Culture-Bound Pedagogy's Effect on Immersion Implementation – the Asian example

Angela Sue Willis
Hiroshima Shudo University

Introduction

There are important things to be done with language instruction around the world, and immersion may be an attractive method to language educators, parents, and even ministries of education -- particularly English immersion since English has become the worldwide language of opportunity and, at times, of survival. Immersion has been very successful in North America, and those programs have a high profile in the field of language teaching -- both ESL and EFL. That success and high visibility may encourage the use of immersion and other content-based instruction in other regions.

However, in order to head off discouragement and failure, it is vital that those with hopes for this methodology understand the differences that come to some classrooms where we apply this new method that seems to work so well elsewhere. Immersion education arose in a specific educational environment and from a specific educational philosophy and from images of children and human nature that are not universal. Thus this system of instruction may not be universally applicable wholesale.

Pedagogies analyzed in this study

The contrasts of Asian pedagogies with Western immersion methodology is the focus of this paper, and it particularly uses Japanese and, by implication, some Chinese pedagogies to illustrate some (note, not all) possible effects. Because North American attention is continually drawn to the fact that math and science accomplishments of Chinese and Japanese students shame the performance of American students, there have been some rather thorough studies of the educational systems and philosophies of these Asian countries. Also, this author has had personal experience with the Japanese system, and some experience with the Chinese cultures via individual students and with discussions with educators in Taiwan.

Stevenson and Stigler (1992) in their long-term and broad-based research found some mutual characteristics among schools in Beijing, Taipei, Tokyo, and Sendai that indicated possible weaknesses, vis-a-vis pedagogical differences, in U.S. education. Since Japan has taken much of their philosophy and culture from China, and since the studies made have shown similar characteristics in contrasting the pedagogies with North America's, this author hopes that referring often to the two as one pedagogy will be acceptable.

In a more thorough study, we must look at these cultures separately to determine differences as well as likenesses for the purposes of applying methodologies. Further, there are so many more countries, even in Asia, that are somewhat removed from these cultures and have philosophies and societal influences that do not fall in line with these Chinese and Japanese cultures that are so often studied. Some of the contrasts here may apply to other Asian countries, and some may not, and there are other contrasts with North America that don't exist in Chinese-culture countries and in Japan. In fact, there are major differences in the societal impacts on education amongst them; however, the fact that they are all quite different from Western philosophies and approaches remains, so for the rest of Asia, too, some cautions may be taken from this analysis. In other words, this is only one contrastive set of culture-bound pedagogies that should be examined in questioning application of Western methodology, but it may lead to other useful analyses.

Definition of immersion programming

As in any analysis, we should begin with a definition of immersion education and then go on to a description of its classroom manifestations. Immersion is a category of a larger language instruction term – content-based instruction (CBI). Content-based instruction covers English for specific purposes (ESP) and, many would say, English for academic purposes (EAP), depending on the focus and material of the curriculum and its courses. That focus and material – i.e., what defines a course as CBI – are aimed at and based on a topic or subject other than the language itself. Some CBI courses are topical but aimed purely at teaching the second language. Some are aimed at teaching the content but with its nuances in the second language – for example, teaching professionals content they already know in order that they learn the lexicon and discourse attached to that content in the second language. CBI also includes teaching content unknown to the learner in the aim of teaching both content and language. Immersion falls into the last. It is expressly different from the other instances in that not only is the language unknown, but so is the content. Linguistically, CBI is the fulfillment of communicative language teaching in that language is used only as a tool, rather than an object of study itself,

a most significant characteristic and, in fact, the point on which immersion's linguistic success turns.

Immersion can be full or partial, that is, all or only part of a curriculum can be taught in a second or foreign language. Immersion can also be what is termed early or late, in terms of when students are immersed in the second/foreign language. Early immersion is normally begun at preschool or elementary school levels. Late immersion refers to when students begin studying their content classes in middle school, high school, or postsecondary levels. Some immersion programs even occur beyond schools – for example, in the workplace.

Table 1 outlines two models of immersion as proposed by some of the high-profile immersion scholars. Table 2 outlines the variables of immersion programming.

Skills intrinsic to immersion

Allen, Cummins, Harley, Lapkin and Swain (1989) say there are three essential components of immersion: "1) integration of analytic instruction with a primarily experiential approach to second language teaching; 2) development of a broad functional range of classroom discourse; and 3) provision of plentiful opportunities for rich and varied language use in both oral and written modalities." (p. 774) (as cited in Glisan and Fall 1991). In most cases, CBI of all types requires academic cognitive skills that are expected of students in the West. Table 3 is a list of learning strategies indicating the academic skills needed for content-based instruction and thereby necessary to students in immersion. CBI also involves focus, action, and classroom behavior that is common in schools of the West when it is taught in a Western language, which it is in most extant models. Table 4 sketches some of these classroom behaviors and focuses.

This may not be recognized by an educator until he or she attempts to use CBI with a group of students that have not developed as learners in a Western society. When this author attempted to introduce content-based courses in a Japanese university, it became apparent that there was a mismatch of instruction and learning. The students appeared to have not been taught the particular skills necessary, especially efficient reading techniques and analytical and synthesizing skills. In fact, though one might assume that it hung simply on the omission of overt teaching of these skills in their former education, with further thought and study, the author proposes that there may be more complex reasons for limitations in using the CBI approach at the university level. These propositions are very likely worthy of consideration in using immersion programs, particularly late immersion. The propositions hinge on the contrast of development of students in Japan and Chinese-culture countries and those in North America and Western Europe and on classroom expectations.

Description of Japanese and Chinese school systems

In Japan and China, there are three, perhaps it could be said four, basic stages that lead up to university education. They are the preschool, the elementary school, and the secondary school, the last being properly divided into lower secondary or middle school and upper secondary or high school. Though middle school has some salient characteristics shared by high school, the two are definitely distinct and should be looked at so. The first two are extremely different from the secondary stages. As the author began to look at the early stages, she came to question whether it was worthwhile, wondering if they indeed had consequences in the tertiary level and thinking perhaps time would be better spent limited to analysis of the secondary levels. However, what we learn as children stays with us in some form, if even a remnant, In analyzing the behavior of university students and in fact the working population beyond university, the culture instilled in this very early education is still quite evident and pervasive. However, the secondary school strongly contrasts from the first two parts of the system, and it produces a new attitude and form of academic study in the Eastern student, with which he arrives at the university or at employment. Thus, they seem equally worth analysis.

Preschool and elementary school philosophies and practices in Japan

The early education of Japanese children is very permissive in contrast to Western children, particularly U.S. and Canadian American and many European. Also, in contrast to the West, these first two stages are largely and pointedly used to teach distinctive Japanese socialization. Here is where the concept of group or, as Sato (1996) describes it, relationalism is built into a Japanese person. The child learns his connection to the group – his responsibility to and identification with a group, the importance of the ability to harmoniously relate with people other than one on one. It is a much deeper entrenchment of socialization than the group work or pro-sociability taught or expected in Westerners.

Throughout this process, there are at least two other elements of philosophy and practice that are at odds with Western thought. One is that children at these ages are never intentionally bad. They are at these times not held responsible for what Westerners might term bad behavior nor even for ignoring teachers' instruction in good behavior. Everything is couched in the kind and gentle offer of alternatives or in posing questions for reflection of consequences, which questions may or may not be attended to. The other is that innate ability is considered of no importance. Instead, the unquestioned philosophy is that all are born without distinction, and the only thing that makes for differences among people are the environments that surround their growth. What brings about achievement academically is effort. If a

person works hard enough, he will acquire the knowledge he is being taught, and if he doesn't acquire it, he has not worked hard enough.

Catherine Lewis's book *Educating Hearts and Minds* (1995) sums these years well in its title. The heart is not the individual personality of the child, but the sense of consciousness of being part of a group, finding personal fulfillment in fulfilling a role in the group for the good of others. The mind is educated by repeating routines and forms that make it possible for the classroom to operate smoothly and lead the student in reflection and careful thought in analyzing academic problems posed for him. The child is considered to be the realization of a gift who can do no wrong. Preschoolers and, for large part, elementary school children are not disciplined.

Contrasts with Western (vis-à-vis North American) pedagogy

What ramifications does this hold for immersion education? For the teachers part, since ideal immersion education uses foreign language native speaker teachers, when the language to be taught is a Western language, the immersion teacher is Western, with Western expectations of children and with aims of Western teachers. In contrast with the foregoing description, first, Western classrooms are virtually completely academic. They are not overtly concerned with enculturating students and, besides that, Western culture is far removed from Asian group culture. Second, the bulk of Western thought toward children is not that the child is basically good. Third, particularly since Benet's development of the intelligence test and with the 'discovery' of learning disabilities, Western teachers do not hold the equalizing opinion that Japanese elementary schools are based on. To further this last point, not only the intelligence potential is of utter importance academically, but so have come to be learning styles and personalities. Teaching should be "sensitive to individual differences among the children served." (National Association of the State Boards of Education, 1988, p. 10) (as cited by Glisan and Fall 1991).

In addition, competitiveness is considered to be a positive element of educational environments in North America. Though it has in the last 10 or 15 years had some courtship with cooperative learning, the North American classroom is still filled with competition. Walberg (1979), in fact, found that it is an integral part of good learning environments, even as perceived by students. The Japanese conceptualization of elementary education has no place for competition in fact. It is based thoroughly on cooperation, fulfilling group roles, and working toward the harmony and well-being of the group in pursuit of academic rudiments.

Cultural clashes with parents and society

Thus, it may be difficult 1) for immersion teachers to supply the culture's special socialization that parents and society depend on during the early years of school and 2) for parents to understand the immersion teacher's rigor and lack of

sensitivity to the goodness and innocence of the young child and to the hope placed in effort. In the Japanese elementary school, teaching a whole class the same thing at the same time works. A Westerner's grouping of children according to ability may or may not produce such good results, but Western pedagogy is thoroughly steeped in the influence of ability.

None of these conflicts need pose severe problems if 1) parents are not set on traditional socialization and the application of the principle of effort vs. ability and 2) students are immersed early. Without these conditions, though, it would behoove an immersion teacher to learn the expectations of the Japanese classroom and simply perform a Japanese teacher's duties in English. It would involve quite a bit of training and cultural sensitivity and acceptance on the Westerner's part, perhaps one of the most difficult inner conflicts being the subsuming of the individual to the group and the ignoring of individual ability. It would take exceptional cultural respect and indeed a manipulation of her intrinsic principles for a North American teacher to not undermine the Japanese and Chinese idea of equality and the opportunity for students to learn from and help each other.

Classroom practices – compatible and not

There are some classroom practices with these Asian early ages that may be generally considered compatible with language teaching. For instance, a pedagogical plus is that preschool and elementary school teachers in Japan and China use very concrete and experiential teaching, which is basic to immersion instruction. On the other hand, some are not especially compatible with immersion language teaching. Though elementary classrooms are not teacher-fronted in these Asian countries, there is a great deal of interaction with the teacher and within groups, and teachers expect lots of responsiveness from students at these levels. Often this would be considered basic to language learning, but the first steps of immersion, ideally, are a long, relaxed, low-anxiety silent period coupled with total physical response (TPR). That is, students are not expected to respond at length or in great amounts at beginning levels, and early responses, when they do come, need only be physical responses, to basic commands, for example.

What may be on the Western teacher's side in running the class in her Western way is that since few mothers in Japan are repeat mothers, the Western teacher is dealing with a new crop of parents each year, who are particularly malleable for two reasons. First of all, they are not veteran parents and thus have to rely on the teacher to set the standard in their child's classroom. Also, young Japanese women are very open to new ways, and internationalization, a current pervasive theme in Japan, appears to be important to them, too. At Katoh Gakuen School in Numazu, Shizuoka, Japan, Michael Bostwick, the director of one of Japan's only two English immersion schools says that 1) parents do not seem to have any problem with

socialization not being taught and 2) students who have completed all of their elementary school in Katoh's immersion program seem to have acquired Japanese culture as well as their Japanese-language-schooled counterparts. The program, though, it must be noted, is not full immersion, and in fact 25% to 50% of elementary school is taught in Japanese, by Japanese teachers.

Early immersion vs. late immersion

In fact, early immersion, which is what the Katoh program is, has had great success and few problems in varied regions (for examples, see Johnson and Swain 1997). It's when we look at late immersion that we see the real difficulties, and in fact, many systems have begun and given up on late immersion programs (for examples, see Johnson and Swain 1997).

For many it may seem more feasible, perhaps, that late immersion or full immersion be done in a second language program rather than a foreign language program. In the first, students are live in the society of the target language, and thus they have both strong instrumental motivation and support for learing the language. In the second, the foreign language program, there may be some motivation particularly since English is such an important international and technologically critical language, but there is no support in society. Also, it is critical that a person keep up with knowledge as it is posited in his own language and the language where he will live and make his livelihood as well as keep his own basic language skills honed in that tongue. In non-Western countries there are often public examinations whose body of knowledge dictate all the academic schooling of secondary students – both middle school and high school age students – and an extremely burdensome curriculum is mandated by governments. It's not just this burden of material or the necessity to function in one's own language, though, that cause stumbling blocks for immersion application.

Secondary school philosophies and practices in Japan

Secondary school in these countries comprises a change in both parts of education (i.e., that of the heart and that of the mind). As to the heart, the unquestioning acceptance of the student's innocence disappears. Teachers seek to instill a conscience and loyalty to rules based on saving the face of the institution and other groups of which students are members, and they do this with vehemence that contrasts with elementary teachers' gentleness and patience. It is not that middle and high school students come to be seen as adults. They are in fact still considered to be children, but it is a time when they are expected to wrangle with life's difficulties as they will need to do as adults.

And as for the mind. The other half of the education process, academics, changes, too, in that students begin to be taught material that will be on entrance

exams that will determine their entrance into high schools, whose reputations will determine students' entrance to universities, whose reputations will in turn determine the students' life work and social status. There is no more the elementary school's time for experimentation and observation and reflection on academic problems. Instead, the academic side of school becomes strictly rote listening, copying and memorizing. Effort, however, does not lose its position. In fact, Japanese secondary educators sternly expect effort to bring about achievement and assume the lack of it when progress isn't made. All that remains constant, then, in passing from elementary to secondary stages, is the subsuming of individuality to the group or society and the expectation of effort rather than ability to deliver the student at the best opportunities via exams.

Classroom practices – compatible and not

Here a Western teacher may find a mixture of fit and nonfit. As explained above, beginning immersion classrooms generally become teacher-centered, as is the secondary classroom in Japan and China. This is based on linguistic theory as well as traditional first-language content pedagogy. In spite of modern schemes that promote learner-centered classes, with students performing lots of tasks for induction/deduction and practice in using the language, the beginning immersion classroom needs a great amount of teacher input. Because immersion involves two unfamiliar bodies of knowledge, it is necessary for the teacher to provide both. Students have a great need for input in language and generally don't have expressive ability. Just as does an early immersion program, a late immersion program must also provide a linguistic silent period at the beginning.

However, though the class time may become teacher-centered, Western teachers expect students to do work outside class that requires cognitive academic skills and some expressive academic language skills. In Japan and China, secondary instruction turns to lecture, teacher-centered style because there is a need to fill students up with information that they will need to output on entrance exams. These entrance exams are crucial to a person's status in life even at this early age, so there is no time for students to experiment, analyze, or reflect, and to large extent even utilize expressive language Thus, students do not learn to use academic cognitive skills like analysis and synthesis. The gap produced here is not only frustrates a North American teacher but also undermines the ability for students to function in an immersion classroom. It is necessary that students be able to process content for language acquisition. It is also necessary that students show some commitment and initiative in their learning independent from the teacher's direct instruction.

Also, this phenomenon of entrance exams and its concomitant 'study' cycle requires that students understand material in their own language. Entrance

examinations are given in the native language exclusively in Japan and China. Johnson and Swain (1997) describe some European countries where these tests are given in a choice of languages at the completion of immersion programs. Their results show that it is possible for immersion students to fulfill qualifications for post-secondary study, but we must remember that these are Western countries.

At present, Japanese and Chinese societies are completely dependent on a hierarchical system that allows the prestige of high schools and universities to determine a person's employment rather than the person's abilities, or even efforts. It is this dependence that will probably more than anything impede the success of immersion in secondary schools there. Until this disappears, there will probably be no place for teaching analytical or other academic skills that are of great value not only in Western education, but also in the Western professional life. Nor will there be any experimentation with these Asian students' abilities to process content in a second language and know it in their own.

Thus, there is a fit in that immersion is often a teacher-fronted methodology; but on the other hand, a nonfit, because content study in Western countries requires student analysis, synthesis, quick reading skills, and at least written expression. These in fact have proved to be elemental in CBI teaching, and particularly in the secondary and tertiary levels (Willis 1997, 1998a, 1998b).

Consequences at the tertiary level

From the secondary school experience then, a student at the university level has these expectations of school: The teacher is the giver of knowledge, and that knowledge is deliverable by lecture. A student's only academic responsibility is to copy, memorize, and repeat it on an exam. There is no other measure of achievement or academic proficiency. The teacher is also expected to be a counselor who keeps learners in line by forcing them to recognize and reflect on their misbehavior and lack of self-control. Motivation is external and very clear – to pass entrance exams.

However, they are also unconsciously accustomed to the following remnants of their preschool and elementary days: Any classroom that does not employ the strict rules, teacher fronting, and lecture style of rote learning leaves the environment open for chatting and playing and freedom of the elementary days when they could hardly do no wrong. Academic sessions are run with explicit routines that they have been taught to use in order to make transitions smooth. In other words, they have an inbred need to know the rules and routines of the organization of the classroom in which they are engaged. Otherwise, they do not know how to 'do' school. Discipline of any individual comes from fellow students rather than a teacher. When there is a time given for thought, proper thought and reflection are to take time.

The expectations of Western teachers at this level of education include the following: Students know that teachers do not have all answers but are looked at as guides into knowledge. Students are accustomed to reading extensively and synthesizing information and ideas. They are also accustomed to participating in class with questions and thoughts of their own. Evaluations are based on class participation, writing, projects, and exams. Students expect to be required to do much of their learning on their own outside of class (homework). Students come to classes knowing that they are responsible for their learning. They will be able to follow the class presentation and information without explicit organization. Class participation and interchange is to be rapid fire. Motivation is internal as well as external and is highly individualized. In bold contrast to a Japanese or Chinese classroom, as illustrated well by the studies of Stevenson and Stigler (1992), Western classrooms are fast-paced, flooding students with problems and activities, not always with smooth organization or transitions.

Western teachers who have not at least studied the Japanese schooling system will not present a class that matches Japanese students' expectations. Students may be stunned that homework is as important, if not more important than, exams, or that there will in fact be no exams for a class. Western teachers may find Japanese students to be rather childish. Japanese students may be surprised at the direct affront that Western teachers offer disruptive or misbehaving students. Japanese students may not be able to follow the organization of a Western teacher's class unless it is spelled out for them and they are clearly given the routines of the presentation.

Students in these countries are accustomed not only to highly routinized classes and explicit instructions, but also to didacticism that does not allow for anything other than correct, expected responses. The secondary school has taught them to be strictly correct with answers. If they cannot respond perfectly, they may not respond at all. On the other hand, Japanese students are taught, particularly in their early schooling, that when problems are posed to them, they should take time to form an answer. Western students are accustomed to quick-clipped questioning, response, and interaction. When asking for participation, Western teachers may not give enough time for the careful thought and reflection that Japanese students have been taught to give. Instead they may consider that the student cannot answer. In addition, volunteering to give an answer in class constitutes standing out, and standing out is against the tacit rules of Japanese society.

After all his years of either being explicitly led into learning objectives (as in elementary school) and then being overtly and thoroughly trained for entrance exams, if the Japanese student is not given a direct connection between the class and the reason he should achieve in it, he lacks motivation. For a Westerner,

however, generally, being a motivator for a content class is considered a less than ideal role for a classroom teacher.

The functions of Japanese classrooms are different from modern Western schools. They represent potential difficulties in implementing a North American immersion model.

Early immersion success and shortcomings

If a Japanese or Chinese student is brought up from early schooling in a true immersion program, being taught in a Western manner, he will probably not have problems with the methodology. Not only that, but he will not have problems in his content area skills. In fact, studies indicate that 'immersion-bred' children possibly emerge with better symbolic skills than those in non-immersion programs (Lambert 1980; Cummins 1998). In other words, they have a better automatic processing of language. This may account for their better facility of their own language, in fact. It may also be a sample of how Krashen input theory and McLaughlin's (1979) active processing may fit together. However, if that student plans to operate in Japanese or Chinese society, he will probably need to learn quite a bit of content in his mother tongue, also. There will be technical discourse and vocabulary necessary for higher learning, training, and operation within his career as well as for entrance exams.

This shortcoming can be satisfied by a partial immersion program, though. At Katoh Gakuen, Dr. Bostwick (1996) reported that students who had gone through four years of Katoh's immersion excelled even in their native language over those in Katoh's Japanese track. In 1998 he told this author that those entering junior high had attained both content and second language and still had attained expected levels of Japanese.

Full immersion and late immersion -- difficulties and possibilities

It would be difficult to put Asian students in full immersion or immersion without substantial instruction in their own languages – particularly because the writing systems are so very different from Western languages. Japanese has another unexpected problem, too. Their society has trouble reabsorbing children that have lived and been schooled abroad in Western countries. If students are thoroughly immersed and taught by Westerners, will this exacerbate that situation? On the other hand, Japan's education ministry has officially declared its effort to internationalize the country via education, and this is one path that may lead to fulfilling that declaration. One of the stated reasons that parents of Katoh Gakuen students choose immersion is in order for their children to experience other cultures.

Another solution might be for Western teachers to learn to teach the Japanese way, using the target language to instill the same values using the same pedagogy. Part of immersion goals, in that case, will be lost, though, in that students will not

gain insight into the culture of the target language, and there still remains that there are academic processing skills that are not given time or environment for in Japanese or Chinese pedagogy.

Putting students into late immersion – full or partial – on the other hand, poses more serious difficulties for teacher and student. Two modifications may be necessary – to bring the Western teacher into line with the non-Western style of teaching, as above, and/or to instill a new style or routine of school behavior but in either case to give extra instruction in the academic skills that Western teachers use in teaching their content.

What complicates the situation even further is that though schools and the education ministry still use entrance exams and still play into the stratified school system, the number of students who apply their efforts toward entering the better schools is becoming a minority. They have been discouraged by the effort and the relative low reward. Thus, an immersion teacher finds students who have never been motivated intrinsically toward academics, and at the university level, are even more lacking in inertia because they have lost hope that there will be any reward.

Many believe that early immersion is unsurpassable, but it has been seen that later language learners can match proficiencies of early learners, even with less exposure to the target language (Sternfeld 1988). However, these studies concluded that the reason for the gains could be the higher order cognitive skills found in adult learners. If these cognitive skills are culture specific, proceeding from the classroom practice described above, then the findings of these postsecondary studies cannot encourage immersion application in non-Western classrooms.

Language in subjects of later years, though, is more cognitively demanding and more abstract, less context embedded than that in elementary school. Furthermore, in junior high and high schools, the immense body of knowledge that a student must learn does not allow for the time it takes for 'teacher talk', physical response, graphic organizers, or experiential learning. In other words, late immersion program must allow for the strategies of early immersion, and there is no time for that. Some experimental immersion curricula feature regular language skills instruction to bring students to a certain level before putting them into an immersion program (for example, Duff 1995; Johnson and Swain 1999). The Japanese case might fit into this model, with the six years of English studied before university, but this language is not oral, and the immersion system relies foremost on listening.

Another alternative Sternfeld proposes is to immerse students but severely lower expectations, along with using elementary strategies. In Japan, at least, this may be feasible at university levels since there is no demand for a content acquisition for life-determining examinations. However, in this case, this author contends that it becomes a language course, with content so subsumed that language

no longer becomes the tool that it is supposed to be in immersion. The usefulness of the language disappears and the great effects of immersion along with it.

One last consideration

There is also the sidedness of brain to consider. Although Hiser (1998) points out that there is no hemispheric favoring in Japan indicated by handedness, Kamada (1998) discusses the possibilities of work and play and hemispherical favoring, which could indicate that pedagogies lead to hemispherical use. On balance, Hsia (1988) reports that Asian American high school and university students are indeed mathematically superior to white peers. This discounts the pedagogical influence in training hemisphere use, but it does hint that there may be some brain use that is genetic. Either way, here is evidence of another culture-based component to learning that must be taken into account in establishing a North American methodology in Asia.

Conclusion

What we can conclude is that though there are bold and positive effects of immersion programming, it requires a profound contrastive analysis. First, programmers must be completely familiar with the philosophical underpinnings – both tacit and overt – of the model. Then they must have either firsthand experience or detailed ethnographies of the classroom practices (which ethnographies are far from numerous). These must be contrasted with the same in-depth familiarity and detailed knowledge of the same elements in the schooling of the society in which the immersion is to take place. It also requires understanding the basics of teaching and learning language as a tool – the sides of both the teacher and the learner – and it requires knowledge and submission to the societal expectations where it is to be tried. Asia and North America being particularly different in cultures and societal expectations, there should be special caution to be prepared for the possible problems that may arise so that indeed that caution may preclude discouragement.

Call for participation in surveying pedagogies

There is a great need for contrastive pedagogies; not many studies exist. As a consequence (or a cause), there are unhealthy assumptions made and acted upon. Because of her desire to see the positive effects of immersion spread in Asia, this author is in the midst of refining a questionnaire to study teachers' individual pedagogies and their perceptions of their societies' expectations of pedagogy. The feedback has come thus

far from Japanese, Taiwanese, and North American teachers. It seeks to find whether there are truly differences between Asian and North American teachers and to find what they are. The questionnaire was used to query some participants at this conference, participants at the 1998 conference of the English Teachers Association of the Republic of China, and several teachers in Japan.

It is comprised of statements from the literature regarding schooling of the two regions particularly those with bearing on immersion principles. At present it is in the refinement stage and wants more input from any readers who would like to help in making it an accurate and workable questionnaire. Please contact the author for more information on how to offer your input in the project.

Works Cited

Allen, P., Cummins, J., Harley, B., Lapkin S., and Swain, M. 1989. Restoring the balance: A response to Hammerly. The Canadian Modern Language Review. 45, 770-776.

Cummins, James. 1998. Immersion education for the millenium: what we have learned from thirty years of research on second language immersion. Learning Through Two Languages: Research and Practice. Katoh Gakuen School, Numazu, Shizuoka, Japan.

Duff, Patricia. 1995. An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. TESOL Quarterly, 29. 505-36.

Glisan, Eileen W. and Fall, Thekla F. 1991. Adapting an elementary immersion approach to secondary and postsecondary language teaching: the methodological connection. In Phillips, June K., ed. Building bridges and making connections. Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Hiser, Elizabeth. 1998. Practical applications of NLP in the classroom. Paper presented at Japan Association of College English Teachers Conference, Okayama, Japan.

Hsia, Jayjia. 1988. Asia Americans in higher education and at work. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Johnson, R. Keith and Swain, Merrill, eds. 1997. Immersion education: international perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kamada, Laurel Diane. 1991. Brain function and English language learning in Japan. Toshokan Jyoho Daigaku, Kenkyu Hokoku 1991, Daijokan Kai.

Lambert, W. 1980. The social psychology of language: a perspective for the 1980s. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson and P.M. Smith, eds.,

Language: Social Psychological Perspectives. Oxford: Pergamon.
Lapkin, Sharon and Swain, Merrill. 1996. Vocabulary teaching in a grade 8 French immersion classroom: a descriptive study. The Canadian Modern Language Review. 53, 1. 242-256.
Lewis, Catherine. 1995. Educating hearts and minds: reflections on Japanese preschool and elementary education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McLaughlin, B. 1979. The monitor model: some methodological considerations. Language Learning, 28, 309-32.
National Association of State Boards of Education. 1988. Right from the start: the report of the NASBE task force on Early childhood education. Alexandria: National Association of State Boards of Education.
Sato, Nancy. 1996. Honoring the individual. In Rohlen, Thomas, ed., Teaching and learning in Japan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sternfeld, Steven. 1988. The applicability of the immersion approach to college foreign language instruction. Foreign Language Annals, 21, 3, 221-5.
Stevenson, Harold W. and Stigler, J. W. 1992. The learning gap: why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Walberg, Herbert. 1979. Educational environments and effects. Berkeley: McLutchan Publishing.
Willis, A. Sue. 1997. An examination of content-based instruction in oral communication classes at the University of South Carolina's Engli Programs for Internationals. M.A. thesis.
Willis, A. Sue (1998a). Feasibility of content-based instruction in Japanese [university] foreign language courses. Studies in International Relations (Intercultural Relations) July 1998. 39-60.
Willis, A. Sue. (1998b). Academic success and content-based language instruction. Studies in International Relations (Intercultural Relations). December 1998. 77-102.

Other Works Consulted

Baker, Colin. 1996. Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism. 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Beardsmore, Hugo B., ed. 1993. European models of bilingual education. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Bernhardt, Elizabeth B., ed. 1992. Life in language immersion classrooms. Multilingual Matters 86. ED355823 (ERIC document)
Bostwick, R. Michael, in press. Bilingual education of children in Japan: year

four of a partial immersion program. In Fotos, S. and Noguchi, M., eds., Studies in Japanese bilingualism. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Brock, Colin and Tulasiewicz, Witold, eds. 1994. Education in a single Europe. London: Routledge.
Chaudron, Craig. 1986. Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in French immersion classes. In Day, Richard, ed., Talking to learn: conversation in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Cohen, Andrew D. 1995. The role of thought in foreign language learning. Working Papers in Educational Linguistics. 11, 2. 1-11.
Crew, Vernon. 1994. When does a carrot become a stick? changing attitudes and English language proficiency of Hong Kong student teachers. Paper presented at the International Language in Education Conference. ED388063 (ERIC document)
Curtain, Helena A. and Pesola, C. A. 1988. Languages and children – making the match. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Day, Elaine and Shapson, Stan. 1996. Studies in immersion education. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
de Courcy, Michele and Birch, Gary. 1993. Reading and writing strategies used in a Japanese immersion program. ED388097 (ERIC document)
Edwards, Viviane and Rehorick, Sally. 1990. Learning environments in immersion and non-immersion classrooms: are they different? The Canadian Modern Language Review. 46, 3. 469-93.
Finkelstein, Barbara, Imamura, Anne and Tobin, Joseph, eds. 1991. Transcending stereotypes: discovering Japanese culture and education. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
Genesee, Fred. 1987. Learning through two languages. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
Holliday, Adrian. 1994. Appropriate methodology and social context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jakubowski, Elizabeth and Tobin, Kenneth. 1991. Teachers' personal epistemologies and classroom learning environments. In Fraser, Barry and Walberg, Herbert, eds., Educational environments. Oxford: Pergamon.
Johnson, R. K. 1994. From core to content: bridging the L2 proficiency gap in late immersion. Language and education. 8, 4. 211-229.
Lang, John. 1993. Near immersion results in one-third of the time. Mid Atlantic Journal of Foreign Language Pedagogy. 1. 109-127.
Met, Myriam and Lorenz, Eileen. 1995. Recruitment, preparation, and support of immersion teachers. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.

Perrine, Byron K. 1991. What works in my classroom: ideas for content design team for the 1991 Foreign Language Development Seminar. ED340231 (ERIC document)

Pfister, Guenter G. 1987. Culture, proficiency, and control in foreign language teaching. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Pinnington, Adrian J. 1986. Inside out; English education and Japanese culture. Tokyo: Sansyusya.

Richards, Jack. 1990. The language teaching matrix. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ripple, R. E. et al. 1984. Cognitive and affective costs of bilingual education; a look at the Hong Kong experience. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Ryan, James. 1994. Organising the facts: aboriginal education and cultural differences in school discourse and knowledge. Language and education. 8, 4. 251-271.

Simmons, Cyril. 1990. Growing up and going to school in Japan. Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press.

Smith, Samuel. 1988. The second language acquisition process in immersion contexts: theory and research. Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education. 1, 2. 119-31.

Snow, Marguerite. 1998. Trends and issues in content-based instruction. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18, 243-67.

Stevenson, Harold W. 1992. The learning gap. New York: Summit Books.

Swain, Merrill. 1988. Manipulating and complementing content teaching to maximize second language learning. TESL Canada Journal. 6, 1. 68-83.

Trimino, Andy and Ferguson, Nancy. 1993. What works in immersion? ED364112. (ERIC document)

Willis, A. Sue. 1999. Pre-industrial Western thought on children and the concomitant pedagogy. Journal of the College of International Relations (Nihon University Institute of International Studies). February 1999. 69 87.