH an international and intranational language at the university. Its use as a medium of communication, can, along with Japanese and perhaps other “additional” languages, bring Japan much closer to joining the community of nations and the community of universities throughout the world, particularly in Asia.

As the first step, this paper argues for a clear language policy and goal-oriented planning at university, which recognizes the use of English as contributing significantly to increased international and intranational academic contact and awareness. I will first outline in some detail a number of issues that weigh on the present function of English as primarily a subject, divorced from other (Japanese language medium of communication) subjects. I will then comment on some contradictions inherent in the university which places English in both a privileged *and* subservient position academically. Thirdly, I will present some theoretical research information that impacts directly on the integration of language and subject matter study at university.

I will conclude this paper with a brief overview of English for academic study (EAP) approaches that could be applicable to the university setting in Japan, particularly in non-language or non-English departments. I shall describe in some detail a seven-year on-going project that is attempting to create

bridges in a number of areas: (1) between Japanese and non-Japanese language faculty, (2) between language skill-building and sociology consciousness-raising, and (3) between (English) language and subject-matter faculty. The main premise of this paper is that (English) language is much more than a subject, and rather than be separated from academia, should be an integral supporting medium of communication within the academic community. There are important educational, social, and political reasons to affect such a restructuring and reorientation in thinking. Additionally, there are cross-cultural lessons in learning language for communicative purposes and these issues need to be addressed. There are equally other important issues relating to expectations and needs, and a re-definition of terms such as bilingual education, CLT, and native and non-native speakers. This paper will address these concerns as well.

## PART I. Background to the problem: The place of English in Japan and the university.

### A. English as a foreign language, or English as an additional language?

It is beyond question that English, now more than ever before, has the potential to create bridges between people, or that English can be used to mediate a number of cross-cultural concepts. Prodromou summarizes this influence and potential of English when he says that “English is the foremost medium of international communication at the present time . . . . . The international dimension of ELT (English language teaching) is not only becoming difficult to ignore, but offers ELT a potentially more significant role than traditional ethnocentric views of the language as a peculiarly Anglo-Saxon entity would have allowed.” (Prodromou, 1992). With regard to English as a western or foreign language, Kachru (1996) offers the following insight into its status and use when he reminds us that “Asia comprises the largest English using populations in three distinct contexts of use: as a *first language*, as an *institutionalized additional language*, and as a *foreign language*” (Kachru, 1996). In referring to Japan, Kachru comments that, although a member of the third group (i.e. the “Outer Circle”

where English is a *foreign language*), Japan is one among many nations in an *expanding circle*, where the initiative in planning and administration for increasing bilingualism is essentially an Asian matter. There are, he says, six major perspectives of English within Japan, three of which are *attitudinal, pragmatic, and acquisitional*. He raises some important points concerning the place of English in Japan. There is, he points out, a continued perception that English is a western language, and that it is a foreign language in use in Japan, despite the fact that there are many innovative and creative uses of English in Japan. With regard to Japanese universities, he notes that a great number of schools in their bulletins recognize the importance of English, and in fact, actively promote its teaching and learning as a medium of communication. The explicit statement of Meiji University (1993–94) that “foreign languages such as English are used only occasionally in class and only when the necessity arises” is not the norm. Kachru, who is known widely for his views on English as a world language, then looked at the course offerings of fifteen major Japanese universities. What he found was an emphasis on teaching and researching of the language as subject study (i.e. literature, linguistics, conversation). Nowhere could he find any courses related to varieties of English, world Englishes, or English as a global language.

The implications are clear. First, English is considered subject study or communication study with no clear academic objectives (i.e. English conversation). Second, English is *not* viewed as a pluralistic language, and its teaching and research reflects the “western ownership” of the language. Thirdly, English is promoted and advertised as useful, but does not function as an important medium of communication, academic or otherwise at university. If, for a variety of reasons, universities believe English is useful and necessary, why is it that very few schools, especially those that are not specialized departments or institutions, such as International Christian University or Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, make a concerted effort to clearly *display* that attitude and conviction and put into practice that usefulness?

For example, why don't universities employ English speaking faculty who *are not* western owners of the language? Why do they not offer

fewer “language as subject study” courses and more “language as cross-cultural communication in use” courses, especially courses that are required for university graduation and/or specialized academic coursework? Why are there not more international activities that employ English as a medium of communication that are an integral part of the university's lifeline?

Is it possible that universities, despite ambitious sloganeering, wish to maintain the status quo: the almost complete dominance of one language, Japanese, as the sole medium of subject matter learning, to the exclusion of English or any other international language? If this is so why is English so prominently a part of entrance tests? Why is it that the English tested is not English in medium of learning use so much as it is analytical English as subject matter?

With the reality of English as an international language, English as a world language with multiple owners, and English as a prominent marketable entity within the university, is it not appropriate to re-examine its actual use and constructiveness? If the university is to maintain, or as Horio (1995) says reclaim, a leading position in Japanese society to serve the learning needs of its citizenry, what place for English? In an age of increasing contact between people and institutions, is it wise to maintain the study of and about English without regard to its usefulness as an academic support medium?

Both Kachru and Prodromou recognize that there are other cultures besides the perceived foreign target culture (i.e. Anglo-Saxon) or the home culture (Japanese) where English as an international and world language can function as a natural media. In the words of Prodromou (1992), “broadening students' horizons is a traditional objective of educational activity . . . . the expression takes on a new and more urgent meaning in a time of the collapse of international barriers.” He quotes from an article written by Finocchiaro (1982) in which she outlines what is sufficient for taking part in the interdependent world. More than a decade later, this ability to cope is even more urgent.

When we teach English, or thru English, we can impart to our students the power, as Prodromou says, “of knowing and caring more about the world they live in.” Teaching (in) English is therefore a cultural activity. At university, if students are led to

believe that their academic success and achievement is enhanced through English as international and world language study, the ambitious slogans that schools now employ to attract students may be justified. But if the university does not now begin to re-examine its own policies with regard to language study, students may soon see the contradictions.

Gika (1996) points out that the status of English as a world language is changing, and that as it changes and its number of users grows, it is vital to move away from traditional limits of language pedagogy. The continued definition of the study of and about English as “foreign” in Japan maintains its status as an outside object, having no place or relation, not belonging; harmful (Longman’s *Dictionary of Language and Culture*, p. 505). Certainly students from high school, who have struggled with the study of English for up to six years for the express purpose of passing a university entrance exam, knew, and perhaps still know the difference. For them, English is *not* necessarily foreign. They use it in creative ways; they are interested (we all hope so) in the world outside Japan and outside the Anglo-Saxon English speaking world.

It is the responsibility of the university to reconnect students, to help (them to) break down barriers to international misunderstanding. One way in which this can be effected is to show clearly that practical, communicative English, (and perhaps other “additional” languages as well) can function academically as an integral part of the university’s community and communication.

It is true that English has the same potential to be as dominant internationally as is Japanese within Japan. Without disregarding the need to learn thru other additional languages, however, I argue that English is a language owned by anyone who uses it. A clear-sighted policy as well as specific plans of action (i.e. coursework, academic activities) that acknowledge its rightful place as academic and practical support for learning content and specialty-area study can go a long way to broadening students’ horizons.

B. English as an additional language outside Japan: four models.

#### (1) Indonesia

What are the forms and functions of English in other non-ESL settings? In Indonesia, where English has supplanted Dutch as the major “foreign” language the government’s stated objective of establishing widespread proficiency among all senior high school graduates to make current international developments in science and technology accessible thru the medium of English (Lowenberg, 1991) has met with very limited success. However, two other objectives have been more successfully attained; providing training in English for people who need it as a medium of communication, and borrowing from English as the primary source for modernizing the native language, Bahasa Indonesia. It is the opinion of Lowenberg that the extent to which English has successfully functioned as a source of borrowings in Indonesia justifies its reclassification as a foreign language. English functions in a complex sociocultural linguistic overall context as the most productive resource in the linguistic repertoire of a large sector of the Indonesian population who shape it (i.e. English) to meet their particularly Indonesian communicative needs.

The approach, concludes Lowenberg, where English has functioned as an “additional” language, has applied in describing the forms and functions of English in other EFL (or as Kachru would say, “Outer Circle”) contexts (Warie, 1977, Stanlaw, 1982, 1987). The issue at hand is the necessity to sharpen our insights on the actual sociolinguistic role of English as it functions in a given society or sub-society (i.e. university) where languages and cultures are in contact.

#### (2) Malaysia

In Malaysia, English is also vitally necessary, especially perceived as so by young Malaysian students (Kaur, 1995). In a study conducted among 182 students, he discovered that English for academic functions (i.e. further education abroad, improving one’s knowledge) received the highest priority. Social functions of English, such as for communicating with family and/or friends, received the lowest priority. Kaur concludes that English, as perceived by young Malaysians, plays an important role in the *personal* advancement of the individual, and in national progress. The English language appears, says Kaur, to serve a utilitarian need for individuals who are about to leave school and embark upon careers or for advanced academic pur-

suits.

Since there are at least three other languages available for cross-cultural communication in Malaysia (Tamil, Malay, Mandarin), the social need is not so great. Young Malaysians believe that personal advancement is *directly* related to the acquisition of the English language. One reason for this belief is that a great amount of common knowledge is stored in the total English-speaking world. In order to communicate with others about that knowledge, practical English, related to academic needs, is necessary.

Kaur asserts that English language instruction should not only continue in Malaysian schools, but with much more rigor than at present. English is important for a variety of functions, and an emphasis on the English language *will not* jeopardize the status of any one national or native languages that appear to serve similar or different functions. Until Bahasa Malaysia can command the utility and status of other international languages, English will remain important.

These two findings suggest that much more research and investigation is needed into the actual functions of English within Japan, and in particular, at the university. While it is true that the overall socio-cultural context in which English is used (or some might suggest abused) in Japan differs from that in either Malaysia or Indonesia, it is true that in all three non-ESL settings English functions communicatively to satisfy concrete communicative and learning needs. These needs are not so much those of an institution or even of those in authority. Rather, I would suggest that the needs we need to investigate are those of the people we are responsible for educating: our students.

### (3) Puerto Rico

What of settings where English is in direct conflict with one other language in particular as regards its function educationally? In Puerto Rico, Spanish is the language for social communication and functions as the national language. In Puerto Rico there has been a number of problems that stem from an overly centralized and politicized school system (Pousada, 1996). Pousada argues that it is necessary to have a national language planning perspective that could help defuse the conflict between Spanish and English. A coherent and clear language planning policy would, says Pousada, lead

to functionally appropriate policies that take cognizance of Puerto Rican people's desire for self-determination.

In Puerto Rico, the greatest obstacle faced by ESL teachers has been the public's resistance to learning English which some call a "motivated failure" (Resnick, 1993). In spite of official proclamations and official school policy that English is of important instrumental utility, only 20% of the population consider that they can use English with any degree of effectiveness. English is *not* indispensable in their daily lives; they already speak a language of international prominence. Puerto Ricans are largely ambivalent about their L2 (English). Most underestimate their proficiency, and some believe that if they become too competent in English, they may "betray" their Puerto Ricanness.

Students at all levels, including university, are very negative about their study of and thru English. Pousada strongly suggests that even before teachers and institutions can consider the manner in which they can educate in/thru English, they need to find ways to overcome this negativity. Learning can not take place without motivation, regardless of methods or materials. The learners' worst fears about the intransigence of English must first be eradicated. Puerto Ricans' resistance to bilingualism is due to several factors. I will concentrate on the pedagogical factors only, as they have most direct relevance to the learning and teaching of English at university.

Schools in Puerto Rico have vacillated over a period of more than 40 years, between ESL and EFL orientations to the learning and teaching of English. Pousada recommends that much more work needs to be done to devise curricula materials that address the specific needs of Puerto Rico in its use of EAL (Olshtain, 1985), where English is the official or co-official language but *not* the mother tongue. A vicious cycle continues to exist in Puerto Rico where ill-prepared English teachers are unsure of their ability to use the language. They rely instead on mechanical and traditional methods of teaching that "disguise gaps in their background and give them control over reluctant students" (Pousada, 1996). Pousada, in direct reference to university concludes that it (the university) is faced with the unenviable task of remediating a dozen or so years of mislearning and unlearning, which in most cases

it is unable or unwilling to do. As a result, students graduate with faulty skills. Some of these students go on to become English teachers themselves, and so the cycle continues.

In Puerto Rico language policy has usually been imposed in response to political imperatives (Pousada, 1996). Rarely have authorities planned or even evaluated their language programs. Some major recommendations of one body that *did* investigate language policy and planning (the Special Commission of Ex-Secretaries of Education, 1986) reports Pousada, is that there should be: (1) more attention to innovative instruction, (2) more research and materials' development, (3) increased staffing to provide learners with more significant levels of communicative competence, and (4) school decentralization to provide local flexibility. The Commission *adamantly rejected any idea that Spanish and English are in conflict*. On the contrary, both languages cooperatively and collaboratively provide avenues to the full cultural development of the individual (Pousada, 1996). Pousada concludes his article with a personal plea that teachers take the lead in surveying student views on ways to improve English teaching. Teachers, he says, can serve as models for bilingualism, and can inform authorities; together they can make improvements at the local school level.

#### (4) South Africa

In South Africa, there is heated on-going discussion concerning language-in-education planning. The discussion centers on two domains: decisions about languages taught as subjects, and decisions about languages used as media of instruction or languages of learning (Barkhuizen and Gough, 1996). One issue of great concern is that of the L1-L2 distinction. The aim of a fully bilingual education system is to achieve a single level of language proficiency by the end of compulsory schooling (Barkhuizen & Gough, 1996). Of particular interest is the emerging concept of People's English as part of "People's Education," and that this idea places English firmly at the center of the educational process where it helps empower and liberate learners (Pierce, 1989).

In official documents, reports Barkhuizen and Gough, much more attention has been given over to language as medium of learning than to language as subject. Because "language is essential to think-

ing and learning, learners must be able to learn in the language or languages which best suits this purpose" (ANC policy document, 1994). In the ANC document, there are three options discussed: (a) use of a language of wider communication, with a gradual step-by-step introduction to those for whom it is not a/the home language, (b) the use of the home language of the majority of learners at a particular school, and (c) *the use of different languages as languages of learning for different subjects*.

One finding in the above-mentioned policy document could be of particular interest to the situation in Japan. Despite the fact that English is the dominant language in South Africa, and it is believed one language can best serve as media of instruction, it is argued that *all* languages are capable of functioning as media of academic study. The maintenance of one language (in this case English) can deny rather than guarantee access to advanced learning and/or future job prospects. The emerging language-of-learning policy in South Africa thus challenges the privileged position of English as the principal language of learning. The approach that considers English *and an African language* as languages of learning is gaining considerable support (Barkhuizen and Gough, 1996).

The implementation of a changed language-in-education policy in South Africa has had to struggle against out-dated methods and routines of school management and classroom teaching. It is no easy matter to ask authorities or teachers to change practice if (1) the specific changes being offered are not clear, (2) there is not sufficient understanding of the rationale for the changes, and perhaps most significantly, (3) the people involved do not believe that changes are necessary or feasible (Barkhuizen and Gough, 1996). Ultimately, the promotion of African languages in schools in South Africa results in a change of status for English. South African school authorities and teachers are concerned about the effect(s) of having students study up to three languages, each taught in the domain of media for learning. Structures, ideas, and beliefs are in potential conflict in South Africa, but discussion centers on *accommodation and collaboration*.

C. Communicative Language Teaching: Cultural appropriateness in an Asian setting.

Most of what we would call communicative language teaching in ELT is still based on the model put forward in 1980 by Canale and Swain. They focus on students' needs for communication in the target (i.e. English) language. This need includes the need for sociolinguistic and general cultural knowledge of the population speaking the target language. It is assumed that the target language is used communicatively in an ESL setting, which further specified, narrows down to an Anglo-Saxon environment (i.e. United States, Britain, Australia, Canada). But how culturally appropriate is this approach to communicative language learning and teaching, especially in an Asian setting, where conflicts may arise between more western ideas and Confucian ideas of education (Stapleton, 1995)? Ellis(1996) questions whether the communicative approach as defined and explicated is culture-specific or is based on more universal generalizations about educational practices that transcend individual cultures (Ellis, 1996, p. 213).

In a Chinese setting, Orton (1990) found that teachers there had to change their value system as well as their behavior in order for the CLT methodology to be accepted in practice. She soon realized that there was great potential for misunderstanding, intransigence, or in the worst case, conflict. Orton restructured her task of teaching the basics of CLT to accommodate Chinese educational values. Based on a relationship between teacher and student that differs in China as opposed to the West, Orton used that relationship to incorporate revamped aspects of CLT to the Chinese situation.

In Vietnam it was found that methodology courses offered by a group of Australian ELT aid volunteers was also based on the Canale and Swain model (Ellis, 1994). The aim of such a model put into practice, is to "produce students who can communicate both orally and in writing with native speakers in a way appropriate to their mutual needs" (Ellis, 1996, p. 214). The desired results can range from basic functional tasks (i.e. greetings) to more difficult academic skills (i.e. lecture-listening, note-taking).

Ellis concludes that in both settings, Chinese and Vietnamese, there are many aspects that make the Canale and Swain model unsuitable for Asian learners and teachers. Brumfit (1985) is concerned that ELT methodologists equate process with con-

tent. For most Chinese and Vietnamese teachers that equation is a huge step in faith at most, or an impossible equation to make at the very least. ESL, the setting in which the communicative approach is defined, takes place in a largely English-speaking environment. The ESL student has a far greater need and urgency to communicate (as defined by Canale and Swain) than the EFL or EAL student. In the extreme EFL situation, the instructor may be the sole provider of experience in the target language. "Without the reinforcement of an English-speaking environment, motivation becomes ... a product of the teacher's initiative on the one hand, and the student's individual will to succeed—or fear of failure—on the other" (Ellis, 1996, p. 215).

Both EFL and EAL are not necessarily designed to help individuals function in the wider community, although they can serve that overall function to varying degrees, depending on the actual local environment. EFL and EAL are part of the official school curriculum (Ellis, 1994, p. 215), and are dependent on factors such as support from school authority and the local community, and government policy. Other factors also enter into this equation: availability of materials, teachers' language proficiency in the target language, teaching resources, etc. It is not given that the CLT teacher in a non-ESL setting need approach the communicative method in the same way as it is approached in an ESL setting. Any number of skills other than communicating orally or in writing could conceivably be defined as communicative (i.e. translation, speech-making, journal writing) The key is to discover *points of integration and collaboration* between western and Asian approaches to CLT. Whoever teaches CLT in an EFL or EAL setting is obligated to make adjustments, and to serve as a cultural mediator. Such mediation crucially involves the awareness of other or additional culture identities while still retaining one's own "home" culture.

Pedagogical practices in China, Vietnam, or in Japan that are influenced by Confucianism are much more teacher-centered than the strong communicative language teaching approach would allow for. There are, however, points of mediation.

Any EAL program that is based on a clear-sighted and goal-driven rationale for implementation, must take into account such points of mediation, as for example, the use of the mother tongue in

class, alternative approaches to pair work and group work, and exam-driven vs. non exam-driven instruction and learning.

In their study of Chinese teachers' views of CLT, Burnaby and Sun (1989) concluded that teachers "see communicative methods suitable for contexts and purposes of learning ESL, and Chinese methods as suitable for the purposes and context of learning EFL." In either case though, they see what they are charged to do (teach) based on their students' needs. Part of their (justifiable) ambivalence about "authentic" CLT stems from the reality of a lack of an English-speaking environment at school. It was felt that an English-speaking environment would be of great benefit to the overall teaching situation. However, this view was not shared by a majority of the teachers. One final point to note is that given China's need to "have examinations that clearly discriminate less able from more able candidates" (Burnaby and Sun, 1989) — this being one important tenet of Confucianism — CLT may conflict with this need, especially so if the exams do not test one's ability to communicate orally or in writing.

With regard to the university situation here in Japan, it is important to note that EAL need not be exam-driven at university level. The more difficult task for teachers concerns motivation, not materials, not the creation of English-speaking environments or even teaching attitudes. There are far more Japanese teachers of English who have been exposed to western methods of education, and who can conceivably manage mediation between Asian educational values and western-based CLT than can Chinese teachers.

What is now necessary is for universities in Japan to critically examine the ways and means in which English language education can satisfy learner needs. One first step is to find out what those needs actually are and then draw up a plan to implement teaching and research practices accordingly. Attitudes towards the position and use of English on university campuses, especially those that profess to be in the forefront of international education also need to be re-examined. The most important point to bear in mind, however, is that the university must fulfill its responsibility to its "customers," the students, and the companies and educational institutions to which those students

will be headed in 3–4 years' time. What are *their* needs as well? How well are *they* mediating between western and Asian values, educational, occupational, or otherwise? What is the university doing *in practice* and what can the university begin doing to actively promote EAL in Japan? What norm or norms will Japanese people wish to aspire to in their pursuit of EAL study? What can the university additionally do to foster a positive awareness of non-native languages and cultures? How do all these concerns and responsibilities tie in with the academic needs of teachers and students? The next two sections will attempt to address these questions.

## PART II. EAP (English for academic purposes) and sheltered content instruction at the Japanese university.

According to Steven Ross (1996, p. 1), in the past twenty years "content-based second language instruction has become the dominant model for second language curriculum organization in North America." Ross reports that this development and spread is also motivated by a number of studies that show second language (SL) learners can acquire content and language simultaneously. These studies of content-based instruction or CBI, have all been conducted in primarily ESL settings, including Hong Kong (Ho, 1982, 1985). Oxford (1993), notes Ross, among others makes reference to an "explicit gradation in the use of content-based language instruction (CBLI), whereby task-based goals are followed by content-based goals."

In reference to content instruction in Japan, Ross comments that the present situation sees a number of Japanese universities offering overseas study programs and/or having initiated innovative bilingual education curriculum in order to meet student needs and expectations regarding communication oriented English language study. This is, he says, largely a result of the increasing competition between universities for a dwindling and more demanding student population, that perceives English language skills to be useful academically and socio-economically as well. Most of Ross' paper then goes on to describe in great detail a sheltered content approach to EAP on his campus, a "sister" department of this writer's school.

One of Ross' most interesting conclusions con-



cerns the transition from task-based to content-based instruction. He states that, “to the extent that learners have the *basic* proficiency to undertake a particular language task, and have positive instrumental motivation to recognize EAP training as essential for future courses, the likelihood of success in sheltered courses is enhanced” (Ross, 1996).

The EAL setting in which Ross teaches and researches is somewhat different from that of an ordinary university department where English is regarded as a subject more than as a media of communication to whatever degree. However, the conclusions that Ross draws suggests a couple of implications for the teaching and learning of EAL at any department where English has the *potential* of becoming a media of learning. First, he suggests that departmental curricula motivation can be instrumental in terms of positive motivation for learners of EAL, whether it be subject-study or media of learning study oriented. Second, his findings confirm that EAL study, for whatever purpose is enhanced by *combining task-based and content-based* approaches sequentially and cyclically. Both these implications point to a redirection in the way(s) in which EFL or EAL is taught and learned at university.

In an ESL setting, Campbell (1996) reports that the construction of a CBLI curriculum and the “methods of instruction by which it is carried out,” vary from institution to institution, depending on the specific needs of the institution. Even in ESL settings, he reminds us that, in general, SL instruction and the teaching of academic subject matter is treated separately. This too is the case, for the most part, at university in Japan. If it is school policy to develop foreign language or additional language competence/proficiency for international communication — and research shows this is better accomplished when connections are made between academic subject matter and language study — then there should be more interest in connecting a task-based language learning skills’ approach to an academic content-based language development approach. Campbell, like Ross, also notes that in any given ESL situation, progress towards a CBLI approach must first give way to development of basic TBLI skills’ proficiency. The implications for university EAL study: develop basic proficiency first, where the object is to instill more confidence lin-

guistically in students so that they can cope with higher level CBLI tasks. The next step is to *integrate* task-based language learning (TBLI) and content-based language instruction (CBLI).

Content-based second language instruction makes the assumption that language can be effectively taught and learned through the medium of subject matter content (Gaffield-Vile, 1996). In a project in Britain at a sociology department of a university, the aim was to develop academic language skills and to make students more comfortable with scholarly discourse that could be transferred to other academic courses. Gaffield-Vile found that students were more interested in their learning, and found the course more motivating than traditional skills’ based language courses alone, *but only AFTER they had achieved a suitable language level*. To quote, “skills-based courses can appear de-motivating and rather artificial, but are necessary at the earliest stages” (Gaffield-Vile, 1996). After they have reached an appropriate level of language proficiency, students, reports Gaffield-Vile, experience a greater sense of accomplishment. They know that they are studying authentic content material, not material adapted for foreign learners.

An important distinction needs to be made between content-based learning and language learning based on content. The latter has the goal of primarily, perhaps even exclusively, developing the student’s additional language proficiency. The former is equally concerned with teaching subject matter content. In fact, as the student becomes more proficient in his or her (additional) language development, more and more skills *directly related* to the particular academic content matter can be developed. Gaffield-Vile concludes that students can acquire critical skills essential to *general academic work* thru the subject of a combined task-based and content-based sociology subject matter course. Among the specific academic skills developed she cites four: the development and structuring of arguments weighing against evidence, introduction and explanation of abstract concepts, use of statistical evidence authoritatively, and explication of issues in a well-reasoned way (i.e. in this case, aspects of academic life in Britain). When students become more competent linguistically, specialist CBI and coursework should, in her opinion, *be added to the*

*curriculum in place of general language instruction*. A bridge between language and subject is thus created.

But what are the actual academic communication needs of students at university? What do subject matter instructors actually require of their students? What are their (the instructors') expectations? In another ESL setting, Tagg and Ferris (1996) report that instructors' requirements vary across disciplines. One general finding was that lecturing styles of instructors—and it is important to note that some of these instructors were “non-native”—are becoming less formal and more interactive. This places new expectations upon students in ESL settings. In order to cope with a variety of lecture and discussion formats, Ferris and Tagg conclude that “genre-specific listening and speaking courses and tasks may be necessary, and that EAP teachers need to prepare students for *comprehension and participation in a variety of lecture/discussion formats*” (Ferris & Tagg, 1996).

Needs' assessment is of vital importance for course design and materials' development in specific contexts (Long & Crookes, 1992). There needs to be a sufficient amount of baseline data taken from real-world sources such as listening/speaking tasks required by instructors in academic contexts. EAP teachers must be aware of such tasks. However, instructors' expectations of students and how students should actually perform inside and outside class, may not be explicit or even clear to the instructors themselves. It is crucial that assumptions, expectations, and requirements of subject matter instructors be made more explicit and more clear (Long & Crookes, 1992).

What the instructors require or expect must be balanced with what students themselves believe. Ostler (1980), in a study of 131 ESL students at a private university in the USA, concludes that “ESL university students in general need help in developing academic speaking abilities (i.e. conversing with their instructors), *not general conversation skills*. There has, in the opinion of Johns (1991), “been a tendency for teachers and curriculum planners, especially of general English courses, to intuit the needs and future language uses of students . . . instead of *guessing at student needs*, we must develop new techniques for examining the tasks students have to perform in English” (p. 72). It is clear that

to effect any union of language and content, instructors' expectations and requirements, *and* student needs must be taken into account. In an EAL setting, where those requirements, expectations, and needs may be less, different, and/or less clear, the overall necessity for real-world (i.e. in class and outside class) fact-finding remains.

If any kind of union or integration between subject matter and language is to be seriously considered in an EAL educational setting, faculty will together have to better understand what they need to share in order to cooperate and collaborate most effectively. Teemant, Bernhardt, and Rodriguez-Munoz (1996) outline a number of principles to guide integration and collaboration. Among these are: (1) language and content go hand in hand, (2) content and language gaps require different approaches, (3) second language learning is developmental, (4) linguistic adjustments make content accessible to students, (5) academic language should be developed as a separate skill, (6) cross-disciplinary collaboration is essential, and—in the opinion of this writer, most importantly, (7) clarify teaching roles. I would add that before language and content instructors get together and discuss areas of mutual concern as regards teaching and research, they find out what students themselves believe to be effective integrated content and additional language development. The object obviously is to create bridges between both content (i.e. subject matter) and language educational objectives. Together, language and subject matter instructors are responsible for supporting the success of students.

Much more research needs to be done to find out what expectations subject matter and language teachers have of their students. Where do these expectations and requirements converge, and where and how do they diverge? How can students at university become well-rounded academic learners and researchers thru an integrative content-language approach to their studies?

Snow, Met, and Genesee (1989) offer a detailed conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in *both* second and foreign language settings. In their model, language and subject matter teachers work collaboratively to determine language-teaching goals (p. 201). There are four settings in which they report their findings. I shall concentrate on the third setting: the foreign lan-

guage immersion class. In this setting the content and language teacher are the same; that is, one person is responsible for making connections between subject matter and language development. Snow, Met, and Genesee feel that, in this setting, “all planning, from curriculum development to actual delivery of instruction, must be guided by consideration of content-obligatory and content-compatible language needs” (p. 211).

Content-obligatory language is essential for an understanding of the subject matter. Content-compatible language can be taught naturally (as the need arises) in the context of a particular subject matter, and that students (may) require additional practice with. An example of this takes place in the mathematics class. Snow, Met, and Genesee all argue that effective immersion teachers “already incorporate content-obligatory language incidentally into their subject matter lessons” (p. 211). However, immersion teachers often disregard the development of content-compatible language. This is meant as no criticism. On the contrary, in a setting where the language teacher and the subject matter teacher *are not one and the same person*, it is only natural that this separation occurs. The argument is that for a more well-rounded language and subject-matter curricula approach, both teachers, or in the above case, the one immersion teacher, should be aware of language development in two domains.

The question that remains, especially in an EAL setting where more than one language is or can be used as a media of learning, is in what areas can subject matter and EAL instructors agree to teach students additional language communicative skills—more broadly and flexibly defined than in the Canale/Swain model—that will enhance BOTH additional language development and academic subject matter learning? Language teachers need to be more sensitive to the content validity of their teaching; content or subject matter teachers need to be more sensitive to the EAL developmental needs of their students in whatever way(s) those needs impact on their subject matter study. For example, as an instructor of EAL in a subject matter setting, a language teacher must purposefully inject more non-language content into his/her teaching. The subject matter instructor should be more aware of the EAL developmental needs of his/her students with specific regard to how those needs help meet

EAL and non-EAL subject learning requirements such as reading texts in the additional language, writing abstracts of research in the additional language, and, if required, presenting short talks in the additional language on the specific subject matter.

Whatever integrated approach is considered, the local institution (i.e. university department) must first ask two questions and answer in the affirmative: (1) is it desirable, taking into account native language, subject matter, additional language, and academic and future job-related needs, to connect content and language instruction and research? (2) will this connection and collaborative policy enhance the *overall* academic learning of BOTH teachers and students, and contribute to a more international atmosphere of learning?

In the department in which the writer presently teaches and does research, there is a perceived need on the part of the decision-making bodies that additional language (i.e. English) learning should somehow be related to subject matter study, and that the two areas are or can be mutually supportive. Specifically, in this setting, what EAL needs do our students have in order for them to perform more ably in their EAL and native language (i.e. Japanese) subject matter classes? What kinds of EAL developmental skills do sociology faculty believe are necessary for students themselves to make more connections between English and Japanese language media of learning study in their own classes? At what point will subject matter teachers be willing to inject more EAL voluntarily into their content classes? In other words, what is the necessary EAL proficiency as perceived by subject matter (and language) faculty for students when they enter and participate in their sociology content classes? What proficiency and general language skills, and what kinds of learning tasks should language faculty develop and employ in *their classes* to solidify this integrative approach?

### PART III. Developing roles of EAL teachers in Japan, team teaching, and curricula and pedagogical implications.

#### A. The roles of teachers in an EAL setting.

In an article in *ELT Journal* (1992) Medgyes poses the question of who's worth more in reference

to the native speaker vs. non-native speaker dichotomy. In an age of increasing international contacts, there is need to re-examine the traditional definition of these two terms and the people who are classified as one or the other. Medgyes notes that, “the road to the learner leads thru the teacher. . . . this requires more teacher-related research. It is important to keep the NS/NNS<sup>1)</sup> distinction” (Medgyes, 1992). Medgyes further comments that both “types” of teacher have equal opportunities to be successful in the language learning classroom. He acknowledges, however, that those routes to success may not be the same or, in some cases, even similar. Each “type” of teacher brings different strengths to the classroom, and both can make greater efforts to improve their abilities to teach English as communication and as learning endeavor (i.e. study skills) for both present and future use.

Putting aside (for the moment at least) the more subtle distinctions between the two, and the changing definition of the two, Medgyes’ article strongly suggests that there are benefits of NS and NNS working *together communicatively to learn from each other about each other’s way(s) of teaching and behaving in class* (Medgyes, 1992). There is increasing recognition that both NS and NNS teachers are, or can be, fully competent in offering students an all-round EAL education (Brady, 1995). This collaboration is especially important in an EAL setting such as Japan where the expectations of NNS teachers may be very different from the expectations of NS teachers, and where students’ learning in high school (i.e. juken Eigo) may impede efforts at traditional CLT teaching at university (Kay, 1994).

Murphey (1995) puts it more succinctly when he says that, “students need role models with whom they can more closely identify. . . . where this person has English as part of his or her identity.” At the same time, Murphey is dismayed by those “role model” NNS teachers who speak/use only or mostly Japanese in class. He suggests that by *not using the target language*, such teachers are implying: (1) English is NOT for using; it’s for analysis, (2) even I don’t speak or use English, and, (3) you (the student) have to speak/be like a native speaker in order to communicate successfully. Murphey concludes that all teachers should try their best to make students “English hungry.” Students should be clearly told and taught that they don’t have to go abroad or be

like a native speaker to have English as part of their identity and their belief/value system.

Students can acquire skills at a certain level but without supporting beliefs that the acquisition of such skills is worthwhile, says Murphey, these skills or behaviors—which, in this writer’s opinion can be successfully used in non-EAL settings as well—will most likely not be well developed and generalized to out-of-class contexts. Ueno (1993) reports on a project that is experimenting with a variety of NS/NNS team-teaching frameworks to provide general guidelines for oral English. Her study was limited to a restricted English curriculum (i.e. required coursework is English as subject study, and elective “Eikaiwa” as English for media of communication) which is commonly found at university in Japan (Brady, 1995). Brumby and Wada (1990) and Smith (1988) have also explored the beneficial effects of NS and NNS working together, where they are equally responsible for instruction and learning outcomes.

Ueno, in particular, found that students responded positively to a team-teaching framework. She found that in the beginning stages of the collaborative course, students were more attached to their “role model” NNS teachers, but as they became more linguistically proficient, grew more attached to their NS teachers, in part, she suggests, as a result of students’ desires to have more target language exposure.

Ueno also concludes in her study that regular consultation between the NS and NNS partner was of great benefit: more reflection on lessons taught, NNS can rely on NS authentic input to upgrade their English, and NS can rely on insights of NNS to better understand students. Most importantly, she feels, was the opportunity to create interpersonal relationships between the two types of teachers (i.e. friendship and trust) which is an essential factor for any successful teamwork. Students, says Ueno, have diverse learning attitudes. The results of collaborative EAL communicative-based teaching indicate, however, that positive attitudes to (language) learning are reinforced and enhanced in this framework.

Kershaw (1996) also comments on the distinctive benefits of NS and NNS teachers working together, and in general agrees with Medgyes in specific terms (i.e. NNS has greater conscious knowl-

edge of language rules and language learner behavior, NS has greater knowledge of language in use in target language settings, etc.). He says that it is much more important to know where students are coming from in the earlier stages of learning (i.e. in this case, high school), than where they are or should be headed (i.e. specialty-area subject study or future job), and it is here where the NNS teacher has the advantage. It is, however, not a question, as posed by Medyges, of who's worth more? Rather, the issue is what is each teacher worth? In the opinion of Kershaw, continued ignorance of the respective roles of native speaker and non-native speaker is perilous to say the least.

As Kachru has reminded us, NS no longer "own" English. As Murphey strongly suggests, it is possible for NNS to have English as part of their identity. Research is going forward in the area of collaborative English language teaching; for example, the British Council, (1995) *English 2,000 Global Consultation*. The influence of NS with regard to ESL, EFL, or EAL teaching will continue to decline. Kershaw reminds us also that ELT can advance towards more informed and judicious use of *ALL* human resources as there continues to be an evolution in NNS and NS attitudes towards sharing professional territory. It is incumbent upon language teachers, both NS and NNS, to find innovative ways in which they can connect their experiences and expertise to enhance the overall educational development of Japanese university students. This collaboration and sharing of territory can serve as a model, and as an impetus, for the important and necessary collaboration of language and subject matter faculty.

#### B. CLT: teacher and student attitudes, needs, and expectations.

How do teachers see their roles as language teachers? How do students view their language teachers, with regard to the NS/NNS and "Japanese" teacher vs. "non-Japanese or foreign" teacher distinction? In a review of the literature concerning attitudes and motivation, Shimizu (1995) makes reference to a number of studies (i.e. Gardner and Lambert, 1972, Cooper and Fishman, 1977, Berwick and Ross, 1989, and Widdows and Voller, 1991) which, together, she says, "have yielded valuable

information for assessing students' attitudes toward the study of English" (p. 6). Suzuki, however, is equally interested in how students see their foreign and Japanese language teachers as people and in performing their professional responsibilities. From a survey of over 1,000 students from a variety of colleges and universities in Japan, she concludes that students have very different perceptions and expectations of NS and NNS teachers.

Her survey found that most students felt English classes taught by Japanese were "gloomy, boring, dead, strict, serious, and at times tedious" (Shimizu, 1995, p. 6). On the other hand, most students found English classes taught by foreigners to be "interesting, humorous, and energetic..they felt relaxed in class and their impressions of their foreign teachers were that they were kind and easy to get along with" (Shimizu, p. 6). In response to the kinds of qualities that teachers should show in their teaching, Shimizu reports that a trend emerged suggesting that students' perceptions of NS and NNS teachers were dissimilar.

In Shimizu's view, the most interesting and surprising result of her extensive survey was the negative responses of English classes taught by Japanese by students, strongly implying that overall, students do not enjoy their NNS-taught classes. She says that one explanation for this situation *may be* the nature of the subjects that NNS teachers teach, subjects that students indicated they were *least interested in studying*. A second possible explanation might be, she says, attributable to the way in which NNS teach English. Widdows and Voller (1991) concluded from their survey that students have a strongly negative evaluation of the status quo where teachers continue using traditional teaching methods such as grammar-translation.

The issue at hand is not so much which generalized (and perhaps stereotyped as well!) teacher "group" teaches better or commands a more positive image from students. Of more importance to the central arguments in this paper is the fact that NS and NNS teachers are believed to be very different in a number of areas and with regard to a number of instructional domains. Obviously not every NS class is (perceived as being) interesting or entertaining, or every NNS class (as being) boring or serious. There are other factors as, for example, experience, educational philosophy, and instructional flexibility

ty, that impact on the manner in which teachers teach. The critical point is that students may have very different expectations generally of their NS and NNS teachers, and that these expectations *may impact negatively* on their overall attitudes to studying and learning (thru) English or any other additional language. Much more research is necessary in this area, which it is not within the scope of this paper to explore in greater detail.

*If it is true* that students can be affected by how they think and feel about subjects and the people who teach those subjects within the foreign or additional language education domain, how much more might they and their learning be affected by perceiving (if indeed they do) differences between language and subject matter study and learning? This is an area in which the writer is deeply interested, and an area which, in the words of others, “cries out for further research.” A whole range of issues comes to mind with regard to the *possible* prejudice students (and faculty too!) may feel towards language learning vis-à-vis subject matter learning at university (Brady, 1995). We need to critically re-examine all of our attitudes towards university study. In particular, those faculty and administrators who are concerned with re-connecting language and subject matter study and research at university, should find out why language as subject is more important or respected than language as media of learning? If this situation is true—and the writer believes it is—what are the implications for effecting any possible collaboration between (1) language as subject and language as media of learning on the one hand, and (2) language study and subject matter study and research on the other hand?

It may be that students have formed attitudes about CLT based on how their teachers, and/or the institutions in which they teach, portray the roles of NS and NNS language teachers. There is a noticeable and continuing territorial imperative observable in most areas of ELT since the Meiji era. One area consists of “foreigners (i.e. target or additional language speaking)” who teach English conversation and (can) develop students communicative skills, while “native speakers (i.e. Japanese and Japanese speaking)” teach more weighty and serious subjects involving the study and research of grammar, literature, linguistics, or philosophy (Brady, 1995).

Thompson (1996) reminds us that there may be some serious misconceptions regarding CLT. He cites four in particular: (1) CLT means *not* teaching grammar, (2) CLT means studying only listening/speaking, (3) CLT means pairwork as defined in western terms, which often means role playing, and (4) CLT means expecting too much from teachers (i.e. teachers must be more flexible and their teaching *should* be less structured).

CLT, as it has been defined and employed in English language teaching since Canale and Swain (1980) is by no means the final answer says Thompson. In his words, “we need to keep concern with the world *beyond* (my italics) the classroom, a concern with learners as individuals, a view of language as patterned and structured to carry out functions to perform” (Thompson, 1996). NS and NNS *can and should work together* to redefine CLT in an EAL setting, an approach that will be of benefit to students, NS teachers (for whom traditional CLT was established) NNS, and by extension institutions where these people come together. This redefinition will demand a rethinking of the roles of NS and NNS teachers on the one hand, and the roles of language and language learning on the other hand.

C. Japanese universities in transition: language learning objectives, the design of appropriate curricula, and some implications for EAL course/program development.

Innovation is a change in the way of doing things. Numerous opportunities exist at university-level for thoughtful research and experientially-driven innovations (Gorsuch, Hinkelman, McLean, Oda, and Robson, 1995). In the opinion of Oda (1995, above), “schools spend *too much time* (my italics) wrestling with curricula formats (i.e. once/week or twice/week class, naming of courses, etc.), when they should be reviewing the content of courses and the necessity of coursework”.

What are the actual needs of university students with regard to English language (EAL) study? In a survey of student needs, Oda found a number of aims as felt by students themselves *other than the ability to speak the language* (my italics). Students strongly felt they needed English in order to do the following: (1) take future courses conducted in English at university, (2) integrate their study of gram-

mar into other courses where, for example, reading would not be a separate subject, (3) write more proficiently in English—and here they felt a preference for NS instruction—and (4) study abroad (Oda, 1995). With regard to pedagogy, Oda found that many universities continue to disregard the Monbusho's stated support for more learner-centered teaching and teaching methods. He found, for example, that schools, for the most part, continue to conduct classes in an authoritarian manner, where the teacher's knowledge of English is valued more than his or her teaching competency or language in use proficiency.

Two other findings are of particular interest here. One is that integrating classes with study abroad preparation motivated junior college and vocational students to study more English and make more connections with subject matter study on their own, both before and after their overseas study. The second finding was that a cooperative and collaborative faculty environment allowed for (more) focused objectives in ELT, and *permitted across the curriculum integration* (my italics).

It is a fact that the Monbusho (Ministry of Education) has abolished *all* general education requirements; universities are now free to set their own general education standards and policies (Wadden, 1994). Wadden goes on to offer four possible outcomes ranging from no change to very radical change (Wadden, 1994). The challenge for universities, whether language department-oriented or not, is to innovate and give students more choice in the kind and content of EAL courses. This could result in a downsizing of English language teaching staff, or a situation where English moves into particular departments according to Wadden. In the latter situation there will, he says, be a premium placed on EAL/ELT faculty with additional academic backgrounds, and where the emphasis will shift from language as subject study to language as media of learning study (i.e. ESP, EAP).

For any innovation to be successful, universities must listen more to students and take cognizance of *their needs*. As long ago as 1983 there was widespread concern that students must be more actively involved in course planning and even management in ELT (Littlejohn, 1983). If there is to be any serious connection between language and subject matter study, such concern must also apply

to non-ELT/EAL learning as well. This is no easy matter to resolve, much less discuss. Learner involvement in the planning and management of coursework at any level of education in Japan, even at university where learning is no longer necessarily exam-driven to the extent it is in earlier years, is a controversial issue. However, as Horio (1995) reminds us, we in Japan are at a stage where education must serve the peoples' needs as much as, if not more than, the State's needs. Students and faculty at universities have needs and expectations with regard to the what and how of their learning and research. It is imperative that any course or program of study take account of all such needs and expectations. Two questions to consider are the following:

- (1) What attitudinal factors, both of faculty (language and non-language, Japanese and foreign) and students impact on the study and research of EAL and Japanese language subject matter study and research at university?
- (2) In what ways can or should teaching and research territory be shared between NS and NNS EAL faculty, EAL and subject matter faculty, and full-time and part-time faculty at university? What possible redefinitions—with regard to roles and responsibilities—will be necessary to effect such collaboration and cooperation?

The final part of this paper will now focus on describing an EAL course and program of study that attempts to innovate in the direction of greater cooperation and collaboration between all faculty, and faculty and students.

#### PART IV. Description of on-going EAL course of study, and related program developments in KGU (Kwansei Gakuin University) Sociology Department.

##### A. Establishment and restructuring of required English course: 1989 – 1996

"There are two-folded goals for English Otsu I and II. One is to improve listening which has not been trained so far for most students who graduated the regular high schools in Japan. . . . .

The other is to improve writing. But this writing gives a different implication to 'so-called' native teachers and "Japanese" teachers. This is a sort of

big problem in this course, especially coordinating English Otsu I and II. For Japanese teachers, writing means either translation of Japanese in(to) English or writing a thematic/thesis writing in well-organized style. There tend to be no process between sentence writing to the whole/free composition. Japanese teachers tend to neglect the process" (Nakanishi, 1993 — personal communication).

I have quoted the late Professor Nakanishi—he was the initiator of restructuring of English language curricula in the Sociology Dept. of Kwansei Gakuin University—at length for two reasons. First, I wish to illustrate his awareness of, and concern for the difference between process and content. Second, I want to point out that the basic goals of the present first-year required Eigo Hyogen (English Expression) course—the name was changed from Otsu in 1995–96—as he interpreted them, were (1) to make a distinction, but more importantly, a connection between process and content, and (2) to develop students' basic proficiency in listening and in writing.

Restructuring of English language curricula within the Sociology Department was motivated in order to upgrade the general language in use ability of the department's students, and to innovate language education within both the department and the university. Professor Nakanishi realized that without collaboration between Japanese and non-Japanese language faculty on the one hand, and full-time and part-time language faculty on the other, there could be no effective restructuring. Thus, he proposed, and the department accepted, in 1990, a restructuring of one of the two required General education English courses, which effectively redefined territorial imperative, and made it possible for required EAL study to become a media of learning in addition to a subject (Brady, 1995).

The primary aim of the Otsu course, and I quote, "is to help students gain confidence in coping with English as more than just a course of study. Listening skills' training and the development of basic writing skills (i.e. listing, taking notes, filling in forms, etc.) are emphasized. Since the language ability of the almost 600 students varies greatly it was no easy task to choose text materials that would satisfy Otsu course goals. After much discussion it was decided to start students out with a relatively easy text, and aim for more sophisticated

four skills' proficiency as the course progressed" (Brady, 1991).

Concerning evaluation of students' progress in the course, Brady (1991) comments that, ". . . . . (it) is an important part of our program, as it should be. We have adopted structured but flexible guidelines that take into account results on uniform tests, class attendance and participation, and outside work" (p. 35). As regards collaboration and coordination of instruction and on-going curricula planning, Brady (p. 36) reports that, "within the sociology department it has been traditional that language classes need not be coordinated; in other words, instructors have been given the freedom and license to teach their classes in whatever way(s) they individually believed would satisfy the very general course description. Matters of testing and evaluation, as well as course materials and teaching procedures, were left to the individual, who was trusted to do the best job possible.

This thinking has changed with the start of the integrated and coordinated Otsu course this year. Teachers still are trusted to implement course goals as they see fit. They are still trusted to use the teaching approaches that they believe best achieve results leading to greater learning. They are still trusted to be a primary motivating force for students to acquire the foreign language and improve their basic proficiency. However, (my italics) *they are now being asked to work together, and delegate some of their authority to a central planning committee which actively seeks their feedback on all matters of instruction and implementation*" (Brady, 1991, p. 36).

The "planning committee" that Brady refers to above was actually two individuals, Professor Nakanishi, and Alan Brady, who acted as co-coordinators. Nakanishi was basically responsible for liaison work with Japanese teachers, while Brady was basically responsible for liaison with native speaker teachers. On all other matters affecting the course they consulted one another. Predictably, coming from two very different backgrounds in education and teaching experience, they often disagreed on means of implementing course goals, especially in the earliest stages of the restructuring. However, there was a basic trust between them that transcended their differences, which at times were quite marked. One year after restructuring had been effected, another full-time faculty member was hired



to assist them in their coordination work. Unfortunately, like many responsibilities people assume in Japan, the responsibilities of faculty were never explicitly spelled out. With the tragic and untimely death of Prof. Nakanishi in 1994, it is now imperative that the responsibilities of all full-time faculty teaching in the renamed Eigo Hyogen course be made more explicit.

The Otsu (now Eigo Hyogen) course recognizes the increased importance of part-time faculty and their roles and responsibilities. This has not been without controversy for a couple of reasons. First, as mentioned before, part-time faculty have traditionally been left free to teach and evaluate as they please, so long as they follow very general course descriptions. Traditionally, they can choose whatever instructional materials they deem necessary individually, and, for the most part are not necessarily accountable to other teachers, even in the same course, for content of instruction, pacing and/or planning of instruction, student evaluation and testing, or in-class requirements such as attendance.

Secondly, part-time teachers are not expected to define and/or interpret course goals in specific terms as part of an overall team effort. Course planning and setting of objectives is the providence of full-time faculty, who are primarily or exclusively responsible for writing up the course description, choosing texts for a group of teachers—if teachers agree to use one text—and other matters which might require any degree of consultation and consensus. Since part-time faculty are usually full-time at other universities, their primary responsibility is to give instruction (i.e. be in class and teach students). They are *not expected to do more than teach and give final grades* (my italics).

In the Eigo Hyogen course fully 80% of classes are taught by part-time faculty, who because of differing schedules, have little if any occasion to have contact with one another or even with the full-time faculty who instruct the remaining 20% of classes. In the absence of more full-time faculty teaching in the program—and the Ministry of Education has recommended that the part-time to full-time ratio of instruction be narrowed at university—, any course which is set up on a uniform basis, as is the case with Eigo Hyogen, *must have* (my italics) a certain degree of coordination that goes beyond

simply scheduling teachers for classes and choosing texts or making up exams.

In the first full year of the restructured course (1991) where eleven people were attempting to work together as a team, Brady (1991) reported that, “with so many different people and different backgrounds, it is natural that there are some very different ways of approaching the Otsu course goals. Some people feel that students should immediately be exposed to very natural and authentic aural (listening) input, and required to begin producing academic style writing. Others prefer a more graded approach, which emphasizes building on what students already are familiar with, and (which) gradually leads them into uncharted learning styles and learning material” (Brady, 1991, p. 34).

But whatever differences there were or still are in approach and/or implementation of goals, the fact remains, as Brady stated in 1991, that “within the framework of the university and the Ministry of Education’s constant calls for improved English education, we are striving to DEFINE a program of study (my italics) *in English that will satisfy the needs of our students and our department*” (pp. 34–35).

Allow me to refer to the words of one of the course’s long-term part-time instructors, Hal Scott. Mr. Scott has taught extensively in Japan and elsewhere. Prior to joining KGU in 1991 he had had years of teaching experience at university, and in programs where he was required to work as a team member. He offers the following as *his* perspective of the program.

“With the year 1996, the Sociology Department’s English Hyogen Program for first year students at Kwansei Gakuin University, approaches its sixth year. Looking back on how far the program has come, very few of us could say that we have not enjoyed a number of successes. A rather difficult goal to attain given the parameters of an academic institution, accentuated with new teachers joining the program every year, changing cultural expectations in the real world, and the fairly traditional predictability of many Japanese EFL students in their approach to communicative competence in English.

Since the start, the program has actually progressed through two stages. In the first stage in 1991 classes were increased from once a week to twice a week with students meeting once a week

each with a Japanese teacher and with a non-Japanese teacher. In addition to this, both teachers shared the same (one) uniform text, teaching different parts that were agreed on before the beginning of the term. Each teacher supplemented their classes with their own individual listening, speaking, and writing materials. The students were given a uniform final exam that was weighted as fifty percent of their final score (grade), while the other fifty percent was based on the student's class performance in each of his/her respective teacher's classes. Final exam questions and textbook choices were ultimately decided by the principle coordinators.

The second stage began in 1994 when a more comprehensive approach to the goals and objectives was taken to further the development of an English language skills' / content curriculum. Listening and speaking skills for communicative competence are selected, based on tasks or situations of interest/needs to both teachers and students for communicating about themselves in the real world. Also, a clearer definition of team teaching (took place) where the roles of the Japanese and non-Japanese instructors were more clearly defined. The final examination is now made up of questions submitted by all the instructors involved in the program. In addition, a student feedback questionnaire has been developed and several committees have been formed to continue the dialogue among the instructors, and to maintain the state of self-examination and progress for the program.

A newly formed in house Feedback Committee has designed a Student Feedback Questionnaire asking for student opinions on the course material, class management, and the student's expectations of the course and teacher(s). In addition to this, a learner training component has been adopted for course orientation at the beginning of the term (note: for this aspect of the program, it was agreed that Japanese teachers, using Japanese when and where necessary, were best qualified). Using a questionnaire, students answer questions which give them an introspective/self-diagnosis profile on setting their learning/studying goals for the term.

The Curriculum Committee has brought about a closer exchange of ideas between instructors on such important matters as text selection, supplementary materials, and class management. This past academic year (1995-96), core texts were

chosen for the two groups of instructors. Though all of the chosen texts overlap one another in listening based skills, the Japanese instructors' texts focus on micro-listening such as (1) discriminative listening, (2) reduced and elided forms of speech, and (3) the rhythm and stressed-timed nature (as opposed to syllable-timed in Japanese) of English speech. The non-Japanese instructors' classes, on the other hand focus more on extensive listening such as getting the gist, understanding intent, and predictive listening. Whereas the Japanese classes concentrate more on writing development, the non-Japanese classes concentrate more on speaking responses to listening and aural input.

The program now is at the stage of fine tuning its progressive changes, looking more closely for a balanced syllabus design of task-based practice with notions and functions vis-a-vis structures and situations that focus on classroom dialogue within the context of real life value systems. Always under discussion is the team teaching concept and which aspects of the program can best be conveyed in class by Japanese and non-Japanese instructors. A program that has been brought about by the hard work and consensus of all. . . which continues to evolve so long as all the instructors agree that we continually need to sharpen our perspective on what we can *reasonably* (my italics) hope to accomplish" (Scott, 1996).

Collaboration crucially relies on active coordination. In the third year of the program (Spring, 1994), it was reported that, "coordination has been strengthened within the Otsu program with the establishment of more strict guidelines on classroom procedures and course guidelines, including materials and tasks to focus on. Specifically, we have now defined Otsu I as primarily a listening skills' development course with additional emphasis on free writing (i.e. getting thoughts on paper without judgements), and opening up in English in class in pair and small group activities" (Brady, 1993). The coordinators agreed that consensus and discussion had to be coordinated for any forward progress to take place. Starting in spring of 1994, there was closer contact between part-time and full-time faculty, and more planned meetings to discuss course objectives.

It was, and still is, no secret that there were differences of opinion among the people in the pro-

gram on the specifics of implementation of course and class goals, and that not everyone was completely satisfied with every decision taken as a group. However, Japanese and non-Japanese teachers had the opportunity to talk about shared classes and the program as a whole in an open forum, *and this aspect of the program became systematic.*

In 1994 also, a summer overseas study program at Stanford University<sup>2)</sup> was initiated—again Prof. Nakanishi was the main architect—which combined language and subject matter study (i.e. sociology). As reported by Brady (1993), “the groundwork—recruitment, coordination, planning meetings, student seminars and orientation—began in the latter part of fall, 1993.” Like the Otsu course, the concept of collaboration and coordination was the foundation for the success of the overseas academic study program at Stanford as well.

One other point needs to be made about collaboration and coordination. In 1994, a new elective course entitled Eigo Hyogen Enshu (i.e. English Expression Seminar) was initiated. This course was established “to satisfy the need within the department for those students who wish to broaden their education in English and improve their ability to participate in argumentative and debate-type classroom interaction” (Brady, 1993).

Prof. Nakanishi in particular had recognized, as far back as 1988 when he and a number of other KGU faculty undertook research on English education at various universities including Keio and International Christian University, the value and importance of team-work, and in particular, the necessity of faculty, both part-time and full-time, working together on coordinated objectives. This is the case with Eigo Hyogen and with the unofficial Stanford program. As regards Eigo Hyogen Enshu, which is now *shared* by three full-time faculty in the department, it is a natural extension of Eigo Hyogen (not only in sameness of name!). The seminar class attempts to develop higher level communication skills that build upon study and learning in the required Eigo Hyogen course.

Since 1991 the (Eigo Hyogen) project's aims have been to both consolidate and extend initial restructuring, with the (ultimate) aim of developing a unique KGU and sociology English skills-content curriculum that would meet the needs of students, faculty, and the larger KG academic community

(Brady, 1994). Brady goes on to report officially, on behalf of all people in the program, that, “. . . the project began to investigate (1) a more comprehensive definition of program goals and objectives, (2) a clearer working definition of faculty collaboration and team teaching, (3) the incorporation of in-house instructional materials into a text-based syllabus, and (4) learner (i.e. student) feedback and responsiveness to a program aiming to involve them more in overall content development and course management.” (Brady, 1993, pp. 17–18). I refer you to the official SOKEN journal report of 1994 for much more information concerning coordination and collaboration.

In the latest official report on the program, as concerns team teaching, coordination, and collaboration, Brady (1995) comments, “the English-language program (s) within Sociology depend primarily on part-time teacher dedication and giving of time and energy. . . . A very small percentage of language classes in Sociology are taught by full-timers compared to the number taught by part-timers. It is also important to keep in mind that part-timers at KGU or anywhere else have numerous commitments that complicate their efforts at being more fully involved in decision making. . . . such as uniform adoption of texts, and uniform adoption of curricula and evaluative guidelines. Research is going on within the program . . . . to find the most acceptable and workable *balance* (my italics) between part-time and full-time involvement in teaching.”

The report concludes that, “great strides were made last year (1995–96), particularly in the fall term, to understanding the need for that balance of commitment” (Brady, 1995).

B. From task-based skills' development to content-based application: a sampling of five collaborative components of the Eigo Hyogen course.

Since spring of 1995, all faculty in the program have agreed on certain guidelines pertaining to: (1) roles of Japanese and non-Japanese instructors, (2) selection of text and other instructional materials, (3) evaluation and grading guidelines, and (4) the incorporation of more content-based learning in the program, particularly in the second semester. Eigo Hyogen is a two semester course for all first-year

students in the Sociology Department. I will now describe some of the above collaborative efforts. I wish to point out, however, that these and other components of the course are continually evolving, and that there is, as yet, no finality to any of the areas listed below.

#### (1) General course and class guidelines

The following are the presently agreed upon guidelines in the course applicable to all:

A. Maximal use of English as the medium of communication, but use of the native (i.e. Japanese) language especially in earlier stages of the course, where and when necessary (i.e. explanation of learner training component of program, nuances of listening strategies or tactics, etc.)

B. Primary focus on development of student's listening development. (J) teachers are to primarily, but not exclusively help students develop basic writing abilities, particularly in response to listening. (N) teachers are to primarily, but not exclusively help students develop speaking abilities, especially in response to listening and in-class management.

C. Clear guidance to students about uniform course-wide attendance and evaluation/grading policies (i.e. more than three unexcused absences per term results in automatic failure). See APPENDIX A.

D. Focus on (1) skills' development (particularly listening), and (2) confidence-building—what Murphey (1995) calls becoming English hungry—in spring term. Focus more on content-based study and learning in fall term.

E. Regarding listening training, (J) teachers to focus primarily on “micro- (i.e. intensive) listening”, and (N) teachers to focus on “macro- (i.e. extensive) listening”, particularly in spring term.

F. Learner feedback and autonomous learning development as an important part of the process and content of the course, especially in spring term.

G. Uniform criteria for class grading (which accounts for 50% of the final grade). Individual teachers can weigh criteria as they see fit along the agreed-upon guidelines. See APPENDIX B.

#### (2) Evaluation, testing, and grading.

As mentioned before, the basic split in grading is a 50-50 split between the CLASS GRADE, and the UNIFORM FINAL EXAMINATION GRADE. This split has been agreed to since the inception of the program, although it was a 40-60 split in favor

of class grading criteria until 1992. The student's classroom performance/achievement and effort (including doing outside work), and his/her ability to pass a comprehensive listening test, weigh equally in determining the final grade. There were and, in the writer's opinion, still remain two very important reasons to have a split of this kind. First, we want(ed) to ensure that students were evaluated in terms of how they were perceived by their individual instructors (i.e. class grade), and how they performed on agreed to course-wide listening skills. Second, we want(ed) to ensure both objectivity and subjectivity in grading.

Whereas the class grade is determined in large part by the individual instructor's evaluation of students (i.e. participation, effort, homework assignments, motivation, etc.), the final exam is completely objective in the sense that it is a machine-graded exam, and all students have an equal chance of performing well on it. This is especially true if the test satisfactorily reflects across-the-board instruction in all classes, and is composed of questions and question types that all students are familiar with. In the first four years of the course (1991-94), the full-time faculty took exclusive responsibility for constructing the test items according to how they perceived instruction to be uniformly effected. As a result, the final exam did not and could not completely reflect actual uniform instruction and assessment of achievement, no matter how well the coordinators intuited the uniform nature of class teaching in the program. There was, until 1994, little if any discussion among all teachers about the actual construct of the final exam, and what in specifics it should test.

This situation changed in spring of 1995, partly as a result of the change in a number of part-time faculty teaching in the program. It was agreed that there must be much more involvement of all teachers in the planning, construction, and administration of the final exam, if it were to reflect actual uniformity and consensus, and be a fairer yardstick of evaluation. From spring 1995, everyone in the program has contributed actual test items along guidelines (i.e. content and test-type) provided by the full-time faculty. A more effective division of labour was set up whereby the full-time faculty designated particular (text) content areas, and delegated responsibility to individual teachers as to

input to be used, and methodology of testing (i.e. type of question and how to instruct students to answer). There was much more time given over to feedback and revision before the final draft was submitted to the administration for printing.

Test construction has always been problematic in a program of this sort where collaboration is an important element of team work, and where there are, inevitably, areas of some disagreement over what should be tested and how. The process involves a number of steps:

1. designation of what is to be tested and how,
2. delegation of responsibility (i.e. who does what)
3. setting of strict deadlines for submission of test item drafts,
4. on-going contact with administration office, especially at point where/when final draft is to be submitted for printing,
5. gathering together/re-recording of all input (listening) material, and recording of live input (i.e. instructions to students)
6. orientation of proctors—usually four or five people—before actual administration of the exam, and coordination with administration office concerning logistical support.

The uniform final examination is given to all first-year students, and is now entirely pre-recorded to ensure more uniformity and fairness. The test itself tests only material and question-types that are in the texts we consensually use. When and if we can agree on non-text items/areas to be tested on a machine-graded basis, we will no longer have to rely entirely on text input for evaluating listening proficiency. It is a fact, however, that without some form of uniform testing, it is very possible that students could be tested and evaluated—in terms of their skill building and achievement—in very different ways. There is also the added possibility that final grades, no longer dependent on uniform guidelines and uniformly utilized materials in class, could or would be widely variable. Unofficial statistics on final grading in the last two years, compared to the first two years, show that final grades between, for example, the five (N) teachers and the six (J) teachers, and between, the (J) group and (N) group teachers are more stable and much less variable. even allowing for individual class and student differences.

(3) Curriculum development and use of materials.

From the start of the course in 1991 until 1994, a principle was established whereby all teachers in the course should use the one same text. The (N) and (J) teachers would consensually decide which units or lessons they would, as a group, cover from the text in class. This would convey to students that we were all working together and had agreed on the in-class core teaching material. Furthermore, by using one text and using material and question types from that one text, we could more easily construct a uniform final exam, which was another principle of the course.

For the first four years of the program, the main or core text material that we all used as a group was the basis of our working together. As mentioned before, the full-time faculty constructed the final exam based on material from that one text. Additional questions were added that tested general listening proficiency. The input, and the listening strategies that evolved from that non-core text input material was not studied by any students. Thus, the final exam was a combined achievement/proficiency exam. Attempts were made at the beginning of each term to inform all teachers of the potential material and question-types that would appear on the final exam. It was hoped that all teachers would then use supplementary listening material and tasks in class that would help prepare students for these non-core text questions.

The results were mixed to say the least. On the one hand, we could, test overall listening skills' improvement by employing material not used by any teachers in class, which combined with achievement listening assessment, might give us a more complete picture of how our students were progressing. On the other hand, there was no way to guarantee that, (1) students were prepared for non-core text listening questions, or (2) had not in fact encountered the material and/or question-types either in class or outside (i.e. in another class, or on their own).

Having more clearly defined the instructional territory and responsibilities for each group of teachers, (J) and (N) in spring and fall of 1994, we were then able to be more flexible in our choice of materials. We decided, from spring 1995, to use four different texts during the course of the year. Each group of teachers, NS (N) and NNS (J) would use two

texts each. The texts were chosen with certain guidelines in mind:

1. they would all focus on listening and writing skill development,
2. the two (J) texts would concentrate more on micro or intensive listening; the (N) texts would focus more on macro or extensive listening,
3. the (J) texts would give students more opportunities to develop basic writing skills; the (N) texts would give students more opportunities to respond orally,
4. one text each would be more suitable to employ in the earlier stages of the course (i.e. spring) ; the other could be used more in fall term,
5. all four texts would have to be appropriate for high beginners to pre-intermediate or intermediate EFL levels of proficiency,
6. in spring, each core text or texts would be used more than in fall; in other words, teachers could focus more on non-text material and activities (i.e. project work) in fall,
7. teachers were free to employ other materials in both spring and fall; in spring, such "supplementary" material would be more skills' based, whereas in fall, it could be much more content-based.

To ensure continuity and connectedness in the course, we agreed to use uniform core materials across the program. To ensure individuality and teacher-learner autonomy, we agreed to use supplementary skill-building listening material in spring, and more varied content and task-based instructional material in fall. We are at present still debating which materials and texts are most appropriate for our students. We are still debating the kind of balance we need between text and non-text instruction on the one hand, and skills and content instruction on the other hand, in both spring and fall terms.

With regard to our choice of materials, our object is to engage our students, maintain some degree of uniformity for testing and grading purposes, and to understand why we use the materials that we do for sound pedagogic and academic reasons. Until we are much more clear, *as a group*, on what we must accomplish more concretely in terms of our influencing the learning outcomes, there will

inevitably continue to be some dissatisfaction with any materials that we choose. But after four years of experimenting with numerous texts, of varied proficiency levels, we have now reached a point where we can choose our materials with uniform learning objectives in mind. It is incumbent upon us all now to carry that clarity even farther ahead.

- (4) The importance of learner feedback and learner training.

"We need to find better ways of exploring the relationship between our students' professed beliefs and their willingness to adopt effective learning behaviors" (Keim, Furuya, Doye, and Carlson, 1996). The concerns above-mentioned by our colleagues at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, are ours as well. We are, first and foremost, interested in meeting our students' needs concerning communicative English study. We are interested in more closely matching what we do and expect as teachers, and what they expect and (can) do as learners. Since 1993 we have employed questionnaires that have given us feedback on how students feel about their study and learning, and what we as teachers (attempt to) do in class to meet their expectations.

Language in media of learning study is not an object, but a discovery process to enlarge personal and interpersonal communication awareness and sensitivity, so as to encourage people to open up to each other. Our efforts at discovering our students' beliefs and expectations concerning their study in English, and our attempts to analyze the results of our surveys, have been far from 100% reliable. We do, however, have extensive data from students over a period of 3-4 years, which gives us some idea of how we are performing in our duties and responsibilities as teachers of communicative language learning. We have had numerous discussion in committee about the form and content of our student feedback questionnaires. In fact, if you look at our 1993 questionnaire, and the one we constructed in 1995, you may not notice much resemblance.

We are clearly in need of more focus and direction in this area of our course. Drawing upon a survey such as the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) developed by Horwitz (1987) as our colleagues at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies have done, can help us more clearly gauge the thinking of our students, and hopefully make our instruction more serving of their personal

and academic needs. This is certainly the goal.

A few words about the learner training component of our course. This was begun in spring, 1995, mostly to help us guide students into more effective learning behaviors that would be of benefit to them in their classroom and out-of-class study of language as communication and media of learning. In this area too we are evolving.

Since this aspect of study-training must come at the early stages of the course, we have asked our (J) teachers to take primary, but not exclusive, responsibility for carrying it through initially. Two reasons are obvious: much of the training is conducted in the native (i.e. Japanese) language, and research shows that students identify more with their Japanese teachers at earlier stages of the course. Additionally, since it is with their non-Japanese instructors that students are more likely to have cross-cultural misunderstandings—especially at the earliest stages of the course—the (J) teacher serves as a kind of counselor and advisor thru this training.

The sub-components of learner training as presently defined include: (1) elements of a “good” class, (2) cooperative and group learning, and (3) journal writing as “writing to learn” I refer you to the appendices for a more detailed explanation of one model that we can voluntarily employ in the course. At present learner training as observed in this model, is not a mandatory aspect of our instruction. In fact, even for those (J) teachers who employ it as part of their spring instruction, usage and methods of implementation vary. See APPENDIX C.

(5) Outside class learning and learning strategies.

All teachers in the Eigo Hyogen course realize the importance of (students doing) outside class work. In fact, many of us are very clear in announcing to our students at the outset of the course that it may be very difficult to pass without applying oneself outside class. There are any number of ways at looking at so-called homework. First, it includes reviewing material and study from the previous class. Second, “homework” includes preparation for the next class. Thirdly, with respect to both review and preparation, homework is also the amount of time and effort one utilizes in review and preparation, and the ability to demonstrate that overall effort to others.

Despite what we as teachers feel, concerning

the amount of time students should utilize in review and preparation, students have their own ideas about such matters. It is a fact that students do much more, and are obligated to do much more, socially and academically, at university and outside school, than study (thru) English. As with most things in life, balance is the key. We want to help ensure that students succeed in the Eigo Hyogen course. They cannot succeed unless they take time to do outside work. On the other hand, research has shown that students do not necessarily value doing outside activities or assignments in the same way we as teachers do in assigning them (Pickard, 1996, p. 157).

Earlier it was mentioned that, in general, the Eigo Hyogen teachers as a group, have agreed not to assign time-consuming outside work unrelated to text study in the spring term (i.e. project work). Although we expect students to review and prepare for their classes as a natural part of their connected learning, we want them to voluntarily do as much as possible outside class with English, aside from their required text study. This includes (strongly) suggesting that they take time at home to listen to material they have already heard in class. This “voluntary” outside study also includes suggesting to them ways in which they can become “English hungry” and satisfy that hunger (i.e. watch news in English, read easier to understand English language materials, etc.).

Outside class work constitutes one important criteria for the student’s class grade, which, as mentioned earlier, is 50% of their overall final grade. Like many aspects of the Eigo Hyogen course, the nature and amount of outside work assigned by us to students is negotiable to a certain extent. Teachers and students have similar and very dissimilar agendas when it comes to study of any kind. The crucial factor is to *connect* with students, and convince them that the outside work we assign is *for their benefit, not ours alone*. As students become more familiar with our teaching methods, and as they become more proficient in their use of English in the second term, we begin to employ more outside class and outside text project work. See APPENDIX D for two examples.

## PART V. Concluding remarks.

This paper has argued for the necessity of innovative policy-making, coherent and concrete planning, and utilitarian implementation of goals and objectives with regard to English language education at university. Furthermore, it is argued, that without collaboration between Japanese and non-Japanese language faculty or between language and subject matter faculty, such policy-making and planning cannot effectively take place. Attitudes about language study and learning may be directly connected to how language courses are established. Furthermore, continued segmentation of (1) education and research, (2) language as subject matter study and language as media of learning study, and (3) general education language study and specialty area study does not benefit the future of university in Japan.

Universities serve the needs of people and the larger society. Specifically, they serve the needs of students who come to learn and faculty who come to teach and research. Without any concerted effort to gauge the actual and practical needs of students and the society in which they will live, policy-making and planning of any sort is little more than guesswork.

In a short article in *ELT Journal*, Widdowson (1996), talks about the conflict between autonomy and authenticity that language teachers may have in the performance of their professional duties. He says, “the authenticity idea gives primacy to the goal of learning. . . . the autonomy idea gives primacy to the process of learning” (p. 67). He concludes by asking whether we can have a pedagogy based on both autonomy and authenticity at the same time, and wonders if there might be some way to reconcile the two (p. 68).

This paper has referred to a number of other seemingly irreconcilable contradictions among which are: (1) language as object and language as process, (2) CLT as the providence of NS teachers and serious language study as the providence of NNS, and (3) Japanese as the sole media of learning and English (or any other “foreign” language) as separate subject matter study. We need to look at our assumptions about education, and language education in particular, if we are to meet the chal-

lenges ahead. We can no longer afford to unquestionably accept present definitions of NS vs. NNS, CLT, bilingual education, academic vs. practical, EFL or ESL, or general vs. specialty education study.

The central question that this paper addresses is the following: what is the role and responsibility of English as an additional language, and as a supporting media of learning, at university in Japan. Other questions come to mind related to this concern. First, should there be more attention paid to general language use and awareness for academic—as well as personal—communication skills in an undergraduate curriculum? Second, what is the function of an additional language (i.e. English) in a social sciences curriculum? Thirdly, what kinds of teaching does/can an EAL course or program offer social science students (i.e. sociology)? Lastly, and perhaps most controversially, how far do faculty think subject disciplines should share responsibility (and vice-versa) for raising communicative competence or awareness in a social science curriculum?

At the 1996 World Congress of Applied Linguistics in Finland, Widdowson argued for defining objectives for language courses of study in Japan. With reference to the broadly-based communicative aspects of language learning, he noted that communication has to do with appropriateness. Which group of speakers or users of English do Japanese wish to identify with in their communication in international settings? Toward which norm or norms are Japanese and Japanese educational institutions striving? Horio (1995) says bluntly that the Japanese educational system, including university study, has not met people’s needs to function as independent citizens in a democratic society. If this is true, let us hope that universities can soon begin to make a difference in this regard.

I close this paper with an extended quote from a teacher in Japan who has taught English for twenty years. He asks whether schools have failed their students and concludes that they have, and that time is, in his words, “running out” (Okano, 1996). He says, and I quote, “I work at a public high school in Osaka and have taught English for more than twenty years. Since I started my career I have felt some frustration and have kept asking myself and fellow teachers about several grave shortcomings in the basic philosophy of teaching and learn-



ing English in this country. When I attended a seminar for Japanese teachers of English two years ago, I was shocked by a recent study on the English Scholastic Aptitude of Japanese students. Out of 162 countries, Japan came in 149th. In addition to this, Japan ranks bottom among its Eastern and South-Eastern Asian brethren. When considered in a future perspective, it seems an even more ominous sign, one which indicates Japan's economic downturn in an era where (my italics) *academic competence is more closely connected with economic prowess than ever before.*" (Okano, 2/1996, p. 12)

Okano goes on to list some of the shortcomings: cultural insulation, the "buck stops nowhere" mentality, the "how-I-look syndrome, and escape from freedom" (Okano, p. 12). He concludes by saying, "after struggling for more than twenty years, I have become increasingly disgusted by this reality. However, I cannot afford the luxury of giving up and waging war to try and change the system. We are faced with a choice between life and death because the wealth-creating engine in the 21st century is definitely shifting away from production assets, such as factories and property, to the interchanges and synergism of heterogeneous intellectual human resources equipped with creative knowledge. Needless to say, it will be the quality of education that will guarantee nurturing these creative resources" (Okano, 1996, p. 13). What role will the university play in this progress?

#### NOTES

- 1) NS refers to a "native speaker" of English as a second or foreign language. NNS refers to a "non-native speaker." The terms are misleading. Native speaker can also mean a person who speaks the native language (i.e. in Japan it is Japanese). Non-native speaker can also mean a person who, in the context of Japan, does not speak Japanese. The terms are also problematical in that they differentiate in the extreme between the two types of speakers.
- 2) The Stanford overseas summer program is a 3-4 week joint English language communication and sociology subject matter (i.e. social issues) course administered thru the Linguistics Dept. at Stanford. It is important to note, that as of this writing, the program is voluntary and unofficial, and that students and faculty who participate in it do not receive official KGU credit. Students do, however, receive three undergraduate credits from Stanford.

#### REFERENCES

- Barkhuizen and Gough. Language curriculum development in South Africa: what place for English? *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 30/3, 1996.
- Brady, A. A short history concerning the sociology department English program. In *SOKEN Journal*. 1991.
- Brady, A. Sociological implications of teaching academic EFL at university in Japan. *Kwansei Gakuin Annual Studies*. Vol. VLIV, 1995.
- Brady, A. Official sociology English project reports for SOKEN. 1993 and 1994.
- Brumby, S. and Wada. *Team teaching*. Longman. 1990.
- Burnaby, S. and Sun, Y. Chinese teachers' views of western language teaching: context informs paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 23/2, 1989.
- Campbell, P. Using content-based courses and activities for student success at university. *Language Teacher*. Vol. 2, 1996.
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 1/1, 1980.
- Chutisilp, P. A sociolinguistic study of an additional language: English in Thailand. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. University of Illinois at Urbana.
- Ellis, G. How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*. Vol. 50/3, 1996.
- Ellis, G. The appropriateness of the communicative approach in Vietnam: an interview study in intercultural communication. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Faculty of Education, La Trobe University, Melbourne.
- Ferris and Tagg, T. Academic oral communication needs of EAP learners: what subject matter instructors actually require. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 30/1, 1996.
- Ferris and Tagg, T. Academic listening/speaking tasks for ESL students: problems, suggestions, and implications. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 30/2, 1996.
- Gaffield-Vile, N. Content-based second language instruction at the tertiary level. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 50/2, 1996.
- Gika, S. Foreign in English language teaching: meaning, role and appropriateness. *IATEFL Newsletter*. Vol. 130, 1996.
- Gorsuch, Hinkelman, McLean, Oda, and Robson. Edges of change: Japanese colleges and universities. *Language Teacher*. Vol. 3, 1995.
- Horio, T. *Educational thought and ideology in modern Japan: state authority and intellectual freedom*. Platzer, S (Ed. and translator). Tokyo University Press. 1995.
- Johns, A. M. English for specific purposes (ESP): its history and contributions. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. 1991.
- Kachru, B. *World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources*. CILT, The British Council. Cambridge University Press. 1992.
- Kachru, B. Past imperfect: the other side of English in Asia. Presentation at KOBE JALT monthly meeting. Oct.,

- 1996.
- Kaur, K. Why they need English in Malaysia: a survey. *World Englishes*. Vol. 14/2, 1995.
- Kay, G. S. Informal expectations of foreign teachers in Japanese universities. *Language Teacher*. Vol. 18:11, 1994.
- Keim, B, Furuya, R, Doye, C, and Carlson, A. A survey of the attitudes and beliefs of Japanese university students about foreign language learning. *JACET Journal*. Vol. 1996.
- Kerr, C. Incorporating E-mail and the internet into a course: extending out of class learning via E-mail and the internet. *Unpublished paper*. Nov. 1996.
- Kershaw, G. Developing roles of NS and NNS teachers. *Modern English Teacher*. Vol. 5/3, 1996.
- Littlejohn. Increasing learner involvement in course management. *TESOL Quarterly*. Dec. 1983.
- Long, M. H. and Crookes, G. Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 26, 1992.
- Lowenberg, P. English as an additional language in Indonesia. *World Englishes*. Vol. 10/2, 1991.
- Medgyes, P. The non-native teacher. *English Language Teaching*. 1994.
- Medgyes, P. Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal*. Vol. 46/4, 1992.
- Olshtain, E. Language policy and the classroom teacher. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.) *Issues and research in TESOL*. Newbury House.
- Okano, Y. Twenty years of frustration. In *Kansai Time Out*. Feb. 1996.
- Oxford, R. Progress in tertiary content-based ESL instruction. *TESOL Canada Journal*. Vol. 11, 1993.
- Pierce, B. N. Toward a pedagogy of possibility in the teaching of English internationally: people's English in South Africa. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 23, 1989.
- Phillipson, R. and Skutnabb-Kangas. English only worldwide or English ecology? *TESOL Quarterly* Vol. 30/3, 1996.
- Phillipson, R. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press. 1992.
- Pickard, N. Out-of-class language learning strategies. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 50/2, 1996.
- Pousada, Puerto Rico: on the horns of a language planning dilemma. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30/3, 1996.
- Prodromou, L. Cross-cultural factors in language learning. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 46/1, 1992.
- Resnick, M. ESL and language planning in Puerto Rican education. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 27, 1993.
- Ross, S. Content-based instruction in a foreign language: the influence of individual difference factors on success. *Unpublished paper*, Nov. 1996.
- Rost, M. Staying up to date: sharing teacher resources. *Language Teacher*. Vol. 8, 1992.
- Shimizu, K. A survey of Japanese college student attitudes. *Language Teacher*. Oct. 1995.
- Shinohara, Y. A group video presentation project for learner training. *Unpublished paper*. Feb. 1996.
- Smith, L. *Readings in English as an international language* Oxford: Pergamon Press. 1983.
- Smith, R. Team-teaching in perspective. *Language Teacher*. Vol. 19/3, 1994.
- Snow, Met, and Genesee. A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/ foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 23/2, 1989.
- Stanislaw, J. Japanese and English: borrowing and contact. *World Englishes*. Vol. 6, 1987.
- Stapleton, P. The role of Confucianism in Japanese education. *Language Teacher*. Vol. 19/4, 1995.
- Teemant, A. Bernhardt, T. and Rodriguez-Munoz. Collaborating with content-area teachers: what we need to share. *TESOL Journal*. Summer, 1996.
- Thompson, G. Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 46/3, 1992.
- Ueno, Y. Team-teaching oral English at the university level: a preliminary survey. *Language Teacher*. 1993.
- Wadden, P. College curricula: forecast for the late nineties. *Language Teacher*. Vol. 18, 1995.
- Warie, P. Some aspects of code-mixing in Thailand. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*. Vol. 7, 1977.
- Widdowson, H. Authenticity and Autonomy in ELT. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 50/1, 1996.

## ABSTRACT

There are economic and social demands being placed upon Japan to integrate itself into a wider community of nations. Such integration crucially depends on the use of English as a media of communication and learning. The continued acceptance and practice of isolating communicative foreign/English language teaching and research from native language (Japanese) academic study bodes ill for the further development of the university in Japan.

**Key Words** : language policy, integration, university curricula

EIGO HYOGEN A/B & C/D COURSE-WIDE GUIDELINES SPRING 1996

1. STUDENT ATTENDANCE

- a. If you are absent, UNEXCUSED, three or more times during the term you will automatically fail.
- b. If you come to class more than 45 minutes late after the official start time, you will be marked ABSENT.
- c. If you come to class 15+ minutes late (after the official start time) 2X, that will equal ONE ABSENCE.
- d. If you regularly show up late and/or NOT READY or PREPARED (no text, no notebook, no HW, etc.), you will be MARKED DOWN.

The ONLY EXCUSED absences are the following (all with proof):

- 1. serious illness or accident
- 2. serious personal/family problem
- 3. mandatory (1 MUST) attendance at funeral/wedding, etc.
- 4. hospitalization

You WILL NOT be excused for any club activities or similar reasons.

2. FINAL GRADE/EVALUATION

- a. Your final grade will be a 50%/50% split between your CLASS GRADE, and the UNIFORM FINAL EXAMINATION.
- b. The CLASS GRADE will be determined by your individual instructor(s) according to the following criteria:
  - 1. Attendance and readiness/preparation to study
  - 2. Class participation (note-taking, pairwork, asking Q, etc.)
  - 3. Outside work (HW): effort and meeting deadlines
  - 4. Results of in-class tests/quizzes
  - 5. Attitude to study/willingness and effort at improvement
  - 6. Final project or report (if necessary)

Your individual instructor(s) will tell you in more specific detail HOW they will evaluate you during the term in the above areas.

- c. The FINAL EXAMINATION will be a course-wide uniform test, primarily testing listening and aural/visual comprehension related to your text study. You will be given details during the term on how you can best prepare for and successfully pass this test.

3. STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. to attend each and every class, and be there ON TIME!
- b. to be attentive and active in class at all times.
- c. to be prepared to study: doing HW assignments ON TIME, bringing required texts and other materials, etc.
- d. ACTIVE LISTENING (your teacher(s) will explain in more detail)
- e. to make every effort to improve your listening, writing, and speaking abilities in English; to ask for help and not wait for the teacher to ask you if you need help.
- f. to ask Q in class if you do not understand something (HW assignment, instructions, etc.).
- g. to listen to fellow students carefully and attentively, and to work with other students on learning tasks in class/outside class
- h. to listen to text material on your own outside class where & when necessary; to use the LIBRARY and improve your reading ability in English.

4. INSTRUCTOR RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. to explain carefully and sensitively all course and class requirements in English wherever/whenever possible
- b. to explain carefully and clearly all evaluative criteria
- c. to help students with skill-building, particularly listening
- d. to caution students when they are not meeting up to their responsibilities
- e. to use English for all important class management and teaching activities; to provide maximum FL aural input in class
- f. to suggest ways in which students can maximize FL study outside class
- g. to provide students with a clear explanation (hand-out if necessary) on term work, assignments, grading, etc.
- h. to help students understand cross-cultural behavior in the class; in particular the JAPANESE teacher can help students better understand NON-JAPANESE behavior. Both Japanese and Non-Japanese are to assist students in cross-cultural learning, but the Non-Japanese teacher is more responsible for creating a cross-cultural class environment.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

EIGO HYOGEN is a general skills improvement course in communication, with particular emphasis on listening. As the course progresses, you will be required to do more and more speaking and writing. Your teachers will assist you whenever and wherever possible but it is your responsibility to succeed and pass this course. The course is for your benefit, and we value your response to it. Your teachers cannot make this course interesting or successful unless you actively participate. If there is anything troubling you about your study in EIGO HYOGEN, please ask us for help.

2. STUDY MATERIALS

Textbooks

You will use 4 texts this year interchangeably. In your Japanese teacher class you will use HERE & THERE, and IN THE REAL WORLD. In your native speaker teacher class you will use YOUR LIFE IN YOUR HANDS and AMAZING. Your teacher will explain how you and they will use the texts.

Notebook

You are required to have and bring to every class and EIGO HYOGEN notebook. Your Japanese teacher may require you to keep a journal or diary in English as well. He/she will explain.

Dictionary

In addition to the 4 texts (your teachers will tell you which texts to bring to class and when), you must also have and use in class and outside class an English - English dictionary. Any quality dictionary will do, including a second-hand LONGMAN DICTIONARY OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH, which you can purchase or borrow from an upperclassman. Your teacher(s) will explain in more detail.

3. STUDENT ATTENDANCE

If you regularly and continually show up late and/or NOT ready or NOT prepared (no text, not notebook, no HW, etc.), you will be marked down. You are allowed to be absent no more than THREE TIMES for each class; otherwise you will not pass. The ONLY reasons you are allowed to be absent are the following (all with proof):

- (1) Serious illness or accident.
- (2) Serious personal / family problem.
- (3) Mandatory (1 MU(ST) attendance at funeral.
- (4) Hospitalization.

YOU WILL NOT BE EXCUSED FOR ANY club activities or similar reasons.

4. FINAL GRADE/EVALUATION

a. Your final grade will be a 50-50 split between your CLASS GRADE and the UNIFORM FINAL EXAM GRADE.

b. The CLASS GRADE will be determined by your individual instructor(s) according to the following:

- (1) Attendance and readiness / preparation to study.
- (2) Class Participation (note-taking, pair-work, asking questions, using English with other students).
- (3) Outside class work (HW): effort and meeting deadlines.
- (4) Results of in-class tests/quizzes.
- (5) Attitude to study/willingness and effort at improvement.
- (6) Project work or report (if required).

Your teacher(s) will tell you specifically HOW they will evaluate you in the above areas.

c. The FINAL EXAM will test listening and aural/visual understanding related to text study. Your teachers will give you more details during the term on how to prepare for and successfully pass this test.

TEXTBOOK:

- 1. *In the Real World*
- 2. *Here and There*

ASSIGNMENTS:

1. PROJECT I REPORTING YOUR FAVORITE MUSIC

You are individually required to submit a report, writing (a paper) and talking (an audio tape) about your favorite music by the end of October, 1995.

2. PROJECT 2 GROUP PRESENTATION (VIDEO)

In a group of 4, you will be involved to create a video tape report, introducing one of the places of your choice on KG campus or around it. By the end of October, each group should be prepared to :

- a) give the name of a place you are going to report, and
- b) submit an outline of your video report.

In each class session starting November, one group presents a report. On the day of your presentation, each group is also required to prepare a mini-quiz to check the audience's understanding and submit the written version of your oral report.

If none of your group members has personal access to a video recorder, you can check one out at the Sociology Dept. Office. Detailed information will be given later.

3. OTHERS REGULAR HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION:

- 1. In the fall semester, you may not miss more than 3 classes (instead of 2) in order to pass the course. Rules for lateness will be negotiated in each class in the first session of the semester.
- 2. You are required to participate in and outside of class activities in a cooperative way and use English in class. Those who cannot maintain collegiate atmosphere will be dismissed by the instructor and marked absent.
- 3. Those who do not have sufficient materials for class will be penalized.
- 4. No late HW papers will be accepted except for those for Project I and II. In the case of project papers, 10 points per week will be automatically reduced for late submission. Please arrange to have them submitted in one way or another.

GRADING:

50 % - final exam (500 points)

The schedule for the final exam will be announced as soon as possible.

50% - class grade (500 points)

15% - attendance & participation

10 pts X 14 sessions + 10 bonus for no absence = 150 pts

10% - Project I: Reporting your favorite music

writing (60 pts) + audio tape (40 pts) = 100 pts

10% - Project II: Video Report

outline (5pts) + video (60 pts) +

quiz (5 pts) + written report (30 pts) = 100 pts

5% - presentation comprehension check quiz

5 pts X 9 presentations + 5 bonus points = 50 pts

10% - quizzes, mini tests, HW assignments = 100 pts

500 pts

CLASS GUIDELINES & DESCRIPTION

I. GRADING

Your CLASS GRADE will be decided as follows:

- A. ATTENDANCE (30 points). 0-6 points for today's first class + 0-2 points for each of remaining 12 classes. Points given depending on time you come to class, readiness to study, having necessary materials (notebook, texts, HW), and attentiveness.
- B. PARTICIPATION (40 points). 0-4 points for today + 1-3 points for each of remaining 12 classes. Points given depending on taking notes, actively participating in pair or group work, trying to use English as much as possible, asking questions when necessary.
- C. OUTSIDE CLASS ASSIGNMENTS (HW) (40 points). You will have up to 10 homework assignments this term. Each one will be graded 1-4 points depending on the following:
  - a. Overall effort and completeness
  - b. Neatness
  - c. Whether the HW was turned in on time or not.

Sometimes the HW will have more than one part. BE SURE TO CHECK ABOUT WHAT YOU MUST DO BEFORE YOU LEAVE CLASS. Also, if you were absent the previous week you are still responsible for doing the HW. You will be marked down not having done the HW.

- D. QUIZZES and TESTS (30 points). You will have anywhere from 2-5 quizzes or tests this term (i.e. if 2 then 2 X 15 points each, if 5 then 6 points each). You will be quizzed on text study (YLIYH & AMAZING), as well as in class study (vocabulary, use of English, announcements, supplementary listening, etc.).

- E. ATTITUDE/STUDY BEHAVIOR (10 points). This will be a combination of what you think and what I think AT THE END OF THE TERM about your overall EFFORT and willingness to study in this class.

II. CLASS REQUIREMENTS

- A. EIGO HYOGEN NOTEBOOK. You are expected to take notes about vocabulary, grammar, listening and communication points, and content from class. I will check notebooks (unannounced) at least two times this term.
- B. ALL REQUIRED MATERIALS. This includes the text or texts, and any other materials that I assign you to bring to class.
- C. POSITIVE EFFORT TO USE ENGLISH. Everyone has a personal ability and attitude about English study and I will not compare your ability or attitude with another's. However, this is a required course and as time goes along I expect you to use more and more English in speaking and to improve your writing ability (your Japanese teacher will help you also in this regard).

III. AN EXAMPLE OF OUR TYPICAL CLASS (with some variation of course).

- 1. Greetings and warm-up. In the first part of the term I do not expect you to speak much (just saying hello or how are you is enough), but later on (from week 5 onwards) I expect you to make some simple conversation with me and with each other at the beginning of the class. I will teach you possible things you can say.
- 2. Announcements. I may have one or more announcements in class about the course, Stanford program, Sociology or KG, or a personal announcement. I will also give you a chance to make announcements (clubs, personal information, etc.)
- 3. YLIYH & AMAZING Study.
- 4. SHORT BREAK (2-3 minutes)
- 5. AMAZING study.
- 5. Supplementary listening/writing/speaking. This will consist of songs, games/puzzles, pair activities and the like. I will make connections with YLIYH, AMAZING and sociology study when possible.

YLIYH: Book # 1, Unit 8 + ALL of BOOK # 2  
AMAZING: Unit 9 (finish), Units 10, 7, 6 and (if time available) # 8.

GOAL SETTING

Student ID No. ( ) Name ( ) Spring 1996

WHAT DO YOU HOPE TO LEARN IN THIS COURSE?

Read the following and choose five statements that describe your expectations of Eigo Hyogen A (in a Japanese instructor class) and B (in a native speaker instructor class). Put them in the order of the importance for you. You can use the choices twice if necessary.

In this course I hope to:

- 1. Understand the grammar
- 2. Improve my pronunciation in English.
- 3. Learn more vocabulary
- 4. learn to write English fluently and correctly
- 5. Be able to read magazines, novels and literature in English.
- 6. Be able to understand TV programs and movies in English.
- 7. Learn how to understand native speakers when **they** talk to me.
- 8. Know how native speaker teachers speak natural English
- 9. Know how Japanese teachers speak English.
- 10. Be able to ask questions and ask for help in English without hesitation
- 11. Be able to give a speech in front of my classmates
- 12. Be able to communicate in English with my friends from other countries
- 13. Learn about various approaches to effective listening
- 14. Know more about strategies (hints) for communication in English
- 15. Know more about cultures in English speaking countries.
- 16. Know more about strategies (hints) for effective language learning
- 17. Communicate with my teachers at the university
- 18. Other: ( )

In Eigo Hyogen A (a Japanese instructor class)

- My first important goal is ( )
- My second important goal is ( )
- My third important goal is ( )
- My fourth important goal is ( )
- My fifth important goal is ( )

In Eigo Hyogen B (a native speaker instructor class)

- My first important goal is ( )
- My second important goal is ( )
- My third important goal is ( )
- My fourth important goal is ( )
- My fifth important goal is ( )

MY GOALS IN THE SPRING SEMESTER

EGO HYOGENis a course to help you improve your skills and get information for communicating in English, with particular emphasis on listening skills. No formal focus is put on reading skills, but you are required to read all of the materials to fulfill the course requirements whenever needed.

Now what particular skills do you expect to improve in this semester and how? The following is a list of the detailed objectives of this course in the spring semester. How will you be able to perform them in English at the end of this semester? Please rank each item on a scale of 1 to 4, and circle the appropriate number that shows your expectation.

- 4: I will be able to perform with maximum confidence.
- 3: I will be able to perform with considerable confidence.
- 2: I will be able to perform with some confidence.
- 1: I will be able to perform with minimal confidence.

[LISTENING] At the end of this semester,

1. I will be able to use approaches for listening on different levels (such as listening for gist, and listening for details).4321
2. I will be able to use varieties of strategies for listening (such as choosing what to listen to, guessing meaning from context, using already known information, etc.)4321
3. I will be able to make appropriate responses to what I hear.4321
4. I will become familiar with natural English speech.4321
5. I will be able to recognize the sound system in English (how words are reduced, cut, blended together and stressed).4321
6. Others4321

[SPEAKING] At the end of this semester,

7. I will be able to ask questions and ask for help in English in class and outside of the class without hesitation.4321
8. I will be able to express my ideas in English without being afraid of making mistakes.4321
9. I will be able to make efforts to interact with my instructor and my classmates, trying to use any possible strategies and resources to understand them and make myself understood.4321
10. I will be able to apply the sound system in English (which is different from that of Japanese) to my speaking.4321
11. I will be able to give a speech in English in front of my classmates.4321
12. Others4321

[WRITING] At the end of this semester,

13. I will be able to write in English according to the rhetorical framework in English writing (introduction - body - conclusion)4321
14. I will be able to effectively draw my readers' attention and guide them to the conclusion in my writing.4321
15. I will be able to use appropriate transitional expressions for successful paragraph development.4321
16. Others4321

ANY COMMENTS?



MY GOALS IN THE FALL SEMESTER (OTSU II A)

English OTSU II is a course to help you more improve your skills and get information for communicating in English. In OTSU I, listening skills were strongly focused. In OTSU II, moreover, it is planned that other interrelated communication skills, speaking and writing, will be also emphasized. No formal focus is put on reading skills, but you are required to read all of the materials to fulfill the course requirements whenever needed.

Now what particular skills do you expect to improve in this semester and how? The following is a list of the detailed objectives of English OTSU II in the fall semester. How will you be able to perform them in English at the end of this semester? Please rank each item on a scale of 1 to 4, and circle the appropriate number that shows your expectation.

- 4: I will be able to perform with maximum confidence
- 3: I will be able to perform with considerable confidence
- 2: I will be able to perform with some confidence
- 1: I will be able to perform with minimal confidence

[LISTENING] At the end of this semester,

1. I will be able to use approaches for listening on different levels (such as listening for gist, and listening for details).4321
2. I will be able to use varieties of strategies for listening (such as choosing what to listen to, guessing meaning from context, using already known information, etc.)4321
3. I will be able to make appropriate responses to what I hear.4321
4. I will become familiar with natural English speech.4321
5. I will be able to recognize the sound system in English (how words are reduced, cut, blended together and stressed).4321
6. Others4321

1

[SPEAKING] At the end of this semester,

7. I will be able to ask questions and ask for help in English in class and outside of the class without hesitation.4321
8. I will be able to express my ideas in English without being afraid of making mistakes.4321
9. I will be able to make efforts to interact with my instructor and my classmates, trying to use any possible strategies and resources to understand them and make myself understood.4321
10. I will be able to apply the sound system in English (which is different from that of Japanese) to my speaking.4321
11. I will be able to give a speech in English in front of my classmates.4321
12. Others4321

[WRITING] At the end of this semester,

13. I will be able to write in English according to the rhetorical framework in English writing (introduction - body - conclusion)4321
14. I will be able to effectively draw my readers' attention and guide them to the conclusion in my writing.4321
15. I will be able to use appropriate transitional expressions for successful paragraph development.4321
16. Others4321
- ANY COMMENTS?

2

## PROJECT 2

### GROUP PROJECT: REPORTING A SPOT ON (OR AROUND) CAMPUS

Your group project in the fall semester is to create a video report in English, introducing a spot on campus or around the campus.

I. In a group of 4, you will be involved to create a video tape report, introducing one of your favorite places on campus or near the campus. For example, a building, a club room, a store, a garden, an eating place, a coffee shop, a restaurant, a street, etc.

II. Take the following steps.

#### 1. GROUP TOPIC AND OUTLINE (end of October)

By the end of October, each group should be prepared to: a) give the name of a particular place you are going to report, and b) submit the outline of your video report.

#### 2. VIDEO TAPE

Cooperatively (= every group member should contribute to complete the project) make a video report.

- 1) Start with the direction guide with a brief map which shows how to get there from the KG main gate.
- 2) Then show and talk about some particular aspects of the place. Interview someone in English, if possible.
- 3) The report should be no longer than 8 minutes.
- 4) In the video, you should of course speak only in English. Try to talk to your audience. Do not read your script.
- 5) In each class session starting November, one group presents a video report.

## 3. MINI QUIZ

1) After showing the video tape, you are required to give a class a mini quiz with 5 questions (multiple choice or fill-in-the blank) in order to check your classmates' understanding. Do not forget to submit the correct answer sheet to the instructor.

2) It is each group's responsibility to prepare the copies of the quiz for all of the class members, grade them, and calculate the average point.

3) The result of the quiz will be a part of the presenters' group grade (the average of the class points) and the listeners' class participation grades.

## 4. WRITTEN REPORT

On the day of your presentation, you are also required to submit the written report based on your tape script. On the cover page of your written report, put all the names of your group members. Late submission of the written report will result in minus 10 points per week.

## III. Criteria for Success

This project weights 10% (100 points) of your final grade. The same group grade will be given to all the members in your group. The points will be allotted as follows:

1. Topic and Outline (5 points)
2. Video Report (60 points) teacher's assessment (30 pts)  
peer and self assessment (30 pts)

- 1) Is the presentation loud and clear enough?(5 pts)
- 2) Is it interesting? (5 pts)
- 3) Is it informative? (5 pts)
- 4) Is it well-prepared and organized? (5 pts)
- 5) Is the length appropriate? (5 pts)
- 6) Do you see the members' cooperation? (5 pts)

3. Mini Quiz (5 points)

4. Written Report (30 points) assessed by the instructor

- 1) Is it addressing the task? (5 pts)
- 2) Is it well organized and developed? (5 pts)
- 3) Appropriate details to introduce the place? (5 pts)
- 4) The use of language (word choice) (5 pts)
- 5) Grammar (5 pts)
- 6) Spelling and Punctuation (5 pts)

If none of your group members have personal access to a video recorder, you can borrow one at the Sociology Department Office. The procedures to check it out shall be announced later.

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a preliminary working report of a project to incorporate E-Mail and internet into the Eigo Hyogen course. The course is a general requirement English course for first year students in the Sociology Department at Kwansei Gakuin University.

The project aims to increase the out of class learning strategies available to the students as well giving the students the opportunity to practically apply their second language by using English instructions whilst in the process of learning and skill acquisition of the internet and E-Mail systems. Furthermore the project should provide further support for the English program within the department as it will be incorporating useful, perhaps even necessary and required, technical skills to all of the students within the department.

Out of class learning strategies have captured interest amongst researchers and teachers as positive ways in which learners can effectively extend their skill and understanding of a language. Naimen et al. (1975) and Rubin (1975) both identify strategies which associate good language learners as those who involve activities outside of the classroom within their language learning strategies. The strategies mentioned encompassed out of class reading and writing. Bialystock (1981) research of strategies contributing to second language proficiency found that functional practice employing out of class strategies aided improved performance on all tasks accomplished by the subjects.

This project aims to provide students with vehicles, the internet and E-mail, that they will employ to extend their out of class learning strategies, provide them with a practical activities for using English and allow them to apply their English language in order to extend their and learn skills. The project will take place over two semesters: the first semester being dedicated to assimilating the students with the

INCORPORATING E-MAIL AND THE INTERNET INTO A  
COURSE  
  
EXTENDING OUT OF CLASS LEARNING  
VIA E-MAIL AND THE INTERNET

SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT  
KWANSEI GAKUIN UNIVERSITY

CHRIS KERR

machines and techniques required to complete tasks and in the second semester the completion of assignments and projects using the the medium.

THE SITUATION

Eigo Hyogen is a required course for all first year students with in the department. It is taught by six native speakers and six Japanese speakers of English and the syllabus is consistent within each group of speakers classes. The native speakers and Japanese speakers each have two texts with which to work and set units are decided to be covered by all teachers within each group. Flexibility for each teacher to personally tailor his or her classes is still retained within the defined curriculum. All classes are taught in English and each class has two lessons per week, one with a native speaker and one with a Japanese speaker. The emphasis is on oral communication and especially the listening component.

The students English language skills vary considerably especially during the first semester as they may elect to take a test and if successful continue their studies at the language center in the second semester. As Japan has been relatively late compared to the developed countries in embracing computers in the work place and the education environment most of the students have never had practical experience with the use of a computer. Some of the students may have used an "wordpro" which is the Japanese equivalent of an enhanced electric typewriter. The Ministry of Education has so far virtually limited the use of computers in any extensive form in secondary schools to "technical or vocational" high schools. The number of students who have used the net or an E-Mail system in any form before entering the Sociology Department of Kwansei Gakuin University is insignificant in terms of the percentage who have previous knowledge or experience with the medium.

The university has its own server and DTN (Desk Top Network) and extensive computing facilities. The DTN supports an in-house Japanese language based net through which students may send e-mail within the university, access information about courses and send assignments electronically. The DTN is explained to students as part of their orientation program and each student receives a DTN number. Several hundred terminals are positioned throughout the campus, both in rooms within departments and in the library. All of these terminals support a Unix based

"Pine" English e-mail program for use outside of the university and carry unsupported www internet access software.

Considering that students receive no training or explanations, pertaining to the "Pine" e-mail or the www internet at the time of orientation, enhances the opportunities for using this medium as an outside extension of the English course. Another positive contributing factor is that the Japanese explanations that are available for the "Pine" e-mail system tend to presume that the user has prior computer knowledge and has had some practical experience with computers. The combination of these factors has allowed us to incorporate the use of English instructions for the computer illiterate novice as another learning tool.

As this is a pilot project and the teachers who are participating have differing levels of technical skill, the project has been divided into self contained units or assignments rather than one elongated process. This division allows for more flexibility in the interim whilst individual teachers gain the skills and expertise necessary to instruct and regulate the process in areas outside of their current domains. One of the aims within the process is to allow for teacher assimilation with all areas that might be adopted into the curriculum whilst the the pilot project is being undertaken.

THE PROCESS

The concept of this being an out of class learning strategies bears strongly on the way and manner that each unit or assignment is introduced.

REASONS TO INTRODUCE THE USE OF THIS MEDIUM WITHIN THE COURSE

Technology across the curriculum - introduce the students to computing skills at an early stage of their tertiary education, which will probably be necessary for them to have in their future work environments. Increase the vehicles that students have to make practical use of their English. This aspect assumes that students will be provided with the names of E-mail groups that the students may contact. It is

- Students must subscribe to a newsgroup and forward a piece of mail they receive from the list with their comments / opinions about use of such a service.
- Communicate with students from another university - preferably from another.

PROBLEMS / SOLUTIONS / EXPLANATIONS

Using the subject to identify the student /class/assignment. Problems faced by not using this system. How to use & benefits.

Bulk mailing to students / Separating assignments and other mail by using different accounts.

Non-users in the class. Assistance - training / training procedures / assignment outlines with procedures.

Communicate with students from another university - preferably from another - making contacts by using the NETEACH-L listserv. Moderation - not possible warning / Keeping private information private warning.

Listserv etiquette / teaching etiquette / commands / subscribing / unsubscribing / posting information / list address & subscription address differences.

also assumed that a certain percentage of the students will be curious enough to roam around and "surf" the net where the majority of information posted is in English.  
By introducing the computing facilities at K.G. early in the first semester it should allow teachers to more easily demand that any written reports to be submitted will have to be typed in the second semester.  
As other upper year level classes and seminars at K.G. are already requiring the use of the internet and E-Mail within the class syllabus the early introduction of this at the first year level should allow even a more advanced and diversified use of this medium within those classes in the coming years.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF INTRODUCTION

Semester 1 - Students will be provided with instructions in English of how to register for an E-Mail address and be given an optional assignment which will carry a set number of bonus points to be added to their total grade. Teachers E-mail addresses will also be provided. The assignment should be simple and may only require students to send a short greeting, an opinion about the video or one of the characters. Students would also be required to print the E-Mail that they sent and to submit it so that the teacher would be able to verify if it was or wasn't received.

Semester 2 - There are a number of options as to what the assignment could be depending upon the outcome of the first semester. It should probably be compulsory be could be designed to from part of the grade of another assignment. Some examples of the possibilities are listed below:-

- Students must communicate with a student within Kangaku by E-Mail and send both pieces of correspondence by E-Mail to their teacher.
- Students must communicate with a student outside of Kangaku by E-Mail and send both pieces of correspondence by E-Mail to their teacher.
- Students must communicate with a group outside of Kangaku by E-Mail and send both pieces of correspondence by E-Mail to their teacher. (Group names and addresses will be provided)
- Students must send a class assignment by E-Mail to their teacher rather than submitting it by paper.
- Students may opt to send a class assignment by E-Mail to their teacher rather than submitting it by paper and therefore collect a set number of points for using the medium. e.g. If the assignment is not submitted by E-Mail then a certain number or % of the points for that assignment will not be allocated.
- Students must check the net and make a short comment or summary about a topic, Web site or home page that they found interesting by E-Mail to their teacher. (The correspondence should of course include the location and name of the Web site)
- Students must submit their journals by email.
- Students must subscribe to a mailing list and forward a piece of mail they receive from the list with their comments / opinions about the list.