

What is English language education doing in Sociology revisited (2002):*

continued ambivalence and indifference to necessary second order non-cosmetic
changes: a way forward

Alan BRADY**

I. Introduction: sociological higher educational probing.

Meighan and Siraj-Blatchford (1998) describe some of the perspectives used by sociologists as they attempt to analyze human conduct. Their definition of perspective is, “a frame of reference, a series of working rules by which a person is able to make sense of complex and puzzling phenomena” (p.239). They remind us that this phenomena is social life. In adopting one or another stance towards social life, in this case the life of an English language higher education or ELHE provision at a particular university within a particular department at that university, there are six assumptions that ground any analysis:

1. A view of humankind, i.e. an idea about what distinguishes humans from other species,
2. A view of society, i.e. the structural features which emerge, develop, persist and change as a result of people acting in concert with others,
3. A view of the interrelationship(s) between (a) society and the individual,
4. A view as to what should be considered crucial properties, the basic factors, which condition human conduct and experience in a social order,
5. A view of what it is “to know” the properties of those aspects of (the particular) social life under investigation,
6. A view of the interrelationship between ‘academic’ explanations of social life and the formulation of policies that can be used to direct the everyday affairs of members of (a particular) society.

(1998: 239)

The specific interpretation that is adopted by any working sociologist thus influences (1) what is seen to be problematic about any particular topic, and (2) the kind of explanation(s) that may emerge from such investigations to explain why it is or may be a problem, and what could be done to make it less of a problem.

*Key words: second order change(s), CLIGAL, excellence in creativity

**Professor, Sociology Faculty, Kwansei Gakuin University

Lindblom (1990: 4) states that:

A social problem arises only when people look at a state of affairs in a particular way: specifically, with a desire for its improvement. . . . Much problem solving (also) takes the form not of altering any state of affairs but of altering people's perceptions and evaluations.

Lindblom goes on to argue that some people believe that social problem solving differs from problem solving in the usual sense of the words *problem* and *solving*. Social problem solving, he argues, can be likened to a process of “resolving conflicts among groups, each of which already knows its preferred solutions” (p.5). Seen as conflict resolution then, social problem solving does not require knowledge; rather, it requires that some causes, interests, or groups prevail over others in a kind of contest for power. Each stubborn or competing group knows what serves its own interests, or holds to an ideology that is more a faith, belief, or value, than a structure of knowledge or information and analysis.

Lindblom maintains that half-hidden conflicts proliferate, and that there exist numerous social problems that defy adequate solutions until such time as “people reconsider the positions they have taken and consequently alter them” (p.6). He also argues that problem solving becomes a process of bringing inquiry and knowledge to bear so as to alter positions and dispositions that will open up possibilities for solutions later on. Lindblom sees problem solving as unending inquiry, that, “at best will not look very scientific in the conventional sense” (p.7). A more appropriate term for this process might be called “probing” he argues since “probing” focuses on persistence and depth of investigation, the uncertainty of result, and quite possibly surprise.

Lindblom also remarks that,

The questioning of scientific problem solving does not call for a return to ideological thinking on the part of those, if any exist, who have shed it. To be sure, many social scientists . . . have fallen into believing that decision makers can approach problems in only one of two ways: either technically, as means to ends, or with all the rigidities, obfuscations, and imprecisions of ideology. But a third option is available: selective and varied probing of both means and ends, as well as of other values. (1990: 11)

Lindblom concludes that the importance of probing is in the possibility that a person—or organization—can change to a degree, that some betterment can be achieved, or that some problems can be ameliorated (p.14).

II. The particular probing context of this study: revisiting (a particular) university's developments from 1989 to 2015

Kwansei Gakuin University and its Sociology Department have stood still for too long a time regarding second order reform of English language higher education (ELHE) curriculum. There have been truly innovative second order MEXT recommended and mandated changes taking place in many higher educational sectors within Japanese society concerning the twenty-first century role and responsibility of English in Japan. This failure to act on the part of Sociology, and in general Kwansei

Gakuin, to effect necessary second order change(s) results from misconceived notions of agency that continue to maintain a stranglehold on the socio-culture at Kwansei Gakuin as a whole. The failure to critically examine a much more useful and responsible ELHE provision within Sociology results also in great part from structural changes that have taken place outside Sociology since 1989. These changes have allowed Sociology to continue to avoid confronting a fundamental 21st century higher education issue: what is the function, purpose, and usefulness of ELHE in the department as it relates to sociology higher learning and study, and as it relates the development of a global consciousness on the part of students and faculty. Due to these first order “changes” Sociology continues to avoid making credible headway to constructively and boldly resolve the dilemma of ELHE in its mainstream university curriculum (Brady, 2000 d).

In 1989 a university-wide committee of departmental full-time faculty Kwansei Gakuin English language specialists recommended that the most useful and beneficial of a number of possible future scenarios for ELHE across all its departments (at that time 7 departments or faculties, there are now 11) would be the hiring of a greater number of departmental full-time English faculty who could reinvigorate ELHE within and across the seven faculties. What has resulted due in large part to (1) resistant socio-cultures and socio-politics both within and across the 7 departments, and (2) economic constraints—also documented in Brady (2000 d)—was an alternative “route” or “solution” to the known English education problems at the university.

This alternate route to change resulted in the establishment of an independent and disconnected (from departments and their curriculum structures) language center that would offer a small percentage of selected departmental students instruction three times weekly of study in English, for unspecified academic socio literacy purposes, and for unknown learning purposes, what is commonly known in the English teaching profession as LENOR or learning for no obvious reasons. Instruction was to be by strictly defined BANA (i.e. British and North American) “native speaker” contract instructors. This less risky and less expensive proposal was adopted, and in 1992 the language center (LC) was started up with the employment of three (two-year) contract “native speakers” who would teach classes in English for a limited number (at most 5-10%) of departmental first-year students.

By 2015 there were twenty such “native speakers” in the LC. In 2001 there had started up an independent graduate school directly connected to the LC now known as the Language, Communication, and Culture Center. Over the past many years instead of having hired additional full-time faculty to offer integrated communicative ELHE within the university’s general and specialized departments, Kwansei Gakuin has opted to create autonomous unaccountable entities on the undergraduate and graduate levels that will take care of *some*—not many, certainly not all—students’ higher learning ELHE needs. It is arguable what those needs are, but I believe that they must involve considerable attention to and concern for globally useful “communicative” requirements of Kwansei Gakuin students, and what students will be able to do *using* English in their academic studies, and later on when they have graduated and gone on to fulfill roles and responsibilities in the connected to the global world and included in the global world Japanese society.

The creation of the LC and the related independent graduate school are major first order changes, and it is argued that they have had, and continue to have, a major structural impact, quite possibly a stranglehold, on more urgent second order ELHE reform within departments such as Sociology, which would critically examine the usefulness of existing socio-cultures. These two major structural “innovations” mentioned above, which I believe have been effected in recognition of ELHE faculty *not* stu-

dent needs, have blocked significant and necessary structural ELHE innovation integrated with discipline study befitting credible global citizenship requirements of a higher education institution in Japan. These first order changes do not recognize the across-the-curriculum communicative role-responsibility of English medium learning at Kwansei Gakuin. Nor do they question the existing rigid faculty socio-cultural arrangements which exist within and across the now 11 departments at Kwansei Gakuin University on its three campuses.

Kwansei Gakuin and Sociology have continued to misconceive notions of autonomy, agency, freedom, and choice. Instead of having created a structural framework that recognizes the benefits of an integrated and socially conceived agency, and which would make allowances for second order changes and integration of ELHE with discipline-area study, Kwansei Gakuin has opted to rigidly maintain student and faculty agency conceived as individual not social, static not dynamic. These and other major first order changes, such as adopting a “global posture” for the university without due consideration of how bi-lingual or multiple-lingual socio-literacy fits into that overall global equation involving ELHE at Kwansei Gakuin since 1989, have resulted in a more rigid culture of collectionism and separated specialization at the expense of integrationism and cross-disciplinary specialization.

What indeed is ELHE doing in Sociology? Why is it necessary for Sociology faculty and students to be academically involved, or required to be involved, in ELHE teaching learning and research within the department? What if anything is ELHE achieving in Sociology, and how is it functioning? Is ELHE practiced for clear reasons that benefit *both* student-clients, and faculty-providers, and which takes account of society’s requirements of a 21st century Japanese higher education? Does the ad-hoc and ambivalent placement of ELHE, both within and outside Sociology at Kwansei Gakuin, on both a meso institutional and micro-level course-class basis, recognize the importance and necessity of integrating language-culture-communication and content cognition and knowledge (co)construction in a one-world ontology of higher learning?

Is there a cohesive and coherent ELHE mission that Sociology can call its own, or do there continue to be a mish-mash of ad-hoc “flavor of the month or year” autonomous faculty-led so-called “innovations” that ultimately may do more harm than good as concerns the development of global literacy and global citizenship of Sociology (and other departmental) students?

It is a main argument in this paper that any social system or organization must be sensitive to the need for an integrative relationship of its social structures and elements which make up those structures. Integration is conceived of as the extent to which an organization’s or institution’s (e.g. Kwansei Gakuin and Sociology, ELHE within Sociology) activities and functions complement rather than contradict one another. Malintegration implies a lack or absence of integration or integrative mechanisms that cause a society—or organization or institution—to have contradictory activities and functions. Integration is also the extent to which an individual person—or individual social structure (e.g. ELHE within Sociology)—experiences a real sense of belonging to a larger social group or collectivity (e.g. a department, a university, society in general) by sharing its norms, values, beliefs, etc. Integration is a key concept of Durkheim’s sociology: it is one of two main variables he used in his seminal explanation of variation in rates of suicide. Any sense of lack of belonging on the part of people operating within one structure contained within or related to another structure in an organization could negatively influence the health of the overall system, and thus the social interrelationships that help substantiate that overall system.

An organization may have in place (1) structures that serve to legitimate malintegration, and a resultant diverse contradictory collection of conceptualizations, behaviors, activities or values, and (2) power mechanisms that allow for certain key placed actors to make decisions that do not question the status quo of an absence of integration in the overall system. If this be the case in Sociology, it is possible then in our estimation, in spite of university proclamations to the contrary, to conceive of Sociology ELHE as a study barrier that students must hurdle in their first one or two years of academic life in order to proceed on to specialized study in the final two years, predominately if not entirely in the L1 Japanese. If ambivalent ad-hoc placement and operation of ELHE in Sociology be the overriding concern, it is conceivable then to think of the practice of ELHE itself as compartmental specialized study, individually directed rather than collectively practiced and directed. What we may then have is an entity (i.e. ELHE) where the compartmental component parts do not holistically or integratively fit within the total higher educational system.

Is ELHE a problem at Kwansei Gakuin and Sociology? Is it the case that the department's ELHE provision has an structural/agency identity crisis? In 1991 the Japanese Ministry of Education unfroze all foreign/additional language requirements at universities. It thus became possible for a university such as Kwansei Gakuin and its departments such as Sociology to individuate an identity not only for integrated language-content, but also integrated liberal-specialized higher education. Some tertiary-level institutions in Japan, long ago or more recently, have opted to involve language and liberal studies in specialty-area education concerns, and thus effect some degree of integration. Wadden (1994) reported two decades ago that some universities opted to seriously re-evaluate (particularly English) language education for its usefulness in support of discipline-area study, and began to require that ELHE faculty be concerned with more than teaching and researching (their) language specializations as self-contained pockets of study. Wadden also stated that some universities chose to stand still and basically do nothing but effect first order cosmetic, emblematic, appropriation, and certification change(s), an argument that McVeigh (2002) firmly supports.

English education at Kwansei Gakuin and within Sociology continues to be problematic because its teaching, researching, and learning have not been re-conceptualized in line with changing local and global realities (e.g. the integrative usefulness of English language study as more than an object of study). The major factors contributing to ELHE possibly being a major problem at Kwansei Gakuin and Sociology, and which structurally constrain ELHE from being an integral part of the Sociology curriculum structure in my estimation are:

- (1) It is not a coherent discipline; rather it remains as a mish-mash of disconnected and varied specialties. ELHE specialists do not corporately plan or evaluate the communicative student learning value of what they and their colleagues pedagogically attempt to do inside or outside the classroom. There is no shared mission; students may remain confused about an institutional rationale for the study and learning of ELHE—or any other additional language for that matter. There is no consensual and explicit mission for ELHE study.
- (2) ELHE is compartmentalized and marginalized: it is isolated and separated from specialty-area study (SAE), and secondly its language-in-use skills' development remains isolated and separated from its knowledge-based use (i.e. analysis of ideas in English as they might be under-

stood in Japanese). While it would be useful for these two orientations to be a connected part of an overall additional language learning higher education mission, this will not happen so long as the two orientations remain invisible from and unaccountable to one another. Furthermore, ELHE study is viewed as a general education obstacle to be overcome in the first one or two years of study. In other words, there is no systemic requirement for ELHE study that would motivate students to enhance their learning of specialty-area Sociology study (e.g. a required second, third and/or fourth year coursework) where some important aspect of the student's sociology study might urgently require explicit ELHE instruction, perhaps in collaboration with SAE instruction).

- (3) ELHE at KGU and Sociology remains trapped conceptually; it continues to be viewed as amorphous conversation-communication study, or amorphously defined specialty ELHE-contained study (e.g. “this course aims to develop student's sociology study,” but gives no indication why or how). Each general pedagogical approach is subsumed under the rubric of general language study for no (institutionally-defined) specific reasons (i.e. LENOR or the learning of English for no obvious purposes). In addition, standards or norms for ELHE study within the contexts of Sociology, Japan, Asia, and international as opposed to hegemonic North American use and usage, are externally measured. There remains conceptual splits between so-called “native speakers” (users) of English—defined as being primarily or exclusively North American—and Japanese only “nonnative speakers” (users) of English.
- (4) Student needs (i.e. *gakusei hitsuyo* in Japanese) are often mentioned in discussion of ELHE by ELHE faculty, but the fact is that to date there has been no systemic systematic effort to actually find out from students what *they* believe they need in terms of explicit ELHE instruction related to their academic Sociology study and as they become “society people” in Japan and in the wider world. There may be efforts being made to take account of student feedback on ELHE instruction after courses have commenced, but this is “putting the cartwheel before the horse” in the sense that the overall design and implementation of that instruction has not included student input or feedback. Students have not been asked, for example, what they think of grammar-translation or western-oriented communicative study and learning approaches (i.e. based on the Canale and Swain (1980) model or variants thereof). Students voices have not been included to any significant degree in the design of a sociology-mission ELHE program.

Social life, for example, in a hospital or in an educational institution, can never be neatly objectified and reported on. The “facts” above are based on close observation and experience of two “sociological spies” and are open to some debate. However, if one looks closely at the ELHE provision within Sociology for (1) signs of systemic and systematic integration, (2) signs of cohesion or coherence, (3) signs of conceptual practiced innovation based on changing realities of ELHE in the world and in other parts of Japan as well, and (4) at issues involving status and recognition of ELHE vis-a-vis SAE at Kwansei Gakuin and Sociology, one will likely see what these two “sociology spies” have seen. Chastain (1980) emphatically states that fundamental second order “change” regarding ELHE is to conceive of second-language study (our italics) *not as a hurdle to be overcome or cleared on the way to a degree, but as an integral part of the total curriculum provision, particularly liberal education.*

A second language study program must have greater student involvement, which requires students

to be more self-directed, where they develop a sense of responsibility to have more active engagement with the aims of their learning, and with the materials that assist in the realization of those aims. Dubin and Olshtain (1986) ask to what degree students depend on knowledge and use of English to get access to subject matter of interest and/or need. They argue that any (e.g. ELHE) reform should seriously attempt to close the gap between existing conceptualizations of language programs as (our italics) *self-contained systems, divorced from the real needs of students* with regard to EL(H)E as language medium of study. They argue that,

The purpose of introducing an additional language into the educational system is to allow communication with the outside world If the educational system places high priority on personal aspects of language learning, then the main objective might be to allow personal growth and enrichment of students and teachers. The program can emphasize communication, and/or individual choice and achievement.

Altan (1999), in reference to English language teaching, argues for a re-examination of old ways and thinking about real change (p.7), and maintains that, “well-trained motivated teachers are the most vital component of high-quality education, (and) the future of a country, therefore, depends on its ability to teach” (p.7). Altan believes that innovation is much more than the implementation of effective single changes. Innovation, in his estimation, requires a radical change in the culture of educational institutions, and in the conception of teaching as a profession (p.9). The problem, as he sees it, is not how to keep or discard the old, or what no longer seems to work well, but rather how to motivate teachers to become change agents and continually develop throughout their careers. He states (p.8) that “if an educational change is to happen, it will require that teachers and institutions better understand themselves, and that educational change depends on what teachers and institutions actually do and think” (p.8).

Altan lists four preconditions for change:

1. Liberality: being mentally open to new and different ways,
2. Being critical: transcending the technicalities of teaching (which) means moving away from “how to” questions to “what” and “why” question,
3. Self-awareness: being aware of reasons for resisting, (and) being less fearful of the unknown,
4. Sharing / access to information: innovations decided on within an institution developed by teachers require teacher-teacher interaction if they are to succeed. Examples of such interaction would include concrete talk about teaching practice, peer/mutual observation of classes with feedback, and developing a shared language—with shared definitions of terms such as “practical,” “academic,” “communicative”—for teaching strategies and needs. (1999: pp.8-9)

It is an accepted fact that most English language interactions in the world, including in academia, media, and business, are between people whose first language is not English. Continued stereotyping of native and nonnative speakers and users may inhibit students from wanting to use English, and/or wanting to use English as Japanese first language speakers, not pseudo-North American English speakers or users—see Brady and Shinohara (2000) for a detailed discussion of language learning and identity. The reality of the global spread and integrated usefulness of English as an important means of

higher study in addition to study in the L1 (i.e. Japanese in this case) does not appear to be fully accepted at Kwansei Gakuin or within Sociology. The real world of higher education that credibly aims to be global is no longer defined in terms of bi-polar native speaker and non-native (e.g. Japanese only) English users. Furthermore, English is now a shared additional or second language resource across a great many national and international borders. De la Cour (1997) amply states our main concern in this paper which is: how do (English) language studies enrich the social sciences; of what use are they to each other?”

III. University excellence, creativity, and thought development: what role and responsibility for and of additional (English) language study

The Japanese Prime Minister’s Commission on Japan’s Goals in the 21st Century (2000) stated in its preface:

Japan is at a major turning point—one might even say a critical point. The advance of globalization and the information-technology revolution call for a world-class level of excellence. Achieving world-class excellence demands that, in addition to mastering information technology, all Japanese acquire a working knowledge of English—not as simply a foreign language but as the international lingua franca. Knowledge of English as the international lingua franca equips one with a key skill for knowing and accessing the world.

Many perhaps most people in Japan, if they have thought about Japan’s place in the world and its future at all, would probably agree with the statement above and an argument put forth in the Japan Times article dated Jan, 29, 2014 (*The confounding case of Japan’s creativity crisis*). That article maintains that a higher education, aiming to excel in recognizing the importance and then developing creativity, is a prime component, perhaps the most crucial component, of knowing and accessing the world both within and outside Japan. In Japan in recent years the “buzzword” for knowing and accessing the wider global world has been what is termed in Japanese, “global jinzai” which is roughly translated into English as global citizenry or citizenship.

This term has been used to (try to) convince educational institutions, the business community, other realms of social and economic interests in Japan, as well as the general populace, that Japan’s present and future vitality, perhaps even its sustainability and survival, critically depends on its people and institutions being more engaged with the world outside Japan, and more than monolingual or mono-cultural. Most people would also probably agree that the ability to know and use English as an additional global language beneficially contributes to the ability to be a global citizen or global nation, and to know and access the wider world.

Crystal in *English as a Global Language* (1997, 2003)), Seidlhofer (2005) and others argue that the English language has achieved global status as it is present in most if not all the world, this even though it is used or spoken by only 1.5 billion people, roughly only one fifth of the world’s entire population. Given those areas of the world, however, where English has (had) a pivotal role in terms of its influence in a great number of social, economic, political, media, banking, travel, science, technology, and communications domains of life locally as well as globally, there is no question, Crystal maintains, that English is indeed a global language. Crystal further says that:

Too many people around the world have found it (English) a useful tool for there to be any serious likelihood of a reversal of this reality, at least not in the near future (Crystal 1997: 1).

The global reach and presence of English is clearly recognized by the Japanese Prime Minister's Japan's Goals in the 21st Century Commission of 2000-01, Keidanren, which is the umbrella organization of and for business in Japan, local Japanese media (e.g. the Japan Times 2007 article, *Japan's Ambivalent English*), and media outside Japan such as the Times Higher Education (2000 opinion article), as well as the Japanese Ministry of Education. In the last twenty years the Ministry has actively promoted a global and international orientation to higher education to include: (a) hiring more non-Japanese faculty, (b) having more global-international study areas in the curriculum, and (c) having a steep increase in university courses taught *in English* as opposed to a continuation or even increase of classes that focus on English language as a *subject of study per se*.

Whatever global competence might mean in terms of being educated to be creative, and in the process having an education that excels in that overall goal, it needs to include English as an important additional language learning medium of excellence in (developing) creative thought. To be creative, and to be creatively excellent, can have multiple meanings or interpretations, and when thought of, verbalized, or written in combination—as is the case for a special issue of *Creative Education*—an even greater variety of meanings and interpretations. Excellence can primarily or solely involve, as the Prime Minister's Commission on Japan's Goals for the 21st Century implicitly states, passively and or uncritically knowing and accessing (what is out there in) the world. Excellence, as opposed to mediocrity, embraces the state or being of excelling, going forward and doing one's best, striving for if not always being able to achieve perfection, or being exceptionally able, being worthy of merit, being or thinking or doing superbly. The concept in English combined with excellent and applied to education at any level, invites different ideas and interpretations of what it means to have “creative excellence” in education, or put another way, to conceive of and practice creative excellence in one's teaching as it can affect student learning.

Many universities in Japan have implemented policies, and both planned for and put into practice, programs of study which to some extent integrate the language-culture-communication and knowledge-content-cognition provisions of the curriculum. Most of these universities espouse and (attempt to) practice “global jinzai” and aim for greater excellence (and creativity?) as it and they relate to the development in students of a more connected and broadened global literacy, inclusive of being able to think and learn in more than the home L1 Japanese. Other universities, including where the writer works, remain stubbornly ambivalent and confused about how to respond to the emergent global realities of higher education. At these institutions language-culture-communication higher learning is an end in and of itself. Students in departments of study at these institutions have very few or no opportunities to develop a more integrated connected creative thought skill-sets in both the local and an additionally useful global (i.e. English) language at one and the same time.

Even if departments of study in these higher education institutions (HEI) do offer general and or specialized knowledge-content-cognition courses in an additional language, this is being done ad-hoc and piecemeal. There remains little if any conceptualization that culture-communication-language and knowledge-content-cognition study requires (1) integrated structures and integrated higher education institution (HEI) specialist-practitioners, and (2) the necessary mindsets and behavior of faculty-teachers to be *both* language and content practitioners at the same time, or at the very least have these

two groups of faculty work more closely together, which is in my observations at my HEI not the case.

IV. Content-language integrated global awareness higher learning (CLIGAL)

CLIGAL is a variant of what is known as CLIL (content and language integrated learning) first developed in Europe more than 20 years ago, and now spreading widely throughout the world including Asia and Japan. CLIGAL is an attempt towards creative excellence in teaching, learning, and research at the tertiary level of education, and seeks to help an institution develop the ways and means of embracing and practicing second order change as opposed to first order “cosmetic” change. CLIGAL critically involves change that goes to the core of what the educational institution believes and values. Does the HEI believe that simply changing course names and offerings, having all of its L2 language-communication-culture study centralized in a language center, or starting up a new department focusing on international studies equates with second order change?

According to De Courcy (2015) higher education is in a time of great change. Few people in the know would disagree. She says that universities are being increasingly pressured to demonstrate their value under increasing economic restraints and changing management and accountability structures, which is also the case at this writer’s HEI. Additionally, universities, maintains De Courcy are being pressured to demonstrate—not simply espouse- excellence in teaching and student/learning outcomes. De Courcy notes that,

external pressures have always influenced the working lives of faculty . . . and a number of global trends have impacted and, some would say, changed the role and working conditions of faculty. There is little debate that teaching and learning in the 21st century requires a very different set of skills (p.2).

What skills do excellent teachers need to now possess? Reviews of research in this area, says De Courcy, call for more clear definitions of higher quality (i.e. excellent) teaching and learning as well as support structures that would promote better teaching practices. Zhu, Wang, Cai, and Engels (2013) maintain it is not realistic to think that the current generation of students can benefit from traditional approaches to teaching and learning. Some models of better 21st century teaching has excellent teachers characterized by their willingness and abilities to co-construct learning with students. Other models see an urgent need of excellent teachers to be socially competent, able to communicate effectively to and with diverse groups of students.

Still other models prioritize a teacher’s passion for his or her discipline(s), while technology competency requires the ability to integrate modern technology into practice. Fitzmaurice (2010) believes that,

. . . individual attributes of the teacher, their ability to deal with complex human interactions and relationships, a concern for ‘weaker’ students, a commitment to student-centred methodologies and a commitment to ongoing professional development are very much part of what it means to be an excellent teacher (p.10).

Teaching in all these models described above is not solely an intellectual exercise; it is relational and according to De Courcy involves creating and maintaining caring physical, cultural, intellectual, social, and moral environments which taken together induce and enhance learning. De Courcy concludes her paper by noting that,

there is little research on faculty's perspectives on teaching excellence . . . what they find most useful for development and what they perceive as good indicators of performance . . . a study on teaching effectiveness in higher education in the 21st century would be of great interest. (p.7)

Splitter (1995) argues that educational quality needs to be defined in terms of the thinking and feeling development of students so that they can feel free to create and explore. Schools, he says, are and continue to be agents of manipulation and preservers and protectors of the status quo. Most schools, confuse educating with a far more limiting economic-oriented view of training, a view supported by Weaver (1991), McVeigh (2002), Cutts (1997), and Refsing (1992). Splitter recognizes that the development of creative and critical thinking may not be welcomed by the wider society and in his words, “may be more of a threat than any priority” (p.1). Splitter's philosophy for thought is a template for teachers and institutions, whoever they are wherever they are, to go beyond training and fitting students into what Weaver (1991) claims are extant systems of power and privilege.

Splitter advocates a *Philosophy for Children* and articulates six dispositions of that philosophy to guide educators in their teaching of creative and critical thinking as follows:

1. argumentation skills,
2. inquisitive skills, in particular searching for (sometimes hidden) reasons and not accepting what is offered or given without question,
3. identification, modification, and application of criteria to form judgments and make decisions,
4. making distinctions so as to be able to more clearly see the complexity of any situation, event, problem, or solution, act, or decision,
5. an ability to identify relationships (i.e. connect the dots) that help to make sense of things such as causes and effects, means and ends, parts and wholes, and
6. the exercising of *moral imagination* by which we think in different ways of proceeding (in thought and actions), and which represents to ourselves and others alternative moral-ethical positions and world views.

It is the larger questions of life that creative and critical-minded HEI and HEI teachers need to offer students as a realistic entry point into excellent creative thought, over and above transmitting uncritically what it or they or others think is or is not useful information, accepted opinions, or the such. These larger questions of life, which are not usually brought into the classroom, include:

- (a) who am I as an individual and member of society (i.e. social being)?,
- (b) does my life (as an individual and social being) have a purpose beyond survival?,
- (c) where did my/the world come from and where is it going?,
- (d) what kind of world do I/we want to live in?, and lastly
- (e) what does it mean to live well?

The language-culture-communication portion of a university's curriculum may be an ideal area in which to initiate a creative excellence higher study that aims to fulfill hopes of a philosophy for thought for children, and at the same time help ensure a more politically, socially, and culturally developed creative thought and action higher learning. Bollinger, Nainby, and Warren (2001) perceive a conceptual gulf between contemporary communication theory and practice, and critical education theory and practice. They also argue that at present there are two separate worlds of thought and study in education. One world is that world of socio-linguistic socio-cultural signifiers, the world humans communicate to each other with which is the entire set of symbols, sounds, gestures, pictures, words, and other things that we use to communicate. The second world is "things" we experience, we feel and think about, all the various things that we communicate about to and with one another. One important goal of education for Bollinger et al. is that teachers work with students to rethink and interrogate how and why we constitute the world as we do.

The prevalent and predominant representational two-worlds model, which is supported and condoned in Japanese higher education and its HEI by having knowledge-content-cognition and language-culture-communication in separate domains of education, fails miserably to account for the complexity of lived experiences of people (e.g. in classrooms) where the emphasis on learning remains fixated on systemic meanings rather than minute here-and-now communicative acts. Students need an ontological vocabulary, Bollinger et al. maintain, which will lend classroom study and educational practice a much greater sense of immediacy. They further argue this is crucial to having a creative, empowering, and emancipatory learning. A one-world ontology of study and learning integrates and connects "things out there in the world" and how we communicate about the world as we experience or imagine it.

Communication, they argue, forms the essence of social life as it unifies humans and the world(s) in which people live. In other words language-communication-culture is not a mere instrumental tool as a means to achieving human world-shaping.

V. A post-method 4 Ps 4 Cs approach to CLIGAL

If we are to value higher education as an excellence in creativity enterprise, as a force that empowers, emancipates, and liberates young minds so that they can be free to create and explore, schools and faculties need to, argues Koliba (2000), teach students skills and dispositions to actively participate in a one-world philosophy for thought ontology of study and learning. These skills and dispositions must reflect criticality, creative, democratic, liberation principles and practices. More traditional (higher) education pedagogy relies on didactic authoritarian learning methodologies where teachers are "experts" in their disconnected fields with knowledge or language skills to impart to students uncritically. This teaches young people fundamental lessons about who they are and must be and about their passive roles in education and by inference in the wider society.

Kumarvadivelu (2001) writes about the search for alternative organizing principles in language-culture-communication teaching and proposes a "post-method" pedagogy of particularity, possibility, and practicality. We would like to add the parameter of purposefulness to Kumarvadivelu's three parameters as we strongly believe that the purpose of any pedagogy-learning ought to include and involve the ongoing nurturing of creativity and creative thought and behavior in students' and teacher learning. Kumarvadivelu offers his three parameter pedagogical model as a response to what he considers to be "the repeatedly articulated dissatisfaction with the limitations of the concept of method

and the transmission model of teacher education” (p.537). His post-method pedagogy is a response to the over reliance on methods and methodology per se in the L2 (second language) profession that gives the L2 discipline its reason to exist.

What Kumarvadivelu says about dissatisfaction with the prevalent language education transmission model is applicable also to knowledge-content-cognition study. Unless a higher education first affirms the breadth and depth of intellectual thought through language-communication interaction, and is prioritized over specialized localized compartmental conceptions and practices of higher education learning, there can be little if any hope of nurturing creativity across an integrated connected curriculum. The implementation and practice of a creatively excellent higher education begins with the (re)valuation of liberal-general deep multidimensional thought development and must have contextual possibility, particularity, and practicality as well as purposefulness.

McVeigh (2001, 2002) observes that higher education in Japan is a myth and states (2001: 29) that:

Japanese education is a paradox: Students sacrifice their youth to intensely prepare for all-important university entrance examinations, only to suddenly lose academic interest once they pass through the university gate. Commonly proposed meritorious explanations are inadequate. Any blame for apathy must ultimately be placed on the system rather than students themselves.

McVeigh maintains that in Japan’s exam-centered education students are “socialized to associate study with preparation, classroom participation with ritualized inspection, test taking with catechism, academics with credentialism, and learning with monotonous training” (2001:29). In the Japanese education system knowledge and content is disconnected, stored, and (re)packaged for later retrieval. Worse it is abstracted from immediate experience where knowledge loses much of its meaning as a body of information that points to something other than itself or oneself. Knowledge acquires, says McVeigh and others such as Cutts (1997), Refsing (1992), and Mosk and Nakata (1992), an overly practical and banal character in the Japanese university. Education is an exercise in perseverance in Japan sort of like jumping through hoops, ingesting large amounts of often useless data which is necessary for one to become, for example, a bureaucrat.

The responsibility for this educating failure, which includes failure in developing students’ excellence in creativity, is shared by the Japanese government, corporate Japan, and in particular university faculties. McVeigh argues that parents of university students and the wider society are also to blame. They uncritically continue to accept the certification and sorting functions of higher education where critical creative knowledge and content and cognition engagement through language-culture-communication study in both the L1 and additional L2 English is not a main goal. Why, asks McVeigh and others such as Refsing (1992), Cutts (1997), Readings (1996) and Brady, Abe, Takeda and Poole (2003), does it matter that Japanese higher education serves an educating purpose?

McVeigh answers that there are important cultural, social, and political issues that require creative thought which the typical tertiary-level school in Japan should inform its citizenry so that the Japanese citizenry can critically and creatively think about and act to seek out local and more global real-world problems and solve them. These would include, for example, racism, sexism, exclusionary policies, ethnocentrism, tensions in Japan’s East Asia backyard and in the wider international neighborhood, en-

vironmental degradation including climate change, inequalities, and the Japanese nation's and its peoples' identity in the world. The lack of a critical thought and creative excellence in thought discourages young people from seeing and questioning shortcomings in their own and the wider world society. Students are also unchallenged to plan their own personal and professional goals.

Similar to those who have extensively researched the role and responsibility of higher education in Japan, Readings (1996) comes to the conclusion that, at best faculty and higher educators must (re) think all that we (seek to) do as an opportunity for creative thought rather than any occasion for denunciation or mourning of the university and what it has stood for being in ruins. In our estimation dissensus or deviance is ultimately a rejection of a (1) separate(d) two worlds ontology of language-communication-culture and knowledge-content-cognition development, and (2) a dominant stultifying continued operational and transmission banking episteme education. The possibilities for both the present and the future of the university, whether in Japan or elsewhere, lie in the interaction and communication of individuals and collectivities in the here and now. A one-world philosophy for thought based on a reinvigorated liberal higher education that values dissensus and deviance in a values-laden phronetic study framework affirms the importance of full creative and critical exploratory thought and being in students' education.

A rebirth of liberal education in Japanese HEI and what it can offer students and young people is necessary in order to accomplish this redirection. Readings (1996) is of the opinion that we must recognize the university as a ruined institution where,

The University is not going to save the world by making the world more true, nor is or can the world save the University by making it more real (1997: 171)

Readings maintains (p.166) that “in all probability far less will have changed in the daily life of professors and students than one might expect” but that “there are shifts taking place in HEI that are interruptive rather than linear.” These shifts he labels “dereferentialization” which in his estimation has led to a marked decline in the ideological functions of higher education. He also wonders what the place of the university is in society, and what the shape of the university is as an institution. Like McVeigh, Cutts, Refsing, Weaver, Mosk and Nakata et al., Readings is primarily concerned with privileging what he terms dissensus over consensus, or what Davies (2001) has termed “deviant thought.” It is not so important, Readings says, that we attempt through any reform or pedagogical approach to turn the university into a haven for thought, but that it is more realistic to focus on bringing thought back into the university where it has become more difficult and less and less necessary.

The “rebirth” of liberal higher education then is a key to creative excellence in HEI. Liberal education at any level, according to the Association of American Colleges & Universities or AACU (2005),

is an approach to learning that empowers individuals and prepares them to deal with complexity, diversity, and change. It provides students with broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g. science, culture, society) as well as in-depth study in a specific area of interest. A liberal education helps students develop a sense of social responsibility, as well as strong and transferable intellectual and practical skills such as (*emphasis italics*) *communication, analytical problem-solving skills, and a demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and skills in*

real- world settings. (p.1)

It is clear then from what the AACU says that liberal education in the 21st century involves intellectual *and* personal development, is a necessity for *all* students, and *is essential* for success in the global economy and for informed critical thought citizenship. The AACU argues that liberal education be across all fields of study. So why study the liberal arts, the humanities, sciences, the social sciences broadly, here in what is general education at Japanese HEI. HEI liberal-general education in Japan is being degraded, downgraded and is disappearing from many HEI curriculum provisions. It is also being marginalized at the expense of greater two-world ontology preferred disciplinary specialized faculty-driven study. According to Sigurdson (2015), a liberal arts education does not intend to train people for specific jobs. What it does do is prepare people for the world of work—and leisure—by providing them with an invaluable set of employability *and* life-learning skills.

A liberal arts education is by nature broad and diverse, not specialized or narrow. Some think that the goals of a post-secondary education are to provide young people with as much specific training as possible before they go out in the working world as what is known in Japan as “*shakaijin*” or society people. In this view employers, including HEI, are relieved of any costs or risks associated with hiring so-called “untrained” workers. But what are some of the more potentially critical discrete skills, capacities, attributes or dispositions that are normally associated with liberal (arts) education? They would include, in Sigurdson’s estimation:

1. evaluative and critical thinking skills,
2. creative thinking skills,
3. effective oral and written skills,
4. critical and reflective reading skills,
5. the ability to pose meaningful questions to advance one’s knowledge and understanding(s),
6. the ability to conduct research and organize material(s) effectively,
7. the exercise of independent judgment(s) and ethical decision-making,
8. the ability to meet goals, manage time, and complete projects successfully,
9. the ability to cooperate with others and work in teams, and
10. a sensitivity to individuality and individual others and tolerance of cultural diversity and differences.

How many of the above and similar related skills, dispositions, and attributes could assuredly be “learned” or developed in a two-world ontology of study where language-communication-culture is separate(d) from and marginalized in relation to possibly uncritical “to be banked” knowledge and content? One might also wonder whether a liberal (arts) education makes for a happier healthier existence, and or makes one a better (i.e. more excellent) person? A liberal (arts) one-world philosophy for thought study may help one to perceive self, and to understand better one’s shortcomings, which taken together allow a person to be a more excellent citizen, friend, spouse, parent, human being. Liberal (arts) courses, argues Sigurdson, enable students to reach beyond their own experiences and “imagine worlds far distant in time and space and can strengthen in people the virtues of tolerance, empathy, and respect for others” (p.3).

It may be that this kind of learned one-world philosophy for thought and knowledge can and will

make one wiser, better, more excellent. It is less assured that a two-world “collection of courses” curriculum that focuses on specialized disciplinary knowledge perhaps transmitted uncritically, and which students must bank for future use as trained workers, can do so. Hepner (2013) argues that higher education needs to throw out textbooks and specialized knowledge and replace them with primary sources. He adds that faculty need to begin communicating with their students instead of talking (down?) to them. A pseudo-intellectualism he says, can be fostered in an environment that “harbors” poor quality courses in which students are simply told what to think instead of how to think and search for truths” (p.3)

There is a fundamental misunderstanding of the role and responsibility that language learning should play in higher education, argues Guillen (2009). From the perspective of teaching and researching the social sciences and sociology he strongly advises that this misunderstanding “could seriously imperil the ability of the university to educate students in the 21st century” (p.1). He recognizes, as do many others such as Littlejohn (2001), Crystal (1997, 2003), Bollinger et al. (2001), and Brady and Shinohara (2000, 2003), that language study is not simply helpful as a tool to achieve some end, as for example, pass a Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), or get a job. Learning language(s) involves, as we have argued throughout this paper, culture and communication study and development, and needs to be studied within the context of critical and creative knowledge-content-cognition development,

Learning a language exercises the mind and enriches the spirit, and is a humbling experience by which students can learn that their culture and their way(s) of thinking and doing things and expressing themselves are relative, not absolute. (Guillen, 2009: 3)

CLIL, or content and language integrated learning, is now a buzzword for English language teaching around the world including here in Asia and Japan, but is noticeably absent both in conceptualization and practice in Kawansei Gakuin-Sociology. CLIL is an umbrella term for the teaching and learning of language and content simultaneously, and covers a range of interpretations and possibilities. CLIL means learning through the interactive medium of English, not learning English as an end in itself. Language is used to communicate ideas, not for example, learning academically about the language’s history, grammar, lexicon, or sound system. It has proved particularly motivating for younger learners while it also enhances subject learning and the acquisition of the language that is to be used as the teaching and study medium of communication, culture, content, and cognition, the 4 Cs of CLIL.

One of the main difficulties in applying CLIL systemically is to find qualified and academically competent knowledge-content-cognition subject teachers who are also trained language teachers. It is reported that only one national educational system which employs CLIL (Hungary) requires its CLIL teachers to give evidence of both subject and language teaching qualifications. In Japan, for example, CLIL has been led by language teachers who may, but usually do not, have knowledge or expertise with subject study. From observations and having researched a number of HEI including the writers’ own HEI, it is rare that knowledge-content-cognition faculty lead or have qualifications to lead a CLIL, or even have *any interest* in leading a university CLIL. The great majority of specialist content faculty at HEI in Japan have not had any formal training in language teaching, though some or many—depending on the particular institution or specialty-area study department—can converse in English

or do their research in English, and some indeed often write academic papers in English.

In Japan in this age of “global jinzai” and the internationalization and globalization of higher education, English-language medium learning in HEI known as EMI or English medium instruction, is seemingly the preferred alternative to any conception planning or practice of CLIL. Unfortunately, given the fact that there is little or no language-culture-communication mission built into the globalized specialty-area curriculum at HEI in Japan, EMI can be taught by English-conversant English-research literate HEI faculty even though they may have little if any expertise in teaching culturally or communicatively in a language (English) that is not their own mother tongue. This is especially true at the writers’ HEI where only 5-6% of the faculty operate in English and many of them are hired as English language teachers. Some universities in Japan, including the one where the writer works, employ a small number of “native speaker” faculty to teach subjects in English, either full-time but more prevalently contract or adjunct faculty, but these HEI faculty in most cases have little if any expertise in language-culture-communication teaching.

Alternatively, some universities are planning and attempting to implement programs of EMI or EMC (English medium construction) study utilizing English language teachers, but these teachers as a whole have little if any subject knowledge-content-cognition teaching experience in the subject (for example, sociology or economics or political science) that would more ideally qualify them as CLIL or CLIL-type teachers. In short and in general, in Japan at HEI, EMI, *not CLIL*, is preferred and has been conceived, planned, implemented and practiced as a new way of dealing with the shortcomings of the (separated and marginalized) language-culture-communication curriculum. EMI or EMC, especially when not conceived or practiced in a CLIL-CLIGAL framework, thus serves to alter ways in which language-culture-communication teaching and learning can be conceptualized or practiced. However, it does so with too little concern for effecting a substantive phronetic one-world philosophy for thought and behavior integration.

We are thus left with a situation at the meso-macro level at HEI where, on the one hand, content is to some degree being delivered in an additional (English) language by faculty but who are not English language specialists. On the other hand, additional (English) language faculty who are so inclined and or motivated personally or institutionally to teach subject knowledge-content-cognition in general or specialized fields of higher study, are leading the charge so to speak with EMI. The growth and spread of EMI in Japan as reported by Brady and Higgins (2014) is linked to broader concerns in Japanese higher education such as educational reform, global-international competitiveness, institutional sustainability and viability, and also as a response to the criticism that Japanese higher education is a closed system. The goals of an EMI for its primary stakeholders—students, teachers, the wider society—have yet to be investigated or determined. Teachers and students in an uncritical and to some degree ad-hoc EMI are greatly challenged to make adjustments in the manner in which teaching and learning is initiated and carried on and progresses.

If it is accepted that EMI or EAP (English for Academic Purposes) has goals that go beyond simply using an L2 in subject learning, and that EMI-EAP ought to help students improve critical creative thinking and intercultural learning skills in addition to improving their knowledge and use of English, then any systemic EMI program conceptualized, planned, or implemented (our emphasis) *will crucially require cooperation and collaboration from the two-worlds of academia: language-culture-communication, and (specialty-area) subject knowledge-content-cognition*. To effect such second order change amidst the many challenges and obstacles that exist within socio-cultures at HEI in Japan is

daunting to say the least. When it becomes extremely difficult if not impossible to meet these challenges head on and circumvent obstacles to integration, collaboration, and cooperation among the storied cliques of HEI faculty, it will be necessary to institute, however possible EMI-EAP, or more advantageously CLIL-CLIGAL, initially on a micro-level class basis. Doing so can solve a number of important needs of higher education to serve its emerging global citizenry and meet the concerns of the Japanese Prime Minister's Commission (2000-01) on Japan's Goals in the 21st Century. The primary stakeholders, citizen-students and faculty working together in the classroom, are involved and invested from the start in determining the what, why, and how of integrated one-world philosophy for creative thought study.

If it be the case that classroom practitioners, from whatever discipline whether language or content-oriented, have themselves interest in and academic and educational expertise and experience in teaching a one-world integrated philosophy for values and wisdom learning study, a quality goals-oriented EMI-EAP-CLIL-CLIGAL can be initiated from bottom-up rather than top-down, which is usually the case in Japan at HEI reports Dearden (2014). Dearden observes that in many national societies and at many HEI in those societies, the educational infrastructure does not, in fact may not wish to, support any quality planning, implementation, or practice of an EAP-EMI or CLIL. Where does this leave those HEI in Japan that do wish to have an integrated one-world philosophy for critical creative thought development across their specialty and liberal-general education curriculum(s)?

It is here that CLIGAL becomes most relevant. CLIL and CLIGAL privilege those skills, dispositions, and attributes of a creative learning that will be necessary to save Japan and its HEI from itself and themselves. The 4 Cs of CLIL-CLIGAL are, to repeat: communication, cognition, culture, and content. This in itself qualifies CLIL-CLIGAL as a choice post-method pedagogy of particularity, possibility, practicality, and purposefulness to serve those interests in Japan and its society who value the future global and international vitality and vibrancy and viability of this nation and its citizenry. We are here arguing that in response to the 2000-2001 Prime Minister's Commission call, those HEI which are willing and able to challenge their core cultural thinking and practices, and to honestly determine whether that thinking and those practices match the future global needs of Japan, should sooner than later employ faculty who are integrated 4 Cs specialists. They further need to set up and strengthen institutional structures that will allow these faculty to practice a 4 Cs one-world philosophy for creative thought phronetic higher teaching and learning.

Global lingua franca English language CLIL and CLIGAL can usefully serve as an impetus within HEI in Japan to breaking down barriers and obstacles to an integrated 4 Ps and 4 Cs curriculum. CLIL-CLIGAL can help institutions and their faculties to adjust, and when necessary transform, socio-cultural, socio-political, and socio-economic structures and practices (agency) to serve the global awareness and global engagement needs of Japan and its young citizenry. CLIL-CLIGAL thus is an enabler of the kind of second order change(s) that are necessary, and which have been voiced in Japan as well as outside Japan for many years now, for its people and its institutions to question their thinking and practices, in short to be locally and globally creatively excellent in its and their thought and actions. There is a real need for Japan and its educational system and practices to "open up." The present and future vibrancy of the Japanese nation-state and its citizenry rests on its and their abilities to think and act creatively and constructively both on a local and international-global level. It is the interaction of people in communication that gives credence to such excellence in creativity.

VI. Concluding remarks

Creative excellence in higher education across the entire curriculum begins with a reunion and re-integration of the two now higher education in Japan disparate worlds of language-communication-culture and knowledge-content-cognition. CLIL or CLIGAL is ideally placed as a post-method 4 Ps (particularity-context, possibility, practicality, purposefulness) 4 Cs (content, culture, cognition, communication) creative excellence approach that binds teachers and students together in search of individual and mutual intellectual, affective, and personal growth, not in service solely to themselves, but which helps their society to be more globally aware and connected with the world. Creative excellence in higher education also begins with a clear(er) recognition of the importance of liberal-general education, and in particular language study as an important, perhaps the most important, part of that education.

Language-culture-communication study needs to be recognized as an important means to the co-construction of knowledge and the development of cognition and emotional intelligence *in every study area in higher education*. A 4 Ps sustainable excellence in creativity higher education crucially depends on realistically, practically, purposefully re-connecting language and content in a connected one-world paradigm of higher study, and this requires a re-valuation of language-communication-culture teaching as the most valuable component of a higher education. Language-communication-culture study does not exist in a vacuum (Calvet, 1998), as is unfortunately the case at the writer's HEI. The study of and in language(s) is an important and valuable means to wisdom learning.

The practice of creative excellence in higher education is rooted in the humanistic philosophy that affirms that all individuals have creative potential (Chen-Tsai, 2013). Burnard (2012) emphasizes the role of teachers as agents who catalyze this process of change, which requires of teachers a high level of professionalism and expertise. In our estimation this professionalism and expertise must be in both interconnected worlds of study, language-culture-communication, *and* knowledge-content-cognition. Chen-Tsai (2013) reports that in a number of studies, several salient characteristics of creative teachers and teaching have been clearly identified such as curiosity, risk-taking, open-mindedness, humor, independence, self-confidence, flexibility, and aesthetic orientation.

Burnard (2012) suggests that the above and related characteristics are “deeply connected to thinking styles which include visualization, experimentation, imagination, reflection, analysis, synthesis, metaphorical thinking, and evaluation” (p.68). Teachers play a pivotal role in helping shape students' learning. Regarding the development of creativity in the classroom, they can condition or impede creativity through their teaching, but also through the manner in which they communicate with their students and be creative themselves in that process. Jeffrey (2006) notes that there are three things that directly point to teachers who are creative: they are innovative, they enjoyed the process of study interaction, and they invested time in their communication and discussions with their students.

What can creatively-minded teachers and institutions do to excellently condition the development of higher learning creativity? Rinkevich (2011) has recommended a number of creative teaching and learning strategies: (1) provoking unorthodox thinking, (2) beginning class with an announcement of a fact of the day to promote lifelong learning, (3) incorporating the total environment both inside and outside the classroom to the one-world learning space so as to encourage students to explore the world around them, and (4) providing autonomous learning opportunities to develop students' (and teachers')

strengths and interests. Developing creativity is not an extra task says Chen-Tsai, but is an essential capability for teachers', in our argued estimation, connected one-world ongoing professional development. Creativity is not limited to special or specific study areas whatever or wherever they might be, but can and needs to be integrated into *all* study provision areas.

Creativity, especially of the excellent variety, requires deep commitment, concentration, risk-taking, and personal and professional transformation from teachers, and their HEI. Creative education thru CLIGAL is not safe, and it can potentially be threatening to orthodox classroom management due to its nature of disruption, dissensus, deviancy, and inquisitiveness about the status quo. But its development is absolutely vital to the sustainability of Japanese society, and in particular HEI which claim to serve the interests and needs of the wider society. Higher education can only be transformed into a creativity development enterprise, and thus improve its value as education for uncertainty, when it becomes more humanized.

University faculty, whether liberal-general language-communication-culture, or specialized knowledge-content-cognition practitioners, cannot magically transform students into agents of creativity or criticality. The important thing is that as change and creativity agents themselves in their teaching, communication with students, and in their research with students, they exhibit and express an ethical code which students can also experience and then choose to absorb so as to transform themselves. Disciplines of higher education study when approached with full participation of students, within a democratizing and humanizing framework, can become excellently creative self-actualizing academic experiences for students and faculty alike, ultimately affecting also the creative excellence of the HEI itself.

Knowledge of and in, for example, (the) sociology (department) or (the) language (center) is not “out there” to be discovered, packaged and retrieved for later use. It is also neither objective nor impersonal. It is the 21st century responsibility of HEI faculty to individually and collaboratively recast knowledge transmission and co-construction into cultural, cognitive, and communicative relevance for students. Included within this responsibility of faculty is a mission to recast communication and culture and cognitive study into a practical and socially responsible knowledge base for life learning.

References

- Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007). What is a 21st Century Liberal Education? *Adapted from College Learning for the New Global Century*.
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Realizing the University in an age of supercomplexity*. Open University Press/SRHE: Buckingham.
- Bollinger, C., Nainby, K., and Warren, J. (2003) Articulating Contact in the Classroom: Towards a Constitutive Focus in Critical Pedagogy. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 3/3, 198-212.
- Brady, A. (2006) Developing an empowering and emancipatory language higher educating for participation in social change. *Social Sciences Review*, 10, 131-151.
- Brady, A., Abe, K., Takeda, J., and Poole, B. (2003) Towards a Clearer Understanding of the Socio-economic, Socio-educational, and Socio-political Role of Higher Education in Japan. *Kwansei Gakuin University Sociology Department Studies*, 95, pp.95-106.
- Brady, A., and Higgins, R. M. (2014). Internationalization, Globalization, Regionalization, and Academic Mobility: Educational Threats and Opportunities To the Development of a Global-minded Citizenry. *Kwansei Gakuin Sociology Department Studies*, 119, pp.55-66.
- Brady, A., and Shinohara, Y. (2000). Principles and Activities that Exemplify a Transcultural Approach to Additional Language Learning. *System*, 28, 305-322.

- (2003). English additional language learning and empowerment: conceiving and practicing a transcultural pedagogy and learning. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, Chinese University Press:13: pp.75-93.
- Brady, A. (2000 d). The integration of English language education within mainstream university discipline-area study in Japan: A case study of Shimada University and Its Sociology Department. *Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Lancaster University (UK)*.
- Bruen, J. (2005) Educating Europeans? Language Planning and Policy in Higher Education Institutions in Ireland. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5/3 & 4, 237-247.
- Burnard, P. (2012). Rethinking creative teaching and teaching as research: Mapping the critical phases that mark times of change and choosing as learners and teachers of music. *Theory into Practice*, 51/3, 167-178.
- Calvet, J. (1998). *Language Wars and Linguistic Politics*. (translation M. Petheram). Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Chastain, K. (1980). *Toward a Philosophy of Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Chen-Tsai, K. (2013). Creative Teaching and Teaching Excellence. In *Creativity Process, Product, Personality, Environment & Technology*: Reisman, F. K. (ed.). KIE Conferencer Book Series, 131-139.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., and Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Cutts, R. L. (1997). *An Empire of Schools: Japan's Universities and the Molding of a National Power Elite*. M. E. Sharpe Press: Armonk: New York.
- Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, L. (2001). Development, Democracy, and Deviance in Contemporary Sociology of Education. In *Sociology of Education Today*, J. Demaine (ed.) Palgrave Press: Houndmills and Basingstoke.
- De Bono, E. (1982). *De Bono's Course in Thinking*. BBC Books.
- Dearden, J. (2014). English as a medium of instruction—a growing global phenomenon: phase 1. *Going Global 2014, Interim Report*, Department of Education, University of Oxford.
- De Coucey, E. (2015). Defining and Measuring Teaching Excellence in Higher Education in the 21st Century. *College Quarterly*, 18/1.
- De la Cour, P. (1997). Sociology and English Language Teaching and Learning. Presentation at 1996 AILA Conference, Finland.
- Dubin, F., and Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course Design: Developing Programas and Materials for Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzmaurice, M. (2010). Considering teaching in higher education as a practice. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15/1, 45-55.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter: why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin Books: London.
- Gardner, H. (2009). *Five Minds for the Future*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Hepner, M. (2013). Good Thing I'm Not a History Major. *Real Clear Politics*.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Japan Times (2007). Japan's Ambivalent English. *Opinion-editorial*, March 3.
- Gottlieb, M. (2014). The confounding case of Japan's creativity crisis. *Japan Times article*, January 29.
- Guillen, M. F. (2009). The Real Reasons to Support Language Study, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Jeffrey, B. (2006). Creative teaching and learning: Towards a common discourse and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36/3, 399-414.
- Kao, J. J. (1996). *Jamming: Art and Discipline of Corporate Creativity*. HarperCollins.
- Keidanren (2013). Fostering people who can excel in Global Arena—A Follow-up Proposal for the Development of Global Talents., *Keidanren paper*, June 13.
- Koliba, C. (2000). *Democracy and Education, Schools and Communities Initiative: Conceptual Framework and Preliminary Findings*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35/4, 537-557.
- Law, G. (1995) Ideologies of English Language Education in Japan. *JALT (Japan Association for Language Teachers) Journal*,

17/2, 213-24.

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

Lindblom, C. E. (1990). *Inquiry and Change: The troubled attempt to understand and shape society*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

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

——— (2001). Higher Education, Apathy, and Post-Meritocracy. *The Language Teacher*, October, 25/10. 29-32.

Meighan and Siraj-Blatchford (1998) *A Sociology of Educating*. London: Cassel.

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

MEXT. (2009). Higher education in Japan. Retrieved 11 November, 2013: <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/loutou/detail/1287370.htm>.

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

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

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

Nakata, Y., and Mosk. C. (1987). The demand for college education in postwar Japan. *Journal of Human Resurces*, University of Wisconsin Press, 377-404.

Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Harvard University Press: Boston.

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

Report of the Prime Minister's Commission on Japan's Goals in the 21st Century. *National Science Foundation*, Feb. 2000.

Rinkevich, J. R. (2011). Creative teaching: why it matters and where to begin. *Clearing House*, 84/1, 219-223.

Robinson, K. (2009). Why Creativity Now? *Teaching for the 21st Century*, 67/1, 22-26.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 59/4, 339-341.

Sigurdson, R. (2015). Why Study the Liberal Arts. University of Manitoba.

Splitter, L. J. (1995). On the theme of "Teaching for Higher Order Skills." Retrieved <http://www.Shss.Montclair.edu/inquiry/summ95/splitter.html>.

Stewart, J. (1995). *Language as Articulate Contact: Toward a Post-Semiotic Philosophy of Education*. SUNY Press: Albany, New York.

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

University Council Report (1998). *Monbusho News (web page)*. A Vision of Universities in the 21st Century and Reform Measures: To Be Distinctive Universities in a Competitive Environment. <http://www.Monbu.go.jp/Halusyo>.

Van Oech, R. (1990). Fostering creativity: The Journey to Excellence. Retrieved www.journeytoexcellence.org.uk/...rsfostering-creativity.asp

Vygotsky, L. S. (2004). Imagination and Creativity in Childhood. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 42/1, 7-97.

Wadden, P. (1994). College curricula: forecast for the nineties. *The Language Teacher*, 18/7: 32-35.

Weaver, F. S. (1991). *Liberal Education: Critical Essays on Professions, Pedagogy, and Structure*. Teachers' College Press (Columbia University): New York/London.

White, J. (2003). *Rethinking the School Curriculum: Values, Aims, and Purposes*. Routledge/Farmer Press, London.

Zhu, C., Wang, D., Cai, Y., and Engels, N. (2013). What Core Competencies are Related To Teachers' Innovative Teaching? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 41/1, 9-27.

What is English language education doing in Sociology revisited (2002):

continued ambivalence and indifference to necessary second order non-cosmetic,
changes: a way forward

ABSTRACT

Kwansei Gakuin University and its Sociology Department have stood still for too long a time regarding second order socio-cultural valuation reform of English language higher education (ELHE) curriculum. There have been innovative second order MEXT recommended and mandated changes taking place in many higher educational sectors within Japanese society regarding the twenty-first century role and responsibility of English in Japan. This failure to act on the part of Sociology, and in general Kwansei Gakuin, to effect necessary second order change(s) results from misconceived notions of agency that continue to maintain a stranglehold on the socio-culture at Kwansei Gakuin as a whole. The failure to critically examine a much more useful and responsible ELHE provision within Sociology results also in great part from structural changes that have taken place outside Sociology since 1989. These changes, which have been documented, have allowed Sociology to continue to avoid confronting a fundamental 21st century higher education issue: what is the function, purpose, and usefulness of ELHE in the department as it relates to sociology higher learning and study, and as it relates to the development of a global consciousness on the part of students and faculty?

Due to these first order and safer changes, Sociology continues to avoid making any headway to constructively and boldly resolve the dilemma of ELHE in its mainstream university curriculum (Brady, 2000 d). This mindset of “there is nothing that can be done” pervades the decision-making apparatus in Sociology.

Key Words: second order change(s), CLIGAL, excellence in creativity