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Abstract

This research investigated the construction of interculturality in the context of foreign language education in Australian primary schools. The study explored the curriculum areas of citizenship education and foreign language education within the Human Society and Its Environment Key Learning Area in NSW primary schools, focusing on how the curricula contribute to the goals of intercultural understanding, and examined the potential of applying Japanese language learning education as one of the tools to serve the development of students’ interculturality.

The methodology used for this study is a qualitative paradigm. The study is a case study with multiple contexts including two primary schools, a high school and a university. The methodology and analysis are framed by grounded theory. The researcher’s position in conducting this study is underpinned by cultural theory. Literature on globalisation, citizenship, language education and interculturality were explored.

The participants were thirty primary school students from two different schools, five high school students and the teachers of their Japanese language classes, five university students who are studying the Japanese language as their major, and other stakeholders. The researcher explored the participants’ perceptions and beliefs regarding the multiple issues of identity, Japanese language teaching and learning and the development of interculturality. In addition, classroom observations were conducted and recorded over several months, curriculum documents were analysed, and teacher seminars and professional development courses were attended. The data analyses, coding and classifying, were conducted in three phases, each building upon the results of the other, as revealed in the grounded theory approach.

The results of this study are discussed around three key themes: self-identity construction through Japanese language learning experiences; schools as sites of cultural production and reproduction where the students’ development of self-identity is crucially influenced; and language education for interculturality. The
students’ school is a crucial location for the development of interculturality, where the curriculum can be planned to stimulate their subjective awareness of self, which is an important process in the development of this quality.

The result indicates that Japanese language education can be a tool to promote and develop interculturality. Recommendations have been proposed in three major areas: the position of language education in the school curriculum; teachers’ professional development to enhance their interculturality; and future research. Language education should be a compulsory subject within any primary school curriculum. It is revealed that the importance of developing interculturality has to be manifested, not as a by-product of schooling, but should be purposefully directed. The notion of intercultural competency while learning a foreign language opens up new dimensions for the language teaching arena. Professional development of teachers, and longitudinal research to follow the outcomes of new language teaching approaches are crucial for today’s society.
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This study emerged from my personal experience of being both a Japanese language teacher and lecturer in Australia and a doctoral student who has been studying in Australia, working within a different educational, social and cultural environment from my Japanese origins. I am also wife of a man from a Fiji Indian cultural background, and mother of two sons who were born in Fiji and brought up within the Australian education system. In this prologue, my aim is to clarify my background as the researcher of this study.

In the year 2000, Dr Lowitja O’Donoghue, an Aboriginal woman and Australian of the Year, outlined three necessary qualities for responsible citizenship. She said these are: an ability to critically examine oneself and one’s traditions; an ability to see beyond immediate group loyalties, extending to strangers the ethical concern we extend to friends and kin; and the ability to see the likely consequences of human behaviour, both intended and unintended. In January 2001, the Australia Day speech by astronomer Professor Bryan Gaensler, former Young Australian of the Year, was on the importance of educating Australian people to respect the culture, beliefs and rights of our native peoples. Tim Flannery, Australian of the Year 2007, in his Australia Day address in 2007 said that the land, its climate, creatures and plants are the only things that we share in common, and said that Australia’s population policy should be based on recognition of environmental sustainability.

My experience as an immigrant, who cannot proudly participate in the ANZAC Day ceremony because of my Japanese background is significant. Because of my Japanese background and the knowledge of the Hiroshima tragedy, I am a pacifist. I cannot agree with commemorating any sort of war experience, even ANZAC Day. Does this mean that I am not a ‘good citizen’ of Australia?

I was born and brought up in Hokkaido, Japan, and lived there as one of the dominant Japanese cultural group for 27 years. Japanese indigenous people still live in Hokkaido, but I know nothing about these people. I am ashamed of this,
but education in Japan while I was brought up seemed more concerned with how quickly Japanese people could catch up with the West, while making sure Japanese patriarchal society was maintained. My parents taught me to be a good Japanese person, honest and hard working, with the ability to keep harmony within their community. They taught me how to act sensibly within the family tradition. Sensible behaviour, in my parents’ view, would include not seeking to stand out in a crowd, not displaying emotion, not being ‘difficult’ or promoting friction, and working hard without seeking prominence.

I was brought up in a typically traditional Japanese family. I lived in a society where the descriptive word of ‘ordinary’ provides a positive connotation rather than negative. There was no question about my identity. I was a Japanese woman who spoke Japanese language, followed Japanese tradition, and lived in Japan. While I was in Japan I never had an occasion to think who I was besides being Japanese.

Everything changed when I married my Fiji Indian husband, whose religion is Islam. After the marriage I lived in Fiji for six years, and in 1987 moved with my family to Australia. It’s been twenty two years since then. In Fiji, I became a member by marriage of the small minority group of Islamic Fiji Indians (about 16% of the Fiji Indian community). Within the community I was accepted and also protected by my husband’s identity as a local man. I also think that I was protected by my identity as a person who was from Japan, a country that contributed a large percentage of Fiji’s economic assistance.

While in Fiji, I tried to be like a ‘Fiji Indian woman’. In a way what I was trying to do was not to stand out and not to create friction. I thought if I could learn to be a Fiji Indian woman, I might somehow be able to melt into society and not stand out.

I was becoming one of the Fiji people, but there was no question about my identity as Japanese; I felt that more than ever. Within my new family in Fiji, I at first felt an outsider because I could not speak their language, I dressed differently, ate food differently. Acceptance increased enormously when I actually developed
the language skills to communicate with the people in their language, became able
to cook their traditional meals, managed myself as a leading person of the family
to celebrate their tradition and sometimes even dressed like the traditional Fiji
Indian woman. My effort paid off in terms of gaining acceptance from the people.

However, although I knew that the people accepted me, I felt negative about Fiji
and its people because, at that time, I felt they were not like Japan, Japanese
people and this made me see the gap, rather than appreciate the difference.
Looking back now, I believe I had quite an arrogant attitude, seeing myself as
coming from a ‘modern’ and very ‘industrialised’ place, whereas Fiji was only a
developing country. I did not realise that my attitude was very limited and narrow.
The effort I made to be accepted by the society did not actually come from my
humble attitude, it was just because of the way I was brought up. When I reflect
on why I felt that way, I feel that I was trying to assimilate myself into the society
by imitating them without respecting them.

The political situation for the Indian minority became worse, and there was a coup
in 1987, which was not favourable to the Indian minority group in Fiji. We were
forced into deciding to leave Fiji, with our two sons. We moved to Australia
thinking about our sons’ future in Australia compared to their future life in Fiji as
children from a minority Indian family. We moved at the end of December in
1987. Since then I have lived in Australia. My older son is now 28 years old and
younger son 24 years. I am sure that we are described as a family of an ethnic
minority group in Australia.

While each geographical shift changed my position of identity from a person who
belongs to the dominant group to a little minority group and then a visibly distinct
minority group, my self-identity remains the same; simply Japanese comes first
before any description of myself. However, I live in Australia now, and I have
been teaching Japanese language in Australia since 1988.

The thesis is concerned with identity, language, citizenship and ways in which
young people learn to shift their intercultural understandings and attitudes through
educational and personal experiences. The study reflects my personal journey
from my own country to my status as citizen of Australia. It aims to reach out to teachers and teacher educators to examine their own sense of identity, and to embrace the overarching principle of interculturality, that of creating an Australian society that is multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic, multi-religious, as well as harmonious and non-violent.
Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1 Introduction

What does it mean to be a ‘good’ citizen of Australia? Australian Commonwealth Government documents such as *Whereas the People: civics and citizenship education* (Civics Expert Group: 1994) show that new citizenship education in Australia define Australia as a pluralistic society characterised by difference and diversity, whose citizens are encouraged to draw strength from our differences rather than seeing these differences as divisive. Does this policy penetrate into everyday classroom practice at primary schools in Australia? Do our teachers know how to teach their students how to become good citizens? How can we educate our children to become ‘good’ citizens of Australia?

This study is about Japanese language teaching and learning frameworks in Australian schools exploring how students can articulate their identity and grounded connection to people within today’s globalised society. In many aspects of today’s society, the importance of political, geographical and physical boundaries is fading away, and so people’s understanding or awareness of boundaries is also fading away. Where these boundaries seem to be disintegrating, people’s sense of belonging is also disintegrating. It is suggested in this thesis that a ‘good citizen’ can only be found within a society where we feel that we belong. Articulating our sense of identity assists us to feel we belong, and this leads us down the path to good citizenship within a society where individuals and cultures connect. This study looks at the nature of change in students’ sense of identity, belonging and citizenship as presented within the goals of developing interculturality in Japanese language classes. The working definition of interculturality in this thesis describes a state of being, a created sphere to understand another culture in relation to one's own, a consciousness of ‘other’ that is at one with consciousness of self. These concepts will be elaborated on throughout the thesis.
As previous research shows, implementing intercultural awareness consciously in the foreign language classroom is a new development within the Japanese language teaching framework in Australia. It has been actively practised, as seen in the national Asian Languages Professional Learning Project (2003). This research investigates whether intercultural awareness actually develops students’ sense of their own cultural identity while learning Japanese, and if it is possible, then to show how students’ interculturality develops while learning a foreign language, in this study, the Japanese language. The study presents a theoretical rationale for developing a more focused approach to citizenship education and the linkage between citizenship education and, through a grounded theory approach, discovers ways of linking citizenship education with foreign language learning.

The focus of the study lies in the primary schools in Australia, using case studies of classes in two primary schools in New South Wales, together with further information gleaned for comparative purposes from interviews with a small selection of students in high schools and in a university class.

This chapter identifies the research questions, the background to the study, identification of the problems, significance of the study, and the definition of the terms followed by the limitations of the study.

1.2 Research Questions

In Australia, questions of nationalism and civic responsibility are increasingly significant themes in discussions of education and cultural practice (Print, 2002; Howard & Gill, 2000; Prior, 1999, Iredale, 1997). Banks (2001) claims that in light of increasing racial, ethnic, cultural, and language diversity, it is important for teachers to help students develop a delicate balance of cultural, national, and global identifications. This importance leads this study to set the following focus research question and sub-questions.
The focus question is:

How does a language learning experience influence development of interculturality?

Sub-questions are:

- What contribution do Japanese language classes make to identity construction?
- How does Japanese language teaching and learning in New South Wales impact on children's understanding of interculturality?
- What are the interrelationships between interculturality, identity and citizenship?

1.3 The Background and the significance of the study

Since the turn of the century, much has been said about globalisation in many different contexts in our life, and progress in technology communications and international economic integration is intensifying. Taylor et al. (1997:54) argue that the rhetoric of ‘global imperatives’ now underpins a host of policy prescriptions from the study of Asian languages and cultures in Australia, to computers in schools, administrative reform and increased participation in higher education. With such social change being experienced in the global society, curriculum in primary school education has to be revisited. Skilbeck (1990:43) noticed a distinction between curriculum as a deliberate effort to reinstate a national consensus about educational goals and values and curriculum as an assertion of a point of view about education and social change which the government of the day is prepared to affirm even if that means the possibility of increased divisions and differences within the country. Hargreaves (1996:23) argues that this discourse of change is grounded in the central proposition that the challenges and changes facing teachers and schools are not parochially confined to education but are rooted in a major sociohistorical transition from a period of modernity to one of postmodernity. Introduction of Japanese language teaching at primary school is seen as a phenomenon which was born during this period of
social change in Australian society, and the process of implementation of the new 
K-10 language syllabus in New South Wales, reflected these changes.

Australia’s National Policy on Language was established in 1987 (Lo Bianco, 
1987), and schools have been encouraged to teach an increasing number of 
languages over the last twenty years. In 1987, nine languages were selected as 
desirable languages to learn in terms of community links, economic rationalism, 
and the geographical situation of Australia. Japanese language was one of the 
selected languages. As part of the trend, primary schools were also encouraged to 
teach a foreign language. This is documented in the ‘Human Society and Its 
Environment K-6’ syllabus, published in 1998, by the New South Wales Board of 
Studies (Board of Studies NSW, 1998:5). It has been reaffirmed in the recently 
published syllabus of the Human Society and Its Environment K-6 that all 
students must have an opportunity to develop an awareness of a Language Other 
Than English (Board of Studies NSW, 2006:5).

In relation to Japanese, this requirement for LOTE has raised a number of 
problematic issues. Firstly, teachers in primary schools do not always have 
specialist knowledge of Japan or the Japanese language and they often face 
difficulties in continuing these programs. This has generally limited the 
introduction of Japanese to those schools that are wealthy enough to employ a 
Japanese specialist. ‘If a teacher can’t or won’t do it, it simply can’t be done’ 
(Hargreaves & Evans, 1997:3). Secondly, the reasons behind the introduction of 
Japanese language classes and the benefits of their implementation for primary 
school children are not always clear to some school communities. There are many 
migrant families living in Australia whose children are already bilingual and their 
parents and teachers do not see any importance in teaching a third language, thus 
presenting resistance to the viewpoint of business leaders and politicians. As 
Brady (1992:175) explains, an initiator of change may not be fully aware of the 
situation faced by implementers and may therefore attempt to produce changes 
with insufficient attention to either the values and experience of those involved, or 
the situational constraints. Thirdly, as the generic LOTE syllabus (Board of 
Studies, New South Wales, 1996) points out, the primary school program should 
consider the links between primary and high schools in regard to LOTE study.
However, the syllabus contains no guidance to help primary schools in their approach to this kind of linkage in the study of the Japanese language. Then, the new syllabus K-10 was published in 2003, declaring the link between Kindergarten to Year 6, and Years 7, 8, 9 and 10 (Japanese K-10, Board of Studies NSW, 2003). However, primary teaching specialists often have no foreign language teaching skills, since Faculties of Education in Australian universities often do not have foreign language teaching components as a core subject. Moreover, there is no evidence for including foreign language teaching components within the teaching program for the HSIE subject within the universities. This indicates that although the syllabus as a document shows the link between primary and high school LOTE studies, it is still an armchair theory, leaving both levels of schooling floundering with the unforeseen outcomes of an unformulated policy and program whose aims and objectives have been ambiguous. It is crucial to identify the primary language class in the larger picture of language education, rather than seeing this study as an isolated component of primary education. Fullan (2001: 81) explains that vision-building permeates the organisation with values, purpose, and integrity for both the what and how of improvement.

Understanding how interculturality develops while teaching school is significantly important, because without this identification, the ‘why and how to’ necessary to promote citizenship education through students’ awareness of interculturality and citizenship responsibilities cannot be clearly understood. The teachers cannot assist the students to develop this quality without knowing how they develop this same quality.

This study will provide significant value to foreign language teachers in general and Japanese language teachers in particular, by clarifying what is interculturality and how the students’ interculturality develops. The syllabus for Language Other Than English (LOTE) published in 2003 clearly discussed the development of intercultural awareness while learning the language; however, this researcher observed the teachers’ confusion when attempting to teach this quality because of the lack of clarification of this concept.
Developing citizenship education in Australia, especially within the New South Wales school curriculum, is necessary as the current program within the Human Society and Its Environment (HSIE) subject may not be effective enough to provide children with multicultural citizenship education for developing intercultural understanding, essential to their becoming positive members of Australian society. It is claimed in this thesis that finding a tool to facilitate children being active participants in a diverse society is a crucial task for Australian education. The study investigates whether foreign language learning could be a concrete experience to assist children in this task, if the aims and objectives of educating language learners are to develop interculturality.

Despite the positive new developments within foreign language teaching and learning approaches, the identification of how this quality develops requires guidance for teachers to teach ‘intercultural awareness’ at a far deeper level than a chopstick, origami and sumo wrestling approach. This study examines how intercultural awareness can be developed and better understood by both the teachers and the students. Unless this clarification occurs, this new challenge in the primary school curriculum will be difficult to successfully implement and the value of the initiative may be lost. The following points state the specific problems in regards to this study.

1.4 Statement of the problem

1.4.1 Australian Languages Other than English (LOTE)

Introduction of LOTE in primary school not only teaches children the language, but also develops an awareness of the global world in which they live. By learning another language and culture, they develop awareness in themselves, self-identity as a global citizen while developing understanding of other cultures and developing linking points between self and others.

As research into the relationship between language and culture progresses, communicative competence is now being redefined in terms of cross-cultural understanding, intercultural and critical communicative competence (Byram,
Very little was said in the research about how the learners learn and the teachers teach intercultural awareness in practical ways in a Japanese language teaching arena. As Crozet and Liddicoat (2000) state, there is a need for research which will help to understand how a second culture is acquired and how an intercultural space is created by the learner. Also Kramsch (1995) explains that in most foreign language classrooms, interculturality is not being taught as a systematic apprenticeship of difference nor is it generally integrated into a multicultural view of education. Wu (2001) also claimed in his research that though teachers design the lessons in certain socio-cultural contexts and introduce the concept of cultural appropriateness, raising the learner’s socio-critical consciousness is not the aim of their teaching.

However, a recent government report on Intercultural Language Learning, which was published by the Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training, in July 2003 (Liddicoat et al., 2003), shows that language teachers’ understanding of the concepts of language and culture varies. It also shows that language teachers recognise a connection between language learning and the interrelated concepts of ‘identity’, ‘intercultural competency’ and ‘literacy’. Nevertheless, they have different levels of understanding and recognition on such connection with the language (Liddicoat et al., 2003: 4-5). In a very positive move, the Asia Education Foundation (AEF), in partnership with the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers’ Associations (AFMLTA) started a project in 2004 called the Asian Languages Professional Learning Project (ALPLP) to focus on languages methodology. In particular they examine intercultural language learning and links across the curriculum, yet it seems that clarification of intercultural competency is still an issue among the classroom teachers. The current development of language teaching shows the importance of the intercultural language component in current Australian schooling, and it is of absolute importance for the teachers who implement it in the classroom to be sure of what it is and how it develops.

1.4.2 LOTE/Japanese syllabus development
The New South Wales government announced the revision of the existing Years 7-10 language syllabuses in its Education and Training Plan for 1999-2003, and
the Board of Studies supported the revision of existing syllabuses for Languages in Years 7-10 with the aim of developing new syllabuses for K-10. As a part of this process, *Languages K-10 Draft Framework* was published by the Board of Studies New South Wales in 2001 and the syllabus was published in 2003. This framework shows renewed emphasis on integrating language and culture, and its aim is beyond the goal of communicative proficiency in the sense that learners are encouraged to find a '…meeting place between different forces, different cultures and different worldviews' (Board of Studies New South Wales, 2001:12).

However, the mandatory years for LOTE are only Years 7 to 10 in the new syllabus. The study of language in Kindergarten to Year 6 (K-6) is a component of the K-6 HSIE (Human Society and Its Environment) key learning area in New South Wales, but it is not compulsory in primary schooling. This causes problems in teaching language from Year 7 as the students’ background knowledge of the chosen language varies. Also, it is observed that HSIE subject/topics seem to be valued less than other key learning areas such as English, Mathematics and Science studies. Clarification of the need to develop intercultural competency may change this trend.

It is crucial to note that the language component and citizenship education are both included within the HSIE content. However, these subjects are seen by teachers as separate components of the subject. The core value of the citizenship education within the foreign language education is vaguely identified, without the horizontal link between the school curriculum and the big picture of education, which fundamentally aims to educate people to be ‘a good citizen’ of this world.

### 1.4.3 Multicultural education policy

Multiculturalism in Australia was introduced in the 1970s and continually reaffirmed and refined in the 1980s and 1990s (Castles, 1992; Markus, 1994). Cultural diversity is seen as crucial to our future, both in terms of interethnic relations and in terms of the need to find a new place in the Asia-Pacific region (Vasta & Castles, 1996: 2). Australia may be regarded as a laboratory for multiculturalism because of the way it has ‘managed’ its internal pluralism, especially in relation to the settlement of ethnically diverse immigrant groups.
However, as Vasta and Castles (1996) claimed a decade ago, and as will be seen in this thesis, racism is still a problem in multicultural Australia; a commitment to fundamental change is still missing in many areas of multiculturalism in Australia.

Multicultural education in Australia emerged in the 1980s and the 1990s, and at the time, gave practical expression to the concerns that Australian values and customs should not be interpreted only as Anglo-Australian values and customs (Foster & Harman, 1992:111). One of the key focuses of 1990s multicultural education was to encourage ‘a multicultural attitude in Australian society by fostering the retention of the cultural heritage of different ethnic groups and promoting intercultural understandings’ (Foster and Harman, 1992:345). While this approach may have helped with the recognition of ethnic differences within the society, it did not address culture as multifaceted and dynamic; furthermore it did not deal with sexuality, disability, age and other social groups. It did not consider who we are. Also, it did not see culture as changing with time and place. Therefore, the word ‘intercultural’ within this educational framework was very limited, and it generally did not go beyond traditional cultural exchanges. It did not help to link one culture to another. It appeared to be almost like assisting society to become a collective mono-cultural society rather than making it a really coherent multicultural society. Although the educational material helped children understand and respect ethnic cultural differences, it only helped them to learn the cultural knowledge of an ethnic minority group. Intercultural understanding was not a core concept, and students were just observing another culture from an objective viewpoint. It was only a one-way trip rather than returning to your self to reflect your own self. It almost appeared like building a defensive environment for ethnic cultural communities, and it appeared to be virtually helping them to erect a fence rather than opening horizons.

Even as far back as 1988, Lois Foster (1988) having significant doubts about multicultural education in Australia.

Given the powerful socialisation function of education, it is not surprising that multicultural education (seen as an embodiment of the cultural pluralism policy) is to become a core element of formal education. Although we are unlikely to disagree with the vision of a cohesive, equal and just society, we must assess for
ourselves if policies of multiculturalism and multicultural education are the only way to achieve these ends. Is the ethnic factor of greater salience in influencing advantage or disadvantage than other factors such as age, sex or class? Or rather, does the key to lessening forms of inequity lie with teasing out the interrelations among these factors? Foster, L (1988: 180)

It is paradoxical that multicultural education leads educationally to so much defensive and inward-looking localisation, and after almost two decades since Foster’s questions, Australia is still looking for a more workable approach.

1.4.4 Citizenship education

As Torney-Purta (1995) claims, the absence of a sense of social cohesion or a sense of belonging to a civic culture promotes resurgent authoritarianism, xenophobia and racism, and alienation among youth from both the economic and political systems. Citizenship education produces young people who can not only survive in this ever changing environment but who can constantly transform it so that it is personally meaningful and socially beneficial. The Australian government policy seems to indicate agreement with this claim. However, it seems that the government interest in education seems to lie more in the shortsighted economic values of the country rather than the human values of its people. From a critical perspective, it appears that there is a lack of understanding that educating the people of Australia as intrinsically culturally educated citizens could fundamentally assist the country. It is observed that a subject such as the NSW HSIE has less weight than an Information Technology subject.

1.5 Focus of the study

The aim of this study is to articulate the need to promote a depth of interculturality and thereby to create a sense of responsible, harmonious citizenship. This study sees Japanese language education within the large picture of primary school education, and sees it as a tool to promote interculturality in practical ways.

Initially the study focused on primary school education, and the main participants were from two primary schools in New South Wales, Australia. However, as the
research progressed using a grounded theory approach, the focus expanded to include a small number of high school Japanese language students (and their teachers). In a later phase of the study, five university students who studied the language since their primary schooling were included in the study to further assist in the clarification of the results of the analysis. This resulted in the expansion of the initial analysis results.

As this study examines interculturality, the study’s methodological base was primarily a qualitative research approach using a case study research design. The two different primary school cases of Japanese language classrooms were the in-depth research sites, as outlined in Chapter 4.

1.6 Limitations of the study

I acknowledge in this section that I am aware of the limitations of this study. The study focuses on interculturality as a core concept, and this concept links the two different components, citizenship education and Languages Other Than English education in the HSIE syllabus in NSW. The participants are all based in New South Wales, and the comparisons are made with national practice and international theory and concepts.

Further, the researcher’s role in interpreting the data raises the issue of subjectivity in relation to the evidence collected and the conclusions reached. I need to highlight that qualitative study has to take into account the role of the researcher, as I discussed in Chapter 4 in detail, where I dealt with this issue. Yet, it is necessary to acknowledge my background as this study has grown from my personal life history. Although I believe this can be a strength for a qualitative researcher, I need to clarify my standpoint as it will be the source of how I conducted the study. Crotty (1998:53) discusses meaning and perspective in the research process, and explains that culture is best seen as the source rather than the result of human thought and behaviour. In this view of the role of culture, Crotty argues, human thought emerges as ‘basically both social and public’.
Also, I would like to point out that I am listening to stories of the participating students and their teachers whose voices are different from mine, and telling their story in this study. Articulating where my knowledge comes from is crucial. Hrycak & Jakubec (2006) presented powerful arguments from a feminist standpoint. They stress the effect of knowledge that begins from the lives of people who have struggled against oppression or exploitation, which can offer critical insight into existing beliefs and institutions. They argue that this critical insight can help us to transform those beliefs and institutions working toward a more just, democratic world.

I conducted this study as a Japanese language teacher, whose teaching philosophy is firmly to place the student as an individual being in this globe. The study was also informed by my personal experience of living in vastly different cultural environments, Japan, Fiji and Australia. Thirdly, the study is informed by my teaching Japanese language in different educational levels in Australia: primary schools, secondary schools and tertiary institutions in NSW as well as a Japanese immersion program managed by Education Queensland.

A fourth way in which the study was informed by my experience is my own sense of my Japanese identity. I always thought I was Japanese, but noticed that my version of ‘Japanese’ depended on where I was and with whom I was dealing. Whether I was in Japan, Fiji, or in Australia, or when I was teaching at primary school, immersion school, teaching jobless youth at a labour market program in TAFE, being a tourist or being a resident, each resulted in a different definition of a Japanese person. In each environment, I have to know who I am in order to comprehend what my role is, with whom I am dealing, and what is their expectation of me in each setting. Moving between these different environments, I have also learnt how it is to be a member of a minority as well as a dominant group. All these concerns and experiences connected with each other when I located myself in a language learning environment as a learner of language as well as a Japanese language teacher, because these experiences are about learning the culture of myself as well as all the people I encountered.
1.7 The structure of the thesis

The first chapter has presented the overview of this study. It gives an overview of the research focus, the problem and significance as well as the limitations of the study.

The purpose of the second chapter is to provide the theoretical basis, which underpins this study. The discussion was focused on key themes of this study: Globalisation and Education; Subjectivity and sense of identity; Language education and intercultural language learning. The discussions in each section unfold the need for a citizenship education which develops students’ interculturality, and its link between citizenship education and foreign language education. Also, this chapter discusses the literature to identify current fields of argument in relation to this study.

The aims of Chapter Three are to clarify issues related to citizenship education and foreign language education in Australia, and assist to locate the two subjects in a large picture of a primary school education in Australia. The chapter discusses the government documents in regard to citizenship education and foreign language education.

Chapter Four presents the research design and the approach to collecting the data, and how the data have been analysed. Employing qualitative research methodologies, this study explored the students’ development of interculturality while learning Japanese language. The case study was intended to gain in-depth understanding of the Japanese language learning environment within primary schools in New South Wales in Australia. This study traced a development of the new LOTE syllabus in NSW since the publication of the draft syllabus in 2000. Interviewing the teachers and the students of Japanese language, attending the language teachers’ in-services to teach intercultural language teaching combining the values education in New South Wales.

Chapter Five documents the findings in regard to the students’ development of interculturality. While core data of this study are based on the primary school
research, the participants from the high school and the university students who have been studying Japanese language since their primary school age provided additional rich data.

The interviews with the teachers and other key participants are discussed in Chapter Six. Together with the field notes’ analysis, the interview results were presented and analysed to clarify key issues in regard to the development of the students’ development of interculturality. Chapter Seven discusses the findings from the data drawing the results into three, correcting themes.

1.8 Conclusion

This research focuses on a the recently developed component of the Japanese language teaching objective, *intercultural competence*, as stated in the 2003 Language K-10 syllabus published by the Board of Studies New South. Educating language learners to develop the ability to create intercultural competency is one of the key goals for future development of LOTE education in New South Wales. This emphasis fits in well with the major trends in education, which give consideration to the diversity of Australia’s multicultural society within the global community.

However, the question remains whether the teachers understand what intercultural competency is, how it develops and how it can be taught in a primary school classroom. In this research, emphasis has been given to clarification of intercultural competency, through the concept of interculturality. It examines how interculturality develops while learning the Japanese language, and how it is useful not only in language development, but as a tool to serve citizenship education in current Australian society, developing awareness of our position as global citizens. It is hoped that such clarification will help the teachers identify clearer aims and objectives of language teaching. It also leads them to realise how vital it is to situate primary school teaching as a significant part of education in general, and a vision of language teaching in particular.
The following chapter concentrates the discussion of theoretical studies in relation to this research.
Chapter 2  Literature Review: Globalisation, Citizenship Education, Identity, Language Education and Interculturality

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a synthesis of the literature that was reviewed to support the theoretical, and pedagogical foundations for this study. There are four main themes in this review of literature: globalisation; citizenship education; student’s subjectivity and sense of identity; and the interconnections between language education and the development of interculturality. Firstly, it was necessary to set the scene by reviewing literature pertaining to the impact of globalisation on the status of curriculum development and the concept of global citizenship. Examining how current theorists of curriculum respond to the issue of globalisation in an educational setting brings to the fore the complexities of making necessary curriculum changes within school education. The discussion of globalisation in regard to education within the current social environment impacts on at least two curriculum areas of interest in this thesis: citizenship education and language education.

The second theme aims to clarify what citizenship education is, and how the meaning of ‘citizen’ has changed within the current globalised society. This section is not a definitive review of citizenship education, but rather locates the discussion of language education within the broader context of HSIE and the place of citizenship education in the primary school syllabus. In a world society, where social/political, personal, and cultural boundaries are almost invisible, there is a need for a clearer direction toward a peaceful coexistence, especially after facing September 11, the war in Iraq and the aftermath of natural disasters in many regions. It is necessary to understand how school education can contribute to fostering peaceful coexistence.
The third theme of this chapter relates to theories surrounding subjectivity and the students’ sense of cultural identity. This section includes discussions around postcolonialism, hybridity, and identity construction in the ideological and political context of a multi-ethnic society such as Australia.

The fourth theme, on language education, intercultural education and interculturality, explores a selection of literature on culture and language to illustrate how subjectivity and a sense of identity are an organic part of the construction of interculturality. As discussed in Chapter 1, the core concept in this study is interculturality which we learn to develop in particular interactive contexts. The thesis situates the research in educational settings.

2.2 Globalisation and education

The education arena is increasingly influenced by economic globalisation, as it aims to serve the interests of an industrialised economy dominated by international corporate interests. As we live and learn in a capitalist society, the curriculum must change according to societal needs. Raising skills to meet such economic challenges through education must be an important consideration when developing a school curriculum. Globalisation, however, has far more impact in the world we live in than an economic one (Tikly, 2001). In educational settings, the curriculum is intended to ensure that people become responsible members of a global society with a sense of personal worth and social responsibility, while at the same time being competent members of an industrialised global network. This responsible attitude is expected to assist them in developing the knowledge and skills to better live and serve this society. While it is understood that all aspects of school education will provide the students with the opportunity to learn such responsible attitudes through daily participation, it needs to be explicit within the school curriculum rather than implicit in classroom management.

According to Taylor et al (1997:68-71), globalisation pressures impact on national policy agendas in Australia, and an OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) study in 1995 pointed to that organisation’s
ideological role in constructing a particular view of globalisation processes and concomitant strategies for positioning member countries as winners in the global economy – strategies in which education was centrally important. The study also showed how Australia, as one member country, both contributed to and utilised OECD ideology to legitimate its own education policy agenda.

Globalisation is multidimensional, involving a range of global flows and networks. Yet, much of the literature on education and globalisation in postcolonial countries tends to predominantly highlight the implications for education and training in regards to economic globalisation at the expense of other issues, according to Tikly (2001). An economic focus is indicative of the implicit view that globalisation has been promoted primarily by economic agents. Tikly argues that this type of approach limits the understanding of the impact of political, cultural and other aspects of globalisation on the education system. Although Tikly’s study was based on the education of people of low income from postcolonial countries in Africa, it indicates a crucial relevance in regards to issues surrounding globalisation and education internationally. Tikly expands his argument and says that processes of migration, diaspora formation and cultural hybridisation have transformed individual and group identities and created ‘new ethnicities’ based on fluid rather than fixed identities. Tikly argues that one of the effects of contemporary globalisation is to reshape cultural identities in new ways, and stresses the limits of educational reform if it is divorced from the wider questions of cultural politics, power, poverty alleviation and democratic governance. He also argues that education cannot succeed alone and if educational reform is to be successful it must articulate with broader processes and struggles for change at the global, national, regional, and local levels.

Careful consideration is needed on whether the Australian federal and state governments want to position Australian education to support the goals of the global economic agenda, or whether Australian education will help fulfil global social and humanitarian needs, as well as economic goals.
2.2.1 Globalisation, economic rationalism and curriculum

The use of the term globalisation began within the business world itself and referred to globalisation as a means of conducting business more efficiently more profitably and more discreetly (Abbott-Chapman, 2001; Apple, 2007:177-178). A further function of the modern education system is to prepare children and young adults for jobs in a corporate dominated global economy. Robertson (2005) in her study in global knowledge economy discourses and the challenge to education systems argues, life-long learning has become essential. The large and continuing shift to the service economy, the gathering momentum of globalisation and the increasing importance of knowledge and skills in production, are constantly changing the skill profiles necessary in the job market. Education surely is undertaken to serve the interests of an industrialised economy.

Globalisation means that many low-value-adding jobs are exported to poorer and cheaper countries, and throughout the advanced world employers complain that a shortage of skilled workers is holding up economic growth. According to Wooldridge (1993) as well as Gillborn and Youdell’s study (2000) in England, governments have also moved their emphasis from education to training. If education reform in the 1960s took aim at the university, it is now the training college, which is in the sights of the reformers. A mixture of technological innovations and demographic trends is persuading governments to improve the vocational qualifications of their workforces. Wooldridge notes that, Sweden is reorganising its school into an international market. Denmark has introduced per-capita funding for technical colleges. American reformers would like to introduce education vouchers and national tests.

It seems that globalisation is interpreted as entrusting education with a mission to develop individuals who are skilful to make the GNP grow for the nation.

The significance of globalisation to questions of national educational and economic development can be summarised in terms of a change in wealth creation. Brown and Lauder (1997) argue knowledge and skills will be central. Prosperity of workers will depend on an ability to trade their skills, knowledge, and entrepreneurial acumen in an unfettered global marketplace. In this sense,
education is used to prosper the nation, and the idea is not based on developing one’s true individual wealth although the argument appears to discuss the prosperity of workers.

On the contrary, researchers such as Gorelick (1998) and Tormey (2006) argue that it is not too late for governments to turn the tide by creating educational curricula that refocus on local culture and the need to save local communities. Tormey especially indicated the approach of constructing national identity through the primary school history class. Such an undertaking would re-humanise education. It goes against the tendency of developing like-minded individuals in schools who would later on graduate into consumers of corporate products and extol the glories of technology. Although this idea challenges current educational trends of serving a monocultural global economy, it also has the potential danger to turn to narrow ethnocentric education.

Discussion on how the tension between globalisation and societal culture is resolved is crucial. Dimmock and Walker (2000) highlight the importance of societal culture in developing theory, policy and practice within a globalising educational context. They express the importance of transforming globalised policies and practices in culturally sensitive ways that respect the integrity of the indigenous culture while allowing room for change and development. Nonetheless, whether these policies and practices are grounded to enable school curricula to link with the skills needed by future workers in an information society, or whether they are designed to serve our human society is unclear.

### 2.2.2 Globalisation, society and the individual

One *Los Angeles Times* story (June 23, 2005 in Ajayi, 2006:471) illustrates an example of social changes:

> In a not-at-all unusual month, Will Wu spent more than 10,000 minutes on his mobile phone – an average of 5.5 hours a day. Sometimes he talked, sometimes he listened. But most of the time the 15-year-old just dialled up a friend and left the phone on. Connected only by wireless headsets, Will and his pal spent entire days – shopping, snacking, doing homework and even nodding off to sleep. (p. 471)
Representation of individuality has changed greatly in recent years. Rather than traditional face-to-face interactions with people of the immediate community, teenagers use electronic devices such as digital cameras, digital music player and iPhones. Before the era of mobile phones and iPods, Willis(1990) wrote:

Youth is, by definition and irrespective of any wider context of social change, a time when identities are understood to be generally fluid – a period of transition during which elements of an adult self and future are explored and settled on, one way or another.

The teenage and early adult years are important...because it is here, at least in the first-world western cultures, where people are formed most self-consciously through their own...activities. It is where they form symbolic moulds through which they understand themselves and their possibilities for the rest of their lives. It is also the stage where people begin to construct themselves through nuance and complexity, through difference as well as similarity. (Willis, 1990:7-8)

Our priority in this time of social change is to develop our children’s and teachers’ more spiritual and emotional minds, what Daniel Goleman (1995 and 2003) calls the emotional intelligence of students and teachers alike. Goleman (1995:256-280) emphasises the importance of teaching children to be intelligent about emotion, to become aware of and recognise their own feelings and those of others and to regulate these feelings. He explains that if we teach children these things, we can prevent problems later, particularly the problems that come from afflicting behaviours such as violence, suicide, and drug abuse (Goleman, 1995:257). As Hargreaves (2003) argues, we live in a time when great vision is called for again, when our prosperity and security depend on our capacity to develop pupils and teachers who can understand and be able to engage with the dramatic social changes that today’s knowledge society represents, along with their human consequences.

What current education should value more than it does is building the student’s identity as a member of a global society. Furutan’s work in 2005 expressed apprehension about the impact of globalisation that enhanced more culturally diverse and different rules in societies, which can be interconnected but often clashed. He expressed his fear of trust erosion caused by globalization (Sztompka, 1999; Furutan, 2005). Latham in 2000 also discussed a post-traditional society. He expressed his concern that at a time when citizens need to be more trusting of
each other to cope with the challenges of globalisation and the information age, social trust appears to be in retreat (Latham, 2000: 203-204). In fact, this uncertainty was predicted by Giddens in 1991. According to Giddens (1991: 21), globalisation is really about the transformation of time and space. He defined globalisation as ‘action at a distance’, and suggested that its intensification over recent years owes much to the emergence of the means of instantaneous global communication and mass transportation. He also argues (1991: 55), the notion of uncertainty arose from this globalisation, and a knowledge explosion has led to a proliferation of expertise, much of it contradictory and competitive, all of it changing. This has begun to create a collapse of certainty in received wisdom and established beliefs. Science no longer seems able to show us how to live, at least with any certainty or stability. Thus, Giddens’ argument is prophetic, as he was not aware in 1991 of the extent to which the knowledge explosion would occur.

Many of these social changes are organised around lifestyle and values, providing new forms of community in which members can participate actively in the process of identity building in society (Shield, 1999; Woodrow, 2001; Weiner-Levy, 2008). Weiner-Levy (2008) claims that the notion of community provides a useful frame for explaining the emergence of new social movements in advanced capitalist societies. She argues against the opinion, that it is irresponsible to accuse education for the economic decline, because this fails to recognise the complexity of the labour market. She contends that schools and universities as institutions are suffering deregulation and pressure towards greater privatization especially in higher education. This is a global tendency that has increased significantly in the last decade (Fitz & Beers, 2002; Power, 2007).

Comparing schools and the universities as institutions, schools focus socialisation of children into norms (Hargreaves, 1997; Pollard, 2004; Al-Issa, 2004), that is expected by the specific society where they belong. Power and Whitty (2002) claim that schools are ‘middle-class’ institutions, which are more explicitly involved in the transmission of the dominant culture than many other institutions. On the other hand, Bourdieu (2007) maintains that universities can be conceptualised as existing in an institutional field, which is relatively autonomous from political and economic forces and as such has its own structures and laws of
functioning, and its own academic practices. However, Bourdieu further argues that university sector, more than any other educational sector, epitomizes middle classness (Bourdieu and Passeron 1997). Therefore, students from the working-class (McLeod, 2000; Reay, 2004: 30-43), do not feel that they fit in a university community. Expectations of school and university as an education institution seems quite different, but both indicated a degree of conformity.

The implications of the role of education in society for building citizenship and democracy in a globalised world are that globalisation and its associated processes of localisation, are in many respects reducing the power and importance of national governments (Gilbert, 1997; Hartley, 1997; Risager, 1999; Hemmings, 2007). Gilbert argues that the challenge for the proponents of national identity is to find a moral basis for selecting the traditions to be promoted as the collective memory, and for distinguishing the ‘us’ from ‘them’ without engendering ethnocentrism or xenophobia. However, this argument suggests an empowerment of a government over a populace. Even though they carefully argue that this approach to curriculum does not engender ethnocentrism or xenophobia, the notion of localisation could narrow down the attitude as a global citizen.

What is at stake here is the protection and reconstruction of national identities. Hargreaves (1996,:54) articulates that a major paradox of postmodernity is that the anonymity, complexity and uncertainty wrought by globalisation heralds in an ironic search for meaning and certainty in more locally defined identities. He states that the main educational response to this social crisis has been to resurrect old cultural certainties or impose new ones through centralised control of curriculum and assessment requirements. Hargreaves comments that it is paradoxical that increasing globalisation should lead educationally to so much defensive and inward-looking localisation that imposed curricula can be hitched so easily to the wagons of national reconstruction.

Assisting students to ground themselves in current society is one challenge that school education is facing. Giddens (2003:47) expressed his concern.

As the influence of tradition and custom shrink on a world-wide level, the very basis of our self-identity – our sense of self – changes. In more
traditional situations, a sense of self is sustained largely through the stability of the social positions of individuals in the community. Where tradition lapses, and lifestyle choice prevails, the self isn’t exempt. Self-identity has to be created and recreated on a more active basis than before.

It is maintained in this thesis that school education needs to provide ways to assist students in maintaining stability within themselves: self identity is created and recreated by finding ways to recognise the value of students’ inner self despite the turmoil of globalisation, so that they can actively establish an equilibrium within their self while dealing with this social change.

Giddens’ concerns can be linked to Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus*, and indicates how the form of schooling and the formation of identity interact. Bourdieu’s theory relates cultural production to social class, and shows that habitus can be constituted in a certain way:

Those who occupy the temporally dominant position within the dominant class are in fact placed in a contradictory situation, which inclines them to maintain an ambivalent relationship with cultural goods and those who produce them. Castigated…for philistine materialism…they have to invoke the very terms used against them by the intellectuals and artists. (1984:316)

Bourdieu’s position explains how it is that the dominant class comes to have a ‘sense of distinction’. Wilkes (1990:120) further develops the idea:

What distinguishes this class is a habitus of legitimately established domination, a way of relating to the world, which, while ambiguous and variant across fractions of its structure, consistently alerts society to the structure of structured, authoritative power.

### 2.3 What is citizenship education?

Questions of nationalism and civic responsibility are increasingly significant themes in discussions of education and cultural practice (Jones, 1998; Rove, 1999; Cogan, *et al*., 2002; Connell, 2006), although citizenship education is not yet an established component within the Australian school curriculum. As Smith (2000) argues, a climate of moral uncertainty (Giddens, 2003; Hargreaves, 2003) has produced a lack of confidence among practitioners in the educational field as to whether they should even attempt the tasks of moral or civic education. In
response, scholars (Schultz, et al, 2000; Bender, 2001; Arweck, et al, 2005; Fendler, 2006) show eager views that agreement on basic values is possible, and to assert which basic values are most fundamental to the flourishing of democratic societies. Australian examples are discussed in chapter 3. However, citizenship is a contested notion, and the definition of what makes ‘a good citizen’ is central to citizenship education (Smith, 1997; Prior, 1999; Wilkins, 1999; Pittiywanuwat & Sujiva, 2002).

The image of ‘a good citizen’ is more often interpreted differently within a culturally and ethnically pluralistic society. Donald, who describes himself as a New Yorker, defines (1996:174) who is a citizen by exploring the multi-faceted nature of the city from different perspectives:

…‘the citizen’ should be understood in the first instance not as a type of person (whether German nationalist or constitutional patriot) but as a position in the set of formal relations defined by democratic sovereignty. Just as ‘I’ denotes a position in a set of linguistic relations, an empty position which makes my unique utterances possible but which can equally be occupied by anyone, so ‘the citizen’ too denotes an empty place. It too can be occupied by anyone – occupied in the sense of being spoken from, not in the sense of being given a substantial identity.

Donald continues to argue that membership of a cultural or ethnic community should never be the grounds for having or not having rights. No one should be disbarred from having rights. Constitutional patriotism, as expressed in the discursive battle to defend and proliferate rights, would be the measure of citizens’ commitment to that principle.

Following on Donald’s argument, ‘A good citizen’, then, is a position that could be occupied by anyone in any society. In this sense, educating young people to be ‘a good citizen’ is not to place them into a mould of a ready-made citizen. Rather, it is to provide the students as many opportunities as possible to reflect upon their place as a member of a society in relation to other members where they belong. The primary question for moral and civic education is not necessarily “what values should we cultivate in young people?” Moral agreement results from processes whereby citizens engage in questions of moral and civic virtue together, through discussion, debate and deliberation as Smith (2000) argues. Agreement on basic values, however, is not the only issue pertinent to moral and civic
education. Wilkins (1999) also argues that fully engaged democratic citizens need the skills and attitudes fostered by an educational system in which students are encouraged to question rather than obey, learn by inquiry rather than rote, while observing the environment, and considering people they are dealing with. This can ensure that people are able to live their lives based on principles of mutual respect, and they will know when these principles are being violated.

The teachers’ attitude toward citizenship education seems crucial as it is not an area that can be easily reflected in an assessment task. Wilkins’ research (1999) on understanding of ‘citizenship’ amongst trainee teachers in the UK shows that while the majority of student teacher are positively inclined to foster ‘good citizenship values’ in schools, there was much confusion over what it means to be ‘a good citizen’. The concept of ‘citizenship’ was felt to be tainted with negative imagery, although a sense of ‘being part of a community’ was thought to be vital for social cohesion.

Articulation of what citizenship education is, and practical instructions for the practitioners, seem crucial. Kennedy (1997) emphasises not only the importance of citizenship education for democratic thriving, but also the importance of understanding theoretical, political, and social contexts in order to shape educational programs. He argues that ‘citizenship education is capable of being constructed in multiple ways and that it is important to be aware of how those constructions take place’ (Kennedy, 1997: 1-5). The challenge for civics and citizenship education is to somehow meld together civic knowledge, civic megatrends and civic realities in a way that will meet young people where they are. (Pp1-5)

Print and Gray (2000) discuss citizenship education from Australian perspectives, and express the necessity for Australian schools to develop and extend the sense of positivism and forge a learning environment that encourages students to become active, informed and concerned citizens in a new age. Factors such as increased educational awareness, the republican catalyst, the changing international scene, the role of indigenous peoples, Australia's regional identity,
and the timing of serendipitous events are the driving forces of positive action for citizenship education (Print and Gray, 2000).

2.3.1 A new citizenship for Australians

Inherent within recent developments in civic education has been a reconceptualisation of citizenship. Distilling the literature and current debate suggests that educators have adopted an eclectic concept of citizenship (CEG, 1994; Macintyre, 1995; Print, 1996; Board of Studies, 1998 & 2006, Commonwealth of Australia, 2005b). Citizenship may incorporate at least five significant features:

1. Citizenship goes beyond national borders to include regional and world issues. At times, Australians may focus their citizenship nationally (elections; sporting events, national celebrations), locally (community needs, local celebrations), regionally (defence, trade) and globally (environment, economic stability).

2. Citizenship is inclusive within Australia, involving all groups of people including indigenous peoples and our multicultural mix, in a harmonious manner.

3. Citizenship will emphasise the responsibilities as well as the rights of citizens, particularly as this relates to political participation, in a liberal democratic context, both nationally and internationally.

4. Citizenship is based upon principles of a civil society, the essence of which is the opportunity for individual interests to co-exist effectively within the constraints of societal demands. To achieve this effectively, citizens will need to be knowledgeable and appreciative of government in practice.

5. Citizenship promotes the concept of participation for the community good, both locally and regionally. For example, the "Clean Up Australia" campaign, now worldwide, was designed to encourage citizens to take responsibility for their local environment and subsequently for the environment beyond local borders.

These features are not absolute. As the citizenship debate broadens and develops, so the likelihood of greater contestation occurs.

Kennedy’s articulation suggests the importance of citizenship education to incorporate multiple approaches within educational programs (see also Howard & Patterrn, 2006; Hassam, 2007). Questions surrounding how best to teach this are even more complex in pluralistic environments where such concepts are
interpreted and applied differently by different people. In pluralistic democracies, varying interpretations of moral and civic virtue have distinct implications for educative practices both within schools and through broader social contexts. It is this point that I feel the discussion of citizenship education dismisses. Smith (2000) claims:

...few discussions provide educators with a close look at the challenges posed to projects of moral and civic education within particular contexts where parties interpret norms differently, or where parties interpret appropriate action differently in light of specific shared norms. Careful attention to context demonstrates intricate nuances within specific societies, communities, schools and situations.

A crucial element in citizenship education is, therefore, to facilitate the students’ intercultural awareness and the role it plays in a pluralistic society.

2.3.2 Issues in citizenship education in the world

Around the world, nations are struggling to accommodate human diversity, and searching for ways to find a connection between the citizens through citizenship education. The followings examples from Japan, South Africa, America and Europe indicate a part of the general consensus of the issues as a world perspective.

Civic education in Japan, as Otsu’s study (2002) shows, tends to focus on propositional knowledge rather than civic values, attitudes, and skills. Civic education is focused not on the present lives of students but more on their lives once they leave school and go out into the wider world. Also, students may learn something about the implementation of democratic processes in the workings of the student councils; they get no opportunity to learn about the essence or spirit of democracy as a political process or concept. Students are not regarded as members of a democratic school society as teachers maintain tight control over student councils, which in any case, have very limited powers (p89). It shows that the civic curriculum is taught as a subject in a way, which does not reflect with the students everyday life.
In addition to civic education being taught as a subject, there have been recent attempts in Japan by the Atarashii Kyoukasho wo Tsukuru Kai (the new text book committee) to incorporate in the official junior high school students’ history textbook one aspect of citizenship education: a national identity of pride, rather than of guilt and of being a victim. The resultant history book has been the focus of criticism in Japan and overseas, particularly in Korea and China over the depiction of relations and wars between these three countries. The book is also peopled with great historical men and their achievements; there is almost no mention of lower class culture, women or social movements. And from a multicultural perspective the book fails to mention ethnic or cultural minorities; that is, those communities from the Edo hinmin and eta (traditionally the lowest class of people), or indigenous Japanese groups such as Ainu, or forced and voluntary overseas labour who were recruited for wartime and post-war Japanese industry as cheap labour. In other words, this version of Citizenship education appears to be based more on the idea of exclusiveness than of inclusiveness.

Unlike the recent Japanese experience, Linde’s study (1997), in a South African school, shows a different approach in citizenship education. South Africa, well known for its past system of apartheid, has been undergoing radical educational reform in its newly integrated multicultural schools. The challenges include conflict resulting from closer contact between diverse cultures in a previously segregated education system. Changing social conditions require new ways of dealing with people, and ways of interacting and communicating with people of other cultures. Linde (1997) explains that in a multicultural society, the values of different social groups differ markedly because of the divergent multiplicity of religion, culture, language and political views. Linde argues that in order to build bridges between different cultures, it is necessary to find common ground. Enslin, in a special issue in 2003 of the *Cambridge Journal of Education* on citizenship education, comments on the response by the South African Department of Education to evidence of continuing ethnic violence experienced in South Africa nearly a decade after the establishment of democracy (Enslin 2003). She describes the intentions of the 2001 Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy that attempts to address the challenges of changing social conditions (Enslin 2003 p.81). Careful research is needed here to find the authentic meeting ‘spaces’
amongst the students, rather than mould the students into an artificial common culture.

Many other studies\(^1\) show multiple measures for coping with cultural diversity in their respective societies. Strictly speaking, all societies are multicultural societies as we all are individual, and have different cultural backgrounds of our own, and should not be always moulded into one group collectively.

In the USA school curriculum experience, the national standards (Ruget, 2005) were designed with the belief that formal instruction in civics and government should provide students with a basic understanding of civic life, politics, and government. The examples of American experience seem to devalue individual worth as a citizen and ignore human diversity. On the contrary, Pluralism is a positive value in American society (Fitzgerald, 1994; Radtivitch 1990.) Radtivitch argues that public education has as its primary purpose the creation of a national community ‘a definition of citizenship and culture that is both expansive and inclusive.’ Ravitch’s argument demonstrates two educational extremes. The ‘particularists’ with intellectual roots in a separatist ideology, propose an ethnocentric curriculum to raise the self-esteem and academic achievement of children from the historically disadvantaged minorities. By contrast, the ‘pluralists’ argue that racial and ethnic minorities should simply become a part of a common American culture. The pluralist argument is that the effects of ‘particularistic multiculturalism’ are mostly counter-productive. Both arguments of an ill-conceived move towards a narrowly utilitarian rationale for citizenship education fail to acknowledge the fundamental worth of being human and of interrelation between human beings. Since 2001 and the September 11 catastrophe, there has been a tendency for civic education to return to a new patriotism (Boyte, 2003).

It seems that the challenge lies in how to value individual worth, while expecting an individual to be a responsible member within a community. As Boyte (2003) comments:

America suffers from excessive individualism, an over-emphasis on rights and an under-emphasis on responsibilities, and an increasingly litigious culture where citizens seek resolution of conflicts through courts rather than communal life.

This remark may be applicable for current society at large.

Throughout Europe, individual nations are also attempting to build their European identities. Osler’s study (1998) shows that member states of the Council of Europe have acknowledged the importance of education for citizenship and have passed a number of resolutions concerning European citizenship and the need to promote democratic values, social justice and human rights. Yet there remains a degree of ambivalence over citizenship education and its relationship to the development of various identities, including personal and national identities.

Educating children to be positive members of a multicultural society identifies a number of issues around the world as discussed above. Japan appears to be trying to maintain strong nationalism, which almost ignores the diversity of its citizens. South Africa is attempting to accommodate historically marginalised cultures into an obtained democratic society by promoting the necessity for educationists to gain insight into intercultural communication skills in multicultural schools. The USA seems to encourage common national identity, and European nations are struggling to find various identities since the move towards a united Europe. What actually all these countries are doing is to attempt to maintain unity and peace in their respective community while struggling to accommodate diversity. Stuart Hall presents us with a way of thinking about ‘cultural identity’ (1990:223). He proposes that a group of people can be unified by a sense of “oneness”; this oneness is constituted by a belief that they have a shared history, shared values and experiences, and shared cultural codes which all function to bring them together and to give them a collective cultural identity.

In an increasingly multicultural world, keeping ‘the oneness’ of a diverse society seems a challenging task. However, the challenge has to be attempted in a way to best suit to the respective nation and its people. Australian society is no exception.
Leading social theorist and political adviser Anthony Giddens points out that in reacting to Western decadence, fundamentalism also rejects democratic reason, emotional democracy between women and men, and the principles of what he calls *cosmopolitan identity*. Writing before 11 September 2001, Giddens predicted that

The battleground of the twenty-first century will pit fundamentalism against cosmopolitan tolerance. In a globalizing world,…we are all regularly in contact with others who think differently, and live differently from ourselves. Cosmopolitans welcome and embrace this cultural complexity. Fundamentalists find it disturbing and dangerous. Whether in the areas of religion, ethnic identity or nationalism, they take refuge in a renewed and purified tradition – and, quite often, violence. (Giddens, 2003: 4-5)

### 2.3.3 Reflections on citizenship and citizenship education

Nationalism and civic responsibility are noteworthy themes of education and cultural practice in current Australian society (Howard & Gill 2000, Harris *et al.*, 2007) like the countries discussed above. The nation is searching for social cohesion within a rapidly increasing multicultural environment. Print (1996, 2007) argues that Australian students need to look beyond the confining strictures of nationalism.

However, Davidson (2003: 144) claims that the present nationalistic ‘xenophobic’ policies of Australia are so mindless in the face of globalisation’s challenge in managing new mass migrations, that there must be a change of heart. Some have argued that policies have been constructed deliberately to keep an Anglo elite in power. Jayasuriya (2003: 198) also stresses political legitimacy to a revitalised sense of Australian citizenship, a pluralistic concept of citizenship as the basis of a new paradigm for Australian multiculturalism. He wrote:

To this end, we need to inscribe this citizenship ideal within a statutory Bill of Rights or Charter of Rights that may eventually be incorporated into a constitution document. This will, among other things, enable us to locate a sense of Australian identity, of being an Australian, in terms of one’s membership in the political community. The challenge is to determine what political forms are best suited to a condition of citizenship marked by substantial diversity, without losing sight of the ultimate objective that politics must create unity without denying or repressing multiplicity.
The terrorist attacks close to Australia and Australian involvement in military actions across the world since 2001 have further spurred on Australian nationalism. Despite this approach to Australian politics during the Howard Government’s tenure until 2007, interestingly, Dockett and Cusack’s study (2003) on Young children’s (ages 5-8 and in the first three years of elementary school) views of Australian national identity, found that there was strong support for diversity among families and peers, with many children accepting and supporting their own dual identification as well as that of others. The study claims that despite persistent media images, the children demonstrated their clear view that there is no one true Australian national identity.

Membership of a cultural or ethnic community should never be the grounds for having or not having rights. School education focused on citizenship is a way to develop children’s ability to link themselves with otherness through better appreciation of who they are and why they are as they are, in relation to everyone they come in contact with (Ramzan & Fox, 2007).

2.4 Subjectivity and sense of identity

In order to discuss the development of children’s sense of identity within the Australian school environment and how it leads to construction of interculturality, it is useful to turn to the theories of cultural identity and postcolonialism. Australia is a multicultural country where it is now generally accepted publicly that its previous multicultural model was unworkable, that racial prejudice still exists, and that Australians are still searching for a genuine meeting place.

Stuart Hall (1992:280) has underlined the notion that identity is mobile and contradictory by critiquing the concept of what he terms a master identity; that is, an identity based on only one factor, for example, gender. This fails to take into account the other factors, such as ethnicity, sexualities, and class, which always intersect in the construction of identity. A sense of identity is actually constructed through various internal and external processes over time, rather than being innate.
Hall maintains that the concept of cultural identity is not something remote and objectified for him. On the contrary, it is a vital part of his very lived experience, of his discursive history as a black Jamaican who subsequently migrated to England. A black Jamaican living in the city of London mobilises a cultural identity which has connections with Jamaica simultaneously as it is marked by ruptures and discontinuities: “Difference,” writes Hall, “therefore, persists…in and alongside continuity”(1990:227)

Bhabha claims that the theoretical understanding of ‘culture-as-difference’ will enable us to grasp the articulation of culture’s borderline, unhomely space and time. At the same time he deviates from a notion of ‘the presumption of equal respect’ for cultural diversity (Bhabha, 1996:56) and points out a recurrent problem with its notion of equality. He argues, at the point at which liberal discourse attempts to normalise cultural difference, to turn the presumption of equal cultural respect into the recognition of equal cultural worth, does not recognise the disjunctive, ‘borderline’ temporalities of partial, minority cultures. Bhabha puts it:

The sharing of equality is genuinely intended, but only so long as we start from a historically congruent space; the recognition of difference is genuinely felt, but on terms that do not represent the historical genealogies, often postcolonial, that constitute the partial cultures of the minority. (p.56)

Bhabha echoes Mikhail Bakhtin’s notion of hybridisation, which challenges the claims to cultural totalisation. For Bakhtin:

The…hybrid is not only double-voiced and double-accented (as in rhetoric) but is also double-languaged; for in it there are not only (and not even so much) two individual consciousnesses, two voices, two accents, as there are two socio-linguistic consciousnesses, two epochs, that, true, are not here unconsciously mixed…but that come together and consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance…. it is the collision between differing points of views on the world that are embedded in these forms. Therefore an intentional artistic hybrid is a semantic hybrid; not semantic and logical in the abstract (as in rhetoric), but rather a semantics that is concrete and social….such unconscious hybrids have been at the same time profoundly productive historically: they are pregnant with potential for new world views, with new “internal forms” for perceiving the world in words. (Bakhtin, 1981:360)
Bhabha endorses Bakhtin’s emphasis of a space of enunciation where the negotiation of discursive doubleness engenders a new speech act, and he extended the concept of hybridity to describe the construction of cultural authority within conditions of political antagonism or inequity, which give narrative form to the minority positions they occupy: ‘the outside of the inside: the part in the whole’ (Bhabha, 1996:58).

In the Australian context, Ian Anderson (1995) examines the ideological and political effects of the colonial process by disclosing the colonial manipulation of the figure of Trugernanner: ‘Invading cultures not only dispossess people of their land. They must also manage or control remnant indigenous populations’ (1995:32); and they do this precisely by exerting control over cultural symbols and languages. He discusses the political effects of using Trugernanner as ‘an emblem of extinction’: ‘As a colonial symbol TRUG-ER-NAN-NE signifies the land empty of natives, and declares the colonial period over’. He argues, to mark and then proceed to circulate the figure of Trugernanner as the ‘last’ Tasmanian Aborigine functioned to disinherit surviving Tasmanian Aborigines of their Aboriginal history and land, to relegate them to the racists’ realms of the ‘inauthentic,’ of the ‘hybrids, half-castes, those touched by the tar brush’(1995:32-34), and therefore to claim that colonial history has effectively come to a close in Tasmania as there are no more colonial subjects as such.

Anderson proceeds to both re-claim his Koori identity, heritage and history, to celebrate and affirm it, and to refuse the racist and destructive categories that colonising regimes have imposed and continue to impose upon him and his people. In re-claiming his Aboriginal identity, Anderson argues for a type of strategic essentialism, which affirms both continuities and discontinuities, both similarities and differences, according to the contingent positionality of the subject (also Hall:1990 & 1996).

Essentialism is a concept which can be both positive and negative in its effects (Spivak 1990:11-12). Dominant groups often use essentialised notions of minority groups by marking certain attributes or qualities as intrinsic to the identity of a particular group (Hall et al, 1999; Ghuman, 2001; Hendrix, 2001). In
colonial terms, this type of essentialism functions to preserve white domination, as whites have the privilege to determine who counts as an ‘authentic’ Aborigine, and it also functions to control and delimit Aboriginal access to modern technologies, urban and other services. On the other hand, a ‘strategic essentialism’ can have an empowering function for minoritised groups as it establishes bonds of solidarity in the face of oppression. Strategic essentialism implies that a minority group reflexively and strategically deploys certain essentialised aspects of identity in order to work as a strategy for social change.

Anderson contests the imposition of the offensive term ‘hybrid’ upon himself and his people as it functions to position them as a people who ‘who belong to neither race (and are shunned by both), and lacking a racial background they have no history’ (1995:33). In the process, he interrogates the ‘hybrid’ construction of Europeans and their cultural identities (1995: 34-40), and draws attention to the way in which Europeans invariably demand that Aborigines account for, authenticate and even justify their identities, whilst they ‘rarely offer their own constructed self for perusal’ (1995:39).

While Anderson confronted the imposition of what he saw as the offensive term ‘hybrid’, he constructed the cultural authority within the contingent positionality of his subject, that Bhabha and Bakhtin claim the notion of hybridisation. From this position, in my view, he became able to give authentic narrative form to the minority positions he occupies.

Fanon in Hall (1990:223) puts it:

Colonisation is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native’s brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys it.

That Australia is a harmoniously multicultural country based on equity and democratic principles is a myth which fails to draw attention to the still unresolved struggles for power that structure contemporary Australian culture. These struggles for power divide along political and ideological lines that are invariably racialised and ethnicised. Pugliese (1995a: 334-5 and 1995b: 213-214)
argues that assimilation, as a doctrine, has not been transcended or supplanted by contemporary multicultural policies; on the contrary, assimilation is an ongoing practice of inscription that constructs the subjectivities of migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds through the deployment of Anglocentric regimes of normativity; and that multiculturalism, as a policy for containing and managing ethnic differences, is thoroughly structured and underpinned by the doctrine of assimilation and a process of social and cultural reproduction. As Stuart Hall (1996:6) elucidates in his work on the question of cultural identity:

> Identities are positions which the subject is obliged to take up while always knowing that they are representations, that representation is always constructed across a lack, across a division, from the place of the Other, and thus can never be adequate –identical- to the subject processes which are invested in them.

This discussion cannot be complete without acknowledging Michel Foucault’s theories on power and subjectivity, although the researcher has not attempted to locate the discussion of identity around poststructuralism. Young (1995:5) indicates that Foucault’s work can illuminate only to some extent the ways in which power has operated in the arenas of race and colonialism. He writes that for Foucault, power is neither intentional nor fully realised, and it is rather ‘a multiple and mobile field of force relations, wherein far-reaching, but never completely stable, effects of domination are produced’. The process of discursive subjugation subjects our bodies, governs our gestures, dictates our behaviours (Foucault, 1980:92-108). It is this point regarding discursive subjugation in the theory of cultural identity that highlights why language learning experience is crucial for development of self identity and subjectivity, which assist the students to build their own chosen *positionality* (Hall,1990) and *multiple voices* (Bakhtin, 1981).

### 2.5 Language education and intercultural language learning

The issue of whether and at what age foreign language studies are beneficial to students’ general learning and intercultural wellbeing is a perennial question for
educators in countries where English is the dominant language (Moses, 2000; Williams, 2000; Huang, 2003; Garza & Crawford, 2005). Foreign language learning has been widely endorsed as being beneficial to the country’s future economy in our global environment of transnational trading arrangements. However, the pedagogical significance of language is also under scrutiny. In this section, the application of overall theory to Japanese language education will be highlighted.

There are considerable numbers of studies on young children in bilingual immersion programmes. The results of research (Worsley & Harbon, 2001; Wiley & Wright, 2004; Brown, 2005; Hones, 2005; Wickstrom, 2005; Dworin & Moll, 2006) generally demonstrate significant cognitive benefits, including better divergent thinking. In other words they point to the benefits of knowing that there is more than one way to speak, and more than one way to behave. This thesis does not cover the literature on bilingual immersion programmes, nor on the linguistic theories of language learning, but rather focuses on how foreign language study may promote understanding, tolerance, and respect for the cultural identities and values of others. (Nugent, 2000; Lantolf, 2000; O’Dowd, 2003; Ivers, 2007).

Arsenio (2002) argues that ‘knowing the good’ is not always sufficient to motivate someone to do the good. Even if moral behaviour is not always in simple opposition to personal goals and behaviours, there are still many occasions when children and adults need to act in ways different from their immediate self interest. What is the motivational force that leads us to do the good in these situations? Many character education programs, and some values education programs, seem to answer this question using a relatively straightforward behaviourist approach (Ashwill, 2004; Althof & Berkowitz 2006). They define the virtues we want children to have, such as honesty or courteousness, give children exemplars of those behaviours, and then reward approximations to those behaviours. What these approaches miss, however, is the extensive developmental literature that indicates that children attempt to interpret and understand their social world (Wood, 1998; Holdsworth, 2000; Sullivan, 2006).
Morality should not become too associated with either rewards or punishments because this will undermine more intrinsic reasons for behaving morally involving issues of justice and fairness. Arsenio uses his recent work to explain how the affective aspects of children’s social relationships interact with their moral understandings to produce moral motivation. At the core of this explanation is the idea that emotional reciprocity, both understanding and being able to respond to others’ emotional state, underlies interpersonal relationships, in general, in addition to moral cognitions and behaviour. Consequently, the affective climate of the school and the particular relationships between teachers and students influence not only academic achievement but also children’s and teachers’ communications and behaviours involving socio-moral events (Cazdon et al, 1996; Ashwill, 2004).

However, language learning provides students with concrete opportunities to experience and examine others’ emotional states by putting themselves in another’s position when they speak in the target language. This gives opportunity for them to understand and interpret their social world.

We encounter people of different cultures in every realm of our lives, and discover differences in perspectives, behaviours, and communication styles. Yet, intercultural sensitivity does not come naturally, and we are more likely to ignore, copy, or destroy difference (Jonson, 2000; Olson and Kroeger, 2001; Durocher, 2007). Olson and Kroeger (2001) define a globally competent person by three main qualities; a person who has enough substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication skills to effectively interact in our globally inter-reliant world. Substantive knowledge includes knowledge of cultures, languages, world issues, global dynamics, and human choices which refer to the knowledge and the ability to analyse how what one does at home has relevance elsewhere. ‘Perceptual understanding’ describes the process we use to take in our world and frame our understanding of others in our world. ‘Intercultural communication includes skills of adaptability, empathy, cross-cultural awareness, intercultural relations and cultural mediation. Their study indicates the importance of advanced proficiency in languages as a key...
component of global intercultural competency for a university graduate as they go forth into our globally interdependent and interculturally complex world.

While these elements of competency are definitely crucial to be a global communicator, Okazaki’s argument (2003) shows another point of view. He stresses that the organic part of global competency and intercultural sensitivity should include the interaction between you and minority groups in its paradigm. If you oppress, exclude and ignore people of disadvantaged social groups, people who are not useful to your own benefit or people who have a different sense of value from your own, you cannot say that you are a globally competent and interculturally sensitive person even if you are competent enough to negotiate with a people of equivalent social position. What Okazaki argues is that although empathy is included as an intercultural communication skill, actually we need to experience being in a minority position of some kind in order to understand the empathy required as a part of intercultural communication studies. It is at this point that language learning can contribute significantly more than being able to speak in a language/languages other than your own. When learning a foreign language, the learner experiences being a minority person whose social/psychological position may feel inadequate and subordinate to the speaker of the target language.

Fairclough (1989) suggests in *Language and Power* that the power behind discourse is ideology and standardisation, with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants. When you are learning a foreign language and speaking in a foreign language, the ideology and standardisation of power construction shifts from the one existing in the language users’ cultural environment to the one existing in the target language’s cultural environment. The learner can learn what it is like to be a powerless person. Corson (1988) also argues that our ability to think in language is not inherent in our human nature, and how people speak distinguish them as individual people, and it is the most critical practice in which individuals manifest and protect themselves in relation to others.
In summarising some of the key ideas of the literature on language and global competence, it seems that when learning a language, we encounter others, then realise the diversity, and apprehend how we react to that diversity. While doing this, we gain an opportunity to verify our own stereotypical ideas intrinsically. This process may provide us opportunity to evaluate our mainstream way of thinking, our customs and our own spontaneous way of thinking, which was nurtured in our life in relation to others. This process helps us to gain the essence of a truly globally competent citizen who is interculturally sensitive. However, it seems that this point was a by-product of language learning, rather than purposefully taught, until recently. Lambert (1999) also argues that the language teaching profession is realising the political nature of its work. Critical Applied Linguistics (Pennycook, 2001) currently seeks to find a way to theorise human agency within structures of power. The approach theorises ways in which we may think, act, and behave, that on the one hand acknowledge our locations within social, cultural, economic, ideological, discursive frameworks but on the other hand allow us at least some possibility of freedom of action and change. Pennycook (2001:71) suggests that we need to start thinking of what is produced in cultural encounters, not just homogeneity or heterogeneity or imperialism or resistance, but rather what ‘third cultures or third spaces’ are constantly being created, as Kramsch (1993) also claims.

### 2.5.1 Approaches to culture in language teaching

The rise of globalisation and world population mobilisation have brought about great changes in a phase of foreign language education, which considers not only linguistic forms or function, but also intercultural understanding. As seen in Kramsch’s claim (1993); every attempt to communicate with the speaker of another language is a cultural act (Samovar, Porter and McDaniel, 2007; Scollon and Scollon, 1995). Samovar, Porter and McDaniel (2007: 12-14) discuss communication between cultures, and explain that communication is a dynamic process which is affected by other people’s messages and which is always changing. They say, it is also symbolic, and each culture assigns their own meanings to the symbols. Moreover, communication is systemic, and it occurs in particular systems that influence what and how we communicate and what
meanings we attach to messages. Scollon and Scollon (1995: 6-7) say that language is ambiguous by nature. They discuss meaning in language that is jointly constructed by the participants in communication. According to the DEST’s (Australian Government, Department of Education, Science and Training) Report on Intercultural Language Learning written by Liddicoat et al (2003), there are four paradigms of culture to teach in language teaching: high culture, area studies, culture as societal norm, and culture as practice.

‘High culture’, or learning knowledge about literature, and the ‘Area studies’ approach, that is, culture embedded in knowledge about the history, geography and institutions of the target language country, are the two most traditional approaches. These two approaches still widely exist within Japanese language learning programs especially within a university curriculum, as part of the civilisation components. Studies of literature, history and even geography are indispensable components when studying the Japanese language in depth. These studies could provide the learners with tools to analyse Japanese culture within language learning, which enhances better communication. This also could assist the learners in observing themselves from other perspectives when communicating with people from the Japanese speaking community. However, the two approaches to teaching culture within the language teaching paradigm limit the connection between language and culture. The former sees culture only within control of an established canon of literature, and the later sees culture as information about ‘the’ Japanese way of life.(Liddicoat et al, 2003:6). Neither sees links between culture and the language, rather seeing the two as separate components.

The ‘Culture as societal norms’ approach sees the culture of a target language as a collective model. This approach seeks general consensus of what people of the target language are likely to do from a given cultural knowledge. Thus, teaching culture in this paradigm sets out to understand the cultural values of the target language when communicating with the user of the target language (Liddicoat et al, 2003:6). Kawakami (2001) places the Japanese language teaching paradigm in this framework of culture teaching, and argues the previous two were teacher centred approaches, where culture was seen as background information to teach
the language. On the other hand, he sees this approach as a learner centred approach, where a lack of cultural awareness is a barrier to communication. Therefore the purpose of teaching culture is to allow students to operate better within the target language.

However, this Culture as societal norm may cause a stereotypical construct of the target culture, (Liddicoat et al. 2003:6, Lo Bianco, Liddicoat and Crozet, 1999:9) seeing culture in one collective way. Also, because culture is still seen as static in this approach (Hinkel, 1999; Roberts et al., 2001; Durocher, 2007), it has limitations as an inter-cultural quality. For example, Japanese language learners learn to reply ‘No, I am still not good at speaking Japanese’; when they receive a compliment such as ‘You are speaking Japanese beautifully’. This is how a Japanese person would show their modest attitude, which is considered an important aspect of Japanese cultural codes. Nonetheless, it appears as though the learners are assimilated into the Japanese culture, because the cultural consideration in this case only considers the target culture, and ignores the learner’s own cultural values.

This type of cross-cultural awareness is very relevant to current Japanese language teaching approaches and many text books (for example, Situational Functional Japanese,1992 & 2000, Yookoso, 1999, Japanese for Busy People, 2006) describe such typical cultural codes that should be taught in language classes. The awareness shows understanding of the target language culture, considering links between culture and language that go beyond traditional cultural teaching approaches. However, the cross-cultural awareness described is still limited, in that the objective of understanding culture is still centred around the target culture only, with little consideration of the learner’s own culture. Thus, it appears to assimilate the learner into the target culture. In this sense, this

---

2 Tsukuba language group, 2000, Situational Functional Japanese, volume 1-3 (Notes & Drills), Second edition, Bonjinsha, Tokyo, Japan
Association for Japanese-Language Teaching, 2006, Japanese for Busy People, Revised 3rd edition, Kodansha, Tokyo
The fourth approach to culture in a language teaching paradigm (after high culture, area studies and culture as societal norm) is ‘Culture as practice’, where ‘cultural competence is seen as the ability to interact in the target culture in informed ways’ (Liddicoat et al, 2003:6).

The Report (p.6) clarifies a new approach;

The target for the language learner is to develop an intercultural perspective in which the native culture and language is made apparent alongside the target culture. With this knowledge the learner needs to develop an intercultural position, which can form a basis for ongoing development of intercultural communicative skills.

There are three crucial differences when comparing this paradigm to the previous ones. One difference is that it does not focus only on the target culture; observation of the learners’ own culture is seen as equally important within language learning. ‘Culture as societal norm’ sees links between culture and language as discussed above; however, because it does not reflect the learners’ own culture, it ignores a negotiation process between the learners’ own self and the target culture.

Secondly, in this approach, culture is seen as fluid rather than static. The parallel observation of their own culture and the target culture makes it possible to recognise the variations within their culture as well as the target culture, which leads to a recognition of culture as fluid. The awareness of both self and other assist the learner to reinforce their understanding of others during the process of communication. This understanding also expands to awareness of variability of language, culture, and views of others (Siboulet, 2005; Liddicoat and Crozet, 2000; Lo Bianjco, Liddicoat and Crozet, 1999; Kramsch, 1993).

Finally, this fourth paradigm sees culture as a core component of language education, whereas within the previous model the cultural component was seen as the fifth element of the micro skills of the language (Trujillo, 2002; Hinkel, 1999; Kramsch, 1993). Lo Bianco (2003) argues, it is crucial to understand how
language interacts with the language users’ attitude and behaviours, rather than only simply understanding the relationship between language and culture, when intercultural understanding is expected. He claims that language learning involves language culture and language ideology (2003: 8). His viewpoints about the relationships between language and culture are summarised as:

Verbosity to observe the language users’ behaviours and attitude;
Interpersonal relations to see how the language usage and behaviour differ depending on the position and the relationships of the language users;
Politeness to see how appreciation, requesting, refusal and acceptance are treated when communicating, and Ritualisation to see the relationship between ceremony, rituals and the language.

The Culture as practice approach seeks to foster ‘an intercultural speaker’ (Siboulet, 2005; Roberts et al, 2001; Jaeger, 2001; ), who can make their own language choices while taking into account the target culture, who focuses not only on the target culture when using the language. Lo Bianco, Liddicoat and Crozet (1999) claim that language learners can find ‘the third place’ (Bhabha, 1994; Kramsch, 1993) between the first language culture and the target language culture while working toward becoming an intercultural speaker.

2.5.2 Interculturality and the notion of the third place

In Australia, the notion of intercultural competence has been discussed vigorously, especially since the late 1990’s as seen in the works of Lo Bianco, Crozet & Liddicoat (1999), Crozet & Liddicoat (2000), Liddicoat et al (2003). They argue that language education which aims to nurture a language learner’s competence to create ‘the third space’ contributes to their overall education. This view marks a fundamental shift in the paradigm for language education in general and education as a whole. Pennycook (2001) also argues that fundamental to language learning is the understanding of how language is constructive of social formation, communities, and individual identities.

Crozet & Liddicoat (2000) claim one competency which should be acquired by learning a language is intercultural competency, and this claim echoes Kramsch
They make a case that interculturality cannot be fostered by only simply learning a language, nor by learning culture as a description of knowledge. Rather, it is nurtured through communication and engaging with culture (Liddicoat et al., 2003). They also believe it can be fostered through making mistakes, rather than through smooth communications, because communication is interaction and occurs in complex interrelationship between parties. By learning culture as process, the learners understand the dynamics and arbitrariness of culture. By comparing cultures the learners come to value their own culture while exploring the other culture. Eventually, the learners enhance their interculturality, and that assists them in creating ‘the third place’.

However, as Kawakami (2005) points out, the examination of culture through a lens of a ‘comparative view’ or through ‘teaching culture’ risks presenting a stereotypical view to the students. Lo Bianco’s (2003) point of view is that although culture can be seen as patterned, learnable and social, it is constantly changed, re-constructed and hybridised. When the social environment changes, the language changes, and a new culture is created. This new culture continues to be created through language. Hence, learning a language is learning cultural behaviour and learning to engage with the culture, as well as learning linguistic patterns and cultural information. Liddicoat, Crozet and LoBianco (1999: 185) note the importance of the teacher’s role:

The teacher is responsible for providing opportunities which allow students to develop their own intermediary place between their own culture and that of the target language community. The third place does not emerge inevitably from classroom language teaching. Whether or not students develop an intercultural perspective depends substantially on the choices which teachers make in their teaching.

Recently, intercultural language teaching has been introduced as a language education policy in Australia, and the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training published the Report on Intercultural Language Learning in 2003, as discussed in detail in chapter 3. The report stressed that a language learner’s communicative competence differs between second language learners and the native language learners (Liddicoat et al, 2003:11). It stresses that the communicative competence for the second language learner is to be able to
engage with different cultures and being able to become an intercultural speaker, hence be able to find ‘the third place’.

The report discusses a non-linear process of acquisition of intercultural competence (Liddicoat 2002). It displays cyclical development; Input, Noticing, Reflection, Output, Noticing, Reflection, and Output (Liddicoat et al, 2003:20). The learners engage with the other culture, and the nature of difference is noticed. While reflecting on the experience, they decide how to respond to that difference. On noticing the outcomes of that decision, again they reflect on the decision, which is then introduced into the learners’ communicative system. This leads to insightful output in the language using a modified set of norms (pp20-21). The modification provides for new noticing, and the cycle continues. The important point in this model is that whether the modification is successful or not, the cycle of acquisition continues. The process of finding the third place is not a linear pathway directly from the learner’s first culture to the target culture. Rather, the learner may find the intermediate intercultural third place after forming Inter-culture 1, Inter-culture 2 and so on while attempting the trial and error of the modification. Therefore, evidence of less ‘native-like’ practices should not be considered as a failure (p21). Crozet, Liddicoat & Lo Bianco (1999:1) claim:

The ‘third place’ is therefore a point of interaction, hybridity and exploration.

Bhabha differentiates between the hybrid notion and duality or binarism, and his images of a ‘third space’ (1994: 53-56). He used the term subaltern to describe a person in the ‘hybrid’ position, literally defining the subaltern as inhabiting an ‘in-between’, between a higher and a lower position. He discusses the hybrid agency, which finds the voice in a dialectic that does not belong to either cultural supremacy or sovereignty.

… they deploy the partial versions of historic memory, that give narrative form to the minority positions they occupy; the outside of the inside: the part in the whole. (Bhabha,1996:58)

This argument explains why the third place developed by language learning is far removed from cultural dominance. While learning a language, the learner sits in
the minority position, because they are learners, not masters. Then from that position, they develop the hybrid quality of themselves by going through a process of negotiation between the competence that comes from their first language culture, and the obstacles, the set rules of the target language culture that they have to follow. Bhabha’s argument also gives reasons why this hybrid quality is nothing less than genuineness of self.

It is only when we understand that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in a contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation, that we begin to understand why hierarchical claims to the inherent originality or ‘purity’ of cultures are untenable, even before we resort to empirical historical instances that demonstrate their hybridity. (Bhabha, 1996: 55)

Bhabha (1994: 53) explains the linguistic difference that informs the cultural act. He explains that the cultural performance is expressed in common semiotic description, that this is the acknowledgement of its ‘discursive embeddedness’ and address, its ‘cultural positionality’, its reference to a present time and a specific space.

The pact of interpretation is never simply an act of communication between the I and the You designated in the statement…The production of meaning requires that these two places be mobilized in the passage through a Third Space, which represents both the general conditions of language and the specific implication of the utterance in a performative and institutional strategy of which it cannot ‘in itself’ be conscious. (p53)

This notion of hybridity, in the sense of the result of progression in the learning practice, allows less ‘native-like’ practices, changes the second and foreign language-learning paradigm previously acknowledged.

As Pennycook argues (2001:143), studies in second language acquisition have tended to ignore the context of learning, viewing learning environments and learners as settings in which variables need to be controlled in a way that achieves the ‘native-like’ language user. However, developing ‘the third space’ and recognising the hybridity (Ajayi 2006, Pennycook 2001, Lo Bianco 2004) means recognising a created identity, which developed through the language learning experience.
Bretag’s study (2006) in finding whether ‘the third space, interculturality’ can be developed by using computer-mediated communication between international ESL students and their lectures at an Australian university indicates that moving towards ‘the third space’ requires individual motivation and that the teacher has an important role to play in modelling this behaviour. This study refers the ‘third space’ as the potential opportunity for a re-imagining of the teacher-student relationship, which is composed of two very distinct cultural identities. Kramsch (1993, 2000a) argues that in foreign language teaching, the study of the acquisition of style and discourse can serve to highlight the fact that language not only expresses but also creates new and unexpected realities. Norton and Kanno (2003) discuss that the language learners can create the ‘imagined community’.

The concept of imagined communities discussed by Kanno and Norton (2003) enables us to enhance our understanding of learning in both temporal and spatial dimensions. In a temporal dimension, they relate the notion of imagined communities with learners’ visions of the future joined to their existing actions and identities. They state that what has not yet happened in the future can be a reason and motivation for what learners do in the present. In a spatial dimension, they examine the interaction between national ideologies and individual learners’ identities on the one hand, and the influence of globalisation and transnationalism on language learning and identity construction on the other. Bianchin (2003) uses a term, non-natural societies, in a similar way to the imagined communities of Kanno and Norton. He notes that a non-natural society requires linguistic communication to generate social bonds, while empathic communications supported by somatic responses in natural society suffice for basic forms of coordination and cooperation. He explains that the ideality of meanings as reproducible intentional units permits the seeing of collective goals and norms of cooperation as endorsed by deliberation, rather than just as flowing from the uniformity of natural biases.

Ajayi (2006) and Norton-Peirce (1995) have both stated that language is the medium through which the individual is socially constructed and through which the individual contests the identity he/she is assigned, and it is also through
language that this same person defines him/herself and his/her subjectivities. Bakhtin’s idea of voice also gives a reason why language learning can account for one’s self development. For Bakhtin,

...hybrid is not only double-voiced and double-accented...but is also double-languaged; for in it there are not only (and not even so much) two individual consciousnesses, two voices, two accents, as there are two socio-linguistic consciousnesses, two epochs, that, true, are not here unconsciously mixed (as in an organic hybrid), but that come together and consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance....it is the collision between differing points of views on the world that are embedded in these forms...such unconscious hybrids have been at the same time profoundly productive historically: they are pregnant with potential for new world views, with new “internal forms” for perceiving the world in words. (Bakhtin, 1981:360),

The language of hybridity becomes a means for critique and resistance to the monological language of authority as Papastergiadis (1997:267) explains. In Bakhtin’s theory, the ‘doubleness’ of the hybrid voices is constructed not through the unification of differences but via a series of dialogical counterpoints, each set against the other, allowing the language to be both the same and different. Papastergiadis notes that Bakhtin’s attention to the mixture of languages within a text, which makes authority ironical remarks and unmasks authority, demonstrates a new level of linking the concept of hybridity to the politics of representation. This clearly constitutes a turning point in the debates on hybridity, a position most evident in the current appeal of Bakhtin’s theory of heteroglossia and the carnivalesque.

For the correct understanding of these carnivalesque gestures and images we must take into consideration that all such gesticulations and verbal images are part of the carnival as a whole, infused with one single logic of imagery...Each image is subject to the meaning of the whole; each reflects a single concept of a contradictory world of becoming, even though the image may be separately presented. Through its participation in the whole, each of these images is deeply ambivalent, being intimately related to life-death-birth. (Bakhtin (translated by Helene Iswolsky), 1984:149)

The ‘language’ metaphor raises the question of cultural difference and incommensurability, not the consensual, ethnocentric notion of the pluralistic existence of cultural diversity. It represents the temporality of cultural meaning as ‘multiaccentual’, ‘discursively rearticulated’ in Bhabha’s terms (1994: 254).
Bhabha’s stance reminds us how ‘multiculturalism’ in our society without multilingualism was a flimsy argument.

It is a time of the cultural sign that unsettles the liberal ethic of tolerance and the pluralist framework of multiculturalism. (Bhabha 1994: 254).

This argument is also emphasised by Crozet, Liddicoat and LoBianco (1999:2).

The end result of such a monolingual view of multiculturalism is that cultures are taken to be only the manifest and exteriorised phenomena that those who do not enter the new world view can observe.

### 2.5.3 Intercultural language learning

The focus on interculturality within a foreign language teaching paradigm is not only seen within the Australian context. Trujillo (2006) has described the European situation, and noted that the presence of interculturality in the language curriculum coincides with a general shift from linguistic to educational objectives as it is recognised that, through the process of learning a new foreign language at school, students are also encouraged to get involved in the construction of themselves as well as the world around them. DeVoss, Jaskin and Hayden (2002) discuss issues of teaching the intercultural and the intercultural communication within the North American context, and express their concern that students are likely to perpetuate unhelpful stereotypes. Nonetheless, Australian context is the focus of this study within the current Australian language learning and teaching environment. Especially the syllabus of the Language Other Than English (LOTE) syllabus in New South Wales echoes the Intercultural Language Learning approach, which has been grounded by the Australian discussions.

Discussion of intercultural competence is brisk within language education (Lo Bianco, Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999; Liddicoat & Crozet 2000; Papademetre & Scarino 2000; Liddicoat et al, 2003) in Australia. The Intercultural Language Learning approach sees language, culture and learning as interrelated. It anticipates that the learners understand their own language and culture while they are contrasting with the target language and culture. That understanding gets deeper through the interaction. It stresses that the competency to build the third
places can be nurtured while going through this process, as this process provides them an opportunity to observe their own culture, as well as the target culture, as both dynamic and arbitrary. It leads them to the third places where they can communicate with people from outside of their own place comfortably. Various viewpoints are accepted and shared in this space. The second language learner has resources to examine how a language works linguistically as learning a second language is a way to develop linguistic awareness by experiencing the variability and arbitrariness of language (Liddicoat, 2000). In short, this Intercultural Language Learning is a dynamic language education, which provides the learners opportunities to go through the processes to develop their own identity consciously and autonomously while dealing with the target language learning.

Lo Bianco et al. (1999) also proposed how to teach culture. They propose that intercultural competence finds multiple examples of ‘the third place’, the comfortable meeting place where people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds meet and communicate successfully (p.1). The importance, they argue, is a question of finding an intermediary place between one’s own culture and the interactant’s culture, not assimilating to one cultural frame (p.5). The methodology of finding ‘the third place’ is shown as Intercultural Language Teaching (ILT).

This teaching model shows three main aspects, the teaching of a linguaculture, the comparison between learners’ first language/culture and the target language/culture, and Intercultural exploration (p.11). Crozet and Liddicoat (1999:113-118) expand the discussion, and emphasise that culture is not learnt without an intellectual effort because culture is not readily accessible to be noticed, analysed and taught. Culture in language in this model of teaching is broken down from the specific into five less specific macro levels. They are world knowledge, which includes the general cultural traits and ways of life of a society; culture in spoken and written genres; pragmatic norms which refer to the culture within shorter units of text; Interactional norms which refer to the culture in organization of units of text; and more specific levels of culture in linguistic structures, words, syntax and non-verbal texts. They stress teaching language learners about their native linguaculture by contrasting it to the target
linguaculture. As the third dimension of ILT, Intercultural exploration is pointed out as crucial.

However, it is necessary to discuss how language teachers perceive this theory as the theorists also feel that such an approach to language education is vastly different to the previous model. Toyoda and Ishihara show us an example of a Japanese language teaching resource in Teaching Invisible Culture – Classroom Practice and Theory (2003) edited by Lo Bianco and Crozet.

Toyoda and Ishihara discuss the uniqueness of Japanese cultural traits in this article. For example, with topics such as ‘tacit understanding’, ‘considerations’, ‘concept of in-group and out-group’ and ‘concept of one’s senior and junior’, some Japanese socio-cultural characteristics were introduced. After the introduction, they related language expressions to characteristics such as ‘hesitation’, ‘politeness’, ‘honorific and humble expressions’ and their connection to the social hierarchy were discussed. The appropriate set phrases, for example to a compliment of ‘your earrings are cute’ where the expected reply should be ‘thank you, but I bought them a long time ago’ are then introduced.

The Toyoda and Ishihara article discusses how to teach invisible culture in the Japanese language. The textbook explains about culture that is uniquely manifested in the Japanese language. However, one can say that there is still a dangerous element in the learners gaining a stereotypical understanding of Japanese people and culture, if the teachers use of this textbook promotes culture as a fixed entity. The point which I make here is that the textbook needs to remind teachers of limitation of these stereotypes. The discourse to explain the culture within the language in this article does not show the difference to the previous model of the culture teaching within the language teaching paradigm. The typical conception of the Japanese language educators ideas toward ‘the language and culture’, which was understood previously, still persist in this article.

The following quotation of Nugent (2000) is another example to show how it is confusing for the classroom teachers to understand the intrinsic relationship between culture and language.
There is an intrinsic relationship between culture and language. The study of foreign cultures through foreign language enables students to develop an awareness of other people’s views of the world, their unique way of life, and the patterns of behaviour that order their world, as well as an understanding of the contributions of other cultures to our society. The teaching of culture should be an integral part of second language programs to help students appreciate the people who speak the language. (p.39)

This type of argument almost convinces the teachers of the language that they have been teaching enough culture in the language teaching.

Kawakami (2005) also claims that Japanese language educators in Australia do not generate new ideas when connecting the culture and the language. He interviewed Japanese language educators in Brisbane about how to practise Intercultural Language Learning. Most of the replies to the interview said that they did not have to change very much, because they have been teaching culture in connection with the language. He also discusses the new teaching resources, *Intercultural Language Learning - Arriving at the Third Place*, published by the LOTE centre, the Education Queensland (The State of Queensland, 2005).

Kawakami illustrates one topic from the resource, “Marriage in Japanese society”. It shows typical items, which are needed in a Japanese wedding ceremony, such as ‘*shuugibukuro* – a special envelope for a monetary gift’, ‘*shukuden* - wedding congratulatory telegram’ and wedding guide including photo of traditional Shinto as well as the church wedding. The teaching guide attached to the resource includes questions such as ‘*donna kekkonshikideshitaka* – what kind of wedding was it?’ ‘*donna huku wo kiteimashitaka* – what kind of dress were people wearing?’ among others. He assumes that the teaching material might be used to introduce the Japanese wedding, comparing an Australian and Japanese wedding, and discussion of what kind of wedding the learners want. However, he questions strongly whether ‘the third place’ can be produced by teaching this way. The issues should be focused, in Kawakami’s view, on the method of application of the Intercultural Language Learning itself.
The need for further research that would help to resolve the very real conflict between theory and practice of the Intercultural Language Learning approach has been discussed by Chen (1999). He expressed his concern that the majority of foreign language classes are still conducted within the perspective of the communicative competence pedagogy, despite the recent criticism of this methodology and the emergence of new paradigms for preparing learners for meaningful communication outside their own cultural environment. Regarding recent trends in Japanese language teaching in the Australian context, Chen found that the pragmatics of socio-culturally appropriate interpersonal interactions tend to be dominated by the native rather than the target language norms, even though students might acquire high levels of competence in the purely linguistic aspects of the language. Chen used an example, a word ‘thank you’ in Japanese, to discuss this issue. Expressions of gratitude in Japanese are numerous and a careful selection has to be made to initiate a formula appropriate to the demands of a particular communicative situation. His study shows that the students’ word choices were often not only inappropriate but also very strongly marked as a transfer from English. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) also discuss the urgent need for further research in this area.

Having examined both Kawakami and Chen’s arguments, it seems that the creation of ‘the third place’ does not seem to penetrate into the classroom practice yet. It seems that only the formula, the study of the Culture 1 and the Culture 2 leading the learners into the Culture 3, has been well-established. Nonetheless, the crucial point to implementing the Intercultural Language Learning materials is the learners’ as well as the teachers’ conscious behaviour and/or attitudes in interacting with the target language and investigating how it works and exploring to see “how you feel” and “how I feel” when using the target language.

2.6 Discussion and Conclusion

The reason for aiming at a language education, which formulates a notion of ‘the third place’ is, in short, raising a human who can make true communication with
people of this globe. The globe discussed here is a place where various people meet and communicate with people who have different ideas, cultural and social background. Educating people to be able to live together in such manner, of course, should be carried out in education as a whole rather than taught in one individual subject such as a language. However, if the education is based on a fixed and static social, cultural and linguistic view, then this paradigm has to be changed initially. That is to say, we need to re-construct the education based on a view, which grasps social diversity, cultural hybridity and a linguistic dynamic.

The task of the school is to integrate the academic culture of schooling into the cultures that the culturally different value, ‘not substitute one for the other or add one on top of the other’, according to Corson (1998: 242). This also applies to language education, and a similar paradigm change is needed. However, where language education differs from other areas of education is that it educates the students about language, which pursues issues of language competency. This seems a crucial point to note, because this is an obvious and self-explanatory point to the language educators. The language educators who teach foreign languages teach a language which reflects the different culture and different ideas from the learners’ own. The aims of the educators are to educate the students to be able to gain a good command of the language and to understand and communicate with the people from a different cultural background. If the educators have this view, then neither the intercultural language education is new idea for them, nor the paradigm change is needed for them. This may be a reason why only the simple formula of ‘culture 1 plus culture 2 makes the culture 3’ became too obvious to the educators. The gap which is apparent here seems to be caused by vagueness of relationship between ‘the third space’, intercultural competence and the communicative competency within the language education.

The crucial point is seen in Kramsch’s claim (2000 b) that a learner’s realisation of their self and others exists within both their own culture, the culture 1, and the target language culture, culture 2. A learner transforms the realisation by travelling between culture 1 and 2 while experiencing language learning. In Kramsch’s view, culture 1 and culture 2 need not be considered as opposites.
Rather they are the supposed culture that a learner creates individually while learning a language. This is not a fixed culture or cultures.

Then, the next important point to deliberate is how to grasp the relationship between the language and the realisation of self and others. This realisation changes, at the same time when the target language competence to meet with the necessary intercultural competence changes cyclically (Liddicoat et al, 2003, Kawakami, 2005). The condition of the realisation and the language competency differs depending on the situation, the environment, and the relationship with the counterpart. What is needed is the learners’ as well as the teachers’ own efforts to deepen their articulation of the self and others within themselves, and also conceptualise culture within themselves. This process also assists them to deepen their understanding of what intercultural competency they need when dealing with the target language. Therefore, what we really need to examine now is how the learners, as well as the teachers, see their subjective self and others when learning and teaching the language. The examination is crucial for the practitioners particularly.

The ‘identity uncertainty’ that has developed in this era of globalisation affects both students and teachers who are shifting from old discourses in order to construct historically new subjectivities. As Bakhtin describes it: One makes a self through the appropriation of the voices of others (1984:31). These voices may speak past realities better than present ones, making them less than ideal as materials for the new subjectivities and challenging old ones via a language in which discursive categories are reified and subject positions assumed. As Bakhtin observed:

Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker’s intentions: it is populated – overpopulated- with the intentions of others (1981:294)

The need for the curriculum change is widely discussed when considering the impact of globalisation in our society. The arguments showed growing tendency on economic rationalism, and the consequent enforcement of the service of education as wealth creation, which focus the prosperity of workers rather than developing ones true individual wealth.
This study sees language education in a process of cultural formation, and situates interculturality as the crucial element to build citizenship in current Australian society. The recent studies of language education discuss what interculturality is within the area of language education, and how language education contributes to the development of interculturality. However, it seems there are gaps between the theory and actual classroom practice. These clarifications will assist what and how we can teach the children to develop interculturality within the language education arena. Also they will clarify that it is the language learning that provides concrete experience.

This chapter discussed theoretical arguments of school students’ needs of identification of their self identity which grounds development of interculturality to be a ‘good citizens’ of globalised society, and [the] possibility of a foreign language education to be an assistance to develop interculturality. The next chapter examines some practical aspects of interculturality within Australian school contexts by examining the government reports relating to curriculum development and renewal.
Chapter 3  Curriculum development in citizenship education and foreign language education in multicultural Australia

3.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the background to the curriculum areas of citizenship education and foreign language education in Australian schooling, and discusses how the new directions in the curriculum are contributing to the goals of intercultural understanding and interaction in so-called multicultural Australia. A number of federal and state reports relevant to these curriculum areas are outlined and analysed, together with syllabus document evaluations.

In the past few years, there has been a clear realisation of the need for citizenship education in Australian schools to bring home to Australian children their roles and responsibilities within their interethnic, interreligious communities at home and globally. In New South Wales, the urgency for appropriate education and positive action was reinforced after the occurrence of the racial riots involving young Australians at the Sydney suburb of Cronulla on the 11th of December 2005. (Sydney Morning Herald 12/12/05, The Australian, 12/12/05, ABC News accessed 11/12/05 http://www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/200512/s1528544.htm). This riot highlighted racial issues amongst Australian youth, and disclosed to Australian society that racial prejudice is still entrenched in this society. Although the rioters do not represent the wider Australian society, these issues seem crucial to be brought into the open via school education. It is a sad reflection of our education system that these racial issues occur amongst the youth who were presumably educated within an Australian school environment. As an example of the depth of racism in all areas of society, it was not long after this riot that Professor Andrew Fraser from Macquarie University made an astonishing assertion (The Daily Telegraph, 10/2/06) that Australia should revert to white-only immigration in order to solve the racial problems. The article also identified that his stance is quite popular amongst his students.
Racism is often expressed in more subtle ways than in the crude tones of last century, but some of the rioters in Cronulla seemed to revert to attitudes of earlier times. Jones (2003:114) wrote that Wartime (2nd World War) propaganda against the Japanese adopted crudely racist approaches. In a frontline morale-building speech General Sir Thomas Blamey had this to say of the enemy: ‘Fighting Japs is not like fighting normal human beings. We are not dealing with humans as we know them. We are dealing with something primitive’. Jones argues that this statement reads like a throwback to comments about Aborigines being ‘sub-human’ and the Chinese being immoral, filthy, obnoxious and treacherous. While these comments had been made during the stress of war time, they also reminded the author of the Cronulla riot(s), where Australian youth of both white and Arabic descent unfortunately showed their racist attitudes. Professor Andrew Fraser’s opinion on the racial issue does not seem to be the solution, because it is not the colour of skin that causes the problem. It is our own attitude.

Interreligious understanding is another significant area that schools’ curricula have not addressed consistently, although some attempts at increasing understanding of faith-based learning have been made through secular ethics-based classes. The Sydney Morning Herald (August 5-6, 2006) reported on parents’ views of an ethics-based class. Of 280 parents surveyed for the Federation of Parents and Citizens’ Associations of NSW, 59 per cent thought it was important or very important that their child be given the option of attending a secular ethics-based class. Some 79 per cent of parents said they would support their children being exposed to faiths other than their own. Almost a quarter of parents said they would like to see the teaching of faiths other than Christianity introduced. The survey also shows that schools are not offering constructive activities that would engage the students who are not attending religious education. The report also suggests that by excluding other belief systems from public schools, the NSW Government is effectively mandating what children will or will not believe.

Considering where the youths who were involved in the Cronulla riot grew up and went to school, we may need to re-think whether or not school education is
heading in the right direction. The following section reviews developments in citizenship education, including civics, citizenship, and values education.

3.2 Citizenship education in the curriculum

In this section, firstly I discuss how citizenship education has been constructed within the Human Society and Its Environment (HSIE) curriculum area in NSW, and how it links with LOTE. Secondly I will discuss a report, the Civics Expert Group’s report on civics education (Civic Expert Group (Australia), 1994), and a citizenship education program entitled Discovering Democracy, which was announced in 1997 by the Federal Government. Both the report and the program were influential in the development of citizenship education in Australia. Thirdly, I discuss the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools (2005) as the present Australian government’s view regarding a set of values for Australian schools. The sub-sections that follow need to be read in relation to the theoretical issues raised in Chapter 2, on what is citizenship education, and what are the relationships between language education, citizenship education and the construction of student identity. Further, for the most part, the curriculum under discussion relates to the primary school years, unless otherwise stipulated.

3.2.1 NSW context of the HSIE Syllabus

Although neither citizenship education nor LOTE are independent key learning subjects of the primary school curriculum, they are a part of the HSIE syllabus. Interestingly, LOTE and citizenship education are never mentioned as being interrelated. The following examines how they are seen within the HSIE syllabus.

The objectives in the HSIE Syllabus (Board of Studies New South Wales, HSIE K-6 Syllabus, 1998 and 2006: 8) include the following statement:

Knowledge and Understandings:

…By studying cultures, students should develop knowledge and understandings about cultures in Australia and other places, their diversity and similarities and how they influence people’s identities and behaviours.

Skills:
By developing skills in social and civic participation, students should be able to take active, responsible and informed roles as citizens in a rapidly changing and diverse global society.

Values and Attitudes:
By identifying, clarifying, analysing and evaluating their values and attitudes as well as those of others about issues and events, students should develop informed and responsible attitudes towards people, cultures, religions, societies, environments and learning. This will enable them to contribute to intercultural understanding and the development of a democratic and socially just society in a sustainable environment.

Intercultural Understanding is defined as: (Board of Studies New South Wales, HSIE K-6 Syllabus, 1998:13 and 2006: 13):
- Identifying and appreciating the cultural, linguistic and spiritual heritages of oneself and others;
- Respecting different viewpoints, ways of living, belief systems and languages;
- Empathising with people of different cultures and societies;
- Recognising that cultural and religious groups may differ in their views on moral issues; and
- Supporting cultural diversity within a cohesive society.

It is also suggested that these objectives are to be incorporated with Aboriginal, citizenship, environmental, gender, global, multicultural and work perspectives. (Board of Studies New South Wales, HSIE K-6 Syllabus, 1998: 9 and 2006: 9)

While both the earlier Prime Ministerial Civics Expert Group, through the report, ‘Whereas the people…’ (Civics Expert Group, 1994) and the current Civics Education Group and the Commonwealth program, Discovering Democracy (Angus, 2000), have recommended that curriculum development on the topic of citizenship should focus on studies of society and environment, they also envisaged that there should be teaching responsibilities on this topic in all areas of learning as progress is made.
Although the syllabus of HSIE in NSW emphasises the importance of intercultural understanding and responsible citizenship, I find there are contradictions in the syllabus. For example, the HSIE Syllabus K-6 in NSW recognises the centrality of language education as follows:

This syllabus recognises the central place of language in shaping and defining culture and identity. Human Society and Its Environment includes the study of languages other than English, which gives students opportunities to study the world through the medium of language, learn about languages and learn to use them.

(Board of Studies, NSW, 1998 & 2006: 5)

It acknowledges a position of the language study as central in shaping and defining culture and identity rather than simply being able to speak in a foreign language, an important distinction. It also aims to give students opportunities to study the world through the medium of language, learn about languages and learn to use them. If the aims of the syllabus were to be fulfilled, a class teacher needs a second language background of some sort. However, it is difficult to find a language subject as a core subject in any university’s teacher training course in NSW, Australia. In the 2008 course handbooks published on the websites of the 10 universities in NSW, no university listed foreign language teaching/learning as a core subject for primary teaching specialist qualifications, although some universities listed foreign language studies (such as Japanese studies at UNSW, and Indonesian language studies at Macquarie University) as a part of the core subjects offered.

The HSIE syllabus statements are significant, because they acknowledge language, including foreign languages, as a crucial element of human society, giving HSIE a key role in language study in primary schools. Then, it is crucial to teach a language as a part of, not separate from this subject. However, this important connection between language studies and HSIE lessens when the language component is treated separately in schools:

All students have an opportunity to develop an awareness of languages other than English in this key learning area. Learning another language enhances students’ abilities to communicate, increases their cultural awareness and cross-cultural understanding, and assists them to develop a greater understanding of their own language and culture...The Board of
Studies’ K-6 Generic Framework for Languages (1996) and Aboriginal Languages Interim Framework K-10 (1998) are documents that support schools wishing to develop specific language programs. Schools may also wish to use the Board’s K-6 syllabuses in specific languages. (Board of Studies, NSW, 1998 & 2006: 5-6)

According to this statement, LOTE could almost be seen as a separate Key Learning Area or component of a broader framework. However, there are contradictions between the policy and the implementation of HSIE components. In many schools throughout NSW, there is a tendency for teachers to devote very little classroom time to LOTE, for a variety of reasons, including lack of continuity over time in teaching one foreign language (often just one term or one year for a particular language), scarcity of primary trained teachers with the capacity or confidence to teach LOTE, changes in school policy, disruption of learning between primary and secondary school, where the LOTE languages offered may be different, and a general sense that the curriculum is already overcrowded. According to recent research conducted by Jen Burnley at Wollongong University, HSIE receives fewer weekly hours of teaching than most other subjects (Burnley 2008. Pers comm.), and so to include LOTE, citizenship education, Aboriginal Studies and other components in the HSIE syllabus in such limited time is difficult to achieve.

One of the most influential policy changes in the 1990s was the decision not to allow the teaching of foreign languages by anyone other than a fully trained primary teacher. Many people from the community teaching their first language in the schools (including Japanese teachers without an Australian qualification) were therefore no longer allowed to continue teaching. Given that few if any teacher education faculties trained primary teachers in a foreign language, the numbers of people available for LOTE teaching dropped significantly. Moreover, it appears from the evidence gathered for this thesis, many teachers are not aware that LOTE forms a part of HSIE in primary schools.
The place of Japanese language in the primary school curriculum is heavily influenced by changing political and economic imperatives. At a time when the Japanese economy was booming, Japanese language learning was popular in schools, but later, once there was a downturn in the Japanese economy, popularity dropped down and greater emphasis was placed on skills training for vocational education in the high schools.

Thomson (2002) argues the debate about schooling and work became sharply polarised during the time of the Howard Government. Those disposed to a more ‘generalist approach’ – advocating broadly based and futurist learning in all school subjects, including those focussed on work education – often found themselves labelled as old-fashioned and elitist rather than as advocates of more democratic approaches to the plight of working-class youth. He writes:

This was a bizarre incarnation of the ‘modernist–progressive versus the traditionalist’ rhetoric favoured by [the then] contemporary government. The argument, rather than being about how best to educate for the global economy as part of an overall education for changing times, became reduced to one of education for jobs or not. (p.128)

The debate continues over the importance of language as a skill, to help trading with foreign countries, compared with language as a value in assisting young people’s citizenship growth.

3.2.2 “Whereas the people...”: Civics Expert Group’s 1994 Report

The Civics Expert Group was instrumental in creating a new approach to citizenship education (Dockett and Cusack, 2003, Print, 1996). The then Prime Minister, Paul Keating, set up the Civics Expert Group (CEG) to make recommendations on civic education in Australian schools in 1993. The most important element of Keating’s big picture was his vision for an Australian
republic. Keating argued that constitutional reform to create an Australian republic was necessary not only because our links with Britain had lost importance and the British monarchy had lost relevance, but also because we needed to establish a unique, unified sense of national identity. This was also the intention to promote a more outwardly focused, confident and economically successful nation (Kennedy and Howard, 2001).

The Civics Expert Group argued against making citizenship education a special school subject (CEG, 1994). Rather, the group saw greater value in integrating it with history, social studies, economics, and other subjects within the learning area known as Studies of Society and the Environment, or HSIE in NSW context.

Civics is not an academic subject divorced from everyday life, but a way of understanding how participation and decision-making operate in contemporary Australia. (p7)

A national telephone survey of the 15 years and over population was conducted as a part of a study conducted by the Civics Expert Group during 1994. With regard to the question about what makes a good citizen, the results were as follows (p155):

1. Obey laws (no percentage identified for this);
2. Care & consideration for others Help others. Treat others equally. Live and let live (38%);
3. Community involvement & Activities (30%);
4. Help in community (25%), Voluntary/charity work (5%);
5. Patriotic (16%);
6. Good character.(Be honest, responsible. Have moral conscience) (15%);
7. Pay taxes, bills (15%);
8. Be responsible parents. Family oriented (7%);
9. Be more aware of political/current affairs (5%);
10. Vote responsibly (5%);
11. Be environmentally conscious (4%);
12. Generally do good (3%); and
13. Unsure (2%)

While CEG recommended that Civics is not an academic subject separate from daily life, the Group also emphasised that teachers need clear guidance to implement this education, if positive outcomes are to be expected. The group
pointed out that part of the Common and agreed national goals for schooling in Australia (1989) were to develop in students a knowledge of languages other than English (p190). It also highlighted the importance of the Australian citizen within an international context. Goal number 7 out of 10 stated:

7. To develop knowledge, skills attitudes and values which will enable students to participate as active and informed citizens in our democratic Australian society within an international context. (p190)

To participate as active and informed citizens within an international context, learning other languages and other cultures was an indispensable part of schooling.

Mellor, Kennedy and Greenwood (2002:4) emphasise that issues such as the creation of an Australian republic, reconciliation with indigenous Australians, multiculturalism and engagement with Asia all require a citizenry that could appreciate and understand the need for the kind of changes Keating was proposing. However, by March 1996 the Keating government had been replaced by the more conservative Howard government and it was not clear what the incoming government’s view would be of a civics education initiative (Mellor, Kennedy and Greenwood, 2002:3). By the following year, a new policy was announced, as discussed in Section 3.2.3 below.

3.2.3 Discovering Democracy (Kemp, 1997)


Unlike the previous Keating Government, where the notion of ‘civics deficit’ was the focus, in the Howard Government, the emphasis was on Australian national identity and heritage. Discovering Democracy was an initiative that acknowledged the need for the teaching of Australian history, recognition of the
European roots of Australian democracy and the need for national cohesion (Mellor, Kennedy and Greenwood, 2002:4). The materials developed for Years 4-10 were designed to be adapted by education authorities, schools and teachers, and to be used in teaching HSIE, History and English.

Dr. Kemp stressed that the core challenge in educating citizens is to balance two elements; commitment to ‘promoting the freedom of the individual, which entails respect for diversity’, and establishing ‘some degree of consensus and congruence’ (Ferres & Meredyth, 2001:24). According to Hughes, Bellamy and Black, (2000:242), the program articulates values such as ‘tolerance, respect for others, freedom of speech, religion and association’, however, this did not refer to the values of empathy or altruism, or the skills of taking account of the feelings of others. It was not oriented to the building of social trust.

An evaluation of the Discovering Democracy Programme 2000-2003 was published by Commonwealth of Australia DEST in November 2003 (Erebus Consulting Partners, 2003). This evaluation was based on a nation wide group of 63 school case studies, a national survey of primary and secondary teachers and in-depth interviews with stakeholders. Within the evaluation report, some recommendations were announced, which included a need for Civics and Citizenship Education to be further implemented and for continued professional development in this area, in order for it to become firmly embedded in schools (p.84). However, the recommendation suggested a disconnection of the Discovering Democracy Programme, and further expressed the importance of values education. The recommendations stated;

Future support for Civics and Citizenship Education by the Australian Government should be principally focussed on students’ acquiring and applying civic values and understandings, in a global environment.

The initial four-year funding should be made available for a major values education and civics education programme, including additional resourcing for Studies of Asia to promote regional and global citizenship and intercultural understanding.

(p.84)
This is an interesting development from the Discovering Democracy Program, with its focus more towards a European rooted Australian identity replaced with regional and global focused values education.

Meanwhile, the survey conducted by the Prime Minister’s Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce on Young People and Their Community (2001), was a concern. Only just under half of respondents believed that most in the community respect young people as individuals regardless of race, sexual orientation and other characteristics. Free text responses also indicated that many young people felt a sense of prejudice due to their age, race and/or sexual orientation (Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce, 2001:127-141).

In 1999, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) carried out an international Civic Education Study (Mellor, Kennedy and Greenwood, 2001). In Phase 1, national researchers from 24 countries conducted qualitative case studies that examined the contexts and meaning of civic education in their countries. The observations from the case studies were used to develop both a test of students’ civic knowledge and a survey of their civic engagement allowing the results to be analysed statistically for comparisons. In Phase 2 of the Study, nationally representative samples of nearly 90,000 students in the usual grade for 14-year-olds in 28 countries were surveyed on topics ranging from their knowledge of fundamental democratic principles and skills in interpreting political information to their attitudes toward government.

Focusing Australian students’ civic attitudes especially on cultural differences, the report claims that the attitudes of Australian students to immigrants are only moderately positive. Eighty nine per cent of the students agree that immigrants should have the right to equal educational opportunities, with 77% agreeing immigrants should have the right to maintain their customs. Almost a quarter of the students stated that immigrants should not be able to continue their own customs and lifestyles.
In the classroom environment, more Australian students expressed that they are encouraged to express their opinion in the class than students from other countries, where 34% say they are often encouraged to voice their opinion in class. Nevertheless, similar to their international peers, a quarter of the Australian students said that this rarely or never happens.

Interestingly, Australian teachers’ survey results did not seem to reflect the outcomes of the students’ survey results. Ninety eight per cent of the teachers thought that schools had a very important role in developing student attitudes and opinions. The majority of principals and teachers, between 70 and 90 per cent, agreed that their students learn the civic competencies of working together in groups with other students and understanding people who have different point of views.

The report also indicated that teachers most want their students to learn to develop a consciousness about the needs of the whole world, to develop honesty, as well as to fight against social injustice, to stand up for one’s opinion, to ensure opportunities for minorities to express their own culture and to recognise the value of Australia as a nation. It seems that teachers need to identify the gaps between what they want their students to learn, how they are teaching, and what students actually achieve from their teaching.

These contradictions between the opinions of the teachers and the students in terms of the influence of schooling on attitudes and opinions became evident. Almost one quarter of the students think that immigrants should not keep their culture, when the teachers indicated strongly that they want their students to be fair to minorities in Australia. Also one quarter of the students think that the school did not provide them with the opportunity to express their opinions, when the teachers want their students to stand up for their opinions.

The reasons for the gaps may vary, one possibility being the teachers and students understanding of the concept terms, for example, the needs of the whole world, social justice/injustice, the value of Australia as a nation. Interpretations of these
and other terms will vary between syllabus writers and teachers, teachers and students, and between schools and students’ families. Without contextualising the students and their learning objectives, the teachers thinking may only end up by simply idealising the classroom, therefore, their teaching objectives will not reflect the outcomes. This suggests the importance of internal and external teaching evaluations, and research on the issues.

The studies conducted, the Prime Minister’s Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce on Young People and Their Community in 2001, and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement study (IEA) in 2002, did not indicate the successful results of Discovering Democracy in terms of the students’ attitude as a global citizen. However, the IEA study took place in 1999 before the Discovering Democracy program might have been fully integrated into schools in Australia.

Civic and Citizenship Education needs teachers to focus on the exercise of ethical judgements and to develop personal and social responsibilities as an Australian within this globalised society, as the Discovering Democracy evaluation indicated.

The challenge seems to be how to provide the teachers theoretical understanding of the key concepts; citizenship/ values education and interculturality in this case, and its practical applications. Kennedy (1997) emphasises the importance of understanding theoretical, political, and social contexts in order to shape educational programs. Kennedy (1997:1) argues that “citizenship education is capable of being constructed in multiple ways and that it is important to be aware of how those constructions take place”. The challenge for civics and citizenship education is to somehow meld together civic knowledge, civic megatrends and civic realities in a way that will meet young people where they are (ibid. pp1-5).

3.2.4 National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools in 2005
As discussed above, in Whereas the people…and Discovering Democracy, the authors raised the central issue of values and their relationship to civics education.
The Civics Expert Group settled for defining some core values: civility and the respect for the rule of law, concern for the welfare, rights and dignity of others and acceptance of diversity. Discovering Democracy stressed other core values: tolerance, respect for others, freedom of speech, religion and association. Although disagreement on core concepts such as ‘tolerance’ was discussed, this was a significant starting point as it signalled that civics education must deal centrally with values.

The National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools (Commonwealth of Australia DEST, 2005a) was developed from the outcomes of the Values Education Study Final Report in 2003 (Commonwealth of Australia DEST, 2003). This Values Education Study was commissioned by Dr. Nelson, then the Commonwealth Minister for Education, Science and Training, in 2002, and the Curriculum Corporation managed the study. It took the form of a qualitative investigation, which comprised of Action research with 69 schools across Australia, a literature search, and research via focus groups and a password-protected online survey to determine parent, teacher and student views on the values the community expects Australian schools to foster. The study was designed to:

- enable schools to develop and demonstrate current practice in values education

- provide an informed basis for promoting improved values education in Australian schools;

- make recommendations on a set of Principles and a Framework for improved values education in Australian schools.

(Commonwealth of Australia DEST, 2003:1)

As a result of the study, draft guiding principles for the improved provision of values education in Australian schools were announced (Commonwealth of Australia DEST, 2003:150). It stated the importance of clarifying a goal and outcomes of schooling to promote care, respect and cooperation. It recognised values of the diversity of community in Australia, which should be a foundation of all schooling, and it should be applied in the practices of the school. Students
were encouraged to explore their own, their school’s and their communities’ values. A whole-school approach with students, staff, families and the school community was expected in values education. Teachers who can deliver an appropriate curriculum for effective values education were expected to meet the individual needs of students.

Based on this report, the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (DEST, 2005a) was published, which identified nine Values for Australian Schooling. They were: Care and Compassion; Doing Your Best; Fair Go; Freedom; Honesty and Trustworthiness; Integrity; Respect; Responsibility; and Understanding, Tolerance and Inclusion. (*National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*, Commonwealth of Australia, DEST, 2005a:4)

The Government indicated great support for values education by funding the implementation of $29.7 million over four years from 2005 to help make values education a core part of Australian schooling (p3.). This funding assisted five key areas including values education forums in every school in Australia; drug education forums in every school; schools showcasing good practice approaches in line with the National Framework, curriculum and assessment resources for all schools to promote values education, and national partnership projects with parents, teachers, principals and teachers educators (*National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*, Commonwealth of Australia DEST, 2005a:3).

The final report of Stage 1 of the Report of the Values Education Good Practice Schools was published in September 2006 (Vaughan, 2006). The project was funded as part of the initial $29.7 million. The aim of the project was to show how implementing the National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools could realise the vision for schools to provide values education in a planned and systematic way (Vaughan, 2006:1) 26 school clusters of 166 schools all over Australia were involved in this project.
The final report identified recommendations to enhance values education. The first point was to reach agreement within the school community about the values that guide the school and the language in which they are described. It emphasised that values education could only be sustained over time if a whole school approach was adopted that engages all sectors of the school community and all aspects of school life. Therefore, school leadership is critical in developing values education as a core part of schooling. It also stated that values must be explicitly articulated and explicitly taught, thus, professional learning of all teachers is critical at all stages of the development of values education. Developing positive relationships in classrooms and schools is stated as central to values education. It also recommended that schools needed to work in clusters, in order to foster effective professional development and quality teaching and learning, as well as provide support for values education initiatives (Vaughan, 2006:215-216).

The report indicated that the Values Education Good Practice Schools Project Stage 1 demonstrated that good practice values education can lead to important changes in teacher professional practice in classrooms and, in particular, in the way teachers relate to and communicate with their students. In other words, an effective values education approach will: “produce calmer and more focused classroom activity; enable students to become better self-managers; help students develop greater capacities for reflection; increase teachers’ levels of confidence in their approaches to their work and their sense of professional fulfilment; and produce strong positive relationships between students and between students and teachers” (Vaughan, 2006:2).

Most of the projects carried out over the cluster schools included a theme related to the observation of different values, cultures and how best to communicate and exchange ideas with these differences.

**Values education in NSW public schools 2004**

The previous curriculum document for values education, *The Values We Teach* (NSW Department of School Education), was published in 1991. This document identified clearly the value of love, self-sacrifice and friendship and respecting
different viewpoints and ways of living (NSW Department of School Education 1991:6-8).

*Values in NSW Public Schools* was published in 2004 by DET NSW. The core values listed in the document are:-

- Integrity
- Excellence
- Respect
- Responsibility
- Cooperation
- Participation
- Care
- Fairness
- Democracy

(DET NSW, 2004:3)

The above listed core values echo the ones listed by the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (2003), although it seems the NSW version spelt out more clearly in regard to demonstrating empathy and compassion. It states for example, that the concept of ‘care’ means: “Concern for the wellbeing of yourself and others, demonstrating empathy and acting with compassion” (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2004:3).

As Hughes, Bellamy and Black (2000:240) argue, moral behaviour involves the ability to think ‘into’ the other person’s situation and to act in a way that respects it. It involves learning to be considerate of others, and knowing how such consideration can be expressed. Values in NSW public schools (2004:2) suggests that the core values are taught in all classrooms and in all school communities. It is interesting to observe how this implementation may indicate a change, as the result of the civics (IEA) report in 2002 indicates almost a quarter of students think that immigrants should not be able to continue their own customs and lifestyles. Also, incidents such as the Cronulla riot suggest that the schools are not entirely successful in implementing Values education in their school curricula.
The NSW Board of Studies indicates the time allocation of the key learning areas, and states English 25% - 35%, Mathematics 20%, Science and Technology 6 % - 10%, PDHPE 6 % - 10%, HSIE 6 % - 10%, Creative and Practical Arts 6 % - 10%, Additional activities up to 20%. Teachers have flexibility to use these guidelines in accordance with the policies of their school system or authority. (http://k6.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au/go/nsw-primary-curriculum-foundation-statements) Although Values education should not be thought of as an individual subject, these suggested numbers do not encourage teachers to include Values in their teaching. If Values are to be engaged explicitly in their teaching programs, a clear and systematic indication of how to engage/teach to enhance Values must be articulated.

Hughes, Bellamy and Black (2000:225-249) discuss Values education in Australia as building social trust through education. In order for children to act compassionately and to take the needs of others into account in their actions, a range of abilities and skills must be developed. The British moral educationalist and philosopher John Wilson has analysed these qualities (Wilson, Williams and Sugarman, 1967;190-203). He describes them as follows.

- the ability to know what others’ feelings are;
- the ability to identify with other people in such a way that other people’s feelings and interests are accepted as of equal validity to ones’ own.
- the mastery of factual knowledge needed to make moral decisions, such as information about people and society;
- the rational formulation of a set of rules or moral principles based on a knowledge of the feelings of others and information about people and society to which a person commits himself or herself.
- the ability to translate principles into actions

(Wilson, Williams and Sugarman, 1967;191-192)

Wilson, Williams and Sugarman (1967;454-456) argue that many of these skills can be taught directly.
Etzioni (1996:179) argues that foundational to moral thinking and decision-making is the capacity for empathy and self-control. Etzioni (2004: 214) also discusses a new approach to international relations, and emphasises that the world needs a new set of shared core values and political institutions, which leads to a truly global community. He uses the term, Moral dialogues (Etzioni, 2004: 67-71), which occur when a group of people engage in a process of sorting out the values that should guide their lives. Through the dialogues, a wider shared moral understanding, political culture, and legitimacy for transnationals institutions can be provided (Etzioni, 2004:70).

The LOTE section of DET NSW suggests that the LOTE curriculum can fulfil an objective of the Values education model in NSW public schools. During the data collection period, I had the opportunity to informally interview Japanese language advisors from the Department. They were producing Japanese language teaching resources that could also engage with the core values that Values in NSW Public Schools recognises.

### 3.3 Languages Other Than English (LOTE) in Australia

An important document was published in 1987 on Australia’s National Policy of Language (Lo Bianco, 1987) that set out a rationale for maintaining and/or developing bilingualism in all Australians, based on a balance of social equity, cultural enrichment and economic strategies. This document created considerable debate and discussion, and laid the groundwork for an official policy. The outcome, the Australian Languages and Literacy Policy(ALLP) in 1991 reflected economic strategies, rather than multiculturalism, and emphasised economically motivated second language learning (Ozolins, 1993: 254-257). The four key goals of the ALLP were that:

- all Australians should develop and maintain effective literacy in English to enable them to participate in Australian society;
- the learning of languages other than English must be substantially expanded and improved to enhance educational outcomes and communication within both the Australian and the international community;
• those Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages which are still transmitted should be maintained and developed, and those that are not should be recorded where appropriate;
• language services, provided by interpreters and translators, the print and electronic media and libraries, should be expanded and improved.


Subsequently, the Commonwealth LOTE programme arising from the ALLP, a distinction was drawn between priority languages and community languages. Ten priority languages were identified; Chinese (Mandarin), French, German, Modern Greek, Indonesian, Japanese, Italian, Korean, Spanish, and Aboriginal languages.

A significant factor in LOTE policy and practice in Australia during 1994 to 2004 had been delivered through the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) strategy. It had supported Asian languages and studies in all school systems in order to improve Australia’s capacity and awareness to interact internationally, in particular with Asian economies. There were four languages targeted under the Strategy: Chinese (Mandarin); Indonesian; Japanese and Korean. Studies of Asia, rather than being treated as a separate subject, was developed within key learning areas, in particular Studies of Society and Environment, English and the Arts. The various state governments were entrusted to implement their own LOTE syllabi in secondary schools, and some state governments introduced language syllabi for primary schools as well. The Japanese K-6 Syllabus for NSW was published in 1997, discussed in detail in section 3.4, was the first formal introduction of Japanese language to primary schools in NSW.

3.3.1 LOTE Syllabus in NSW
Since 1995, some syllabuses have been developed in Languages for K-6, including the Japanese K-6 Syllabus published by the Board of Studies NSW in 1997. Aims for this syllabus were to develop in students’ positive values and
attitudes about the Japanese language, including appreciation of the cultural identity of speakers of Japanese; skills in communicating in Japanese; and sociocultural understandings and knowledge of the Japanese language as a system (Japanese K-6 Syllabus, Board of Studies NSW, 1997:8).

The objectives included three major categories: Values, Attitudes and Sociocultural understandings; Communication skills; and Knowledge and Understandings. Curriculum links across other learning areas were identified, and the syllabus encouraged the teachers to aim to develop students’ competencies in the areas of communication, cultural understanding, problem solving, personal and interpersonal skills, technological and scientific understanding, and mathematical understanding.

Some suggested themes for the development of teaching and learning content included: Meeting People, School Life, Me My Family and Friends, Out and About, and Daily Activities (p12). In each theme, Communicative Functions, Language Structure and sample Cultural Aspects were suggested for the teachers as a guide for their teaching. For example, under the theme of “Meeting People”, the communicative functions included greeting and introducing others, the language structures including greetings and farewell, and under cultural aspects, students were taught about bowing to others when greeting them (p15).

The syllabus outlined a thematic approach for planning a Kindergarten to Year 6 programme: ‘Themes’ referred to a generalised area of study, e.g. Interacting with Others, whereas ‘Topics’ were more specific studies of an issue or section of a theme, eg Greetings, Farewells, Introducing Self/Others.

As seen above, development of the learners’ cultural awareness was clearly valued as a part of the language studies, and the students’ development of their self identity, intercultural awareness was already appreciated in this syllabus. However, within this syllabus, ‘culture’ was not clearly treated as a fluid entity, rather it was dealt with as if it was fixed. It is significant that the concept of self and others within this framework treated ‘self’ and ‘other’ as different, separated
entities, thus ‘interacting with others’ was not actually entering into the spirit of the intrinsic understanding of others.

In 2001, the NSW Board of Studies published a Languages K-10 draft framework. This clearly demonstrated that the Board of Studies recognised language learning as developmental, highlighting the importance of Kindergarten to Year 6 as a foundation for studies from Years 7 to 10. As the previous syllabus showed K–6 separately, the high school practice tended to neglect the students’ learning experience during primary school. As discussed above, the previous syllabus also identified the necessity of integrating language and culture; however, the difference in the new syllabus is apparent. This new framework showed a renewed emphasis on the integration, and echoed the belief of Kramsch (1993) that every time a person uses language, he or she is undertaking a cultural act. The framework also endorsed the option of ‘intercultural language teaching (ILT)’ which has been articulated by Lo Bianco, Liddicoat and Crozet (1999). ILT prepares language learners to negotiate comfortable third places between the self and the other/foreign. The intercultural language teaching approach appears to go beyond the aim of communicative proficiency in the sense that ‘learners are encouraged to find a meeting place between different forces, different cultures and different worldviews’ (Board of Studies NSW, 2001:12).

The new Japanese K-10 Syllabus was published in 2003 by the Board of Studies NSW. The aim of the Syllabus is to enable students to develop communication skills, focus on languages as systems and gain insights into the relationship between language and culture, leading to lifelong personal, educational and vocational benefits (p15). The objectives consist of three parts; Using Language, Making Linguistic Connections and Moving Between Cultures. The following objective descriptions show that the syllabus documents a careful awareness of the connections between English and Japanese language as well as intercultural understanding and relationships.

**Objective – Making Linguistic Connections**

Students will explore the nature of languages as systems by making comparisons between Japanese and English, leading to an appreciation of the correct application of linguistic structures and vocabulary.
Objective – Moving Between Cultures

Students will develop knowledge of the culture of Japanese speaking communities and an understanding of the interdependence of language and culture, thereby encouraging reflection on their own cultural heritage. *(Japanese K-10 Syllabus 2003:16)*

This identification is one that differs from the previous syllabus. Also, the difference is recognised in cross-curriculum content. Although the previous syllabus also encouraged the curriculum links to other learning areas, it was very undemanding. This new syllabus expresses the cross-curriculum content with eight specific areas: Information and Communication Technologies (ICT); Work Employment; Civics and Citizenship; Difference and Diversity; Gender; Key Competencies to enhance students’ thinking skills such as collecting, analysing and organising information; Literacy; and Multiculturalism. The following examples show the links for Civics and Citizenship and Multiculturalism for K-6.

Civics and Citizenship

In K-6, skills to be learnt and developed are:

- Recognising the importance of symbols to create a sense of identity
- Identifying changes that occur in language and customs through cross-cultural contact.

Multiculturalism

In K-6 skills to be learnt and developed are:

- Engaging directly in cultural activities at school and within the local community
- Recognising ways in which people express their culture such as through music, dance, costume and celebrations
- Reflecting on influences in local culture such as restaurants, religions and festivals
- Participating in activities associated with Japanese customs and practices.

*(pp25-27)*

The syllabus follows that broad directions established in NSW Board of Studies K-10 Curriculum Framework and is part of a continuum of learning from Kindergarten to Year 12 that supports sustained and sequential learning (p5). However, the mandatory requirement for length of study is merely 100 hours of the School Certificate only.
The essential content consists of a mandatory 100-hours study of one language over one continuous 12-month period between Years 7 and 10, but preferably in Years 7-8. The mandatory course, consisting of Stage 4 outcomes and content, is a requirement for the award of the School Certificate. (p21)

This syllabus also states that the study of languages in K-6 is a component of the K-6 HSIE key learning area, not a key learning area itself. Moreover, learning a language to communicate is not mandatory but optional.

The study of languages in K-6 is a component of the K-6 HSIE key learning area and consists of a core element and an optional element. The core element is embedded in the cultures outcomes in the K-6 HSIE syllabus and focuses on learning about languages and learning about the world through languages. The optional element focuses on learning to use a language to communicate. The study of languages in K-6 can be used to enrich students learning and also to contribute to the achievement of the K-6 HSIE cultures outcomes. (p21)

It seems that the sense of responsibility to teach the language for K-6 is relegated to HSIE from the language area, thus it tended to be left hanging in the middle of nowhere (Ramzan, 2006). This fact accords with a result of the Review of the Commonwealth Languages Other Than English Programme in 2002. An inhibiting factor for LOTE programmes in Australia amongst others is a perceived lack of importance of LOTE and undervaluing of LOTE by parents, children, some educators and the general community (Erebus Consulting Partners, 2002b: xviii & 172).

### 3.4 Report Evaluation of NALSAS strategy in January 2002

An evaluation of progress was initiated for in the second quadrennium (1999-2002) of the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Strategy. This NALSAS Strategy supported Asian languages and studies in all school systems in order to improve Australia’s capacity and preparedness to interact internationally, in particular with Asian economies. It arose from increased recognition of the need for the development of educational policies that provide for improved knowledge and understanding by Australian students of the nations and cultures of Asia (Erebus Consulting Partners, 2002a:13). Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese and Korean languages were targeted
under the Strategy, for which the Commonwealth had allocated some funding to the states since 1995.

The review stated that the rationale for teaching studies of Asia widened by the mid 90s from the ‘economic growth’ factor to incorporate a social imperative whereby ‘awareness of our similarities and our interdependence with our Asian neighbours can contribute to unity, empathy and understanding’ (AEF, 1995:5 in Erebus Consulting Partners, 2002a: 15). Also, it was reported within the review that there was tension between Australia and countries of Asia whether it be political, strategic or economic. Therefore a greater need for understanding of the underpinning ideas and values of Asian societies was expressed. In the wake of September 11 the need for such understanding intensified.

The report identified that the number of students studying of the four NALSAS languages increased considerably since the beginning of the program, peaking in Years 6 and 7 with around 40% of all students in 2000. Also the number of teachers available to teach Asian languages also increased, and Syllabus and curriculum documents in most jurisdictions produced that provide a legitimate place for Asian studies and languages in the core curriculum for students of all ages (p81).

While the positive results were evidenced, some issues also arose from the evaluation. The first issue was the level of proficiency of both the teachers and the students. The research evidence suggested that to bring students to high levels of proficiency requires immersion and significant amounts of instructional time over a sustained period, 500 to 800 hours for the ‘easy’ languages, not mass exposure. The issue of continuity of language learning is one that many jurisdictions were aware of. The review suggested;

While there may be benefits from language learning of any kind and for any length of time, these benefits are not the kind that translate into measured outcomes of language proficiency. If we are serious about improving these outcomes, then more focused efforts may be necessary. (p.89)
In relation to the continuity, depth of learning was another concern, particularly for primary schools.

There is a view in some schools…that Asian language learning is an ‘extra’, often provided on a fee-paying basis out of regular school hours. Some schools are very proud of their ability to offer such programs. While the quality of these programs is likely to vary, they are largely unaccountable. They also miss the point that the NALSAS objectives are meant to apply to all students. They perpetuate an elitist view of language learning. (p.90)

Secondly, it seems there was a separation of funding and projects for language on the one hand and Asian studies on the other within NALSAS. The report regretted that only about 10% of funds in jurisdictions was directed towards Asian studies. This had lead some to believe that studies of Asia became the ‘poor cousin’ in the relationship. Here again, separation of the language and culture is evident, although the fact that the culture and language studies are inseparable is agreed by a view from any dimensions. The report states (p82);

There is now a strong feeling that the way forward is for greater emphasis to be given to understanding culture, and the role that language plays in shaping and reflecting culture. Clearly, cultural and language studies should be inseparable, and it would be desirable for there to be closer integration of the two aspects in a future Phase of the Strategy.

Moreover, perception of Asian studies by teachers was a concern particularly at primary schools. It should be noted that NALSAS Strategy was established during the Keating government that focused on the position of Australia within Asia. The Commonwealth provided over $179 million to support the study of Asian languages and studies of Asia since 1994-95. In 1999 The Commonwealth agreed to continue its funding of $30 million to December 2002. As discussed in the section 3.2.3, within the Howard government, Discovering Democracy was launched by Dr Kemp, focusing on Australian historical and social roots with Europe. This was funded with $18 million from 1997 to 2000 and, following an evaluation, a further $13.6 million to extend the programme to June 2004 and helped it become embedded in the mainstream school curriculum (Erebus Consulting Partners, 2003:vii). The funding was to assist curriculum development and teacher professional development. Discovering Democracy and NALSAS, were both developed in the late 90’s to early 2000, and one focused on European heritage, and one was to focus on Asia. Could this be assumed as a
reason for devaluing Asian studies at primary school level? Within tight curriculum programming, teachers do not find a persuasive reason to teach about Asia. This evaluation revealed (p.91):

…about one-quarter of schools do not teach about Asia at all and at least the same number do so in only superficial ways. The greatest barrier to further implementation is teacher knowledge; not only about Asia itself, but also about the existence of resource material, and about how they can ‘fit in’ another subject area in what they see as an already crowded curriculum. These teachers see no compelling reason why studies of Asia should be given greater priority, and many see it as not being of relevance to them. Their attitudes are reinforced by the lack of unequivocal support given by educational leaders in many jurisdictions, which has encouraged the view that studies of Asia are an optional rather than a necessary part of the Australian curriculum.

It seems from the above quotation that the teachers needed a guide to good language teaching practice. The evaluation expressed that all stakeholders interviewed showed their concern about consequences of discontinuing the NALSAS funding. It was thought that under these conditions, most likely there would be a fall in participation rates, not only in the compulsory years but in senior school also over time, as the groundwork being laid at junior levels would no longer be there. Competition across the KLAs would make it very difficult to encourage schools to take on anything outside of minimum curriculum requirements (p.84). The report emphasised that continuation of this funding was imperative to continue teaching Asian languages and studies of Asia.

Despite this evaluation recommending the continuation of NALSAS strategy until 2006 (pg. 95), the funding ended in December 2002. However, The Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) undertook a new project, the Asian Languages Professional Learning Project (ALPLP) from July 2003 to June 2005, discussed in section 3.7, and $1.2 million was funded for this project. This project was managed by the Asia Education Foundation (AEF), in partnership with the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers’ Associations (AFMLTA). Intercultural language teaching was brought to the forefront by the ALPLP. Understanding the concept, principles and implications of intercultural language learning in the language classroom and teaching of the language as a whole school approach was the core of this project. The Report on
Intercultural Language Learning (Liddicoat et al, 2003), discussed in section 3.6 of this chapter, which was funded as a part of NALSAS strategy, was a core document that informed the development of this project.

NALSAA was terminated at the end of 2002, and ALPLP started in July 2003. The difference between the two projects was identified, from developing technical skills of language to developing intercultural understanding. Also the crucial point in ALPLP was its participants, which included not only language teachers, but also school administrators and other learning areas and class teachers.

Almost at the same time that the NALSAS evaluation was underway, another national report was commissioned to review the Commonwealth LOTE program. It sometimes appeared that the various sectors or interest groups were operating without the knowledge of or collaboration with the others.

### 3.5 Review of the Commonwealth Languages Other Than English Programme, December 2002

The Commonwealth Government commissioned a review of the Commonwealth Language Other Than English Programme, which was delivered to the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training in December 2002 (Erebus Consulting Partners, 2002b). The purpose of the review was to investigate the Commonwealth’s role in language education in Australian schools, focussing in particular on:

- The current provision of languages programmes in schools;
- Issues related to the successful implementation of languages programmes; and
- Work on languages education being undertaken through the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA)
The review revealed that all of the major curriculum statements, policies and plans for at least the past two decades have noted reasons why LOTE should be an important and legitimate part of the learning experiences of students. Some examples shown in the review amongst the others were as follows.

…Learning a LOTE helps young people to gain a better understanding of other societies. They are able to develop an ability to interact with people and cultures other than their own, both face to face and through technology (for example, the Internet), and acquire skills and understanding that can be used in future social, cultural and vocational contexts…
(The introduction to the WA LOTE Beyond 2000 Policy)

…Promotes a wider world-view, by demonstrating the interrelatedness of languages and cultures, including how culture and languages are linked with and borrows from other cultures and languages…
(The Catholic Education Office of the Canberra and Goulburn Archdiocese LOTE Policy Guidelines, 2002, p.6)

…the ability to use a language other than English and move between cultures is important for full participation in the modern world, especially in the context of increasing globalisation and Australia’s cultural diversity. Learning a language offers students the opportunity…to gain direct insights into the culture or cultures which give the language its life and meaning; to consider their own culture, and compare it with the culture of countries and communities where the language is spoken…
(The Victorian Board of Studies’ Curriculum and Standards Framework for LOTE, 2002, p.5)

(all the above cited in the Review of the Commonwealth LOTE Programme, Erebus Consulting Partners, 2002b:167-170)

The range of reasons in support of second language learning in Australia show similar backing from the studies carried out in Europe, including the United Kingdom and the United States. However, what differed from country to country and from time to time was the relative priority given to languages (p167). These differences were not negligible as subsequently they influenced the programme funding, in Australia. This was apparent as NALSAS experience demonstrated how it influenced development of LOTE in Australia during 1994 to 2002, discussed previously.
The review also explored those voices who were opposed to having LOTE in the Australian school curriculum. Two arguments were put forward. The first was the belief in the dominance of English and the apparent lack of necessity for widespread study of other languages. This opinion was due to the assumption that English is the *lingua franca* of the world. It classified the language as a technical skill, which was only required for a special need. While this view also acknowledged the importance of intercultural understanding, they also viewed that intercultural understanding could be taught through the SOSE curriculum, thus lessen the importance of LOTE. Secondly, although this opinion did not oppose LOTE in principle, it argued against compulsory language study. This was based on a belief that LOTE is too hard, both intellectually and logistically for all schools to provide a worthwhile learning experience. Moreover, the review identified that the economic value to the nation by learning LOTE could not be proved.

Whether the purported benefits of second language learning are as significant, either for individuals or for nations, as its supporters claim is a matter for research that is beyond the scope of this review. It is sufficient to note that it is difficult to demonstrate the economic value that has accrued from the Commonwealth’s investment in LOTE. (Erebus Consulting Partners, 2002b:169)

However, the review acknowledged the needs of LOTE programs, and the authors cited the UK Nuffield report to support their argument (pp170-171):

In the face of such widespread acceptance and use of language, [our] complacent view of [our] limited capability in other languages is understandable. But it is also dangerous. In a world where bilingualism and plurilingualism are commonplace, monolingualism implies inflexibility, insensitivity and arrogance. Much that is essential to our society, its health and its interests – including effective choice in policy, realisation of citizenship, effective overseas links and openness to the inventions of other cultures – will not be achieved in one language alone. (The Nuffield Foundation, 2000:14)

Discussed above, the review acknowledged that the reasons for support LOTE learning has shifted from the study of LOTE for its own sake, or for the purely economic rationale for acquiring and developing knowledge and skills for intercultural understanding and engagement (pp187-188).
The focus shifts from “learning a language” to building the capacity of the nation’s young people to understand and successfully engage with a multi-faceted and complex global community. Learning a language other than English may be one of the ways in which this understanding and engagement is achieved, but of itself could not be considered a sufficient “means” or an adequate “end”.

The review expresses the belief that a broader framework is needed that encompasses both language and cultural studies that has intercultural awareness and engagement as the underpinning rationale.

The summary of Recommendations includes (pp195-196):

That MCEETYA Taskforce responsible for LOTE be given responsibility for the development of a national strategic action plan which establishes as targets that, by 2012;

- all students in primary and secondary years should participate in meaningful, effective and sustained programmes in one or more languages.
- All students from Year 3 to Year 10 should display an appropriate level of communicative competence, linguistic awareness and intercultural understanding and skills related to a language.

After six months of the publication of this evaluation the Report on intercultural language learning was published.

### 3.6 Intercultural language report

The Commonwealth of Australia, Department of Education, Science and Training published *The Report on Intercultural Language Learning* in 2003 (Liddicoat, Papademetre, *et al*: 2003). The report was intended to address teacher quality, and to comment on evidence of good practice for the integration of sociocultural elements into language teaching, which was a focus area of the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Strategy Plan Phase 2 during 1999 to 2002 (p.2). It was also to develop a framework for designing curriculum for intercultural language learning.
This report was based on data that included a survey, a literature review, and an analysis of curriculum frameworks currently used by systems across Australia. The result of the investigation indicated that culture learning was seen as the acquisition of knowledge, information and data about aspects of language and culture. The data indicated that perception of culture within a language learning framework varied. Further, analysis of the curriculum documents showed that it was necessary to construct a coherent framework for conceptualising culture and culture learning in language programs in schools.

Throughout the documents culture learning is varyingly referred to as knowledge, competence, capability, and a process of valuing. Particularly in relation to Assessment, Standards and Outcomes, both within and across these documents, there is little consistency of approach in describing such learning…There is certainly no stated position on how culture learning changes and progresses over time. (p.42)

Also, the report suggested the need for teacher’s engagement with an intercultural language teaching approach to curriculum.

There is clearly a need for an explicit conceptual framework which promotes teachers’ engagement with an intercultural language teaching approach to curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment. Such a framework can also provide a basis for further work in understanding how such learning develops over time and according to context. (p.42)

Subsequently, a national Framework for designing curriculum for intercultural language learning was developed, and the following points were described (p.43):

- a conceptualisation of language, culture, learning, and intercultural language learning as key concepts;
- a set of principles, which integrate the key concepts (language, culture, learning and intercultural language learning), and which are used as the basis for making choices in the development and operation of the curriculum;
- a conceptualisation of intercultural language learning and curriculum design;
- a set of processes for designing, operationalising, evaluating and renewing the curriculum;
- a set of exemplars with commentaries to illustrate intercultural language learning through students tasks and programs of work.

The framework seems to indicate that the emphasis was laid on conceptualisation and clarification of the key ideas, language, culture, learning, intercultural
language learning, curriculum and its design. Finally, the report identified implications for designing curriculum for intercultural language learning as four aspects: Materials development, Curriculum development, Professional learning and Research.

As for the materials, the Report argued that the materials available did not integrate language and culture, and they rather separated the two by presenting cultural information in English.

What is needed are materials which allow teachers to use cultural information to develop an awareness of communicative practices and which will facilitate communication in the target language as well as the development of intercultural sensitivity. (p.99)

Among other recommendations, it was stated that the material should also provide the teachers and the learners with the means to reflect upon the learner’s first culture and find a link between the first culture and other knowledge. Collaborative use of information technology as an intercultural language teaching tool could also be beneficial if it coordinated with a focus on language-specific materials as well as generic materials.

The report stressed (p.99), the importance of the integration of languages and culture into the school curriculum:

Although languages can play an important role in teaching about anti-racism, multiculturalism, and human rights, the teaching and learning of languages should not be seen as the sole or natural site for teaching about these issues; rather, these issues should be seen as a responsibility across the whole curriculum, which are supported by Languages as they are by all other curriculum areas. The relationship between Languages and other curriculum issues needs to be clarified at the policy level if Languages are to be properly integrated into the whole school curriculum.

The individual teachers’ needs of professional development to ensure that concepts permeate all aspects of curriculum design were also stressed. This would be helped by research on the nature of the acquisition of intercultural competence for both the teachers and the students. (p.100)

One such gap is the lack of research on the nature of the acquisition of intercultural competence. This means that there is little current knowledge of how intercultural competence grows and changes over time, and what the typical paths for development of such competence is in instructional contexts. This gap is a problem for both assessment and for curriculum
design, as sequencing is now based on a very small research base leading to much work being based on ad hoc judgements of how a small body of research on a small range of languages applies to larger questions and to other languages. The research is better developed at the level of theory than at the level of application, and what is needed to maximise the impact of the current research base.

The gap identified by the report is being addressed in part in this thesis.

As the result of this report, ALPLP was implemented, (see section 3.4)

### 3.7 Asian Languages Professional Learning Project published and implemented in 2004

The Asian Languages Professional Learning Project (ALPLP) was a DEST program and was funded through the Australian Government’s Quality Teaching Programme to implement this project throughout Australian schools in 2004 and 2005. The objectives are written:

- to improve their skills and understanding in languages pedagogy, particularly intercultural language learning;
- to become familiar with current research developments and resources in the field;
- to be able to apply new knowledge and understanding with confidence in the classroom;
- to strengthen connections between language programs and other areas of the curriculum through whole-school approaches.

(Asia Education Foundation, 2004a:7)

Two significant issues in this project were acknowledged. They were identifying the need to assist teachers to understand the concept of interculturality and the need to integrate LOTE into other areas of school curriculum.

Integration of sociocultural concepts into language teaching was stressed during 1999 to 2002 with the NALSAS strategy plan, and intercultural language learning was introduced in a new LOTE syllabus in June 2003 in the case of the NSW context. At the same time the Report on intercultural language learning was published in July 2003. These ALPLP objectives indicate that, by emphasising the teachers’ difficulties in implementing the concept of interculturality, and the need to address the problem specifically, gave a significance to interculturality and intercultural competence that was not so clearly identified before.
Pronouncement of the importance of intercultural competency and teaching this through the whole school approach indicated a new dimension of language education. The project implementation was offered to 60 schools nationally and 349 language teachers from all jurisdictions and community Languages providers (Asia Education Foundation, 2005:4). The participants of this program participated as a school team including a principal, a teacher and a LOTE language teacher. It seemed an ideal setting to implement the interculturality.

This project was implemented in two phases. Phase 1 explored the concepts, principles and implications of intercultural language learning in the language classroom, and Phase 2 focused on supporting whole-school, integrated approaches to Asian languages and on strengthening links between languages and other areas of the curriculum. The program resources (Asia Education Foundation, 2004a, b) showed clear indication of its purposes and the applications.

The Evaluation of the ALPLP was published in 2005 (Asia Education Foundation, 2005). It recognised this project as a high quality professional learning programme, which assisted the teachers to understand language methodology and linking language teaching with other curriculum areas. Recommendations related to the outcomes of the ALPLP are as follows:

1. Further development and promotion of intercultural language learning as a means of revitalising and re-purposing Languages education in schools to be undertaken at a national level.
2. Further nationally consistent professional development programmes for Languages teachers in intercultural language learning be undertaken.
3. Collaboration with expertise in intercultural language learning be maintained, extended and included in professional learning programmes in intercultural language learning.
4. Research be commissioned and undertaken on students’ attitudes to language learning within intercultural language learning and on the effect of intercultural language learning on retention into Languages education.

The MCEETYA announced in 2005 as the outcomes of the ALPLP that National Statement and Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005-2008 are
based in an intercultural learning approach (Commonwealth of Australia MCEETYA, 2005). Under the plan eight main projects were implemented. Improvement in the national coordination and quality assurance of ethnic schools was implemented in July 2005 to December 2006. The current provision of Indigenous languages programmes in Australian schools was investigated during July 2006 to October 2007. The state and nature of languages education in Australian schools were investigated in July 2006 to August 2007. The project to develop a nationally coordinated promotion of the benefits of languages learning in schools was implemented in December 2006 to February 2008. Teacher education for languages teachers was reviewed in July 2006 to July 2007. Leading languages education project for principals and school leaders to promote greater awareness of language learning was implemented between July 2006 and April 2007. National Seminar on Languages Education was conducted during June 2006 until January 2007. The evaluation is anticipated for 2008. At the time of writing, the evaluation was not available; however, a recent report published in June 2008 indicated that the federal government had allocated a further approximately $1.4m to national level projects to investigate and improve languages programmes.

It should be noted that the ALPLP evaluation, which laid the foundation for the MCEETYA Plan, does not indicate the differences between primary and high school implementation within the content of the evaluation. It will be interesting to see the MCEETYA evaluation in regard to how language education was planned and what support was given to promote languages within the primary school curriculum. Identification of the differences between the two teaching environments is necessary as linking with other curriculum areas in primary schools and high schools have critically different facets, and linking the language with other curriculum areas is crucial for successful implementation. Neglecting the identification may result in false positives when evaluating the success of the program.

Primarily, the classroom teachers teach across the curriculum in primary schools, and specialist teachers teach specific subjects in high schools. Issues arose such as:
• whether a language specialist teaches language classes, or classroom teachers teach the language in a primary school context (The later situation requires teacher education to include language teaching as a core subject);
• how not to devalue HSIE, which is primarily seen as a ‘big umbrella’ of language, Asian/European studies, Values education rather than an important facet of primary school education; and
• how both high schools and primary schools are to continue after this funding ends.

I attended both Phase 1 and 2 meetings of the ALPLP workshops held in Sydney, and discovered some teachers difficulties, especially with primary schools. The details are discussed in Chapter 6.

The National Languages Summit was conducted at the National Press Club, Canberra 7th June 2007. The Summit was titled ‘Languages in Crisis’, and was presented by the Australian Academy of the Humanities (AAH) and the Group of Eight (Go8) language specialists from Australian universities who shared a concern for language education in Australia. Ferguson, a participant, who was employed as the Project Manager for the MCEETYA, expressed his full support for the National Statement and Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005-2008. He also expressed his concern that increasingly, languages education is perceived by many institutions as an ‘add-on’, rather than an essential part of education in this country.

3.8 Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning in Practice

The Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning in Practice (ILTLP) was funded to complement the National Statement and Plan for Languages Education 2005-2008. The project aimed to extend teachers’ understanding of and

---
engagement with Intercultural Language Learning. Participants engaged in the project from July 2006 and an initial report of its implementation was published in March 2009. Although this project was in its early stages of development during the time of writing this thesis, it will be important to follow up its outcomes and implications for future research and development of intercultural language teaching and learning.

The ILTLP project invited participating teachers and school leaders to engage with a nationally coordinated research and professional learning program that was underpinned by the latest research in languages teaching and learning and grounded in classroom practice. Its objectives focused on increasing teachers’ knowledge and understanding of the principles and pedagogies of intercultural language teaching and learning, and integrating that knowledge and understanding into classroom teaching and learning to enhance student learning outcomes.

The project was delivered in four phases. During Phase One, the project commissioned and supported school-based research focusing on long-term programming and assessment. Phase Two focused on the development of a set of professional learning materials and processes to support the delivery of the ILTLP project in each state and territory. Phase Three was to deliver the teaching program in each state and territory and establish school-based research. Modification and refinement of the ILTP resources was the focus for Phase Four. Participants included about 400 primary and secondary school language teachers, as well as academics, researchers, educational administrators and the Australian Federation of Modern Languages Teachers Associations as the national professional body.

The Report-in-brief was published in March 2009 indicating evidence of the participants’ engagement with the ILTLP project, increased knowledge and understanding of the principles and pedagogies of intercultural language teaching and learning. Further work in languages education, intercultural language teaching and learning have been also identified, which include needs of further on-going conceptual development of intercultural language teaching and learning as a means of re-focusing and re-purposing languages education in school.
education. It also indicated that continual national exploratory research and ongoing professional learning programs for languages teachers in intercultural language teaching and learning needed to be undertaken. The ILTLP project model of the interaction of academic expertise with teacher professionalism was identified as a key approach to be explored further. Moreover, the further research on students’ learning and attitudes to languages within an intercultural language teaching and learning stance, and on the effect of intercultural language teaching and learning were indicated as necessary.

3.9 Discussion and conclusion
This chapter has covered the areas of citizenship education and foreign language education with particular emphasis on curriculum and professional development, exploring key documents from the Commonwealth, using NSW as the example of state implementation. It seems that the recognition of the importance of citizenship education is apparent in current Australian society where the incidence of racial prejudice is undeniable, especially after September 11 and the subsequent fear of terrorist threats. The documents discussed clearly recognised that learning other languages and other cultures were an indispensable part of the schooling necessary for students to participate as active and informed citizens within an international context. Although there seemed to be little difference in the government stance for the citizen of Australia over time, in fact the Keating government promoted a more outwardly focused and economically successful nation concentrating on Asia. In contrast, when the Howard government was in power, the then Education Minister David Kemp’s Discovering Democracy saw an Australia more rooted in Europe and valuing Australian history. It has been said that the Keating government focused toward the future of Australia while Kemp saw the importance of the past. However both governments promoted citizenship education together with foreign language education, and the two subjects have been always identified as important within a school curriculum. From the point of view of the primary school NSW K-6 curriculum, they have been included in the HSIE syllabus (see section 3.2.1). However, this importance does not seem to be reflected in actual teaching practice, according to the
evaluations of the school implementation practices. Four issues stand out with regard to enforcing this syllabus. The first is an interpretation of key concepts. Second is a hidden hierarchical order within the school curriculum. The third is the teacher training required to understand and implement the curriculum. Finally, there are the actual classroom applications.

As discussed in this chapter, it is crucial to have more clarity about how we conceptualise ‘a good citizen’ of Australia, and how we promote “Australian values”. After September 11, then the Cronulla riots in Sydney NSW, and the continuing discussion of potential terrorist threats, the Howard government focused on values education to promote Australian values to an Australian citizen. What are Australian values? The 2005 values education document listed nine core values in Australia as discussed in section 3.2.4. It is questionable whether these core values are characteristics limited to citizens of Australia. I think these are values for every human being. By labelling these as Australian values, barriers are built between Australian and ‘non-Australians’ living in Australia. The question then arises, Who are the Australians? Are people who have formal Australian citizenship the only ones to feel Australian? Are people who are minority groups in Australia classified as non-Australians by the majority? Or are people in Australia going to be re-colonised by an illegitimate definition of ‘Australian values’? Bhabha (1994: 58) wrote:

The struggle against colonial oppression not only changes the direction of Western history, but challenges its historicist idea of time as a progressive, ordered whole. The analysis of colonial depersonalisation not only alienates the Enlightenment idea of ‘Man’, but challenges the transparency of social reality, as a pre-given image of human knowledge. If the order of Western historicism is disturbed in the colonial state of emergency, even more deeply disturbed is the social and psychic representation of the human subject.

We need to have an agreement on how we conceptualise who and what is ‘a good citizen’.

This issue also applies in the language-learning paradigm. The new LOTE syllabus in NSW added a new objective ‘moving between cultures’ to further emphasise intercultural competency. However, conceptualisation of ‘culture
learning’ within a language-learning paradigm is crucial for the implementation of the syllabus; the report on intercultural language learning articulated this point as discussed in the section 3.6. Especially ‘culture’ within a language education was seen as static and fixed, and now the new syllabus agrees with the concept of culture as dynamic and fluid, also discussed in chapter 2. From the literature and the evaluations of the teachers’ professional needs, it seems that unless this shift is fully conceptualised by teachers, the successful outcome of true ‘intercultural’ awareness simply cannot be met. Integration of language and culture within other learning areas within a school curriculum is not possible without this conceptualisation. ALPLP took on an important role in regard to the penetration of ‘intercultural language teaching’ as discussed in section 3.7. However, it is still uncertain how the participants interpreted ‘culture’, ‘intercultural’ and ‘intercultural language learning’. This concern is discussed further in chapter 6.

The second issue is the hidden hierarchical order of the school curriculum. The HSIE subject is often seen as the least important within a teachers’ daily practice as the demands of other key learning areas such as Mathematics, Science and English are perceived as greater than those of HSIE within the primary school curriculum. In this study, I have engaged with the teachers from five primary schools, initially including a pre-observation period, and can add to the published research with anecdotal evidence. My observation indicated that the teachers try not to cut out English or Mathematics classes whenever they have extra curricula activities such as a ‘read-a-thon’ or ‘walk-a-thon’, and chose instead to leave out the HSIE subject in order to compensate for any time loss.

The Report from the Prime Minister’s Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce 2001, Footprints to the Future, clearly prioritise three areas in schooling, Literacy, numeracy and information technology.

The Taskforce…endorses the commitment to literacy and numeracy in the National Goals for Schooling…In highlighting the necessity of functional literacy and numeracy skills the Taskforce would also add competence in the use of information and communication technology…The Taskforce believes that consideration should be given to the development of high level industry-recognised information and communication technology competencies for all students, at Australian Qualifications Framework. (Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce,, 2001:19)
Thomson who studied the impact of globalisation on the work of schools and educators in a disadvantaged locale in one Australian city argues about this hierarchy. He claims (2002:128), the Howard Liberal Government introduced new and coercive measures to steer schools towards utilitarian and short-term goals. It simplified the schools policy agenda to one of the ‘old basics’ – Literacy and Mathematics, Science and English. He argues that this provided a ready source of panic about the alleged failures of schools and teachers to do well by all Australian children.

The debate about schooling and work became sharply polarized during the time of the Howard Government. Those who favored ‘vocationalist education’, where the focus is all subjects is towards immediate usefulness and work applications, were in control of the agenda. Those disposed to a more ‘generalist approach’ – advocating broadly based and futurist leanings in all school subjects, including those focused on work education – often found themselves labelled as stuck-in-the-seventies, airy-headed elitists rather than as advocates of a more nuanced and democratic approach to the plight of working-class youth. This was a bizarre incarnation of the ‘modernist-progressive versus the traditionalist’ rhetoric favoured by contemporary government. The argument, rather than being about how best to educate for the global economy as part of an overall education for changing times, became reduced to one of education for jobs or not.

These ‘old basics’ are, of course, necessary; however, in the current climate of social change caused by the significance of globalisation, fast moving mass communication technology, media culture, and so on, the responsibilities of school education cannot be centred only around the teaching of Literacy, Mathematics, Science and Information and Communication Technology. Fitzclarence, Green et al (1995: 146) argue in their study on Australian students’ knowledge, identity and schooling that it is important to understand life in and out of school, and the changing circumstances and subjectivity of young people today, as well as the widespread public anxiety about contemporary realizations of youth and schooling.
…the young people who are presently the subjects of schooling are also to be understood as the exemplary subjects of postmodernism, itself understood in terms of the relationship between new technologies (and their associated cultural fields) and the consumption-commodification complex. Importantly, this notion of postmodern subjectivity must be grasped as a matter of at once being and becoming. This is because students and young people generally are clearly subjects-in-process, and also because postmodern identity formation needs to be viewed historically and with due regard to local-global dynamics. (Fitzclarence, Green and Bigum, 1995:146)

Philip Wexler writes his own study of life in school:

When I tried to encapsulate what students were doing in these high schools, their words summed it up best: becoming somebody. They were not struggling to become nobody, some high postmodernist definition of a decentered self. They wanted to be somebody, a real and presentable self, and one anchored in the verifying eyes of the friends whom they came to school to meet. (Wexler, 1992:7)

In a society like Australia, children will have an opportunity to move from home to school, then on to full adult life. Adding to the traditional subject areas, more structured ways to assist young people’s self-making seems a part of the responsibilities that school education in a current society has to take.

In this chapter, I have discussed the documents on how citizenship education and LOTE education are seen in primary school education especially in NSW, and how the two subjects are interrelated but how little practical efforts are made to interrelate them. After the discussion of the methodology of this study in the following chapter, I will examine the actual voice of the students and the teachers of Japanese language with the purpose of finding the connection between citizenship education and Japanese language education.
Chapter 4   Methodology

4.1 Introduction
The purpose of this study is to examine how language education influences development of students’ interculturality. The study was conducted using qualitative methodologies, with a variety of data gathering sources. The researcher examined government documents and policies in language education, citizenship education, values education, and other curriculum development documents relating to teaching languages other than English in the NSW primary schools. The sites of the study included primary schools and their Japanese language classes. Participants in the study included primary and high school students and their teachers and university Japanese language students among other key participants. In addition to extensive observations of classes, the school environment provided a contextual background to this study.

This chapter outlines the research questions, the overall methodology of the research, the research design and methods used in conducting this study.

4.2 Research questions
How does a language learning experience influence development of interculturality?

Sub questions are: -
1) What contribution do Japanese language classes make to identity construction?
2) How does Japanese language teaching and learning in New South Wales impact on children’s understanding of interculturality?
3) What are the interrelationships among interculturality, identity and citizenship?
4.3 Methodology – Qualitative paradigm and Grounded theory

4.3.1 Qualitative approach

This research was developed under the qualitative research paradigm as the research is more concerned with the individual participants’ perceptions of their world rather than quantified data. Burns (1994:238) states that qualitative researchers believe that the thoughts, feelings and perceptions of their informants are vital since humans are conscious of their own behaviour.

Qualitative research places stress on the validity of multiple meaning structures and holistic analysis, as opposed to the criteria of reliability and statistical compartmentalisation of quantitative research.

(Burns, 1994:11)

Hammersley (2000) maintains his view that the field of qualitative research is far from a unified set of principles infiltrated by groups of scholars. It has numerous variations, depending on the researchers. Patton (2002:76) claims that qualitative research is not a single, monolithic approach to research, and lists (Patton, 1990: 66) ten theoretical traditions (e.g., ethnography, phenomenology, symbolic, and others). Tesch’s (1990: 58) list of approaches to qualitative research is a mix of designs; such as action research and case study, and data analysis techniques; such as context analysis and discourse analysis, and disciplinary orientations, for example, ethnography and oral history. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) include under strategies of inquiry areas such as case studies; ethnography and participant observation; interpretive practice; grounded theory; biographical method; historical social science; and clinical research.

This qualitative research examines the value commitment of human culture, and sees culture as fluid and dynamic rather than fixed. Unlike traditional humanistic studies, that questions the equation of culture with high culture, cultural studies asserts that countless expressions of cultural production should be analysed in relation to other cultural dynamics and social and historical structures (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000). Theories of cultural studies tend to involve the production and nature of the rules of inclusivity and exclusivity that guide academic evaluation and in particular, the way these rules shape and are shaped by relation
of power. At the same time, they have maintained that theorising outside of everyday experience results in formal and deterministic theory.

4.3.2 Grounded theory

The Grounded theory approach, as developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) has been employed in this study as an overarching methodological approach. Glaser and Strauss (1967) advised researchers to discontinue their practice of bringing theories to the field and gathering data with the goal of disputing or verifying those theories. Instead, they described a method in which the practice would be reversed, Grounded Theory, with its explicit purpose the generation of theory from data. The grounded theory method offers a systematic approach for generating substantive theories that were born in and helped explain the real world (Hutchinson, 1988: 124; Strauss and Corbin, 1998:vii). While the researcher suspended all prior theoretical notions, data relevant to a particular problem area should be collected, and then inspected to discover whether any theory or at least hypothesis could be developed directly from the patterns found in the data. It is important to clarify here that it was not the researcher’s intention to verify or disprove the cultural theory, which underpins this study. Rather, this theory sets my position as a researcher.

Grounded theory may be best understood as a method, not a theory per se, an approach, and a strategy (Punch, 1998; Greckhamer & Koro-Ljungberg, 2005). The essential idea in grounded theory is that theory is developed inductively from data. According to theoretical sampling (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), data collected are continually compared and analysed until theoretical saturation is achieved. The procedure allows for a systematic analysis of the data and follows a given, repeatable procedure. In this study, the data being gathered were constantly compared and analysed at given points and then modifications of data collection methods were attempted. ‘The rigor of grounded theory approaches offers qualitative researchers a set of clear guidelines form which to build explanatory frameworks that specify relationships among concepts’ (Charmaz, 2000:510)
In this study, a substantive theory addressed the concept of ‘interculturality’ together with the concept self-identity development and its relationship to citizenship. The research was developed systematically following a grounded theory approach. According to Glaser (1978: 36), the process of data collection is influenced by the emerging theory. Therefore, data analysis is done while collecting data, not after the data is finally collected, in order to ensure that the collection of data is moving in a meaningful direction.

There are some arguments about why grounded theory should be discounted. Thomas and James (2006) warn that educational researchers should be aware that the significance of interpretation, narrative and reflection can all be undermined in the procedures of grounded theory. They argue that what ultimately materialises following grounded theory procedures is less like discovery and more akin to invention. Layder (1993:31) argues that a grounded theory approach should be more guided by data than limited by it. He claims that this theory-constructing approach must have a central place alongside theory-testing approaches. Charmaz (1995:31, 2006) is arguing to develop a new form of grounded theory. She argues that grounded theory offers systematic approaches for discovering significant aspects of human experience that remain inaccessible with traditional verification methods; however, she does not go so far as to advocate abandoning empirical research with thinking, feeling, acting human beings. She has asserted that grounded theory can ‘bridge traditional positivistic methods with interpretative methods’ (Charmaz, 1995:30).

This study looks at the emerging concepts which were discovered by the data. The data collected served to guide the ensuing steps rather than to limit the research. The very reason the research design was changed at various stages of the process was because of emerging knowledge. The multiple data collection methods used in grounded theory research diminish bias by increasing the wealth of information available to the researcher (Hutchinson, 1988:131). Tesch (1990:23) also discusses grounded theory from the viewpoint of qualitative research in sociology. He explained that this theory was inspired by phenomenological philosophy, and it was not only inspired by it, but it took an explicitly phenomenological stance.
One of the tenets of phenomenology is to ‘bracket’ existing notions about a phenomenon, and let the phenomenon speak for itself. Grounded theory suggests taking that tenet seriously. Preliminary observation in this study generated the first stage of the research, which in turn shaped the interviews with the primary students. The stages of research are described in Section 4 and 5.

4.3.3 Case study

This study made a road map for building theories of developing interculturality, from a case study research approach.

Case studies have various attributes that harmonise with general characteristics of qualitative research (Gillham, 2000; Yin, 2003). Case studies are, however, differentiated from other types of qualitative research in that they include thick description (Geertz, 1973) and analyses of a single unit or bounded system (Smith, 1978; Donmoyer, 1990). Yin (1994:13) defines a case study, as ‘an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident’. Stake (1995) considers the case as an integrated system. In a more inclusive sense, Miles and Huberman (1994) consider the case as ‘a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context’ (p.25). Also, O’Leary (2005:79) defines a case as ‘a bounded system, or a particular instance or entity that can be defined by identifiable boundaries’, and research into real-world problems is often case based.

O’Leary (2005:150) explains that case studies allow for in-depth exploration, an examination of subtleties and intricacies. They attempt to be holistic, to explore processes as well as outcomes and to investigate the context and setting of a situation. When examining the core of this study, it is found that it explores and delves into the students’ subjectivities which are affected by the complexities and sophistication of human nature within their language learning environment. The context of the language students’ learning environment, the status of language education, and citizenship/values education are core elements of this study.
Gaining in-depth information on the particular context of primary Japanese classrooms is well served by the case study method. It is not to say that the structure was set in rigid ways, but it was rather flexibly formed according to the needs of this study. The research was designed to find explicit answers to the research questions by means of finding a point of contact between the theory and the practice. The case study was selected to arrive at an in-depth understanding of how interculturality develops while learning the Japanese language, and to interpret multiple events that the learners are experiencing within a particular group of students in NSW, Australia. Also, it serves the purpose of filling the gaps between research and practice in fields of citizenship education and Japanese language education in Australian primary schools. The researcher defines research problems and conducts research in such a way that the outcomes clarify and find the intrinsic nature of the links between language education and citizenship education.

An essential feature of theory building is the comparison of the emergent concepts, theories, or hypotheses with the extant literature (Eisenhardt, 2002:35). The case in this study was initially with Japanese language learners from primary schools in NSW. From the data generated, it became clear that the study would be advantaged by exploring further, to include five high school Japanese language students and five university Japanese language students for a comparative study. Patton (1990:184) notes that ‘In-depth information from a small number of people can be very valuable, especially if the cases are information-rich.’ By employing multiple case studies, researchers can seek out both what is common and what is particular about the case (Stake, 1995:238). Furthermore, adopting multiple case studies enhances the external validity or generalisability of the findings (Merriam, 1998). ‘If a finding holds in one setting and, given its profile, also holds in a comparable setting, but does not in a contrasting case, the finding is more robust” (Miles & Huberman, 1994:29).

The study was started at the same time as the publication of a new, draft LOTE syllabus for NSW in 2001, and it followed the development of the syllabus. It was quite an interesting journey to observe the development of the syllabus implementation, particularly in terms of a new objective of ‘moving between
cultures’ as this resonates with the key concept of this study. ‘Culture’ appeared as a new dimension to language teaching and learning. This ‘moving between cultures’ was promoted as Intercultural language learning, and the promotion expanded to incorporate language education as a whole school approach assisted by the Asian Languages Professional Learning Project (ALPLP) as discussed in Chapter 3, and then the more recent ILTLP (Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning in Practice) project, funded by the Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training through its Australian Government Quality Teacher Program.

### 4.4 Research Design

This case study developed as follows.

**Phase 1:** Primary schools – The foundation of this study

**Phase 2:** Interviewing the five high school students and their teacher.

**Phase 3:** Interviewing the five university students.

The key contextual background through Phases 1 to 3 was the development of Intercultural language teaching in NSW. It seems that the publication of the Federal Government Report on Intercultural Language Teaching (Liddicoat, Papademetre, *et al*: 2003) was a crucial breakthrough to the implementation of the Intercultural Language Teaching project, and it impacted this study significantly.

### 4.4.1 The site of the inquiries and the participants

This research was undertaken at multiple sites, with Class A and Class B from two different primary schools as the core of the inquires. The later addition of a high school class and a university students’ group served to support the ‘thick’ description of the data.
Table 4-1: The research development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>The core data collected</th>
<th>Contextual background/ following ‘Intercultural Language Teaching’ development – the field notes were gathered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>The documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>NSW LOTE Syllabuses (include the past syllabus, the draft syllabus and the current syllabus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An action research</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSW HSIE (Human Society and Its Environment) Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication of Draft syllabus for LOTE, NSW. The concept of ‘the meeting place/the third places’ was introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending the draft syllabus discussion meeting organised by the Board of Studies NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attending the Japanese language teachers’ in-services, which were organised by the Department of Education, NSW and AIS NSW to prepare themselves for the implementation of the new syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The government Report on Intercultural Language Teaching was published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report on Intercultural Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3 2004-05</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005-06</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty primary school students and two teachers

Class A
Class A was comprised of 15 students from a Grade 5 & 6 composite class and their teacher who teaches Human Society and Its Environment (HSIE) in Japanese. The class is from a large co-educational independent school in Sydney, and the school accommodates students from kindergarten to year 12. The school curriculum is unique in terms of implementation of foreign languages. All the primary school students must choose one foreign language from the available three, Japanese, French and German. The students’ parent’s background varies, and includes 3 Greek, 2 Polish, 2 Macedonian, 2 Turkish, 1 Palestinian, 4 Japanese, and 2 Korean.

The timetable for the two Years 5 & 6 Japanese composite classes were as follows,

Mon 0830 – 1000
Tue 1:15 – 2:30
Wed 1:15 – 2:30
Thus 08:30 – 10:00
Fri 11:00 – 12:30

Within this time frame, the teaching was distributed among 3 subjects, Mathematics, Language and HSIE, and the three subjects were taught in Japanese language. The teacher was a Japanese native, and she taught at this school for 13 years.

Class B
Class B was comprised of 27 students from a grade 4 and 5 composite class and the teacher in charge of the class also teaches Japanese. Out of 27 students 15 students participated in the interviews. The Japanese class was allocated one 50 minute lesson per week. This public school, K to 6, is situated in a relatively newly developed suburb in the South Coast area. Out of the 27 students, only two student’s parents are of ethnic minority background, 1 Macedonian and 1 German.

The teacher taught at state school for over 20 years. She was very keen to keep Japanese in her teaching program. She arranged a Japanese student volunteer to
help her Japanese class sometimes. She then organised a Japanese teacher volunteer from a Japanese teaching organisation in Japan to help her Japanese class for 3rd term during 2002.

Every Japanese class on Monday afternoon followed a similar process. The class began by explaining and handing out home work for the week and some notices to take home. Then the Japanese class began by watching a Japanese language video program. The class was accustomed to this program. The students responded to the video program very well. When a character in the program asked the audience to do something, the students showed no hesitation to do so without the classroom teacher’s guidance. After the video program, the teacher gave some interactive activity. Sometimes she invited some Japanese students to help her class. The activities were always linked with the video program. This teacher used simple classroom instruction such as quickly, quietly, well done, hands up and etc in Japanese very efficiently. There were more than 20 students in the class, and most of time the students were all well involved.

The students who participated were 15 students from the class of 20 students. The students were chosen whoever brought the consent form back from their parents.

**High school students and a teacher**

In addition to the above 30 primary students, there were five high school students who participated in the interviews. These students had chosen Japanese as an elective subject at high school and had been learning Japanese since primary school. Their school is an independent co-educational school where the school philosophy is based on the Christian faith, and the Japanese language has been taught from Kindergarten to Year 12. Their teacher also taught these students when they were in the primary section of this school. She is a Japanese native, and has 10 years of Japanese language teaching experience in Australia.

The high school students participation was determined after analysing the first phase of this study.
University students

As a result of the second phase of this study, five university students whose major study is Japanese participated. They had studied Japanese since they were in primary school.

4.4.2 Other informants

There were several informants whose contributions through informal, open ended interviews, were highly valuable to identify contextual issues related to this study.

Table 4-2: Stakeholder participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese language consultant 2</th>
<th>A Japanese language consultant from Queensland. One of the organisers of the ALPLP project in QLD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An officer from the Board of Studies NSW.</td>
<td>Officer who participated in the Boards syllabus writing team the new syllabus survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some language teachers from the in-services and a seminar I attended</td>
<td>Teachers who had experience with or wished to become informed about the new syllabus and teaching culture, and continued to keep in contact. One of them had participated in the ALPLP project; her comments as a participant in this project provided me with a great insight into the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers from the participating schools</td>
<td>Teachers who had familiarity with the school’s attitude towards cultural issues within the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Japanese Language consultants 1 & 2

Kimiko was a Japanese language consultant from the Association of Independent Schools (AIS). After teaching the Japanese language at primary schools and high schools in Australia for the previous 12 years, she was working as a Japanese language consultant for the Association of Independent Schools (AIS), NSW. Her duties included visiting primary and high schools within the AIS, and assisted the teachers in implementing the language. She was also a key player for the language teachers of AIS, conducting a in-service implementing the new syllabus. She also worked as an HSC examination committee member for the past 10 years.
Sherry was another consultant who worked in the Queensland education system. She was an in-service organiser for ALPLP in Queensland. I communicated with Sherry via email. One purpose of the communication with Sherry was to strengthen the data that was collected to clarify the development of ALPLP.

**The Board of Studies consultant**

Although face to face interviews could not be conducted, emails were exchanged with a member of the Board of Studies.

**In-service participants – language teachers**

Since the introduction of the new syllabus, a number of in-services were conducted by the NSW Department of Education as well as the AIS. Since year 2002, I have been attending those in-services in order to examine the teachers’ perception of the intercultural awareness described by the new syllabus. Informal interviews were conducted with those participants during the in-service seminars as well as after the seminars. Email communications following these workshops were maintained between the researcher and the participants.

**Other teachers from the participating schools**

Since one of observation objectives in Phase 1 was to examine how the school community perceived language teaching, which was to assist this research in drawing ‘a big picture’ of language teaching as a part of the school curriculum, I joined the other teachers at morning recess and lunch time as much as possible. After more than one full term of classroom observation I was welcomed by other staff members at both schools. The observation was particularly useful in order to evaluate the possibility of language teaching as cross-curriculum teaching.

### 4.5 Data collection and generating additional data

The data was collected in order to collect thick descriptive data (Geertz, 1973). Interviews with the students and teachers are the core data of the study, which also included a journal recording the observation notes and the in-service attendant notes, audio recorded classroom talk and supporting documents.
This diagram indicates the concepts and the process of this study. The first phase of this study involved primary school students and is indicated by the numbers 1-3. The result of this phase enabled me to focus on the students’ identification of their self and others and its relationship with their Japanese language learning experiences. The second phase introduced high school students, and concentrated on level 3, and the third phase involved university students and also concentrated on level 3. Level 4 indicates the overarching framework for this study.
4.5.1 Data collection Phase 1 – Primary schools

The main research activity in this phase was preliminary observations followed by the determination of the core participants of this study. This study began at the same time as the draft LOTE syllabus was published in 2001. The draft syllabus was significant to this study as it clearly stated the importance of intercultural awareness, which was different to the previous syllabus. The third place/places notion was introduced in this draft. The original design of this study was, therefore, to examine how the students would create the third place while learning Japanese, as implemented under the draft syllabus. In order to carry out this plan, action research was initially chosen as the design of this study. Although the research shifted from the original design to a case study, the first phase became a core of this study. As discussed in section 4.3.2, the foundation ideas were emerged in this phase.

The contextual background of this phase was the publication of the LOTE draft syllabus. The Board of Studies NSW organised the draft syllabus discussion meetings with language teachers, and DET NSW and the Association of Independent Schools NSW organised the language teachers’ in-services in order to better prepare for the implementation of the new syllabus. Attending these meetings provided me with insights into the gaps between the administrators and practitioners, thereby assisting me to change the direction of this research from an action research to a case study.

Part1 of Phase1 - Preliminary observations

The preliminary observations were undertaken during second term in 2002. Four classes where the Japanese language was taught regularly as a part of the teaching program were chosen as possible participants for the research. The observations were to examine the best suited participants for this study as well as to observe how in general Japanese language teaching was delivered in primary school in New South Wales. With all of the four classes, I sat in a corner of the classroom while the classes were underway. The initial plan was to implement the program, which reflect the new objective of the new syllabus ‘moving between cultures’ and to see how language teaching can promote the development of interculturality.
Thus, fundamentally, I needed to find classes with teachers who had familiarized themselves with the LOTE syllabus, and who were prepared to implement the language teaching program which I was going to produce with the teachers as discussed in the later section. My focus was the students’ development of interculturality.

Also, understanding how the schools and teachers were seeing the language subject within the school curriculum was a focus point of the examination for this phase. Ongoing observation of the students’ talk while they were in the language classes started in this phase. Also, my observation focused on how the concept of interculturality was valued in the classroom by the teachers as well as the school environment.

After this observation, the two participating schools were determined. The reasons for the decision were:

- the schools’ interests inclined toward multicultural/intercultural education
- the teachers’ teaching style suited my action research plan program
- the students’ level of Japanese language suited my action research plan program

During the weekly school assemblies, and on special events’ days, such as Multicultural day at school A and a visit by Chinese students at school B, I stood with the parents, and noted what was said by the teachers and the principals of the schools, as well as some comments made by parents who attended these events. These notes became a basic resource to illustrate how the schools and their communities saw interculturality. Also this provided me with insights into the school environment.

The students from the Japanese classes often came to talk to me when I was in the classroom and on the playground. I often stood outside their classroom in the morning before the lessons started and met the students who came early. They regularly came up with interesting questions and comments on Japan and Japanese people. I had approval from the principals to be in the school grounds.
Adding to the two schools discussed in the previous section (the participants section), the following two schools were also original participants in this study.

Class C
The five observations took place one hour a week as the Japanese class was only conducted one hour after the morning recess break on Wednesday morning. Class C was a part of a small Catholic school, situated in an industrial area in southern New South Wales. The Year 6 class was taught by 2 teachers, teaching as a team. One teacher taught 2 days a week and other 3 days a week. Japanese class was one hour a week, and was taught by a Japanese language specialist, undertaking a Graduate Diploma of Education(Japanese) after completing her BA major in Japanese. During the Japanese class, the classroom teacher was present in the room. Before the arrival of the Japanese language teacher, the classroom teacher guided her students through a satellite class, which was later broadcast on SBS. This school became a resource centre for the Japanese language within the local Catholic diocese.

I was hoping to incorporate language teaching with other key learning areas of the school curriculum as I wanted more effective intercultural language teaching implementation. Thus, I spoke to both teachers in charge of this class before starting the observation, and they agreed to assist us, myself and the Japanese language teacher.

However, I came to realise this class could not be a part of the study, because I needed a more flexible teaching and learning style to implement my intercultural language teaching model.

Class D
The Class D was part of a very small independent school in suburban Sydney. This school reflects the Montessori teaching philosophy. Japanese was offered from Kindergarten to Year 6, however it was not compulsory. There were no other languages offered to the students. The teacher was a native Japanese
woman who had Montessori education in Japan when she was a primary school student. She had an average of 10 students from year 3 to year 6 students.

During my visits, her class started and finished with a song. The students seemed to enjoy the 30 minutes Japanese classes. Her teaching materials prove that she spent a lot of time in planning and preparing for the class. However I did not choose this class, because the teaching did not reflect the NSW LOTE syllabus.

This study examines language teaching and interculturality, therefore seeing how language education sits as part of the big picture of the school curriculum is the crucial starting point, particularly in primary school language education. Therefore, I required the participating teachers to be fully familiarised with the school syllabi.

**Summary of Preliminary observations – issues observed**
- An experienced classroom teacher positioned Japanese at the bottom of her priority list, so that the Japanese class was always going to be cut whenever she had to add extra curricula activities to the timetable. She had no time to follow the Japanese syllabus, although she wanted to maintain the Japanese program for her class.
- A less experienced Japanese teacher tried to incorporate the Japanese syllabus, but her approach was very narrow, looking at the language & culture separately, hence, teaching separately.
- A Japanese native teacher did not follow the syllabus, in fact, did not know the Japanese syllabus existed though she was very enthusiastic, and spent a lot of time in preparation for her class.
- A Japanese native teacher who teaches part of Maths and HSIE in Japanese knew that she has to follow the syllabus but she struggled with the programming. She knew the new draft syllabus was released and she had to give the feedback evaluation on the new draft syllabus.
The core participants of the study were chosen. The focal points of the selection were that:

- the teachers valued intercultural awareness
- the teachers considered the syllabus
- the students could read and write Hiragana.

**Part 2 of Phase 1 – Focusing on the two primary classes**

After the preliminary classroom observation, the participants for the planned intervention in Japanese language teaching were determined. As it seemed that the challenge was knowing how to teach languages for the purpose of creating ‘the third places’ (Lo Bianco, Liddicoat & Crozet, 1999:13) that the LOTE syllabus NSW encouraged as a new objective, it was hoped that a better teaching method could be trialled as classroom action research to fulfil the syllabus objective. The researcher’s planned Japanese language teaching and learning program was intended to examine how intercultural awareness might develop by following the draft LOTE syllabus published in 2001.

This research was planned to consist of two spirals of an action research cycle as is described by Lewin (Burns, 1994:295). The action research aimed to discover ways to improve the innovation (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1981; Brown & Jones, 2001; Friedman & Antal, 2005), which in this case was to enhance the learner’s intercultural awareness and self-identity. The teaching and learning program was to be used as an instrument to shape the process. However, the implementation phase served rather to enhance the case study, as a means of learning more about the primary school children’s responses to the language classes.

The teaching programs (refer to the Appendix 1-2) for both schools were designed after reflecting on the classroom observations, which took place over one full term with the two classes. Consideration was taken of the Japanese language class environments, the draft LOTE Syllabus, NSW, and the students’ abilities in the language, for example, how well they can use the Japanese script and vocabularies. The teaching programs were planned differently according to the class’s characteristics. However the teaching programs were not implemented as planned, since they relied heavily not only on the teachers’ agreement to the
innovation, but also on the time available to teach in Japanese, which was far less than anticipated, and on increased use of Japanese across several Key Learning Areas of the curriculum, which was not understood well by the teachers (See Appendix 1 for Class A and Appendix 2 for Class B). Class A did two cycles of the completed program although the way it appeared in the class room was not what I expected. Class B did only a half cycle of the program.

A genre based curriculum cycle (see Appendix 3) for both classes was consciously chosen in order to examine whether the development of the learner’s intercultural awareness was evident. If so, how was it displayed by the learner. The observation points were:

• What are the possible ways to enhance the learner’s intercultural awareness
• What is the ‘intercultural personality’ (Kramsch, 1993:9) developed by Japanese language learning experiences applying Intercultural Language Teaching.
• How do the children identify self and other/foreign in Japanese language class?
• How are learners encouraged to find a meeting place between different forces, different cultures and different worldviews, through Japanese language learning experiences, as expected by the Department of Education and Training in New South Wales. What is the impact on the learner?

These questions were useful to reflect on in the ongoing case studies as the research progressed.

Interviews with the teachers and the primary school students

The first interviews were held with T1 from Class A and T2 from Class B, as an initial part of the action research, and the second interviews were held after deciding on the change in the research design. With T1, the two interviews were held at a coffee shop near the school, after school hours. The interviews with T2 were held after the day’s teaching, in the classroom. Between the two recorded interviews, a short conversation took place after each classroom observation period. T3’s interviews became necessary after seeing the results of this phase.
Also, three interviews with the primary students were conducted. With both Classes A and B, the first series of interviews involved 4 groups of three and four students, involving a total of 15 students. The second interviews were with groups of two and three with a total of 15 students. The third interviews were with two children. With Class A, the interviews were held outside the classroom during their Japanese study time for approximately 15 minutes. The teacher chose the students in each group. With Class B, the interviews were held during their library time for approximately 15 minutes per interview. The teacher allowed me to use their classroom when the other students were at the library.

**Part 3 of Phase 1 – deliberation on the primary school language teaching**

As mentioned above, the key constraint to implementing the action research segment of the case studies was time, but another major constraint was that of focus. Teachers were not able to allocate sufficient time to teach Japanese on a regular weekly basis. Furthermore, the teachers had not focussed on the new syllabus requirements and were therefore not ready to use a program that focussed on ‘moving between cultures’. Although the agreements from both teachers were obtained, and the discussion between the teachers and the researcher on the teaching program was extensive, the teacher’s understanding of ‘culture’ within the language class was different to that of the syllabus. The teachers’ idea of culture in their class seemed divorced from the language and an isolated part of the language class. For example, culture in their class was represented by ‘singing a moon song’ in an isolated manner rather than connecting the singing to examine the significance of ‘moon’ in Japanese society and their society. Moreover, the teachers’ evaluations of the classes’ level of competence did not correspond with my class evaluation, which was based on the observations, which took place during the preliminary observation period of one full school term.

During this period I found the following positive points from observation of the teacher and children conversations, children’s conversations, and the conversation between myself, the children and the teachers.

- The teachers were very keen language educators.
- The teachers knew each students’ strengths and weaknesses.
- The teachers believed that language learning helps the children’s personal development.
- The teachers used the language efficiently when teaching the language.
- The students had acquired basic language skills.
- The students could hiragana fairly well.
- The students were always well involved with the language activities.

However, there were difficulties, some of which could not be overcome.
- The teachers understanding of culture in the language class and ‘intercultural’ ideas were based more on conventional interpretations of visible culture than the wider interpretations of interculturality.
- The teachers did not see that language teaching could be taught across the curriculum.
- The teachers were capable, but not confident in using the language.
- The public school teacher struggled to continue her language teaching program because of the time constraints.
- The time constraints that limit language teaching time compared with the importance placed on other subjects’ requirements.
- The teachers were not familiar with the LOTE syllabus.

The above mentioned difficulties were also evident for other teachers who were at the draft syllabus discussion meeting and at the Japanese language teachers’ inservices. Through the informal interviews with these teachers and observing the presenters, I found that the teachers as well as some of the presenters understood the ‘culture’ in the new objective ‘moving between cultures’ from the new LOTE syllabus to be the same as traditional visible ‘cultural’ artefacts and customs, also discussed in Section 2.5.3. I thought, unless teachers understand the concept of interculturality, the ‘culture’ within language teaching will continue to be taught in traditional ways. The teachers were the facilitators for students to meet the objectives. If teachers do not comprehend the syllabus, the objectives cannot be met.

Nonetheless, the above observation became the first data of this study. In many ways, the emergence of these gaps in the understandings of language teachers
provided me with new ways of exploring my topic. Furthermore, as a part of the action research model, the government papers in regard to citizenship education and language education were examined as discussed in the previous chapter. This document examination was extended to the 2nd and the 3rd phases.

4.5.2 Data collection Phase 2 – Interviewing the five high school students and the teacher

The publication of the Report on Intercultural Language Teaching (Liddicoat et al, 2003) was a crucial breakthrough for this study. As the results of Phase 1 emerged, I found a number of differences between the teachers’ and my interpretation of ‘culture’ in the language class. Thus I could not carry on the action research, because the person who programmed it and the person who implemented it, had a different understanding of the syllabus and a different way of teaching culture. However, the Report findings re-directed the study. I decided to examine how the students actually ‘move between cultures’ while studying language. Unless the teachers understand how students move between cultures, they cannot teach them, even though the syllabus expresses it as an objective. The important point is, I thought, to show the teachers how ‘culture’ is fluid rather than concrete. Unless the teachers see it, they cannot be convinced that they are not teaching culture. The teachers must see that the version of culture they teach is concrete and traditional culture, which has the risk of promoting stereotypical ideas. Through Phase 1, I came to understand that the teachers have different ways of understanding ‘culture’, thereby a different interpretation of the new objective ‘moving between cultures’.

Going through the first phase, three interviews were conducted with the two cohorts of primary school students. However, the direction of the study changed, and I did not think the interviews provided me with enough evidence to show how the students’, notion of self was developing. Therefore, I decided to compare the primary school students’ interviews by asking the same questions of the high school students. In this way, I could attempt an analysis of the responses of older students who had studied Japanese for several years longer than the younger students.
In order to fulfil this purpose, five high school students who started learning the Japanese language at primary school age were included as participants. Two interviews were conducted with each student, first in a group of two and three, then individually. These interviews were held during their lunchtime in the school grounds for about 30 minutes. Their responses were recorded by a note taking tape recorder.\(^5\)

Their Japanese language teacher, T3, was also interviewed. Semi structured interviews were conducted twice in the staff room of her school for about one hour each. Also, after each of the students’ interviews, I had an opportunity to speak to T3 in her office for about half an hour. T3 also taught these high school students when they were in primary school.

The new LOTE syllabus was published in 2003 during this phase.

4.5.3 Data collection Phase 3 – Interviewing the five university students

Although the high school students expressed their reflections of Japanese studies in an articulate manner, I was still not convinced that the interview results were a sufficient reflection of their primary experience of Japanese studies to justify a discussion about development of interculturality over time. However, the interview results, discussed in the following chapter, showed very clearly how their Japanese studies impacted on their identification of self and other. This result motivated me to progress to further interviews with students who were studying Japanese for longer than the high school students. Five university students who had been studying the Japanese language since their primary age were chosen as additional participants.

Interviews were conducted twice with each student. The first interview was conducted with two groups of two and a single student, and the second interviews were with the individuals. The university’s meeting room was booked for those

\(^5\) Sony TCM-400DV, Cassette-Corder
interviews. The first interviews took more than two hours with each group as their experiences and their own opinions were richer than the high school students.

During this phase, from 2004 to 2005, I attended the Asian Languages Professional Learning Project seminar, which was organised by AFMLTA. The focus of this project was to implement intercultural language teaching. I had similar misgivings as to the teachers’ understanding of ‘culture’ that I had during the previous phase.

4.6 Data analysis

As described above, this study consisted of three phases, and the following discusses how the data were analysed in each phase.

4.6.1 Phase 1 – Primary schools
The data collected during the first phase (see Table4-3) became the foundation data for this study.

The students’ interviews
The students’ tape-recorded interviews were transcribed as written notes. The students’ names were coded and the data were classified into the following themes for groups A and B. Further analysis of these oral recordings from the students’ interviews was used to strengthen the interpretations of each theme for each group.

1. Japanese language learning experience
2. Differences between Japan and Australia
3. Citizenship
4. Living in Japan
5. Opinions on the different people/culture
6. Feelings towards other people / other culture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collected</th>
<th>How the data was treated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary observation for one full school term Interviews with the primary students and their teachers Field notes in this phase contain of: - the school assembly - attendance of the school’s special event (Multicultural day- school A, Welcoming the Chinese visitors-School B, - speaking to the parents who attended the school assemblies and the special events, and come to pick up/drop off the children - Classroom observation - Informal conversation with the students during the morning before the class starts and during their lunch time - Negotiation process of the implementation of the program with the two teachers - Informal chat with other teachers at the staff rooms - Attending the draft syllabus meeting organised by the Board of Studies NSW</td>
<td>The field notes were written up with information of who, what, where, and when. My impression of how and why were added to each specific field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers’ and the students’ interviews</td>
<td>All the recorded interviews were transcribed as written texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email communication with some policy makers. Informal interviews with the other key informants.</td>
<td>The email conversation was collected as the data. The informal interviews were treated in the same way as the field notes. My impressions on why and how were added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected but disregarded -Planning of the teaching program, which was partially implemented, but not completed. -Implementation of an action research cycle one, which includes two of the interviews with the primary students and their teachers.</td>
<td>The key reasons for discontinuing the planned teaching program were extracted from my self reflection notes on the negotiation process with the teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the initial classification and interpretations of the above grouping, a matrix (Miles and Huberman, 1994) with defined rows and columns was constructed, with the rows named with each student’s coded name and columns named with the above themes. Analytical notes were written in each cell, and the initial analytical notes were compared with the data. Then the findings were refined and further analysed.

Within each theme, the data were further reviewed to identify interrelationships, to discover new emphases and to deliberate on the emerging theory. The key themes were narrowed down, and two key themes, self and others, emerged. Going through this process, the differences between Classes A and B were gradually illuminated.

With the data now classified in Self and Others, my question of “what is interculturality?” could then be addressed, as is discussed in Chapter 5. The texts in the matrix and the written notes from the field notes were revised.

_Semi structured interviews with the teachers and informal interviews with other informants_

The first interview focused on examining the teachers’ perceptions of Japanese language teaching and how they teach the language, especially culture. The observation of the class from part 1 of this phase provided me with quite clear indications of how they taught, however it was necessary to consolidate the observation notes. The following questions were prepared as part of the semi structured interviews

_The main questions._

- Do you teach culture?
- How important is it to learn or teach Japanese within primary education?
- How do you teach culture?
- What is your teaching philosophy?
- What kind of contribution can the Japanese language teacher provide the students?
Do you know that LOTE is included within the HSIE syllabus?
Do you think Japanese language teaching can contribute to citizenship education?
Do you use the draft syllabus?

The teacher’s perception of the language teaching matrix was constructed after the teachers had responded to the above questions. The three teachers’ opinions were compared. The fourth column was added for the Japanese language teachers who are described as other informants in this phase. Informal interviews were conducted during and after the meetings I attended. These interviews were then compared with the first two teachers, and then with the third teacher in the next phase.

**Field notes**

**Table 4- 4: Field notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The field notes</th>
<th>How they were generated as data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom observation</td>
<td>The field notes assisted the production of the teaching program. 2 assisted me to familiarise myself with the students, and it also provided me with a solid insight into the interviews analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Informal conversation with the students during the morning before class starts and during their lunch time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negotiation process of the implementation of the program with the two teachers</td>
<td>3 assisted me to decide on changing the research design. Also, through this process, some key themes arose in regard to the teachers’ views towards their teaching of the Japanese language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Informal chat with other teachers in the staff rooms</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5 assisted me to construct a general view of the teachers’ and the Board’s attitude to the teaching of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attending the draft syllabus meeting organised by the Board of Studies NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The school assembly</td>
<td>6 &amp; 7 assisted me to decide on the final participants. This provided me with some insights into what the schools were involved with in order to encourage the intercultural development of the students and the schools approach to the students’ intercultural understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attendance at the school’s special events (Multicultural day- school A, Welcoming the Chinese visitors- School B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field notes in this phase were gathered and generated into seven sets as seen in Table 4. The field notes were typed up, and analytical notes were written. The texts were placed within the conceptual framework for this study. The fieldnotes sets 1 and 2 concern the whole of the class conversations, and 15 students from each class took part in the formal interviews. The balance of each class was considered as another voice, which was included in the matrix under the title ‘other voice’. Sets 3 to 5 of the notes were carefully sorted out into the language-teaching matrix, with the extra columns added to incorporate these data.

4.6.2 Phase 2

After analysing the data with the groups of primary students, I felt the necessity to interview another set of students. By this point, I had begun to theorise about the development of interculturality as a process of identity-development and self awareness/maturity. When I was examining my data relating to how the primary students’ Japanese language learning experience was impacting on their self-making, my concern from the interviews was that some students might not have been mature enough to express how they felt and thought about this experience. Thus, it was decided to include some high school Japanese language students who could explain their Japanese language learning experience at primary age in a more explicit manner. This became a method of establishing some benchmarks for the interviews with the primary school students from Phase 2. Five high school Japanese language students were recruited as volunteer participants. The group included two students from Year 10, two students from Year 11, and one student from Year 12 of all whom had started Japanese language studies at primary age.

The students’ tape-recorded interviews were processed in the same way as the primary school students in Phase 1. The semi structured interview questions were basically the same as those used for the primary school students, and they were sorted into the same categories for the individual students.

However, a different data matrix was constructed for their reflections of the primary learning experiences. The initial aim to progress the study into this phase
was for the high school students’ self-analysis to assist in analysing the primary students’ data, especially the construction of their self and others, and to compare the high school student responses with the Phase 1 responses of the primary school students. The students’ row in the matrix was divided into two, one was focused on their primary school age and the other was their current opinions and their reflection on the theme. After the data were packed into the cells, analytical notes, which were focused on the construction of the students’ self and their perceptions of others, were written. Then the data were repacked into the themes of self and others as in Phase 1.

The written interview texts provided me with thick description, and they were focused to analyse the relationship between the students self and the others, and their relationship to the Japanese language learning experiences. Their reflections of their Japanese primary school language experiences were obtained. The comparison was made between the primary school students’ analysis and the high school students’ primary school experiences. The contrast was also made between the high school students’ reflection on their primary experience and their current one. However, although the two themes, self and the others, were identified in a clear manner, the overlapping third space could not be identified. The written texts of the interviews were reviewed and the above process was repeated. Finally the summary table for the themes, self and others, was made.

The information from the teacher’s (T3) interview was added to the teachers interview matrix used in Phase 1, by adding a column. Transcribing the initial interview indicated an interestingly different insight into her language teaching, when compared to T1 and T2. Then the second interview was conducted with T3.

The results of this phase provided me with another set of theoretical concepts. These results motivated me to find more mature participants who could evaluate their Japanese language learning experiences, and to examine how they identified the relationships between their self and others and to the Japanese language learning experience. My motivation was then to find a set of patterns from the primary, high school and university students in which the Japanese language
students identified their self and others and how the Japanese language learning experience affected that notion.

4.6.3 Phase 3

In this phase, I targeted five university students who started their Japanese language learning at primary school. Discussions were directed at illuminating the principal categories of self and other identification and its relationship to the language learning experience. The same questions as those asked of the primary and high school students were used as the fundamental questions for the semi-structured interviews. They were categorised in the same way as the primary and high school students’ interviews.

The aims for this phase were to validate the previous groups’ students’ self-reflection of their language learning experience, and to identify their own evaluation of the relationship between the Japanese language learning experience with the identification of their own self and others. A different pattern from those of primary and high school was identified.

The matrix was again constructed to identify the three layers of identification, the primary experience, the high school experience and the university experience. The data were packed into the cells as demonstrated in the past two phases.

4.7 Conclusion

This study developed into three phases of progression. As discussed above, it began as action research; however the methodology was changed to a case study with a grounded theory approach, which provides a framework for allowing theory to be discovered. The data from Phase 1 - document analysis, the field notes collected during the classroom observations and the records of the teacher meetings - became sources to analyse the context of this study.

The multiple case studies were undertaken to gain in-depth information from Japanese language primary school students in New South Wales, focusing on the
influence of the language learning experience on the students’ development of interculturality. This chapter provided an overview, which includes the methodology and design chosen for this study. It discussed how the actual methodology was formed into a shape and how this shape progressed, how the participants were determined, who the participants were, how the data were collected, and then finally how these data were analysed to find answers to the research questions.

The following two chapters will present the results of the process(es) discussed in this chapter.
Chapter 5 The students

5.1 Introduction

The first phase of this research, which focused on primary school Japanese language students and their school environment, provided foundation data for this study as discussed in the previous chapter. The data from the primary students led to Phases 2 and 3 of the research, including interviews with high school students followed by interviews with university students. This chapter analyses the data from these interviews with the students from the three phases of the data collection. The aim of each phase was to explore the perceptions and beliefs of students regarding their identification of self and others, analysing the differences and similarities of the points of view of students at various stages of their Japanese language learning. The underlying research question for each phase was to explore how interculturality developed in students as they experienced Japanese language learning. As explained in the previous chapter, the second and third phases emerged from the data in Phase 1, as it appeared that interculturality development may be linked both to developmental stages of language learning as well as to attitudinal changes in students from pre-adolescence to adulthood.

The data obtained from the interviews were analysed descriptively to identify response categories corresponding to the sub-research questions on which the study focused. The categories that emerged were:

- Sense of identity,
- Belonging,
- Other Cultures and
- Japanese language learning.

As this study maps the students’ identification of their sense of self and other, their sense of belonging, and the influence of Japanese language learning experiences on the development of interculturality, the students’ perception of self and other are depicted as two circles. As explained in Chapters 2 and 3, much
research discusses the ‘third space’, where these hypothetical circles touch or overlap. In this research the concepts of two circles, self and other, are modified to identify the complexities of the interrelationships.

5.2 Primary students

The students from the two primary schools are labelled Group A and Group B. Group A school was a large independent school in Sydney central district, and Group B school was a public school situated in a relatively quiet suburb in the South Coast area in NSW.

Table 5-1: Profile of primary students in Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Gender/ Age</th>
<th>Parents’ background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agm1</td>
<td>Male / 11</td>
<td>Australian / Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agm2</td>
<td>Male / 11</td>
<td>Australian / Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agm3</td>
<td>Male / 11</td>
<td>Japanese / Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agm4</td>
<td>Male / 12</td>
<td>Australia / English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agm5</td>
<td>Male / 10</td>
<td>South Korean / South Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agm6</td>
<td>Male / 11</td>
<td>Turkish / Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agm7</td>
<td>Male / 11</td>
<td>Israeli / Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf8</td>
<td>Female / 12</td>
<td>Japanese / Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf9</td>
<td>Female / 11</td>
<td>Greek / Rumanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf10</td>
<td>Female / 11</td>
<td>Croatia / Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf11</td>
<td>Female / 11</td>
<td>Greek / Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf12</td>
<td>Female / 10</td>
<td>Australia / Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf13</td>
<td>Female / 11</td>
<td>Polish / Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf14</td>
<td>Female / 11</td>
<td>Turkish / Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agf15</td>
<td>Female / 11</td>
<td>Croatia / Croatia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 15 participants from A-Group. Out of 15 students only 2 students’ parents are both Australian and one student’s parents are from England and Australia. One student’s parents are Australian and Jewish, and another student’s parents are from Australia and Greece. The rest of 10 students’ parents have a background of both speaking a language other than English as their first language. Of all the students, one student was born in Japan and one student was born in South Korea. The other 13 students were born in Australia.
Table 5-2: Profile of Primary students in Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Gender / Age</th>
<th>Parents’ background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bgm1</td>
<td>Male / 10</td>
<td>Germany / Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgm4</td>
<td>Male / 10</td>
<td>Macedonia / Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgm8</td>
<td>Male / 10</td>
<td>England / Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgm2, bgm3, bgm5, bgm6, bgm7, bgm9</td>
<td>Male / 10</td>
<td>Australia / Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgf10, bgf11, bgf12, bgf13, bgf14, bgf15</td>
<td>Female / 10</td>
<td>Australia / Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 15 students, all of the students had one or both parents born in Australia. Two of the students’ fathers are from Macedonia and Germany, and one student’s father is from England. The other 12 students’ parents are both Australian. The student whose father is from Macedonia thinks he is a half Macedonian. He said it means nothing, but his father is not Australian.

5.2.1 How did they identify themselves?

The students from Group A showed awareness of having a strong cultural identity. The students identified themselves as whatever their parent’s home country was, rather than as Australian, although the students of the English parent identified themselves as Australian. It appears as though they felt surrounded by a cultural boundary which is quite strongly projected by their family. Although they were born in Australia and they feel that Australia is their home, the cultural ‘boundary’ surrounding them was described like a hard shell, for many a comfortable place to be in.

Students from Group A said:

- Australia is my home, but Europe is in my blood. “I want to me myself. I’m European, coz I have a bit of Greek, Romania, Cyprian and Turkish.” (agf9)

- Not everybody who lives in Greece is Greek. People keep their own culture wherever they live.(agf11)

- I was born in Australia and I’m a Greek I feel like I just fit in Greek.” (agf12)

- I practise the religion of Judaism, that’s why I think I’m Jewish. (agm7)
They stated their opinions on whether they belong to Australia.

You cannot say that you belong to Australia, because they cannot own this person. (agm6)

You cannot just belong somewhere just because that’s where you live. (agm4)

I’m Jewish, so I belong to Israel. (agm7)

The school the students attend encourages a multicultural education, and many students identify themselves as from an “ethnic minority” family background. They are encouraged to sound out who they are at the school. This may be one reason for their articulate description of themselves.

On the other hand, the students from Group B generally identified themselves as Australian, but the identification was described as a natural assumption of being Australian because they lived in Australia. They did not talk in the same way about “identity”; hence, their self identity is to them quite an all-encompassing general concept, not based on clear reasons as the students from Group A identified themselves. This is a typical response from majority groups who often make comments such as they do not have an accent, or in the case of many white majority people, state they do not have any ethnicity.

The students from Group B made comments such as:

I am Aussie and a girl and I love dancing (bgf15).

My dad is from England, but I am Australian, because I was born here. (bgm8)

I am a half Macedonian. It means nothing, but my Dad is not Australian (bgm4)

I belong to Australia, but I would like to belong to England, because I like the English accent (bgf10)

Their school community includes very few families from countries outside Australia. Almost equally, students from both groups said they belong to family, school, and local sports group they attend after school.
Neither group felt that they belonged to Japan though they speak Japanese language except one student from Group B.

I feel I belong to Japan, because I know a lot of words in Japanese. (bgf10)

Group A students made comments such as:

We don’t belong to Japan. Japanese people have different religion, culture and everything.

5.2.2 How did they identity culture of ‘other’?

Although A-Group students strongly identified with their own cultural background, they were quite open to people from other cultures. On the subject of cultural dresses or refugees, Group A students commented:

We should keep our beautiful culture. We walk in jeans and a top, that’s weird to other people. (agm2)

As long as people want to become Australian citizens, they should be allowed. (agm5)

They (refugees) should be able to come in. (igf13)

It’s…cool to keep their tradition. (agm6)

In contrast, the students from Group B were quite open to the way they identified themselves, but they seemed to construct a boundary of difference or exclusion between themselves and other cultures. They made statements such as:

Muslims celebrate Christmas after the holiday has passed. Same as the Chinese people, their Christmas is in January. That’s really weird. They might think we are weird, but ours is normal. (gmf14)

I like people to wear their cultural dress, but not covering the face. They should wear more pretty dresses. (gmf11)

It would feel weird walking around with different clothes on. (bgm7)

It feels a bit strange if you’re not like us. (bgm6)
I think almost all people with dark skin are bad but with my friend she is really kind and polite. (bgf13)

On the issue of refugees, Group B said:-

Should stop them to come. (bgm5)

I don’t want people like Osama. (bgm4)

I don’t like it if they come illegally, if they come to kill people. (bgf11)

People come and die here, why not just stay there and die. (bgm6)

Most of the refugees are from Afghanistan. They should go back to Afghanistan. (bgm2)

People in detention centres must have done something bad. (bgf14)

The students’ common perception on the refugees was quite negative, and the students felt that the refugees were a burden to Australian people. The most of the students from Group B said that they neither discuss issues of refugees at school nor watch TV news. It suggests that these opinions are quite likely influenced by their home environment.

While mapping the students’ identification of their sense of self and other, their sense of belonging, and the influence of Japanese language learning experiences on the development of interculturality, it became recognisable that the interrelation of these themes, self and other, related quite strongly to their sense of the cultural identity surrounding them at home. Group A students’ self identity is based on their families’ cultural identity, and they have concrete ideas on how they see themselves. It seems that they create a boundary (in this case a sense of solidity) around themselves because of this strong recognition. When ‘other’ approaches, this boundary separates them from ‘other’, because they recognise who they are with a strong manner. However, they recognise ‘other’ with quite an accepting manner. This is very different from the sense of boundary exhibited with Group B students, whose sense of self identity is not as strong yet. In contrast to Group A, Group B students seem to construct their ‘boundary’ around the other. As a result, when they try to connect with the other, their feeling bounces back because of the ‘boundary’ they themselves formed in relation to others. For the Group B students, other is quite visible, or ‘hard’ compared to
examining their own self in this stage. The sense of self and other is illustrated in Figure 5.1

Figure 5.1: Sense of self and other where hard boundaries are present

5.2.3 Japanese language learning
The Japanese language learning environment provided the students with the opportunity to have positive rather than negative experiences when dealing with the other, in this case Japanese language learning experience.

Primary students showed that the Japanese language learning experience had a softening effect on their own and others’ cultural boundary which divided self and other, and defend their own hence reject others. The experience provided them fun and positive feeling toward Japanese learning and that feeling was also transferred to others. The teachers’ role becomes very crucial in this case as ‘fun’ activities provided them such positive impact. It is a fact that it is not all the language learners develop this. However this study indicate that they can develop this positiveness direction of an appropriate facilitation.

The students from Group A said:

There’s always differences, but you find those differences are something you can relate to (your own). We’ve got differences, but it doesn’t matter. (agm6)
Japanese like baseball, they don’t play cricket. But they like sports, same as us. (agm4)

Through the Japanese learning experience, the students noticed the difference, but at the same time, they link their own life to this experience and found similarity behind the differences.

It makes me think more like, what people believe in, how and what people do to support their beliefs. (agm7)

It made me think that Australia isn’t the only culture. It made me feel like kinder towards their religion and stuff. (agm6)

They are starting to notice their own culture, and trying to observe their own culture.

I like Japanese customs like bowing etc, because it’s different. It makes sense. (agm1)

Now I have respect for Japanese people. Before I thought it’s just different people. (agf15)

They are starting to acknowledge their own feeling toward Japanese by having concrete experience such as bowing.

Understanding other culture is good thing, because it’s fun to do different things. (agm2)

I love kanji, specially I love 駅 (eki – station) (agf12)

I feel like I can do something special. (agm2)

By learning different language and expressing themselves by using the different language, they are starting to feel very good about themselves.

It appears that the Japanese language learning experiences provide them an occasion to reflect themselves to Japanese. The experience provides them with the opportunity to observe their own feelings rather then the feelings always influenced by their parents, family or even the school philosophy. Key words used included:
• *relate* to (other culture)
• *became kinder* (toward other culture)
• *respect* (Japanese)
• *makes me think* (about other culture)
• *makes sense*
• *fun* to do (different things)
• *makes me feel* (special)

It is crucial to observe that this realisation was found by their own experience, rather than the reality was taught by the society they belong to.

The students from Group B said:

- We learn Japanese dancing. They dance differently. It was heaps *fun*. (bgf12)
- I talk to my family in Japanese sometimes, and I *feel good*. (bgf10)
- I know how to say things in Japanese, and other people don’t know, and I feel I’m *special* (bgf11)
- I can greet someone from Japan in Japanese; I couldn’t do that when we had visitors from Hong Kong.” (bgf13)
- You *can understand* Japanese people. (bgm7)
- It’s *amazing* how they can write. (bgm9)

Observing the language used while talking about their feelings about other cultures and the Japanese language learning experience, Group B’s feelings about ‘other’ as culture were expressed differently when they talked about Japanese activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other culture</th>
<th>Japanese language learning experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weird</td>
<td>fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strange</td>
<td>feel good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t want</td>
<td>special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t like</td>
<td>can understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>amazing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observing their comments on ‘belonging’, they did not feel that they belonged to Japan except one student. This indicates that they identified Japan as other. However, they utter unfamiliar sounds, write totally different scripts to their own, dance differently. The students felt weird initially, then get used to, finally they realised that the experience was fun, that it made them feel good about being able to do so.

It seems these positive experiences helped to soften the hard shell that surrounded self for the Group A and to soften the hard shell bounding the ‘other’ for the Group B, hence a lessening of the boundary affect as illustrated in Figure 5.2.

**Figure 5.2: Sense of self and other where boundaries are softened**

5.2.4 Interculturality

It seems from the above description of the student interviews, that interculturality can be illustrated through observations and analysis of student perceptions and beliefs about self and other. When learning Japanese language, it seems that these young primary school students were provided a situation where they could reflect their own view in relation to Japanese. For example, they learned to bow when they said thank you in Japanese. They giggled when they first did this action, but found out why the Japanese people bow by reflecting on their own way of saying thank you. Then they come to understand there are many different ways to express sincerity. After that, they do not giggle when they see someone bow, because their interpretation of someone who bows changed from the foreignness.
of ‘other’ to something that they could relate to in their own behaviour. Interculturality seems to be felt and expressed through the diverse beliefs that the students held toward otherness, and then subtly changes through the language learning experiences.

It is crucial to note that the perception of bowing which was expressed as giggling was a reflection of their self identity previously nurtured by their family and society where they live. The new insight toward the bowing is the students’ own discovery. This discovery was possible as the boundary became lighter, or softer.

Although the students from Group A were brought up within a multicultural environment, their self identity appears quite defensive, because they surround themselves with a strong cultural boundary. Their identification of self appears clear and strong. As both the school and the family encourage them to keep their cultural tradition, they appear to be very proud of themselves. This is a valuable aspect for them on the one hand, but it is very strong and it seems to repel other cultures other than their own in terms of their self identification. Therefore, when observing their interrelationships with others, although they showed acceptance toward others, they are not connected to others. Nevertheless, it seems that the Japanese language class provided the students a focus to examine their cultural encounters with others. This seems to assist them consciously to view other culture specifically, rather than viewing cultural diversity vaguely. It assisted them to reflect how they actually think about their own culture as well as Japanese. This reflection leads them to lighten the boundary as illustrated in Figure 5-3.

Figure 5-3: Group A experience of interculturality
The students from the Group B showed their sense of self identity in vaguer terms compared to Group A. Instead, their identification with other sometimes appears negative, and thickens the boundary around the other. It seems those positive feelings toward the Japanese language and culture helped soften the boundary while they were in Japanese classes and participating in Japanese activities, hence a lessening of the boundary affect as shown in Figure 5.2.

The students from Group B are, contrary to Group A, mostly from mainstream Australian family backgrounds as seen in Table 5.3 below. Also, the school community is formed by the mainstream Australian population. It is interesting to observe that student bgm4 said that his father is Macedonian, but it means nothing, and bgm1 said that his father is an Australian although he is from Germany. On the contrary agm7 whose father is from Israel said that he belongs to Israel, and agf12 whose mother is Greek said she is a Greek. The students’ bgm1, bgm4 and agm7, mothers are Australians, and agf12’s father is an Australian.

Group B have very little encounter with different culture. Within this environment, the Japanese language class provided the students positive experiences of other culture, which helped softening the boundary as illustrated in Figure 5-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ background</th>
<th>Group A (15)</th>
<th>Group B (15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both Australian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Australian &amp; one English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Australian &amp; one from ethnic background</td>
<td>2 (Israel &amp; Greece)</td>
<td>2 (Germany, Macedonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both ethnic background</td>
<td>9 (Poland, Turkey, Japan, Greece, South Korea, Croatia, Rumania)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This softening effect assisted them to gain a broader perspective toward otherness. Although the Group B did not articulate their self-identity as clearly as they articulated their perception of otherness, when they encountered Japanese learning, their feeling clearly changed from a sense of ‘weird’ to one of ‘fun’. This change seems to be a sign of early development of interculturality.

**5.3 High school students**

In this section five students from a regional private high school were interviewed in order to make comparison between the primary students who had had a brief encounter with Japanese language and adolescent students who had been learning Japanese for several years. The school is co-educational and based on a Christian philosophy. The family backgrounds of the students in this school are fairly diverse, including both Australian-born families and more recent migrants from Europe and Asia and a few from South America. The socioeconomic status of most families is middle to upper middle class. The students who were interviewed are described in Table 5.4.
Table 5-4: High school students’ backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Gender/age</th>
<th>Parents’ background</th>
<th>Japanese in-country experience</th>
<th>When started Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Male / 16</td>
<td>Australian / Australian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Male / 16</td>
<td>Australian / Australian</td>
<td>2 weeks school excursion</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Female / 17</td>
<td>English/English</td>
<td>2 weeks school excursion</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Female / 16</td>
<td>English / Scottish</td>
<td>2 weeks school excursion</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Female / 18</td>
<td>Italian /Italian</td>
<td>2 weeks school excursion x 2</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1 How did they identify themselves?

The two boys, B1 and B2, are in Year 10. B1 started his Japanese study when he was in Year 2 and B2 was in Year 5. They chose Japanese as one of their elective subjects. They both said their parents are Australian. Of the three girls, G1 and G2 are from Year 11, and both of them started Japanese studies when they were in kindergarten. G1’s parents and G2’s mother were from England and G2’s father was from Scotland. G3 is from Year 12, and she started her Japanese studies when she was in Year 2. She was born in Australia, but both her parents were from Italy. G1, G2 and G3 chose Japanese as one of their HSC subjects. All of the students had progressed in this same school from primary school to high school, which had provided Japanese to the primary school students and continues to do so.

While the primary students from Group A and Group B showed that they had created a boundary between self and others by identifying differences in cultural identity, the high school students’ perception of boundary seemed to reflect more their adolescent sense of self as a high school student than of self as culturally defined. Their responses indicated they felt they lived a confident, comfortable life in self. The students’ identity seems to be defined primarily by this firm
comfort zone. Although the students do not seem to mark a boundary around those seen as other, the comfort zone surrounds the self firmly.

All the students identify themselves as Australian. The following are some of the students’ comments. B1 is proud of being an Australian. He sets himself into a stereotypical image of an Australian male, and placed himself in a privileged position in his perspective.

I am part of the great southern land; the guy with the bush hat on and it just separates me from other parts of the world like America and when I go on the Internet and I talk to people from America I’m mainly known as the Australian person and it’s definitely something that I hold and it’s something that I love because I love this country. (B1)

B2 shows a similar identification of self and belief in his country

…everybody loves us and you know it’s just being really lucky to be in a country like this where there isn’t great poverty and there’s social security and medical benefits and all that stuff. (B2)

G3 also shows her faith in the country, and she believes she is Australian.

I think I am Australian, but I am from an Italian background. My first language was Italian until about 5. But sometimes I think more than others (that I am Australian). I think it’s more to do with whether you agree with things that government does, or that kind of thing. A lot of time I feel I am Australian. (G3)

G1 also easily identifies herself as an Australian.

Even though like my grandparents have relatives in Scotland and England and wherever else, I still think of myself as Australian because they are Australian and my parents are Australian and this is where I have lived my whole life. (G1)

It is interesting to see how confident the students are about their Australian identity. Their beliefs clearly reflect their place in Australian society. They were brought up to trust in their Australianness, and nothing has occurred to detract from that comfortable space. It is also interesting that, the reasons the students nominate why they like to be an Australian tend to be based on other people’s estimate of the positive characteristics of the country. Another point to note is the
students’ naive belief that poverty and hardship are not present in Australia. Their comfort zone is a socioeconomic one as well, where they have not experienced for themselves a need for social security or in any way associated directly with poverty.

The students expressed their opinion confidently, with an assurance coming from their wider experience beyond Australia through travel. G3 compared ‘we’ and ‘they’.

I think I know people who haven’t been overseas, and they don’t understand what we are like compared to the rest of the world. I think only by understanding other countries and other culture traditions and languages that you can understand your own well enough. (G3)

G2 also compared herself with people who have not been to another country.

I think you can study history, and you can study economics, you can study about all kind of countries. But if haven’t been there, you are not intimate with that, you don’t really understand it. (G2)

They recognise their self by comparing with others who are less privileged than they are. They are surrounded by a comfort zone, protected by the school, family, friends who they can fully rely on. Giddens, (1991, p188) uses a term ‘the protective cocoon’, and discusses ‘trust’ as basic to this ‘protective cocoon’ which stands guard over the self in its dealings with everyday reality. He discusses how available information is reduced via routinised attitudes which exclude, or reinterpret, potentially disturbing knowledge. From a negative point of view, such closure might be regarded as prejudice, the refusal seriously to entertain views and ideas divergent from those an individual already holds.

It seems their comfort zone gets firmer through their schooling. As Wexler (1992) argues, students’ attempts to assert a self and to have this self image be recognized and valued by others is what life is all about in high school. Because the students need to gain the recognition of others within their life circuit, they try to avoid dissonance in their school life, and that can be a reason why the comfort zone becomes firmer. Such a comfort zone becomes increasingly important to them as their social networks become significant to their future career decisions.
is the beginning of their utilisation of their social capital. The dissonance could be caused by failing to meet the expectations of school and family. This could create a tension between self and other or between different aspects of the self in favour of an opposition where one side is devalued and the other is idealised.

5.3.2 How did they identify culture of ‘other’?

The five high school students discussed their understandings about other cultures.

…they have probably got other cultures that they wish to uphold and that’s their right. But that’s sort of part of what Australia is because it is a multicultural country. So Australia really can be defined by many different things and many different cultures. (B1)

if someone wears a scarf over their head or just has a different way of speaking I don’t mind at all. (G2)

I think anybody who comes here and gets citizenship can call themselves Australian rightfully whether they were born here or they’ve come here to emigrate. I think they have that right and I think they’re Australian. (B2)

These students’ attitudes towards immigrants corresponds to the average Australian Year 9 students according to the results of research conducted in Australia. As discussed in Chapter 3, according to a survey conducted in 2002 by IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) a quarter of the young people of Australia are not prepared to tolerate this kind of difference. A total ‘agree’ category has 89 per cent of students supporting the proposition that ‘Immigrants’ children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have’. However, the percentage who agree with the proposition that immigrants should have the opportunity to continue speaking their own language drops, with fewer than three quarters of the survey respondents indicating support, and 27 per cent disagreeing. Almost one quarter of them believe immigrants should not have the opportunity to continue their own customs and lifestyles. This data provides an interesting perspective on the publicly espoused multi-cultural, non-assimilationist policies all Australian governments have followed for decades (Mellor, Kennedy and Greenwood, 2002:92).
However, the students’ opinions on the other cultures sound derogatory. They showed an attitude of tolerance toward other cultures, but little inclination to show acceptance as comparable to or equal to their own position. There is a tone of superiority of ‘tolerating’ rather than accepting. This reflects the Howard government approach, and points to an attitude reflecting their sense of security from being within the comfort zone of the dominant group. They are protected by the hard comfort zone. They appear to reflect a gap between those who are privileged and those who are underprivileged. For example. B1 says ‘they have probably got other cultures’, and goes on to say that keeping their own culture as ‘their right’.

The following G1’s comment also shows this sense of tolerating rather than accepting.

that’s part of their religious beliefs and I have nothing against people who wish to do that; that’s quite acceptable and they can still call themselves Australian. That’s what you get for being, living and being part of a multicultural society and you have to be able to accept that and understand that. (G1)

G2’s acceptance is almost by force.

You might not agree with it but you have to be able to accept and understand and allow that to happen. (G2)

B2’s comment could be taken as arrogant, where he speculates that ‘they’ might feel ashamed to keep their way of dressing.

If someone comes over here and they have a different way of dressing, they should have every right to do that and to do that if they want to without shame. (B2)

They identify other cultures with acceptance, but the acceptance can be interpreted as coming from a distanced dominant position.

5.3.3 Japanese language learning

The responses of the high school students seem to indicate that that Japanese language learning is facilitating their self development. As shown above, they do
not notice much dissonance by seeing otherness, because they are within their secure comfort zone. Although they still see others from a distance, the learning experience is assisting them in coming out of their comfort zone, opening up the comfort zone to contemplate otherness from a new perspective.

(learning Japanese) presents a difficulty, they put you out of your comfort zone… just like hammering at your confidence. I mean you grow up with English, it’s just so easy. Whereas when you are sitting down and trying not to speak the way you’ve been taught to speak, to write differently, to sometimes even act differently, so it’s different, yeah and it puts you out of that comfort zone that you are always in, so, like it’s so easy just to stay in and say no I don’t want to do that, I don’t want to open myself up to that. (B1)

learning language is a constant challenge. You’ve got to keep on going, keep on going. Learn new words and just build upon, everything (G1)

They were beginning to observe themselves differently to when they were within their comfort zone. When they are in the comfort zone, they do not notice things, because everything is settled and seems natural and nothing sticks out. Also, they are experiencing being in a weaker position, an underprivileged position where they must keep their patience as they cannot express themselves as freely as they can in English when they are in the language class. Besides, they are getting to know that their normative ways do not work in Japanese language and its cultural environment.

Although they still see others from their privileged position, the position between Japanese and their self seems closer. G2 expressed how she was getting the humble feeling.

I feel rude when I find (I don't understand them/Japanese). Sort of uncomfortable and rude at the same time. (G2)

G3’s comment suggests that learning Japanese is making a difference to the way she sees herself in comparison to students who are not learning Japanese. It is providing her with new confidence.

Probably, initially I was pretty scared if I could do it or not. But then feeling very satisfied that I could do something very different. And I think that continues like up until now. It’s still a really good feeling that you can do something that’s really different to our own. Because when you
learn French or a language like that, it’s still very similar, like based in Latin and that kind of thing. When you get to learn a language that’s got completely different characters, completely different structures and that kind of thing, then that’s definitely satisfying. (G3)

The high school students’ identification of their sense of self and other are also illustrated in two circles, self and other. However, unlike the illustration of the primary school students, their self can be depicted as on a higher level that their sense of other, rather than placed in a equal position as shown in Figure 5-5.

They are within a hard shell of the comfort zone. They are accepting other culture, but there is gap between their self and other.

**Figure 5-5: High school students’ perception of self and other**

![Diagram](image)

Japanese language learning worked as a hammering effect, so aptly described by B1, from inside the shell and provoked self-realisation by a weakening the hard comfort zone shell as illustrated in Figure5-6.

**Figure 5-6: High school students’ development of interculturality**
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They are beginning to have conscious/concrete recognition of others.

…by learning a language you are opening yourself up to a different culture and then I think by doing that you become more accepting of other cultures. (B1)

“Once I’ve learnt Japanese if I decide to do another language I would definitely be very interested because of the experience I’ve had with the Japanese language. I’d be definitely willing to learn another language.” (G2)

The Japanese language learning experiences seem powerfully influential as having that hammering effect from inside of their self, making a crucial contribution to crack the hard comfort zone from their own experience rather than from outside social learning as seen below in Figure 5-7.

**Figure 5-7: Japanese language learning experience as a gentle hammering effect from inside**

The hard shell has cracked, and made space for circulation between the self and others. Because this circulation is possible, they are ready to see themselves in relation to others, ready for exploration of self and other.

**G3’s case**

Observing G3’s comments, it seems she also experienced a gentle hammering effect like other students. However, her comments also showed her more complex feeling toward her self identity. Although she identified herself as an Australian, G3 likes to call herself a global citizen rather than being just an
Australian or Italian.

I am a global citizen rather than a citizen of one country. (G3)

G3 also commented that identity should be determined by an individual rather than by social recognition.

I think it depends on the person whether or not you want to be an Australian. (G3)

She sees conflicts amongst others.

… it's a bit of a contradiction, as specially because the world is more globalised and globalisation and that kind of thing, but people are actually thinking smaller. I think specially here, like just things are happening like terrorism, and the government that we have as well they are really conservative, and kind of appeal to one part of the population only. (G3)

She thinks that learning Japanese assisted her to develop empathy and acceptance.

… going on exchange, learning about a different culture makes you see that we are all human, and we are, even though different background and that, we are all human and we have kind of same basic needs even though we have our differences. That makes me think about like refugees situation, helps you to empathise with things going on different part of the world in stead of a lot of people who think oh well, it’s not in my country, so who cares, you know.

Makes me more open minded, definitely accepting different things and different cultures even different religions. It’s (Japan) all different to here, and that just gives you a different dimension on things like you don’t think about, you know. A lot of people now talk about Islam and you are more willing to accept the difference, I think by learning the language.

While she thinks she has grown in her acceptance, she does not sound accepting to students who do not study a language. She rather sounds judgemental.

Students that do languages are generally more intellectual. They are usually better thinkers and they are able to take a challenge. Whereas students who don’t do a subject like a language tend to always want to take the easy way out of things. Because languages present a difficulty.
She also compared the students who went to overseas and who have not, and made a judgment.

I think you can study history, and you can study economics, you can study about all kind of countries. But if you haven’t been there, you are not intimate with that, you don’t really understand it (the other culture).

G3 thinks others are bouncing back from the boundary created to divide each other rather than being interrelated, but she thinks that she has learnt acceptance and empathy. Figure 5.8 illustrates G3’s position.

G3 seems to be indicating that her Japanese language learning has changed even her way of thinking, yet she indicates Japanese language as just one of the subjects at school.

My first language was Italian before I learnt anything or any other language. I can still that, you think you are always being connected with the language, but I don’t know that with Japanese. I don’t know how I feel after finishing HSC I probably continue to university. Because it’s really just a subject you do at school. (G3)

Figure 5-8: G3’s development of acceptance and empathy

Although G3 imagines herself as an openminded, empathetic person, she seems still self centred rather than reflecting herself in relation to others. After the beginnings of her development towards a sense of interculturality through a hammering effect, she has yet to develop in herself a genuine interrelation with others. However, it is encouraging to see how her flexibility is developing, moving and changing the shape of her comfort zone based on her own inner experience as illustrated in Figure 5-9.
**G2’s case**

G2 had a different understanding of Japan and its culture before starting her Japanese studies because of her grandparents’ influence. It was not her wish or her parents wish for her to learn Japanese. It was the primary school that chose Japanese language for a LOTE curriculum, and she started her Japanese learning at the kindergarten. She was a little worried about her grandparents’ reaction when she decided to go to Japan on a school excursion, because she knew that her grandparents had a long-held prejudice against Japan and Japanese people.

…”my granddad was in World War Two, so it influenced the way I thought about that. My grandma was the same age as granddad. She really doesn’t like Japan and the Japanese people because of the war ….and she really didn’t want me to go to Japan. But, I think the people are really nice and I think it's a very pretty place as well. (G2)

…”I actually bought them souvenirs which they didn’t like because my granddad, he was really lovely and he just accepted that it was war and it was a different sort of thing. My grandma has tried, but I don’t think she fully accepts that it has changed now. (G2)

Figure 5.10 illustrates G2’s shift in her relationship between herself and Japan.

As she mentioned, she had her grandfather’s influence toward how she felt about Japan and Japanese people, and it was a negative. Her actual/concrete experience in learning Japanese language and visiting Japan allowed her to form her own evaluation of Japan. Also she believes that she helped her grandparents’ way of thinking about Japan to change.
Figure 5-10: G2’s shift in a relationship between her self and Japan

G2’s comfort zone was cracked by the hammering effect that impacted on her Japanese language learning experience as it did for the other students. Also the hard boundary that surrounded her concept of Japan, which was initially formed by her grandparents influence, had softened after the experience.

5.3.4 Reflection on Japanese learning in primary school

The high school students reflected upon their earlier learning experiences during their primary school studies. They were asked to recall anything at all, guided by general questions such as those asked of students in Groups A and B. Although these responses cannot be compared directly with those of the current primary school students, given that language curriculum approaches vary, and the high school students are remembering back several years, the interviews provided useful information. There were some insights gained by both the researcher and the students themselves as they compared their own journey of language learning. Their replies revealed their changing attitudes, perceptions and emotional responses to their experience.

One of the common areas the students discussed was writing in Hiragana. The students said that in primary school they remembered feeling strange writing in Hiragana when they started. However, the primary school teacher, who was the same for all five students at the time made it as an enjoyable activity.

When I first learnt Hiragana I came to school and I had never learnt another language before and I found it very strange. But Ms H basically

---

Hiragana is one of three main systems of writing Japanese characters.
started on one, two, three… and the Hiragana and basically it was just memorising that and so the language at first is really easy to learn, and she made it so enjoyable. It was fun. (B1)

The students recalled feeling worried at the beginning of the learning, because the language was very different to what they used to read, write, speak and listen. At the same time, the language attracted them because it was different.

When I first started learning I didn’t really, I was just sort of thrown into it. So I kind of had a bit of apprehension to it but once I started Hiragana I sort of really opened up to it. (B2)

Every character in Japanese is like Art. I liked it. It was so different. (G3)

However, they reported that they felt less anxious and more confident once they started to learn the language. Knowing the language made them feel that they were special, because other people did not know it. They recalled their feelings of being more open to Japanese, a sign that their ‘hard shell’ of the otherness of Japanese was softening.

I liked doing it because people would say oh how can you read it or how can you write it like how do you know what it says but you’ve learnt it so you can say well I do know what it says. It gives you more confidence. (G1)

The students’ feelings towards the Japanese learning experiences shifted from ‘strange’ and ‘worried’, to ‘fun’ while they were in the primary school. Their feeling further swung from there to ‘challenging’ during the high school. Also it should be noticed that all the students made comments about their teacher that she made the class fun.

I think when I was trying at primary school I was taught by a teacher who was enthusiastic, and she made lessons fun. It’s like it was just fun to learn something that was really different. (G3)

The students feeling towards Japanese language learning changed from strange, to
fun, to challenging. It is interesting to speculate on the degree of influence the teacher and the teaching styles had on student attitudes. In the next chapter, interviews with the teachers helped to illuminate, though not answer this issue. A larger study, possibly a longitudinal study, would be useful to explore these issues further. However, this thesis is purposively limited to exploring student perceptions of interculturality development. In the case of the high school students, it seems that the shift in attitude was enhanced by the teachers’ own positive attitude. In the final chapter of this thesis, some further discussion surrounds the degree to which that the teachers approach may influence the students feeling towards their language learning experiences.

Table 5: Comparisons between primary school and high school experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary experiences</th>
<th>High school experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strange &amp; Worried</td>
<td>Fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because:-</td>
<td>Fun because:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Never learnt</td>
<td>- The teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>another language</td>
<td>made things fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>- Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese characters are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging because:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Different to English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Languages present a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feel I am rude when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don’t understand the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cannot say things the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>way they say in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.5 Japanese in-country experience

Four of the five high school students interviewed had Japanese in-country experience during their high school years. While they were physically in Japan, they noticed differences between their Australian life and Japanese culture in much more concrete ways than merely learning in the Australian classroom

You just notice things more. (B2)

And it’s different if you go to somewhere like England like you don’t notice it as much but seeing it’s an Asian country it’s very different, even the food we eat is very different. (G2)

The noticing provoked the comfort zone.
...When we were in Japan it was a massive shock; quite a lot of us just couldn’t believe how different it was. It wasn’t better or worse it was just different a lot of things like Japan is so big compared to Australia, like in size Australia is a lot bigger than Japan but the cities are huge. If you look at Tokyo which must be at least ten times the size of Sydney (G2)

...like building wise, massive buildings they sort of just, that freaked me out because I’ve lived in a small town and there’s not many buildings there and I’m not used to them. I don’t really like a lot of buildings and when I went there though it was, that disturbed me a little bit but it didn’t sort of put me off at all. ... When you just talk to people, the people were so nice over there and it was just, because not all people are nice here. The people in Japan went out of their way to help you which was really different I guess. We have that here as well but the culture, the change in culture and how things were done it was a bit of a shock. (B2)

They negotiated within themselves.

At first I was a bit sort of wondering like how it all worked and stuff but the other thing I had a problem with and in the end I didn’t, was communal bathing, that was the only thing. (G1)

Japanese people generally restricted expressing themselves. Like at school, all the girls were the same, how to wear make up, wear a short skirt, and things like that. They didn’t, not one ever said was what they thought. No one ever was different. They don’t like to be out of a group. It is like that too here to some extent, but not to the degree that it was. I guess that was hard to adapt. (G3)

They also experienced being silenced.

... Probably harder (to live in Japan) even if I had perfect language skill. But because I didn’t, I was quiet a lot of time. (G2)

When they were in Japan they noticed, compared, observed, negotiated and they reported that they finally found solutions for themselves for dealing with Japanese culture.

When they were in Japan they:-

noticed (because it’s so different) ➔ compared with their own ➔

observed their own/how they feel ➔ negotiated within themselves / sifting ➔ found what they wanted to do.
5.3.6 Development of Interculturality

As described earlier with the primary school students, language learning had the hammering effect on the comfort zone which surrounded their self, because of the activities undertaken in the classes:

- writing different letters – more like creative arts than writing
- speaking differently
- sometimes acting differently (bowing etc)
- hearing unfamiliar language spoken, or seeing unfamiliar writing,
- learning different ways of language construction and different language rules (spoken & unspoken)
- confidence diminished because of the things they could do in English, they could not do in Japanese. eg, making a joke

They hadn’t realised how much they took for granted and what they understood as ‘normal’ in English culture and how it differed from what was considered ‘normal’ in Japanese culture. It is crucial to note that this realisation was done through their own reflection, within themselves, rather than being explicitly taught.

It seems that the safe environment was constructed while learning the language at primary school, and this foundation assisted them towards positive realisation of differences, now they are in high school, rather than negative.

This was reinforced when they were in Japan. They
- noticed, because things were so different
- compared their own with the Japanese
- observed their own/how they feel
- negotiated within themselves, therefore their feeling/position shifted
- found what they wanted to do.

These students’ reflections on in-country experience resonate with the pathway for developing intercultural competence that Liddicoat, Papademetre, et al (2003) have researched. They indicate a non-linear process of acquisition of intercultural competence. The process includes Input, Noticing, Reflection, Output, Noticing,
Reflection and Output (Liddicoat, Papademetre, et al., 2003:20). They stress that it is important to notice a difference in the input to reflect on the nature of the difference and to decide how to respond to that difference. The students indicated they also went through the first four points of the process, Input, Noticing, Reflection and Output, and found what they wanted to do, rather than compromise themselves by mimicking what Japanese people expected them to do. It is interesting to note that Liddicoat, Papademetre, et al. (2003:20) point out the end-point of this cultural practice is an intermediate intercultural ‘third place’ that may be evident of less ‘native-like’ practice. They also point out that this is the result of ongoing intercultural development, and it is the result of progression in learning.

The high school students utilised their Japanese learning experiences to prepare themselves for substantial intercultural interaction between their self and others. This real interaction becomes more visible with the older students, compared with Groups A and B of the primary school cohort, because their hard cocoon has cracked, and made space for ‘circulation’ between the self and others. They indicated through their reflections that they were ready to see themselves more clearly and less culturally confined in relation to others, ready for exploration of self and other. This process seems important to the development of the students’ truly democratic attitude. On the other hand, it was also evident that these particular high school students still live within their socioeconomic and culturally dominant comfort zone, the protective cocoon in Giddens’s term (1991) which supports them to maintain their ontological security. As long as they are within that comfort zone, they are in a privileged position, thus belonging to a dominant group that provides them security. Unless they are able to come out of that zone, the students cannot locate themselves on a level, or equal position with the other. This is to say, the students tolerate the other culture, but they do it from a distanced position of imagined superiority. The significant factor for the high school students was that their stated ‘challenging’ experience of language learning provided them with opportunities to find their own voice, and assisted the students to come away from their assumptions of the dominant norm.
The small comparative study of these high school students became an important step of my research into the development of interculturality. From the data, it emerged that the primary school Japanese language learning experience was a crucial foundation of interculturality for the high school students. To hammer the comfort zone, the protective cocoon, means the gradual breaking down of the trusted security, a breaking down that comes from within. It is possible that without building the safe learning environment during their primary experience, the hammering effect may not occur so positively. It should be noted that the Liddicoat (2002) study indicates the acquisition of intercultural development is progressive, but not staged. It needs a longitudinal study with one group of the same participants from the primary to the high school to clarify whether it is staged development. However, it seems the primary foundation study provided a valuable foundation for the students to prepare themselves to progress to a higher stage of their intercultural development within the Japanese language-learning environment.

5.4 University students

As a continuing exploration in this research of the ways in which students experience Japanese studies, my study moved from high school students to the university. In this way, I anticipated there may be further changes to students’ awareness of interculturality, and thus to their concepts of self, identity, and ‘other’. My work entered a new phase of the grounded theory approach. Given that it was not possible to undertake a longitudinal study in the time available for a doctoral study, the aim of conducting interviews at the higher education level were to trace students’ analytical view of their experience of Japanese studies over time. This section examines the students’ own evaluation of the impact on their self-development by taking Japanese studies.

Five university students who were majoring in Japanese were chosen as the participants. Each of these five started their Japanese studies when they were at a school, and have continued the studies at a university level. There were four females and one male who agreed to be interviewed. Four of the students were
enrolled in a combined degree in Arts and another discipline, including Law, Commerce and Science (See Table 5.6.).

**Table 5-6: Profile of university students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Gender/age</th>
<th>Major studies</th>
<th>Parents’ background</th>
<th>Japanese in-country experience</th>
<th>When started Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>2nd year Arts (Japanese)</td>
<td>Mauritius. Australian</td>
<td>2 weeks when she was Year10</td>
<td>Year5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>3rd year Law /Arts (Japanese)</td>
<td>Both Australian</td>
<td>3 weeks stayed with her host family as a part of the university’s Japanese studies.</td>
<td>Year6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>3rd year Commerce / Arts (Japanese)</td>
<td>England Australian</td>
<td>2 weeks when she was Year10. Also 3 weeks stayed with her host family as a part of the university’s Japanese studies.</td>
<td>Year6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>3rd year Law/Arts (Japanese)</td>
<td>Both Australian (The parents separated when she was little)</td>
<td>1 year studied at a Japanese high school when she was Year10</td>
<td>Year6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U5</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>2nd year Science/Arts (Japanese)</td>
<td>England Australian</td>
<td>6 months studied at a Japanese high school when he was Year10</td>
<td>Year5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4.1 How did they identify themselves (Sense of identity / Sense of belonging)**

Each of the students’ identification of their self was described through a recognition of their relationship with another culture, in this case Japanese.
Student U1 commented that when she was in Japan, she really grasped that she is an Australian.

I don’t know just, there are so many different customs in other countries that you don’t even think about, You realize when you are there (in Japan), just feels like you lied back in Australia. It’s so different from Japan. (U1)

U2 and U3 noticed that ‘the normal’ thing in Australia is not always ‘normal’ in Japan.

When we went somewhere when we were in Japan, I felt that, because we were just...I guess the way we looked as well... there are more things that I couldn’t really do over there. The normal things I used to do, couldn’t do every day. So I distinguished who you are. So I really felt I am Australian...you know, like…[not] eating while walking, talking in a train... things like that. (U2)

I am surrounded by I guess Australian culture. That’s why I’m saying I’m Australian. Because I’ve been brought up here, that’s why I’m Australian. What surrounds you forms who you are. (U3)

5.4.2 How they identify culture of ‘other’

The students spoke strongly against an “us and them” attitude.

…I don’t think George Bush has learnt another language…war and problems are based on difference. They are different to us and it’s like us vs them attitude. But if he did foreign language studies and that sort of thing, he would start to understand other people better, and start to realise that there are different ways to solve things.” (U3)

The students tended to acknowledge the differences they experienced quite easily, and at the same time, they seemed to have developed an attitude to search for interrelationships and explanations that the younger students had not yet developed.

When you go to another country you learn about another culture and you learn how other culture sees your own culture, and you get that more objective understanding. (U2)

If all Australians understood even a little bit about another country maybe they will be more understanding and accepting. (U4)
The students had strong opinions about the Australian government’s decisions made over the period of the Howard Government.

Probably if you ask any Australian person, they won’t know, they hardly know about any indigenous culture of Australia and about other cultures. About asylum seekers, that’s all based on us-them approach and they (the asylum seekers) are different so we cannot let them in, things like that. And also John Howard saying he doesn’t think gay people should be able to get married. (U3)

You should not be controlling people. The Detention centre is a wrong idea. (U2)

You can be fascinated with, like African culture and so on, but nothing is level with how I feel with Japanese culture and people. (U1)

5.4.3 Japanese language learning
The university students clarified their own reflections on their experiences with Japanese language learning. It seems that not only their language skills, but their insights into how they viewed others as well as their view of self became deeper while learning the language.

If you learn the language there is deeper and better understanding [of people], because you can understand different ways of expressing yourself [my emphasis]. (U3)

…we think what might be necessary [when dealing with Japanese people]. What I experienced about bowing is, they didn’t seem to have exactly correct way, and I’m open to other ways too [my emphasis]. (U2)

The students have gone beyond the confines of their own social world in Australia. Considering that their Australian society is a multicultural society, it is interesting to discover that the students’ indicated that going overseas or learning another language is necessary in order to experience the differences.

…Australia is just a small part of the world, and Japan is so dominant in the world as well, like a trading partner and things like that. I think for me it just opens up, opens my eyes up, to just realise that there’s not just one way of doing things [my emphasis]. Australian (sic) is just a small part. (U2)
[We need more experience]...because the world is coming closer, it’s not like it’s all segregated at all. Like Australian citizens don’t just include... OK you can have white skin... it’s for every one. It’s lots of people and I think if you don’t know a language or you haven’t been overseas, you don’t have real international experience, like **experiencing the differences** [my emphasis]. (U3)

All the students claimed that people in multicultural Australia do not seem to notice other cultures much at all.

...quite often lots of people don’t acknowledge that there are a lot of cultures in Australia. Lots of people don’t consider other customs or cultures… I think by learning another language, you learn to respect other people more. (U2)

Two of the students expressed the feeling of all those interviewed. They stated that they had learnt to think in other ways, not only one Australian way, by learning the other language.

I like people who have studied a language. People who haven’t had experience of different cultures seem to... because they haven’t considered, I don’t know...I think the typical Australian way of thinking is one way. (U3)

If everyone knows one foreign language and has one friend from a different culture like the Middle East, I think there will be less problems, because you realise that they are the same as us. (U4)

Their attitude to interrelate their own sense of self with Japanese culture was expanded to also interrelate with other cultures.

Learning Japanese made me more interested in learning other languages. (U4)

...makes you think what’s important or what is prioritised in different people’s lives. (U2)

There are a lot of people here who haven’t been exposed to different cultures. And they cannot ever think about how any cultures may work. (U1)
The students commented they learned to respect other people through learning the language.

Just because quite often lots of people don’t consider, like even there are a lot of cultures in Australia. Lots of people don’t consider other customs or cultures and things like that. I think learning other language you learn to respect[my emphasis] other people more. (U1)

If I hadn’t studied Japanese, I don’t think I would be as open as I am or accepting or, yes, I think, I don’t know. I think I guess I was brought up in a traditional kind of Australian way in one thing. Now I am studying Japanese I feel I’ve got a broad view of, just a way things can be, because it’s a such different culture as well. It does just broaden your mind. (U2)

The students also expressed the empathy that they developed by learning other language, and compared them with other people who only speak English.

If everyone speaks English, then you wouldn’t understand the empathy because you’ll be a bit of self-centred and expect a lot, but learning Japanese you become more humble[my emphasis]. (U3)

When you did not understand the word, you realise that you have weaknesses. When you are speaking in English you are more confident.(U4)

You become humble and you accept other people more easily, like I don’t only accept Japanese people more easily, but other cultures as well. (U2)

It’s more of a challenge than French or any languages. (U1)

They further expressed the differences between people who learnt the language and who did not.

Sometimes if you meet someone, and talk to them for a while. You sort of think, maybe they have learned languages or stayed in a foreign country. Just you feel it, I don’t know. I think that [those experiences] benefit a whole lot of people for sure. (U3)

If you do learn the language there is deeper and better understanding, because you can understand different ways of expressing yourself. Japanese people use a lot of umm *Aizuch*\(^7\), but Australians don't, and even if we are speaking the language that will be a misunderstanding if

\(^7\) The Japanese continuously use verbal as well as non-verbal signals, which is called *aizuchi*, and indicate that they are following what is being said.
you don’t use the *Aizuch*, and maybe she (another student) wouldn’t know that by her learning English. By me learning Japanese I would. (U2)

Through the language learning experiences, the students learnt how to interrelate their own life with the ‘other’. Initially, they felt there were many differences between Japanese and their own language and culture. After identifying the differences, they realised that difference can be a positive rather than a negative attribute.

We maybe Australian, Japanese may be Japanese, but we are really not that different, and through learning about different customs and speaking a different language, I think you become more accepting. (U3)

If everyone knows one language and has one friend in a different country like in Middle East, I think there will be less problem, because you realise that they are the same as us and they are doing things like they going to uni, or going to work and have family. (U2)

Even if it’s only one Australian and one Japanese who can communicate, that’s very important. (U4)

They noticed that they learnt about themselves while learning Japanese language. By learning a language, you’ll be learning other things as well, like our attitude[my emphasis]. We wouldn’t be selfish, we would try to understand. (U4)

From studying Japanese we become more accepting ourselves. And George Bush says ‘we are American..., this this etc.’ and you think, they just are not open to new concepts, or different ways of life and things like that. And through studying Japanese it stands out... but I don’t really know... I think you become a lot more accepting, just accepting how people feel... and differences too. (U3)

You realize that you have weaknesses. Like when you did not understand the word is. When you are speaking in English you are more confident. (U2)

It seems the students also found more connections among themselves and their fellow students through their Japanese language learning. They showed their ties with fellow students in the class.

Friends in Japanese class are broader minded and accepting of other people, and other friends are more red neck Hill Billy. (U4)
… if all of Australia understood even a little bit about another country maybe will be more understanding and accepting. Maybe those from another country wouldn’t be so aggressive either, and we wouldn’t be so aggressive and we could all get on happily. (U3)

5.4.4 Reflection on primary Japanese learning

Although all of the students expressed enjoyment toward their primary school Japanese language learning experiences, they reflected that their initial encounter with the language was different from only the enjoyment.

“Once I learnt a little bit more, I felt comfortable in writing Katakana and Hiragana. And other people couldn’t read it, so I felt like I had a special quality.” (U3)

I do remember we were giggling [my emphasis]. (U4)

When I first started Japanese, I thought ‘Oh No!’ (it was so different) (U2)

Naturally I am quite shy, and I wasn’t comfortable [my emphasis] in saying that I didn’t understand a word in Japanese, but gradually I melted into the environment. (U1)

It seems that they had to overcome the initial experience of the difference before their experiences became positive. However, their experience of the primary Japanese class remained as fun.

If you started young, you remember language was fun [my emphasis]. (U1, U2, U3, U4, U5)

I enjoyed being able to do something different, though initially I was scared. (U3)

Once I got passed initial difficulties, I started to enjoy it. (U 1, U2, U3, U5)

It seems that the initial feeling of different became a reason why they feel that they were special.

…different, not like German or French, completely different. other people couldn’t read it, so I felt like I had a special quality [my emphasis]. (U3)

The following feeling seems worked as a medium to develop the affects.
Table 5-7: The university students’ reflection on the Japanese learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The initial feeling</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Realization</th>
<th>Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable /weird</td>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>enjoy</td>
<td>Humble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasn’t interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giggling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.5 Japanese in-country experience

The students’ comments on the in-country language experience were very similar to those of the high school students’. They noticed things in Japan, and realised how they took things for granted.

It’s hard to describe. I just noticed when we went to Japan. How many things were different, just way of, even little things like the way what different things in polite and impolite in Japan. We don’t even realize. It’s sort of we take for granted. (U2)

…in Australia we express our opinion, can do our own things, things like that, but I felt over there was reserved. I can remember my host dad said to me you shouldn’t say that and you should sit. But in Australia we express our opinions and who you are and things like that. Whereas in Japan, oh, it’s better sometimes just be quiet and a little bit withdrawn, which to me it’s not an issue. It’s OK. It’s just different. (U1)

They compared and felt it was very different, but also found something similar.

The food was different, the language was different, but everyday life seemed pretty much the same. (U3)

While immersed in the different culture, they discovered their own culture as well.

When we go somewhere when we were in Japan. I felt that, because we were just, I guess the way we looked as well, there are more things that I couldn’t really do over there. The normal things I used to do, couldn’t do every day. So I distinguished who you are. So I really felt I am Australian. (eating while walking, talking in a train, things like that). (U1)

The students experience in Japan seems identical to the high school students’ experience in Japan, going through a path;

- noticed, because things were different
- compared their own with the Japanese
- observed their own/ how they felt
- negotiated within themselves, therefore their feeling/position shifted
- found what they wanted to do

However, the university students expressed the final point, found what they wanted to do, with more consideration to what the Japanese people might feel from what they do/say. As discussed in earlier section of this chapter, Liddicoat’s identification of the pathway for developing intercultural competence is cyclical, and it starts with Input, Noticing, Reflection, Output, Noticing, Reflection and going back to Output. An interesting comparison can be made at this point. Whereas the high school students, indicated that they went through a similar path to Liddicoat’s pathway up to Output, the university students went on to notice and reflect on Japanese people’s feeling, a process that was not clear from the high school students.

**The emerging themes as a result of the Japanese language learning experience are**-

- feeling empathy to others
- crossing boundaries between us & them
- developing affection toward the language and culture
- being accepting towards other peoples view points
- developing confidence by being able to do something very different
- showing consideration towards other people and cultures.

### 5.4.6 Interculturality

To summarise the above, Japanese language learning experiences seem to provide them opportunities to reflect themselves and interrelate the reflection with others while they were experiencing the differences.

**Figure 5-11: The university students’ shift in identifying their self and other**
before and after Japanese language learning experience.

Initially they thought they and Japanese were different.

While learning Japanese language, they learn to feel empathy. Also they learnt different ways of dealing with Japanese.

They learnt to reflect themselves and interrelated with the other.

They found an attitude to observe their self as well as others with wider views.

Comparing this with the high school students experience in learning Japanese, the university students exhibited a calm and analytical attitude. This was opposed to the high school students’ ‘hammering the boundary’ attitude, which seemed to happen internally from the students’ self. The university students’ reflection on their language learning was indicated as a more reflective activity rather than the more robust effect shown by the high school students. Going through the long learning experience and in-country Japanese language experiences, it seems that the students gradually built a skill to analyse between their own self and other. While the students were reflecting upon their own self, they examined themselves. Their experience in both respect (respect toward others) and humility (humble
themselves) seems helped them to develop their self-identity in well balanced ways, not positioning themselves lower or higher toward others, and their self identity was visualised by themselves by comparing self and others gradually.

This is not to say that Japanese language learning experience was the only factor that is responsible of developing the skill. Figure 5-11 illustrates the students’ shift in identifying their self and other and the relationship between that shift and their Japanese language learning experience. Their self and other sit in their society; therefore it can be assumed that many different issues impacted on the students’ development of interculturality. The only focus of this investigation is on Japanese language learning experience, thus discussion of influence of other key issues that may have impacted the development of this skill is not a central subject in this study. However, comment such as ‘I talk to my family in Japanese sometimes, and I feel good’ by bgf10 suggests that the classroom experience might have been further fostered by other social factors. G2’s experience of how her grandparents influenced her feeling toward Japanese study is another example. Also, the following section of U4’s case suggests how the students’ other experiences fostered her Japanese language learning experiences.

Figure 5-12 illustrates an analytical self that the student gained through the Japanese language experience. This analytical self seems to be developed as both respect and humility from challenge (self fighting) that was shown in Figure 5-7 as ‘a gentle hammering effect’. It can be assumed that the student’s personal maturity as a university student also affected this development.

**Figure5- 12: An analytical self that they gained through the Japanese language experience**
Anthony Giddens (1991) argues that Self is not a passive entity, determined by external influences. In forging their self-identity, no matter how local their specific contexts of action, individuals contribute to and directly promote social influences that are global in their consequences and implications.

Today, impersonal experience seems meaningless and social complexity an unmanageable threat. By contrast, experience, which seems to tell about the self, to help define it, develop it or change it, has become an overwhelming concern. In an intimate society, all social phenomena, no matter how impersonal in structure, are converted into matters of personality in order to have a meaning. (Giddens, 1991:171)

The students’ analytical self developed by their external influences. It can be observed that one of the influences is their Japanese language learning experiences.

**U4’s case**

U4 links her Japanese language learning experience with her personal life experience.

My parents separated when I was very young, and they (her parents) had just two different opinions. And that’s partly why I feel that I can empathise and understand different culture, because there’s always two sides. I thought they (mum and dad) were both wrong. (U4)

As she grew, she came to understand they had just different opinions

there was always mum’s side of story and dad’s side of story, and nobody was wrong, but just two different opinions. (U4)

She now remembers what mum explained to her when she was resisting to her mum and dad.

Mum always said just remember there’s always two sides of story and story behind. There’s always more than what you see. (U4)

She has learnt to apply this experience to dealing with others.

I feel that I can empathise and understand different culture, because there’s always two sides. (U4)
U4’s Japanese in-country experience

U4 expressed that her parents’ separation influenced her way of learning Japanese.

Yes, definitely my parents’ separation helped me learning Japanese. Japanese language has its own reasons to be different to English, and English has its own ways. (U4)

Figure 5-13: U4’s development of interculturality

She rejected both her mum and dad

She came to accept both her mum and dad.

Dealing with her mum and dad, she has learnt to analyse things objectively – she said ‘there’s always different sides of a story.’
U4 analysed herself as an open minded person, and that assisted her to get herself in Japanese culture easily.

Well, it’s really strange, because everybody says that Japan is like a complete opposite in culture for Australia. But maybe I went there with broad mind when I got there everything seemed pretty normal. I don’t know if I went back now I probably notice the difference a bit more, but because I was younger, and really broad minded, there wasn’t much different. (U4)

Although U4 expressed that she did not feel different about Japanese culture when she had the in-country experience, she actually noticed the same points as the other students. However, she seems already knew that the difference that she noticed were the difference that everybody have, not only Japanese culture.

The food was different, the language was different and maybe people were more generous and kind maybe. But everyday life seemed pretty much the same. Maybe stigma was there because Japanese old culture like kimono, karate, judo, etc is really old culture, and that image you get when you go to Japan. That’s why people think it’s so different. But actually living there, the cloths are same now, the cars are the same and everything the same except some building are different style, but that’s not really cultural that’s environmental. (U4)

U4 appeared as a student who was self-taught about intercultural skills, and interestingly she learnt it from her parents’ separation case, then she enhanced the skill while learning the foreign language.

**U5’s case – very subjective being**

Comparing to U1, 2, 3, and 4, U5’s reflection on Japanese language learning and Japanese in-country learning experience shows different development.

He indicated that he had a negative feeling towards Asian countries.

My school didn’t have many Asians. Therefore, I was always interested to know, but I wasn’t fond of Asian countries at all. I don’t know the reason. (U5)

It seems while engaging with the fun activities with primary Japanese class, a boundary U5 created around Japan, one of the Asian countries, was softened.
With early years, the culture was festivities. That was always. OK today is a doll’s day. Doll’s day was twice interesting because that was also a girl’s day, and today’s its Green day. Just spontaneous, “Oh what we do tody?” It was fantastic. Dress up and games. Class was always excited about what we are doing this week. (U5)

Interaction between self and Japanese/Japan began.

I didn’t understand exactly why, but my attitude changed enormously. I have very special feeling towards Japan. (U5)

U5 was able to interrelate and apply the Japanese learning strategy to Biology study

...through character learning, writing, my learning structure changed a lot. (U5)

Biology is a lot of just vocabs, very similar learning, I do same way how I learnt Japanese. Same applications. (U5)

U5 talked about Japanese in-country experience

...comparison all the time. Daily things like when I came back from Japan a big comparison. (U5)

Everything what I did was control. I guess. I had more of OK. This is kind of way you go, what to do, you'll be home at certain time. Not that I didn’t like, I got on well with the family very well, and they are like my second family and feel very close. But also ways like “OK you finish school at this time, come home, and this week end we will do this, and we will do together or etc. Very different from Australian family. It’s free condition. (U5)

U1, U2, U3 and U4 indicated that they also compared, but they also negotiated within their self, and found something that suites both their comfort and the Japanese culture. In U5’s case, he controlled rather negotiated. Also it seemed that he was defending himself from others.

When I was in Japan, when they see a foreigner like me, we look like British, American and Australian. Saying that I’m Australian as a person saying I’m American especially in Japan, it’s important because they were against towards Americans. Questions I get asked, “Are you American”, and I will say “NO I'm Australian.” That’s very different to Japanese people. (U5)

U5 also acknowledged himself about his defensive attitude to others.
I’m always correcting my friend like ‘That’s not Japanese’ or ‘That’s not Chinese’ when my friends mix Japanese things and Chinese things. My attitude is pretty **defensive** [my emphasis]. (U5)

I’ll be very defensive when people refer Japanese things to Chinese. (U5)

The attitude reflects his opinion on immigrant people in Australia.

When foreigner comes I am very negative towards them, because I don’t feel as if they can contribute as much probably Japanese could do. (U5)

**Figure 5-14**: U5’s shift in identifying his self and Asia through the Japanese language learning experience

He did not like Asian countries and people.

The boundary toward Japan, an Asian country, softened, but other parts of Asia are still within a boundary.

He opened up himself to Japan, and the interaction started. However, Asia was left alone.
His close feeling towards Japan and Japanese people even support Japanese immigrant who wish to live in Australia.

If Japanese people come to Australia, and are kept in detention centre, I’ll be very very angry. I’ve got very biased toward Japanese, so for Japanese immigrants to come in and be detained, then I’ll be very anti…because I know what Japanese people could contribute to Australian society. I probably don’t know a whole other culture, that’s why I said I’m very biased. (U5)

Although U1, U2, U3 and U4 expressed their openness towards ‘other’, which they identified as learning through their Japanese language learning experience, U5 clearly denied that Japanese learning influenced his world views in general.

I sort of discovered I was attached to Japan. That’s completely separate [from my feelings about other cultures]. That’s (Japanese culture is) the only one I became fascinated with. (U5)

If Japanese people come to Australia, and are kept in detention centre, I’ll be very very angry. (U5)

Liddicoat, Papademetre, et al (2003:17) discuss the stages of ethnocentrism in Intercultural learning framework. They explain that the stages of ethnocentrism are; denial, defence, and minimisation. A learner who is at the stage of denial does not have alternative ways of perceiving the world beside his/her own perception. The defence stage includes a perception of ‘us’ and ‘them’ attitude. In minimisation stage, a learner minimises his/her understanding of cultural awareness and their characterisation of similarity is only based on their own cultural activities, but they do not recognise the problems that underlie cultural difference. U5 does not clearly fit in the stage of ethnocentrism in terms of his feeling and understanding in regard to Japanese culture. However, his appreciation and ability to operate with intercultural competence is limited to Japanese culture.
In this example, U5 has applied a language learning skill to his biology study.

5.4.7 **Summary of the university students’ group**

Three different sets of the students’ identification of self and others were found. One set includes the students, U1, U2, U3, and some of U4’s experiences, one set was unique to U4, and thirdly, U5 showed processes different from the other four students.

The set of U1, U2, U3 and U4 was very similar to Group B’s experience of interculturality. Initially, a strong boundary was found around others. While learning the Japanese language, this boundary became softened. Gradually, the communication between their self and other occurred. Eventually, however in the university students’ case, the students developed themselves to observe their self and others analytically.

In the case of U4, her analytical self also developed in the same way as U1, U2, and U3. However, she had experienced interculturality earlier than other students through her earlier social experience, her parents’ divorce case. Then Japanese language learning seems to have affirmed the development. Nonetheless, when she was in Japan, the initial impact of her Japanese in-country experience appeared as less obvious, less noticed, because of the social experience that she had been through earlier.
U5’s intercultural experience was limited to the Japanese culture, and he would not expand his experience to other cultures beside Japan, unlike the other students. A strong boundary was shown around his self as well as ‘other’ after experiencing Japanese study and positive in-country experiences. It seems the boundary became even stronger after his in-country experience.

5.5 Discussion and Conclusion

The result indicates that the language learning experience for the participating students became a medium, and provided the students with opportunities to negotiate and re-negotiate their self and others.

The process resulted in a softening effect between self and others for the primary school students. The primary school students’ identification of their self appeared to follow their family’s cultural background, and a clear boundary was observed between their self and others. Group A’s boundary was seen around their self as they possess a strong cultural background to express who they are in Australia. Group B’s boundary was placed around other as they found others’ cultural background strongly than their own family’s cultural background in Australia. The Japanese language learning experiences worked to make these boundaries softer.

For the high school students, a strong firm boundary was identified around their self. Unlike the primary students’ case, the boundary was found as a comfort zone rather than a cultural boundary. The Japanese experiences worked as a gentle hammering effect to crack the boundary within the boundary. The students wanted a reason to rethink who they are and what they do in an environment removed from their parental and school influence. It did not seem that the Japanese language experience crack the self boundary on its own, rather it appeared as an essential stimulus for this rethinking, negotiating their self, within the comfort zone, and other. Possibly they may have been searching for other within their self. The Japanese learning experience was only a tool, a hammer,
and the students used the hammer by themselves negotiating within themselves to crack the boundary.

The university students indicated a similar path to Group B’s, the primary school students, experience of interculturality when experiencing the Japanese language study earlier. Going through the longer period of Japanese experience, it seems the experience provided them with a focal point from which to better observe their self and others in relation to their self. In case of U4, she leant the observation skill through her parents’ separation, and expanded the skill to learn the language, and further, to observe things with a wider view.

In common with the primary school students, the high school students and the university students, the Japanese language learning experience seemed to provide an important factor to impact the boundary between their self and other. In the case of U5 it seems that the impact appears differently to other students, as it was only impacted between his self and Japan, but did not extend to others. It seems, U5 included Japan and Japanese culture within his comfort zone, but the boundary around him stayed hard, and even became harder. A clear difference between U5 and other students identified from the interview was his in-country experience. He controlled himself from Japan and Japanese culture rather than negotiated, and eventually he found a way to include Japan within his comfort zone by compromising himself with Japanese culture.

This chapter mapped the students’ identification of their sense of self and other, and investigated how their interculturality occurred and developed while learning Japanese language learning experiences. The two circles were depicted to illustrate their sense of self and other. It is important to note that the two circles were placed in the society where the students live. Therefore it has to be assumed that Japanese language learning is not the only element that impacted their interculturality. However the discussion in this chapter focused on the Japanese language learning as it is only factor that was investigated in this study.

In the following chapter, I will discuss the teachers’ viewpoints in regards to the language teaching, which includes new vision to culture teaching within the
language-teaching arena. Other key stake holder’s views are also discussed as it is crucial to draw a large picture of a primary school education to examine the language learning environment as a part of the school curriculum.
Chapter 6 Teachers and other stakeholders

6.1 Introduction
The new syllabus shows renewed emphasis on integrating language and culture, and its aim is beyond the goal of communicative proficiency in the sense that learners are encouraged to find a ‘…meeting place between different forces, different cultures and different worldviews’ (Board of Studies NSW, 2001:12). Educating language learners to develop the ability to create intercultural competency is one of the key goals for current development of Language Other Than English (LOTE) education in New South Wales. However, the question remains whether schools and their teachers are aware of how to incorporate this new development into ‘the big picture’ of language teaching. This chapter explores the responses of teachers and other stakeholders to these significant issues.

In Section 6.2 I discuss the interviews that I conducted with the three teachers who taught the primary school students in this research. The teacher identified as T3 also taught the high school students in the research. The interview data include the teachers’ perceptions of interculturality and language teaching. In the following section I report on the series of seminars that I attended regarding the introduction of the NSW draft syllabus for teaching languages in primary and secondary schools. The discussion in the last section focuses on the new objective in the syllabus, ‘moving between cultures’, which is the key to the development of interculturality, the focus of this study.

6.2 The teachers’ interviews
The interview process was set up to investigate the teachers’ perceptions and opinions about how to deal with the concept of culture in their language teaching. The questions were devised around the following four investigative areas:
• What do teachers believe that language teaching achieves?
• How do teachers understand culture in language teaching?
• How do teachers understand intercultural language learning?
• To what extent are teachers clear or unclear about what they are expected to do to with the new objective ‘moving between cultures’?

My intention was to find if there were gaps between the teachers’ understanding of intercultural competency and the current theories about culture in language teaching and intercultural language learning. I anticipated that this information might be a guide for assisting teachers in promoting intercultural language learning. In-depth and semi-structured interviews were conducted with three Japanese language teachers from three different primary schools.

Teacher 1 (T1) is from an independent international school where the Key Learning Area of Human Society and Its Environment (HSIE) is taught in foreign languages at the primary school. She teaches the group described in Chapter 5 as Class A. A language is taught from Kindergarten to Year 12. She is a Japanese native teacher who has been teaching at this school for 13 years.

Teacher 2 (T2) is from the public school in NSW where Class B was observed. She has more than 20 years experience as a primary school teacher. She learnt Japanese as a foreign language at TAFE for 3 years. She also attended an in-country intensive Japanese language teaching course in Japan for 2 months.

Teacher 3 (T3) is from an independent co-educational school where the school philosophy is based on the Christian faith. Japanese language has been taught from Kindergarten to Year 12. She teaches a Japanese subject to the high school student participants in this research. She also taught them when they were in the primary school. She is a Japanese native teacher who has 10 years experience of Japanese language teaching from Kindergarten to Year 12.

The three teachers displayed very different characteristics. T1 seems like driftwood, which still is floating on a sea of Japanese-teaching and struggling to find control of the waves. T2 is like mangrove, she stays in a dark secure water of
primary teaching, but does not move out from the comfort zone to try out the way it could be better for both herself and the children in terms of Japanese language teaching. T3 appeared as a solid big ship that cruises Japanese language-teaching field exultantly so far.

6.2.1 Teacher 1 (T1)
Teacher 1 teaches Human Society and Its Environment (HSIE) in Japanese for a Year 5 and 6 composite class, labelled in this research as Class A. It seems she understood what intercultural competence is, and how she can teach it as shown by the following comment.

Kids who know only the smell of their own house feel that other types of smells from another houses are dirty.

Kanji is different from the alphabet. It is visual, has meaning, many different readings and has radicals. While learning these, the kids learn to accept the differences naturally.

While saying this, it seems that she does not feel very positive about the new syllabus.

(new objectives) are a distortion in order to keep LOTE. Whenever LOTE declines in popularity, new ideas appear.

It seems that T1 could not find a linkage between the theory behind the new syllabus and what she is actually teaching in her Japanese classes.

Although T1 teaches at a school that values multiculturalism and foreign language teaching, T1 expressed her confusion about trying to teach a KLA of HSIE without having the depth of knowledge in the subject area. Her confidence in teaching Japanese seemed adversely affected by feeling cast adrift over this aspect of her work environment.

When you have a head of language who understands the difficulties a Japanese teacher would have when compared to teaching of European languages, it would be easier to attain realistic outcomes. If the next head of language doesn’t understand these differences, then it’s a headache.
T1 said that she felt pressure about teaching HSIE in Japanese. She said she does not feel she is teaching something pedagogically worthwhile.

At the moment the children love learning Japanese because it’s fun. I know that they are having fun, so I don’t want to make Japanese subject like Maths or English. I want to keep it as a fun subject. So I tend to do only simple things…realistically, I cannot do anything reasonable within their language level. So I have to use English a lot, but I am not supposed to.

It appears that T1 believed she had insufficient school support which in turn hindered her confidence to her teaching. From our interviews, it seems that T1 may need some support external to the school to assist her approach toward her teaching area of HSIE.

6.2.2 Teacher 2 (T2)

T2 has taught for more than 20 years at public schools in NSW. Of the three teachers interviewed, she was the only non-native Japanese speaker. She learnt Japanese at TAFE for 3 years, and went on to take an in-country Japanese language teaching course. She is currently teaching a Year 4 and 5 composite class, labelled in this research as Class B. I observed her Japanese class for one whole school term, and found she taught very well by utilising TV Japanese language teaching programs in her teaching to provide an authentic Japanese environment. When I asked why she used the TV program, she said,

They love the character ‘chibi’.
I can do other things while they watch TV.

T2 also invited Japanese students, who go to a university nearby, to her class, and got assistance from the students for her class, for example making origami.

The students visit us once a month, and teach origami, and do some Japanese activities together. They teach songs too, and the children love it.
I asked if the students assistance was helpful, and she said,

My Japanese is very poor. I have such a strong accent. It’s good if the children can talk to real Japanese people.

It did not seem that the learning experience at TAFE and attending the in-country language course helped her to gain confidence in teaching Japanese to her students. In my observation, she was using her Japanese skills efficiently, and taught the students in effective ways. That was evident when witnessing the ways the students respond to the TV characters’ questions and instructions for the audience.

It seemed that T2 has tried to expand her students’ Japanese experiences, while at the same time feeling inadequate to take on the full task of teaching Japanese. She seemed swamped by the requirements. That is the reason she gave for incorporating the TV program and the invitation of the Japanese students to her classroom.

Her class was always active and the children were well involved with the class learning activities. However, she said she was too busy with other teaching programs for her class to tackle new demands, and did not try to accommodate the new Japanese syllabus for her class.

I know we have the new syllabus…no time to read it carefully yet.

When I showed her one teaching program, which aimed to promote the student’s intercultural competency, she said:

No, it’s too difficult for them. They cannot read Hiragana. …I don’t want to make Japanese a difficult subject like Maths or English

This program was written for this class by reflecting on what the students did before. As I had been observing this class as part of Phase 1 of the research, it did not seem too difficult for the students in my view.

An episode from my field notes when I was collecting the data from T2’s class is an example of the teachers’ apparent confusion. While I was visiting the school, a
teacher at the staff room told me that her class was studying celebrations from different cultures. This was a part of the HSIE syllabus. I noticed that she was using the words ‘Turkish Christmas’ to explain the Muslim celebration of Ramadan to her third grade students. What the teacher was doing seems right if she was fulfilling the syllabus directive to ‘understand other cultures’, and assisting to develop the students’ ‘intercultural understanding’. However, the crucial failure in this case was the teachers’ unconscious attitude. She was labelling the celebration within her dominant norm of Christianity. Her vague understanding of the concepts such as ‘culture’ and ‘intercultural’ also showed her lack of ‘intercultural understanding’.

6.2.3 Teacher 3 (T3)

Language education is a personality builder. (T3)

Teacher 3 explained in the interview that she was initially confused about her teaching, but she can now articulate how to teach ‘moving between cultures’ in the new syllabus.

Although her school teaches Japanese from Kindergarten to Year 12, T3 felt that other staff members marginalised Japanese language teaching. She related an incident that occurred soon after she started teaching at this school.

When we made a paper lantern during the class, the head master from the primary school said to me that our school is a Christian school, and making lanterns is not appropriate.

She admitted that she herself did not feel that language teaching was worthwhile until she enrolled for a Graduate Diploma in Japanese language teaching, and then to a Master of Arts specialising in Linguistics.

I thought, because language teaching was on the decline, the theorists and language teachers were making a farfetched argument when I heard [them talk about] the importance of language teaching.
Once she gained theoretical knowledge after completing the two postgraduate courses, she was awakened to her real interest in teaching language. She clarified her view of teaching culture in her class.

[I] make them understand the differences, experience the different things, and make it enjoyable…As a teacher, I have to make sure that a positive impression of the experience has to stay with them after the experience…While constructing Japanese sentences, I try to give them the opportunity to think about the differences between English and Japanese.

It seems her self-esteem rose as she gained confidence in her teaching. Her assurance was demonstrated by the clarity with which she explained the direction teachers should take. For example, she commented that language teachers should do the following.

A teacher’s own interpretation of culture affects our teaching. We have to train ourselves to be objective, which means we have to know who we are, and always have to relate our experiences to our own life.

A language teacher has to have an awareness revelation/ self-revelation. Language education is character education.

She explained about “moving between cultures”

To sum up, while learning Japanese, the children have to know themselves, and reflect their own culture in Japanese, or reflect Japanese culture in their own.

She examined her journey as a Japanese language teacher, and thought it was a valuable opportunity to reflect about herself as being a Japanese language teacher. At the same time, she believes the teaching experience provided a way for her to see herself not only as a language teacher, but to reflect on herself, who she is at the current time in the current environment.

I think the language teaching experiences helped my married life. The language teaching and learning is all about reasoning on your own, and you have to see things objectively rather than being emotional.

Interestingly this coincides with one student’s reflection about the Japanese language learning experience as discussed in Chapter 5.
My parents divorced when I was little, and I always listened to mum’s side of the story and dad’s side of story. I was always in middle. I got on very well with Japanese learning, and I think this experience helped me learn a second language.

This confident teacher was not always so confident. She felt unsure as a Japanese person who lived in Australia, in a different culture, speaking in a different language and working in a different environment. She commented on how to deal with Japanese native students who are in her Japanese class.

…for them, I work to build their confidence as a Japanese person living outside Japan. They may not speak English fluently yet, they look different to others in a class, but it doesn’t matter, because as confidence grows they’ll find their place within Australian culture. I encourage them to have a Japanese face in Australia. I know I have to do this for them, because I was lost myself at one stage.

The student made an insightful comment that her experience with her parents helped her to understand that there are many ways of reasoning in the world. She learnt a way to sit in the middle between one culture and another, and that made the language learning easier. The teacher’s experience shows that she also found a connection between language learning and teaching experiences in her professional life and in her personal life. She learnt how to teach the language, and that helped her to build her self-identity. Her own self-awareness gave her the sense of being a person who could be relied upon, allowing students to feel confidence in themselves.

6.2.4 Discussion: Comparison of the three teachers

A summary of the interview data revealed six themes, or issues, that were possible constraints for teachers that therefore may hinder a teacher’s ability to teach intercultural competency.

Internal issues
- Uncertainty of self-identity/self-esteem/self-confidence
- Insufficient theoretical understanding of Interculturality
- Internal/conceptual uncertainty in Interculturality
- Internal/conceptual uncertainty in Japanese language teaching
Environmental issues
- Unrealistic expectation of the Japanese language teaching curriculum
- Insufficient school community support/collaboration with colleagues

These six issues emerged with each of the teachers, although there were differences in the way they expressed their internal issues. The key word here was ‘uncertainty’.

T1 and T3 are Japanese native speakers who developed their teaching careers while teaching Japanese in Australia. It seems both of them became unsure about being Japanese people in Australia, and this situation affected their being Japanese language teachers. Interestingly T2 is a skilful primary school teacher, but she does not seem confident in teaching Japanese. The confidence that she has as a primary teacher slips off when teaching Japanese, because she is not confident in her Japanese language skills, although she displayed more than enough ability to teach the language.

The three teachers displayed very different characteristics. T1 seems like driftwood, which still is floating on a sea of Japanese-teaching and struggling to find control of the waves. T2 is like a mangrove, she stays in a dark secure water of primary teaching, but struggles to move out from the comfort zone to try out the way it could be better for both herself and the children in terms of Japanese language teaching. T3 appeared as a solid big ship that reliably carries her Japanese language-teaching field with her students on board.

All the teachers demonstrated a sense of struggle when teaching in a language or an environment that is foreign to them. T3 initially felt marginalised from the environment of a traditional Christian school philosophy. T1’s self confidence depended on a head of language’s understanding the complexity of Japanese language teaching for a subject area (HSIE) that was not her specialty. T2 felt incompetent in Japanese language skills. These factors constitute the struggle that teachers experience in their effort to develop intercultural language teaching. If
the teacher is struggling, how can they help their students make the cultural transformation, which creates the intercultural ‘third place’? T1 and T2 are struggling to make ‘the third place’, while T3 appears to have successfully met the challenge. Papademetre and Scarino’s work (2000) show that developing intercultural competency is an extended process of reflection rather than a short-term process of presenting cultural information. T3’s reflection also shows that she took a long time to acquire this competence.

T3’s struggle, as the Japanese language teacher, was caused by her being a Japanese person who teaches Japanese language outside Japan, her internal struggle, and being a non-Christian teacher in a Christian school, external struggle. T3 was feeling marginalized. She was able to identify her position within the environment where she lived and worked. She felt that she was in an inferior position. In T3’s case, her further study played a major role in breaking the boundary she had created, and assisted her thinking of herself in this new, displaced or decentred position within the paradigm. Placing T3’s case in what Hall (1996:2) explains, T3 seemed to attempt to rearticulate the relationship between subjects and discursive practices that the question of identity raises.

Our subjectivity and our sense of identity are things which are always in a process of becoming and transformation; this hinges on the different positionalities that are made available to us and that we proceed to take up. (Hall, 1996:2)

Hall refers to Identity as the meeting point, the point of suture, between on the one hand the discourses and practices which attempt to include, speak to us or haul us into place as the social subjects of particular discourses, and on the other hand, the processes which produce subjectivities, which construct us as subjects which can be ‘spoken’. They are the result of a successful articulation or connecting of the subject into the flow of the discourse, into the intersection.

T3 finally found her position where she teaches now. She first felt that she was forced into a strained interpretation of language teaching, when she was feeling inferior within the school community as well as where she lived. Then, she started her studies of language teaching, and found conviction in regard to her
teaching style/method, this also assisted to nourish her strength/confidence. She successfully articulated her position within the environment where she lived, and moved on to the next stage of her teaching experience where she feels comfortable, and became who she is now. I have labelled her as the ‘good ship’, where the ship starts the journey in rough seas, but finds eventually some smooth sailing.

T1 also felt inadequacy as a Japanese language teacher who teaches Japanese language at an Australian school. The differences between T3 and T1 are that T1 has not placed herself at a place where she feels confident yet. She feels constrained with her subject, and has not felt confident in applying her knowledge to her HSIE and language teaching, thus cannot grow as an experienced teacher. T1’s subjectivity is still bound in a position where she cannot articulate herself. For example, she felt timid on ANZAC Day, although she was not born when the First World War ended.

T2 seems nervous about her Japanese language ability, although she demonstrated excellent teaching skills as a primary school teacher. She was always apologetic about her Japanese class. It seems that T2’s identity as a Japanese language teacher also hinges on uncertainty. In T1 and T3’s case, being a Japanese person outside Japan as well as being a Japanese language teacher in Australia where there are still traces of the war history, and there are still traces of racism. In T2’s case, she is already established and perceived well as a primary teacher within the community, and she is definitely a member of a dominant group in Australian society. Nonetheless, her identity as an experienced and confident primary school teacher wavered around her place as a Japanese language teacher. It seems that the positionality that Hall discusses assisted T3 to take up the identity and T1 and T2 still struggled to identify their positions. Hence I labelled them “driftwood” and “mangrove” respectively.

At this point, I turn to the discussion to Homi Bhabha’s concept of hybridity. His 1996 work Culture’s in-Between (Bhabha, 1996) describes the construction of cultural authority within conditions of political inequity. Hybrid strategy opens
up a space of negotiation where power is unequal but its articulation may be equivocal. Bhabha writes:

Hybrid agencies find their voice in a dialectic that does not seek cultural supremacy. They deploy the partial culture from which they emerge to construct visions of community, and versions of historic memory, that give narrative form to the minority positions they occupy; the outside of the inside: the part in the whole. (1996:58)

This hybrid concept seems to explain T3’s positionality. T3 spoke about her life in Australia as ‘compromise’; however, it was not a reluctant ‘compromise’. Her compromise was the result of the successful articulation of her subjectivity and she moved on from that point, and transformed herself. She became able to free herself from the cultural supremacy, and found a position where she can construct her self-identity, whereas, T1 and T2 were still seeking the hybrid agency. The intercultural competency in T3’s case seems to be the agency that leads her to take up the new positionality. While T3’s successful transformation enabled her to explore the process of the transformation, T1 and T2 were still searching.

For Crozet & Liddicoat, teachers need to identify culture as an explorative process they can undertake with learners rather than having to solely rely on research in cross-cultural discourse. (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999:113-125). The interview summary suggests that in addition to the more obviously demonstrated environmental issues of school curriculum and school support for the teachers, the internal issues for the teachers are significant constraints that appeared to hinder a teacher’s ability to teach culture and intercultural competency in language classes.

In conclusion, intercultural language teaching requires teachers to become not only learners of language but also learners of culture, and it is also involves self-reflection (Crozet and Liddicoat, 1999; Joye, 2001; Crabtree & Sapp, 2004). This indicates the importance of learning their own culture and how to reflect themselves. Nevertheless, the three teachers’ interviews suggest that, unless the teachers find their identity, they will be in a difficult position to identify culture as an explorative process, thus difficult to be the ‘learners of culture’ even before teaching such a concept.
6.3 Other stakeholders
Between May 2002 and mid-2004 after publication of the Languages K-10 Draft Framework in 2001 (see Chapter 3), a number of key seminars were conducted with policy makers and researchers in the field of language education, together with invited teachers from both independent and government schools in NSW. After the publication of the Draft Syllabus, both the Association of Independent Schools and DET NSW organised teachers’ in-services and prepared themselves to implement the new syllabus. This was significant, because it underlies the importance of language learning and its role in developing the students’ intercultural competency. It was more significant on a personal level, because this concept is a key to connecting language learning and a concept of citizenship. The languages K-10 Draft Framework (Board of Studies NSW, 2001) indicated a crucial difference in intercultural awareness, when compared to the previous syllabus, and its approach became the impetus for undertaking this study.

Well before the introduction of the concept ‘moving between cultures’, most theories of language education discussed the importance of culture within language education, and culture teaching within the language teaching arena was well developed. However, the theorist’s advocacy to examine culture within a language did not seem to penetrate through to the practical. Culture teaching was always seen as the fifth element of language education: reading, writing, speaking, listening and cultural understanding, rather than seeing culture through a language as discussed in Chapter 2. Introducing the new objectives of ‘moving between cultures’ expects the learners to develop a deeper understanding of culture by learning a language. It also expects the learners to examine their own culture, then reflect on that experience when examining the language that they are learning.

The following section discusses the views of other stakeholders and the language educators whom I interviewed while attending various seminars in regard to issues of intercultural development within the language education. These interviews were open-ended free flowing discussions in an environment where the participants were clearly focused on the issues of language education.
6.3.1 Japanese language Consultant 1 - Kimiko

Kimiko was one of the organisers from the in-service mentioned above. She worked as a Japanese language consultant for the Association of Independent Schools in NSW for the past 7 years. While she assisted development of the Japanese language program within the Independent schools in NSW, she worked with many of Japanese language teachers from both primary and high schools. She also worked as a member of the HSC examination committee for five years. I first met Kimiko when I was also working as an HSC examination committee member. I explained to her about my study and my interest in the new objective of ‘moving between cultures’. She shared her concern with me about the new objectives and the teachers’ perceptions on the teaching of culture.

I asked Kimiko what she thought ‘moving between culture’ meant. She replied:

When making a Mother’s Day card, children wrote ‘to Mum, Happy Mother’s Day’ in Japanese. When they wrote ‘Okaasan e (‘Okaasan’ means ‘mum’, and ‘e’ means ‘to’ in English)– To Mum’, some kids notice that ‘to’ comes after ‘mum’ in Japanese, whereas ‘to’ comes before ‘mum’ in English. Even some Year 2 kids noticed that. I like to think of kids thinking “English to Japanese and Japanese to English”. It is this kind of thinking that assists them in learning.

I also asked what she thought about the teachers’ perception of interculturality.

When we are marking HSC examination papers, I sometimes get frustrated because some teachers show no concern about Japanese culture. For example, how to use ‘wakarimasen’ – ‘do not understand’ in English and ‘shirimasen’ – ‘do not know’ (Japanese use these words differently to its use in English). Some teachers do not bother with the difference. I don’t know if they don’t bother or if they don’t know how to use the words correctly. I often feel some of the teachers are quite arrogant. They do not try to understand the finer differences. That’s why they use ‘shirimasen’ instead of ‘wakarimasen’ incorrectly, but the two words are almost the same, so even if you use the wrong one, the Japanese people understand what you want to say although it’s culturally wrong. So most of the teachers agree to accept that either word is correct when we are marking the papers.

She said a typical Japanese language teacher in primary school teaches vocabulary and Japanese traditional culture.
High school teachers have the HSC at the end, so they have to follow the syllabus. But often Japanese language teachers teach at primary school only, and they do not even read the LOTE syllabus.

She had her own opinion about treating Japanese culture while learning Japanese. She said,

I disagree with some of our teaching. We are supposed to teach the students to reply ‘not at all’ when someone comments how good their Japanese is, as would be expected in a Japanese native speaker. But if the students happily want to say ‘thank you’ in reply, I’d rather like them to say what they want to say. We should not try to twist the students’ actual feeling into that of a Japanese native speaker.

She expanded on her thoughts toward the English language.

English is placed on top of the language hierarchies, and people who speak English sometimes appear as arrogant to people who cannot speak English. Especially I feel that when I travel to other countries where English is not a national language of the country. In such countries, if you speak English, you have an air of importance. Japanese people also place English in a place of importance. We need to break the hierarchies.

She also talked about her own experiences of language shift. She was working for a researcher who was researching Japanese influence in Korea during World War II. She translated documents from Japanese to English on a Korean made movie censored by the Japanese army.

Because the Japanese used in the document was the formal army language and the letters and the expressions used in the document were old, formal and rigid, it was a difficult job. I realised while doing the translation that the English I translated was much more familiar to myself and easy to understand when I read it after the translation compared to the Japanese I was translating. I was really struggling between the language constitution of English and Japanese. Since that experience I am so interested in the oral languages I use, Japanese and English.

She then linked her personal life with the Japanese language teaching experience.

I feel that I was always angry when I was in the intercultural space, because in there, I had to negotiate with something that I disagree with. I can relate that with our experience in raising my daughter. My husband is an English man. My Japanese ways and his English ways did not always overlap, and my daughter was often left isolated in the middle of this East verses West conflict until we reached some kind of compromise. If the intercultural space is the
place where you have to compromise with something you disagree about, then I am not happy being there.

Finally, I asked her if she knew LOTE is included in the HSIE syllabus.

No, I didn’t know. You sure? Then why do we have a LOTE syllabus?

Kimiko’s comments indicate her insightful awareness of ‘culture’ in a language teaching environment, and showed her understanding of ‘moving between cultures’ as an objective of the syllabus. She also connects her language teaching experience of ‘moving between cultures’ with her personal life in dealing with other cultures. However, Kimiko reveals her apprehension over Japanese language teachers’ carelessness in dealing with ‘culture’ in their teaching. Her concern goes beyond the issue of language skills, and claims that the current language teaching approach has the potential risk of placing the students into a mould of stereotypical Japanese culture. Nonetheless, it is interesting to observe that she was not aware that LOTE is included in the HSIE syllabus, although she shows her concern that the LOTE syllabus is being neglected by primary school Japanese language teachers.

6.3.2 Language consultant 2: Sherry

While DET NSW was in charge of organising the in-service for the ALPLP project, I needed to know how the other counterparts involved in this project found the ongoing process, because I was not really convinced about the teachers’ perceptions about intercultural language teaching as discussed above.

I contacted Sherry, the education officer, Cultural Literacy and Languages from Brisbane Catholic Education, April 2005. I asked about the development of the project. She replied:

…in Queensland, we worked through Phase 1 with approximately 60 teachers. From these 60 teachers 11 were chosen to participate in Phase 2, which had just concluded. In Phase 1, we aimed to have language teachers develop an understanding of intercultural language learning principles and be able to apply them in their classrooms. The project says that Phase 2 is when true intercultural language learning happens... when language learning is connected to all curriculum areas.
My concern about teachers’ perceptions of interculturality appeared justified at least in Queensland. Sherry commented:

What am I doing at the present time? I am working with language teachers, from all languages, to deepen their understanding of intercultural language learning. Basically, it is Phase 1 again, but over a much longer period of time. This is to allow for deeper learning. One of the confining aspects of ALPLP was a very tight timeline. Teachers did not have enough time to engage with the new knowledge and apply it in their classrooms before having to report back their findings. Teachers had only one term. So, the program I am facilitating now hopes to provide lots of time to engage with the new thinking and to try things out in their classrooms.

The consultant reiterated that it was crucial for the organisers to acknowledge the fact that the teachers need deeper understanding for the successful implementation. Sarah’s comments indicate that there were quite deep gaps between the theory and the practice of intercultural language learning. The reasons for the gaps needed to be acknowledged. This acknowledgement seemed reflected in the ILTLP project that was commissioned in 2005 and completed in 2008 (see Chapter 3).

6.3.3 Participants from the AIS in-service for implementation of the new syllabus

The Association of Independent Schools also organised teachers’ in-services. Japanese Extensive Course K-8, was conducted in May 2002. The focus was on how to implement the new syllabus. Special attention was paid to one objective: ‘Making linguistic connections’, which explores the nature of languages as systems with an emphasis on comparisons between English and LOTE. Teaching culture and its connection to the language was another focus. The organiser’s aim seemed to be the integration of Japanese language with other subject areas. However, the teachers attending were all Japanese language specialists not primary teaching specialists, although most of them were teaching Japanese at a primary school. Thus, integration in this case was incorporating a variety of content within Japanese language classes, rather than expanding Japanese language teaching to other subject areas.

By this stage, I felt that the teachers who attended these conferences and seminars were enthusiastic in their teaching and they knew culture teaching is crucial in a
language teaching practice. At the final section of this in-service, the participants worked as a group to make the integrated program. When they were trying to integrate other subject areas, they used a variety of Japanese cultural themes; however, I did not see any of the group trying to observe the culture in the language.

In 2003 the new syllabus was distributed to teachers, aiming to start from 2004. At the same time the Report on Intercultural Language Learning was published by the Commonwealth Government (Liddicoat et al., 2003). The report provided a clear understanding of where ‘intercultural language learning’ stood in each state and territory in Australia at that time, as discussed in Chapter 3. The results also showed there is a wide range of understanding of the concepts of language and culture among language teachers.

6.3.4 Participants from the ALPLP workshop - Informal interviews
During 2004, I attended two meetings organised by the Asian Languages Professional Learning Project (ALPLP) as discussed in Chapter 3. One of the main objectives was to engage with the concepts, principles and implications of intercultural language learning (Asia Education Foundation, 2004a:7). The theoretical presentation of Intercultural Language Learning was very clear at these meetings. Yet, during the breaks as well as group discussion time, I noticed the teachers were still confusing ‘intercultural approach’ with ‘multicultural approach’. One teacher’s comment among others exemplified this confusion:

Glad to see multicultural education is back again. (a male History teacher)

I also had an opportunity to have an informal interview with Kaori, a Japanese language teacher, along with the principal and a teacher from that school. The school is a public school, and located in suburban Sydney. Generally, as the principal said, the students are from a middle class social background where the parents of the students expect a wider range of education rather than following only traditional Key Learning Areas. The school organises a trip to Japan every second year. The previous year, Kaori took eight students and two parents to
Japan. When DET NSW announced the ALPLP project which involved a whole-school approach, Kaori mentioned to the principal her interest in joining the project. The principal agreed to this, and the matter was discussed at the staff meeting. Finally the whole school agreed to join in the project. Then, the principal and the teacher accompanied her to the in-service.

When I spoke to them, the principal seemed very enthusiastic about the project. He said the parents are interested in the new approach to language education; for example, they were very supportive about the Japan trip, and organised many fund-raising activities for that. However, he said, there are not many Asians living in the area, and the students’ families are not familiar with Asian culture, although there are many Japanese and Chinese restaurants in the area. The other teacher from the school, Helen, also showed her interest in this project especially as she was also a language teacher, teaching Italian language classes together with her normal duties as a teacher in charge of Year 5 class. She said that herself and Kaori could be an excellent team to take up leadership of this project.

Kaori has an Australian qualification to teach primary school, and taught the Japanese language at this school for ten years. She was a confident Japanese language teacher, who had already organised the Japan trip twice successfully. Nevertheless, she only taught Japanese language class, and never worked as a teacher in charge of a class. Thus, she was not confident with integrating the Japanese language program with other subject areas. Her experience with the Italian teacher also did not turn out as she expected. Kaori did not agree with the ideas the Italian teacher had. Because the Italian language is not that different to English when compared to Japanese, her approach to the integration was not realistic, Kaori thought.

The kids in my Japanese class have only a limited vocabulary, and can’t make a sentence. But Helen thinks we can present a short drama in Japanese and write part of a science report in Japanese and things like that. The kids in a primary school cannot do that. She thinks the kids can do it in Italian, so why not in Japanese. She makes things more difficult.
Then, I asked Kaori what she thinks the students can do in order to implement the project. She said,

I don’t have any concrete ideas, but with the whole school, we can organise a Japanese summer festival day, for example. I can teach a Japanese summer dance.

Later, I had the opportunity to talk to Kaori personally, and we exchanged several emails since then. Kaori said, other teachers feelings toward this project were not all positive at the meeting. She felt some of them even said, but not loudly, this would create more work for them. Also she thought it was a whole-school approach, but other teachers were not positive about that, and they placed the responsibility with Kaori only. The teaching body asked Kaori to make some sample curriculum to implement the project. While she told me her side of the story, I casually asked if she had read the HSIE syllabus. She said “No”. In fact, she had not read any of the syllabi from the KLAs.

From these discussion with Kaori, it emerged that what she really needed for the next step was practical support from the classroom teachers, and to make stronger interconnecting relationships while creating new curriculum with the other teachers, if the successful implementation was to occur.

The ALPLP’s main objective focuses on intercultural concepts, and I was not very sure that Kaori’s awareness of ‘interculturality’ was the same as the organiser’s.

6.3.5 Participants from the 2002 New Millennium Conference

During 2002, I attended the New Millennium conference organised by DET NSW. This conference had the objective of encouraging teachers of languages to see language acquisition and language teaching from a different perspective from their current practice. I asked teachers from a variety of community and foreign language teaching contexts about how they teach culture, and what they think about the new objective, ‘moving between cultures’, from the draft syllabus. Some of them said:
We teach culture, and we have enough material about teaching culture.
(Toshiko, Japanese language consultant 2 from Education Queensland)

It is not new, we have always been teaching culture.
(Linglin, a Chinese language teacher from TAFE NSW)

These language teachers’ comments indicate a fundamental difficulty in introducing intercultural language teaching. The teachers’ confidence in teaching culture is based on previous notions of conventional and concrete culture discussed in Section 2.5.1, therefore, ‘moving between cultures’ in their mind is ‘moving between conventional and concrete cultures’. These teachers’ comments support the arguments by Kawakami (2005) and Nugent (2000) in regard to the teachers’ confusion of the intrinsic relationship between culture and language, also discussed in Section 2.5.3.

6.3.6 Officers from the Board of Studies NSW and the structured sample meeting organised by the Board of Studies 2002

The structured sample group meetings, K-10 LOTE Draft Syllabus, were organised for teachers of Chinese, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean and Spanish by the Board of Studies NSW during July to September 2002. The Board’s syllabus development process was shown as follows.

Phase 1: Syllabus Review / October 2000 – November 2001
Phase 2: Framework development / November 2001 – March 2002
Phase 3: Syllabus development / April 2002- June 2003
    Draft syllabus and survey – July – September 2002
    Consultation (6 weeks) - From 31 July 2002 to 10 September 2002
    Consultation report and amended syllabus to the Board of Studies
    – Endorsed March 2003
    Distribution of the Syllabus – May 2003
Phase 4 – Implementation – 2004
I attended a regional meeting for teachers in September 2002. There were 24 teachers across the above-mentioned languages, most of whom teach at high schools, but two teachers were from community language classes. The meeting focused mainly on the mandatory Years 7 and 8, and there was neither mention of the cultural component of language teaching nor questions or explanations about ‘moving between cultures’. I understood that there was a tacit understanding among teachers as well as the presenters that culture was well combined in their teaching program.

Interestingly, the presenter from the Board of Studies did not know about the primary teaching program when one teacher raised a question. Linda who teaches Japanese language classes from Kindergarten to Year 12 at a private school asked about teaching of the Japanese script in a primary school. The facilitator of the meeting said,

This meeting is for high school up to year 10. We don’t know anything about the primary implementation.

The previous K-6 and 7-10 syllabi were revised, and the new language K-10 syllabus was about to be published. It was logical to assume that the importance of the connection between Kindergarten through Year 10 was realised, and that that was one reason for the change. However, it was obvious that the presenter for the meeting did not consider the connection, and they were not ready to discuss the new syllabus for primary schools at this K-10 LOTE draft Syllabus meeting. Although the study of language in K-6 is still a part of the primary schools HSIE component, and the only mandatory course for language is the period between Years 7 and 8 within the new syllabus in NSW, it does not appear that there is an understanding that language teaching needs to be viewed as part of a continuum from primary school to high school. It appears that LOTE organisers ignored the primary component and HSIE ignored the LOTE component; as a result neither paid good attention to primary LOTE teaching.
### 6.3.7 The Board of Studies NSW

The Board of Studies NSW was responsible for producing a significant new syllabus for LOTE education as discussed in the previous sections. It seemed that teachers needed to understand what the motivation was behind the Board’s decision to introduce the new objectives of ‘moving between cultures’ within the new syllabus. I approached consultants at the Board to assist me to understand its motivation for the new introduction. I believed that if the teachers were advised in a clearer manner, then the teachers may comprehend the actual meanings of ‘moving between cultures’, and could have avoided the confusion that was demonstrated at so many of the meetings and workshops I attended. The following is an answer to my question via email, from the Board of Studies NSW in regard to the new introduction of ‘moving between culture’.

…I would like to point out that for many years now culture has not been taught separately from language, but rather through language. The syllabuses were developed to reflect current research both nationally and internationally into best practice in the teaching and learning of languages. (Senior Curriculum Officer, the Board of Studies, NSW, 18 Oct 2004.)

I also asked if the Board found the need to provide teachers’ support for the implementation of the new objective ‘moving between cultures’, and the reply was:

I think the above answers (she pointed out the above section of her reply) have explained that there wasn’t a separate consultation on ‘moving between cultures’.

I understood that the Board sees that culture has not been taught separately for many years now, therefore there was no need for special support for the teachers.

The reply indicated that the Board viewed that ‘culture has not been taught separately from language, but rather through language’. It does not seem that the Board is aware of what is going on in practice. This comment contradicted my series of observations of Japanese language classrooms as well as the series of interactions with the language teachers since starting this study. A very common answer from Japanese language teachers to the question of how do they teach culture is:
I used a seasonal event as a cultural aspect of language teaching. For example, *hinamatsuri* (girls day in March) and *kodomonohi* (children’s day in May) and so on. We make an origami doll for girls day and *koinobori* (a carp streamer) for children’s day.

(A Japanese teacher of 5 years in a primary school in suburban Sydney)

The teachers commonly separate the cultural part from the language part within language teaching. Also, I had the impression that the teachers were not sure how to teach culture through language at a primary school level in particular, because they are not sure what teaching culture through language means. Primary school teachers seem to need practical guidance to know what teaching culture through language means and its practical classroom application. Nevertheless, primary school language teaching seemed to have very little guidance.

When the Senior Curriculum Officer mentioned above wrote that the syllabuses reflected best practice (see above), there seems to be little recognition of the classroom issues that teachers face.

### 6.3.8 Participants from the Modern Languages Teachers’ Association’s workshop ‘Moving Between Cultures’

In September 2004, I attended a workshop organised by the Modern Languages Teachers’ Association of NSW. The theme of this workshop was ‘Moving Between Cultures’ – a focus on intercultural language learning, and the presentation clearly exhibited what and how to promote intercultural language learning. Some language examples were displayed during the workshop as a stimulus to discussion, and the following is one of the Japanese language examples:

- a. *goshujin kanroku ga arimasune.* – Your husband looks dignified
- b. *Iie, hutotteiru dake desu yo.* - No, he is just fat

This example was given to demonstrate how culture is shown within the language. While it was an interesting example, it seemed that the example was instead associated with the stereotypical images of Japanese culture by the participants, rather than as another dynamic expression signifying unpretentiousness.
The presenter’s clear demonstration on what and how to promote intercultural language teaching was interpreted differently by the teachers, and showed a limited understanding of culture. Again, it seemed that language teachers lacked a theoretical understanding of culture and its link to a language. The teachers did not demonstrate an awareness of the need to understand their own subjectivities or the nature of their own culture in order to assist the students to work with culture in the language classroom.

6.3.9 A Japanese language consultant, the Department of Education and Training NSW - linking Values and Japanese language teaching

Values in NSW Public Schools was published in March 2004, and a draft Teaching Values in K-6: Resources for teachers was published in May 2004 by the Department of Education and Training NSW. The office of a Japanese language consultant of NSW was developing teaching materials for Japanese language to incorporate teaching Values. In an informal interview with the consultant, it was explained to me that the theme for the topic was a Japanese family. For example, some suggested statements were “[c]hildren often live with their father, mother, grandfather and grandmother” in Japanese. In the activity sheet for the teacher, four aspects for the Values concepts addressed were: fairness, participation, cooperation and respect. Each aspect was linked to the Japanese theme. They were described as:

- Cooperation
  Students work cooperatively in groups and report back to the class.
- Fairness
  All students are encouraged to give their opinions which should be valued by the group.
- Participation
  All students participate and offer their opinions and reasons.
- Respect
  The activity promotes respect for the opinions of the students, and for lifestyles in other countries.
From these interviews and discussions with the stakeholders who participated in organised seminars, the emerging themes and issues can be summarised as follows.

- The teachers are still not sure about culture teaching in their language class.
- The teachers need to know the subjective nature of their own culture in order to work with culture in the language classroom.
- The teachers are still separating language from culture as the 5th element of the language skills rather than seeing culture within the language.
- The teachers are still confusing ‘intercultural’ and ‘multicultural’.
- Teaching culture is not presented clearly enough, thus still reinforcing stereotypical ideas about culture.
- Primary language teaching is neglected by some of the policy makers.

### 6.4 Discussion and Conclusion

As I discussed in Chapter 4, my study was initially designed as an action research intervention. My plan was to reflect and use the Language K-10 draft framework published in that year (2001). Three models of Japanese language teaching programs were organised to form the teaching cycle for the action research. However, it was evidenced that the teachers involved were not familiar with the new draft syllabus. It emerged that the teachers were not convinced of the importance of intercultural competence and they were not aware of the connections between the model I intended to implement and the draft syllabus. After much deliberation I moved away from the action research model to a new phase of the research as the next phase of a grounded theory approach.

Initially the new objective of ‘moving between cultures’ did not gain much attention from language teachers as well as some seminar organisers, because ‘moving between cultures’ did not sound like a new idea. The main reasons for that are, first of all, language teachers knew that language teaching always involved teaching the culture of the target language. Secondly, the teachers knew that language learning could contribute to widen the learners’ world views,
although it was not articulated why and how this was so. Adding to that, discussion about acculturation, which may occur while learning a language, was not a new concept to language educators.

Nevertheless, many teachers are not aware the previous approach to culture teaching may risk the formation of stereotypical ideas about the target language culture. Previously culture teaching was generally limited to the study of visible cultural items and practices rather than invisible culture that is reflected through a wider and deeper study of the language. Also, the new syllabus advocates that the learners must better understand their own culture in order to understand the target culture in depth. All these indicate that the new introduction needed particular attention by language teachers, because they are the people who deliver the syllabus to the students. If the teachers’ interpretations are not as same as the intention of the syllabus, the objectives of the syllabus can never be fulfilled.

Developing intercultural competency is clearly not something as easily taught as Mathematics or Geography, nor is it easy to assess the outcomes; Mathematical equations can be tested, geographical facts can be tested but it is difficult to test the understanding of the relationship between two disparate cultures. It needs ‘exploration’ (Liddicoat et al, 2003; Nucci et al, 2005). Therefore the teachers’ valid understanding of the concept is the key to its implementation. From the research in Phase 2, the conclusion that can be made is that the teachers did not understand well enough to implement the new objective.

This chapter discussed the language teachers’ view towards the students’ intercultural development while learning the language. The teachers are the key to the implementation. Although the syllabus indicates how to deliver this crucial task within a day-to-day teaching model, the teachers’ interpretation of the syllabus affects the implementation. It seems that there are gaps in understanding between the syllabus writers and the practitioners.

Placing language education within ‘the big picture’ of Australian education, the following chapter discusses the implications of the findings from chapter 3, which presented the curriculum issues in Australian education, chapter 5 which
presented the findings from the students interviews, and this chapter, 6, which discussed the teachers and other stakeholders views of issues in regard to development of the new syllabus, which focuses on students’ interculturality.
Chapter 7 Discussion of Findings

7.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the various aspects of the research are brought together, and the common themes and the emerging gaps are explored. The key themes of self-identity construction through Japanese language learning experiences, schools as sites of cultural production and reproduction where the students’ development of self identity is crucially influenced, and issues in language education for interculturality are discussed.

7.2 Self-identity
The students’ interview results with the primary school students’ group, the high school students group and the university student’ group indicated that their Japanese language learning experiences had a critical impact on their realisation of self and other, and that realisation impacted on the development of their self-identity. Importantly, the students also found Japanese language learning experiences to be a catalyst for mediating their interactions between self and other and for clarifying their perceptions of self/other. Their learning experiences appeared crucial for making links between self and other. The findings indicated that students raised their conscious observation of their subjectivity in relation to the Japanese learning experiences. They reported that they could more easily form a genuine interrelationship with others. In comparing the data from each cohort of students, a discernible increase in awareness among the different age groups came to light.8

An interesting finding among the teachers was that some teachers seemed to be still searching for their self identity in terms of their role as Japanese language teacher in an Australian school. A discussion of the linkage between language

---

8 For further research, a longitudinal study of the same children over say ten years or more of their education would create greater validity, but the limitations of doctoral research to two or three years of data gathering precludes this.
education and the development of students’ as well as the teachers’ self identity is a key theme in this thesis.

7.2.1  The primary school students’ experience and their self-identity
The students’ conventional perception, towards otherness shifted by learning Japanese. It was not that the shift was controlled by an agent outside the self, but it occurred from within. The students previously showed a strong cultural boundary between their sense of self and their sense of ‘other’. Their defensive, ‘hard’ cultural boundary, which seemed to be nurtured initially by their family values, and reinforced by other social influences, was softened when the students learned Japanese language. The students learned to utter unfamiliar sounds, write totally different scripts to their own, and dance differently, among other experiences. They commented that they felt weird initially, then got used to the new learning, and finally realised that the experience was fun. The general consensus was that it made them feel good about what they could do. It is crucial to observe that this realisation occurred through their own experience, rather than through any sense of coercion from the dominant (English language) culture. This realisation led them in turn to develop different values around the new language and culture, from a stereotypical perspective to a more personal view developed while learning: from weird to fun and from hard to soft. The Japanese language learning class was an opportunity for students to find their own truth, a place where they could tell their own story free of control. For Bakhtin (1981:344), authoritative discourse cannot be represented – it is only transmitted.

The shift the students made is the beginning of the hybridisation process described and theorised by Homi Bhabha in 1994 and introduced earlier by Mikhail Bakhtin (1981). In his famous work, The Dialogic Imagination, Bakhtin states that an individual has a dominant voice, promoting a sense of security and a sense of belonging within their close social circuit. However, individuals also experience an unconscious realisation of another voice within them. He defined hybridisation as ‘… a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance’. Bakhtin (1981:358) explains this ‘internally persuasive discourse’ as opposed to one that is externally authoritative:
In the everyday rounds of our consciousness, the internally persuasive word is half-ours and half-someone else’s. Its creativity and productiveness consist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition. It is not so much interpreted by us as it is further, that is, freely, developed, applied to new material, new conditions; it enters into interanimating relationships with new contexts. (p.345)

In the case of these students, the new context (Japanese experience) was given, and the students’ internally persuasive word (fun) was created, which led them into a new relationship with a new context (the students’ new world). Although this might be a temporary shift, it assisted them to recognise their internally persuasive discourse, and the boundary was softened.

After analysing the interviews and observing the students’ formulation of internally persuasive discourse, it is important to consider where and how the students created this dialogue between their subjectivity and their external context. Similarly, I have discussed in Chapter 2 Homi Bhabha’s concept of hybridity and ‘the third space’ where one can find ways of speaking about self and other, and eventually incorporate some of the ‘other’ within ourselves. It can be surmised that the teachers’ role is a crucial element of the process. The teachers can facilitate a learning environment for the students where they can tell and listen to their authentic stories of their own experience away from the dominant norm, yet within a supportive environment.

7.2.2 The high school students’ experience and their subjectivity

Although the primary school students seem to have created a link between self and other, the high school students had seemingly created a new identity around their adolescent selves, where they tended to shelter themselves away from the others. The high school students’ subjectivity was sheltered by a comfort zone formed by their social network: family, school, friends and the community where they feel they belong. This comfort zone seems to include the same component as the ‘protective cocoon’ described by Anthony Giddens. Giddens (1991:3) uses the term in relation to the establishment of trust.
Trust, I argue, is a crucial generic phenomenon of personality development as well as having distinctive and specific relevance to a world of disembedding mechanisms and abstract systems. In its generic manifestations, trust is directly linked to achieving an early sense of ontological security. Trust established between an infant and its caretakers provides an ‘inoculation’ which screens off potential threats and dangers that even the most mundane activities of day-to-day life contain. Trust in this sense is basic to a ‘protective cocoon’ which stands guard over the self in its dealings with everyday reality. It ‘brackets out’ potential occurrences which, were the individual seriously to contemplate them, would produce a paralysis of the will, or feelings of engulfment. In its more specific guise, trust is a medium of interaction with the abstract systems which both empty day-to–day life of its traditional content and set up globalising influences.

Giddens explains that avoidance of dissonance in our social life forms part of the protective cocoon which helps maintain ontological security. He argues how available information is reduced via routinised attitudes which exclude, or reinterpret, potentially disturbing knowledge. From a negative point of view, such closure might be regarded as prejudice, the refusal seriously to entertain views and ideas divergent from those an individual already holds.

Although the students showed no bigotry toward others, and appeared to be quite accepting of others, the acceptance operated from a distance rather than from a balanced position. From the interviews with these high school students, there was a sense that they had more confidence, more sense of self, or what Giddens calls ontological security, than the primary school students. At the same time, this confidence seems to have created some communicative barriers to having close interactions with those others who were outside their security zone. They seemed to be cocooned by a solid ontological security that was hard to crack, projecting a one-sided self without consideration of others. In everyday language, their perspectives could be described as ‘self-ish’. Like the primary school students, the school environment reinforced a sense of ontological security. Another sociologist, Philip Wexler, talks about high school students ‘defensive’ self (Wexler, 1992; Luttrell, 1996; Reay, 2004), where their sense of self seems to have strengthened, and the comfort zone of the students in this case becomes more strongly delineated. Wexler (1992:128-135) maintains that students’ attempts to assert an image of self and to have this self image recognised and
valued by others is what life is all about in high school. He emphasises how schools produce that ‘defensive’ self, a self that must be defended against different forms of institutional ‘lacks’ and ‘attacks’.

Wexler’s argument could explain the difference in the result between the primary school students and the high school students. The primary school students’ self was rather a reflection of their family background. Their self-recognition seemed deeply influenced by their families’ cultural background, but they were able to ‘soften’ towards the other through their language classes. Therefore, they recognised ‘other’ in relation to their cultural background. On the other hand, the high schools students showed a stronger boundary around their self. Within this boundary, they seemed to nurture their own self image, and they felt challenged when something did not fit in this image. Therefore, any significant identification with others was seen as a weakness rather than a strength; their interests belonged within their internal sense of identity, not in others.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the Japanese language learning experience created a hammering effect from inside of themselves to unsettle their subjectivity and crack the protective shell (see Chapter 5). The transformational experience helped to create an opportunity to ease the boundary, and begin a process of self-reflective change. The students were beginning to observe themselves as well as others, creating a dialogue between their subjectivity and others. From here they were ready to form genuine interpersonal relationships between themselves and others.

Although the high school students’ experiences were different from the primary school students’, both groups indicated that they needed an internal incentive to stimulate their understanding of self in order to interact with ‘other’, and both groups of students achieved the change by coming out from their dominant norm. However, in the high school students’ case, the challenges presented through learning Japanese were not always the positive experiences they were accustomed to having in the classroom. The students were usually confident enough in themselves to cope with the usual classroom challenges, however this confidence was not always obvious in learning Japanese. The challenge of meeting these
demands in language learning was greater than other subjects might have been, and seemed to help them to find their own voice.

As long as they were within their comfort zone, they were in a privileged position, because they did not have to feel that they were disadvantaged. Unless they come out of the zone, students cannot locate themselves on an equal footing as the others. This is to say that the students ‘tolerate’ the other culture, but they do it from a distanced, apparently superior position. The challenging experience of language learning provided them with the opportunities to move away from their dominant position.

7.2.3 The university students’ experience and their subjectivity

The university students were more able to define an objective view of their sense of self in comparison with the younger students, as a result of their conscious reflection of themselves in relation to their experiences of studying Japanese. They were more explicit in describing behaviour that is appropriate with English speakers but not always appropriate when dealing with Japanese speakers. They brought to consciousness what they may previously have thought was legitimate language, however, after studying Japanese, realised it was not always legitimate. However, unlike the experience of the high school students, they demonstrated how they negotiated within themselves, and found a solution rather than feeling frustrated. The solution was to gain an open attitude, which allowed them to observe others’ view without prejudice.

While going through the practices of observing how language works in the English speaking environment and how the Japanese language works in the Japanese speaking environment, consequently they have learnt a way to observe their self and other in an objectively conceptualised way rather than a self-centred way. The students commented on different ways to express themselves in the Japanese language. One student pointed out the Japanese way to use Aizuchi, which is to make brief responses while listening in Japanese. She noticed that she did not feel comfortable when using Aizuchi, because she felt that it would be annoying if she used it, as she herself was annoyed when someone used that
technique when speaking in English. Therefore she did not like using Aizuchi when she spoke in Japanese hoping that she would not annoy people. However, she realized later that not using Aizuchi leaves the other party with an insecure feeling. Thus, she had to decide whether she values her own feelings or the Japanese speaker’s feelings. This kind of practice is forced frequently when the students speak in Japanese. This students’ self-analysis on how she felt and how the other party might have felt indicates that the student learnt to observe her own feelings (self) as well as the others’ feelings. Through this learning process the student came to understand that considering only her own feeling does not convey her sincerity to others. In this point, she has learnt to understand the Aizuchi system in an objectively conceptualised way.

However, Nagata & Sullivan (2005) discuss a Japanese language learner who felt in conflict with the gender language norms, and they argue that the second language acquisition process is far from neutral but is rather a deeply subjective experience (2005:25). The participant in the Nagata and Sullivan study expressed how she found her own style in Japanese, which was more reflective of herself. In comparing their study, with the present study of the university students my students also expressed an initial discomfort (conflict) when using Aizuchi. They eventually found an objectively conceptualised way to use Aizuchi, which is different to simply mimicking it as a native Japanese speakers’ act, unlike textbook examples that attempt to force the learners to assimilate into a Japanese cultural norm.

Researchers of Japanese as Foreign Language education (Nagata & Sullivan, 2005; Ohara 2001) indicated their apprehension about the descriptions of culture in Japanese language textbooks, and discuss the concept of the learner ‘creating their own style’ or ‘finding their own voice’ rather than learning culture by rote. Aizuchi is also described as a cultural expression that is part of language learning. For example, in situational functional texts of teaching Japanese, learners are advised that Japanese speakers use Aizuchi to indicate that they are following what is being said (Tsukuba language group, 2000:19). The crucial point here is about how this type of concept should be taught in JFL classes. The arguments of Nagata and others, and the results of this study, point to the importance of
developing a new view of foreign language education. Conventional style in language teaching, and language learning which enables the learners to use the language like the native language user, seem to be challenged.

The studies such as Chen’s in 1999 (discussed in section 2.5.3), indicate it is a challenging ask to teach culture in a language classroom. He expresses his concern that socio-culturally appropriate interpersonal interactions are still largely understood based on the learners’ cultural norm of the language. In addressing Chen’s concern in relation to the results of this study, it is postulated that the participants in his study were still at an early stage of the process of ‘cracking’ the shell of their comfort zone. Therefore, the organic interaction with the other, the Japanese language in this case, was not yet achieved. Also, the teachers’ perception of culture might still only be focused on material aspects of Japanese culture, thus, the teachers have not successfully provided the students an opportunity to create a dialogue between their self and the deeper meanings of Japanese culture. If it is the case, the students cannot find their own voice that comes from their inner self, which means they only mimic the Japanese language, and the words were not reflecting the voice of the other. The concept of socio-cultural sensitivity needs to be deconstructed, to find the gaps between the actual meaning and how the learners as well as the teachers understand this concept. It is also crucial to notice by the language instructors that the language that the students are learning to appear as ‘less native-like’ (Liddicoat, Papademetre et al, 2003:21), which may be the result of progression in learning.

The university students learnt to use the language in a mindful manner, and communicated to the speaker with an open mind, because the interpretation of what they saw, listened to and read might not be the same as that of the person next to them. This finding is interesting when comparing the responses with the younger students. Both the high school students and the primary students showed a more closed attitude, placing a boundary around themselves or around others. The high school students seemed to be ‘cocooned’ inside themselves, and hesitated to open up. They needed some stimulus to crack the shell and open up the boundary of their comfort zone. As the IEA Civic Education Project conducted in 2002 indicated, and as discussed in Chapter 3, many Australian
youth of high school age showed quite a closed attitude toward the ethnic minority populations of Australia, and the fact was evidenced through incidents such as the Cronulla riot and the Macquarie race riot in 2005. The primary school students from Group A indicated that their self was closed within their cultural boundary. Those from Group B indicated that they themselves did not inhabit a cultural boundary, but that others were within another cultural boundary. It seemed from their responses that their negative interpretation of others was influenced by their social network such as family, friends and the school environment. Zimmerman (2004) explored how a culture trains children in perceptions, and how a culture’s ontology, ethics, and epistemology is self-perpetuating. She argues that the dialogue between cultures is crucial, and it is especially important that the dominant culture begins to listen more respectfully to those cultures that still embody the relational ways of knowing that have atrophied in the West. As Zimmerman (2004) argues, in the primary students’ experience of having a dialogue between their culture and Japanese culture, the students found that their internally persuasive voice, and their boundary softened.

The university students learnt how they would need to behave and speak differently from their own cultural norms if they were to act appropriately in the Japanese language community. This is not to say that the students learnt how to assimilate themselves into Japanese society. Rather, they found a way to distance themselves from their subjectivity, and to observe their own subjectivity in relation to Japanese when dealing with the Japanese speaking community. Roux (2002) argues in his research on inter/ or cross cultural communication that socio-economic status, educational background, religion, gender, age and world-view are some of the determinants that influence who and what we are, but also why we react in a particular way in certain situations (Tusting et al, 2002). In the case of these students, they were almost forced to distance or come out of themselves from their normative conception of who and what they are, because the conventional conception created a conflict within themselves. Through this experience, they learnt to observe why they, as well as Japanese people, react or respond in a particular way in certain situations.
7.2.4 The teachers and their subjectivity

The three teachers showed different views of themselves as Japanese language teachers. The metaphorical expressions, Driftwood, Mangrove and The Good Ship were used to describe my interpretation of the teacher’s perception of themselves as a Japanese language teacher. Driftwood (T1) and Mangrove (T2) are still searching for their own comfort zones. The Good Ship (T3), found her new positionality as a Japanese language teacher in Australia. It is interesting to compare the teachers’ experience as a Japanese language teacher with the students’ experience in learning the Japanese language, especially the high school students and the university students. It seems that the teachers also enclosed themselves within a boundary, and this boundary seems like the comfort zone that the high school students described.

Both T1 and T2 still inhabited their own comfort zone. T1 understood what Japanese language learning can contribute to her students, but she divided herself between the conventional mould of an HSIE teacher and a Japanese language teacher, thus still struggling to conceptualise ‘culture’ teaching within the HSIE subject, which actually includes a language component. Thus she has not experienced the ‘self-revolution’ as T3 did. She is still within a boundary, placing herself as a Japanese person teaching the Japanese language in a place where the Japanese war experience still tends to provoke a negative image of Japan and Japanese today. This is something that she feels, her understanding of her position, not one that her fellow teachers expressed. T2 does not fit the mould of the conventional Japanese teacher, a Japanese native speaker. T2 is confident in herself as an experienced primary school teacher, but she is not confident in teaching the Japanese language although she is a skilful Japanese language teacher. As a result, T2 almost subconsciously fears the more challenging language classes necessary to accommodate her students’ abilities.

Despite her initially rather negative experience of Japanese language teaching, T3 was able to confidently assess her profession as a language teacher with successfully developed skills to suit. She used the word ‘self-revolution’ to describe the process of becoming a successful language teacher. This ‘self-
revolution’ is similar to the ‘hammering effect’ of the high school students, something to provoke one’s self to change. The high school students used the challenging Japanese language learning experience as the hammer; however, T3 had to use her own realisation of herself, being a Japanese native speaker, teaching her language in a place where the interpretation of Japan and Japanese differs greatly from her own. This also reflects the university students’ identification of feeling conflicted when using *Aizuchi*, for example.

The experience of teaching the language seems just as subjective to the three teachers as learning the language is for the language students. It seems the teachers also need some provocation to break out of their comfort zones in order to become fully confident language teachers. Norton (2000) argues that second language acquisition (SLA) theorists have struggled to conceptualise the relationship between the language learner and the social world because they have not developed a comprehensive theory of social identity, which integrates the language learner and the language-learning context. This argument can be applied to the teacher as well. The integration of Japanese language teaching and its social context need to be theorised for the teachers to be able to view their position as Japanese language teachers in Australia. Norton also argues that the second language teacher needs to help the language learner claim the right to speak outside the classroom (Zaid, 1999; Tudor, 2001). However, this could not be done if the teacher does not have a clear view of themselves as a language teacher inside as well as outside the classroom.

### 7.3 Schools as sites of cultural production: Interculturality

From the data, it has been found that the participating students and the teachers’ subjectivities shifted while learning and teaching the Japanese language. This suggests the crucial link between language learning and cultural learning that forms part of a student’s educational experience. Considering the theorists’ arguments that schools are sites of social and cultural production and reproduction (Wexler, 1995), places where certain styles of self and knowing are ‘authorized’ amidst race, class, and gender inequalities (Levinson & Holland, 1996; Luttrell, }
This study shows that the foreign language learning classroom provides a vital site where a new cultural ‘reality’ is produced. This section discusses the identification of conventional schooling on the one hand as cultural reproduction, and, on the other, as a potential site for the cultural production of a new sense of intercultural identity through the notion of interculturality in foreign language learning.

The two primary schools that participated in this study provided an interesting contrast in terms of the schools’ social environment and in terms of the teachers’ own subjectivities and experience. Primary school students, Group A in this study, are from a school where multicultural education is embraced as a core philosophy of the education that they provide. This is very different from the school where Group B was located, where the school community had limited cultural diversity. For Group A, they knew that the school encouraged them to express their cultural heritage in the playground as well as in their classrooms. The study by Austin, Dwyer and Freebody (2003) shows that schoolchildren are accomplished in expressing themselves in a way to please their associated classroom interactants. The students knew that representing their cultural heritage articulately, for example ‘I am Greek, because I have Greek in my blood’ is a positive action in their school.

In Group A, there was clear evidence of the ways in which the students acknowledged the influence of teachers and classrooms with regard to their social interactions with others, and, in particular, the ways in which teachers made cultural assumptions about what was appropriate. As discussed, T1 is the HSIE teacher and a Japanese national. During the observation period of this classroom, it was noticed that the teacher often discussed subject matter from her point of view as a Japanese person. She often used the words ‘we Japanese’.

For Group B, it appeared more difficult for students who were not part of the dominant culture of the school to feel they could assert their separate identity. It appeared there were fewer efforts on the part of the school or the teachers to celebrate diversity. Compared to the previously mentioned Greek student from Group A, a student from Group B with one parent from Macedonia did not seem
willing to attribute any significance to having a Macedonian parent. When I asked him what it meant to him that his father’s country was Macedonia, he responded ‘it means nothing.’

What makes a particular way of acting in a classroom available to the members as alternative or different for that group is the normative accountability of that action. If the student sensed that announcing ‘I am a Macedonian’ did not give accountability as a class member, the statement would not be made. Skinner and Holland (1996: 274), Francis (1998) and Epstein (1999) discuss how children and young people are the passive objects of schooling, where they learned conformity to dominant relations and social structures. This might be an indication that this student needs an environment where he can create his own persuasive voice, which presents his identity created by his own reality. The student’s comment on his father’s cultural heritage of ‘it means nothing’ appears to be a reflection of his school environment, rather than his own voice.

It was also noted in the staff room of the school of Group B that some teachers in conversation with others appeared to be insensitive to cultural diversity; for example confusing elements of Chinese culture and Japanese culture, or using the words ‘Turkish Christmas’ to describe the Muslim festivity of ‘Ramadan’. Martino and Pallotta-Chiarolli (2005) argue that students’ feelings of powerlessness and resistance within a system often reflects a lack of acknowledgement or even a negation of student voices. They tend to be encouraged to act within their peer groups in a way that will be accepted as ‘normal’. In response, students may negate their differences, or else strive to create a visible, differentiated and reputable self as their primary activity in school. Luttrell (1996:132) shows her concern at how schools encourage some aspects of the self more than others. The argument was evidenced in this research. One example was given by the teacher T3. She reported that the principal of the primary school did not like her to celebrate the Japanese summer festivity by making a lantern with her class. His argument was that a lantern is a representation of Buddhism and their school is based upon the Christian philosophy.
The two participating primary schools, and the primary school where T3 also taught, indicated that each school was a recognisable site for creating a particular cultural environment which in turn was likely to permeate teaching and learning. School missions, philosophies and strong sense of social justice, values and behaviours impacted on the teachers’ attitudes, which in turn also influenced greatly the shaping of the students’ attitudes to identifying their subjectivity and sense of otherness, crucial for the development of the students’ interculturality. On the contrary, the perception by T3’s principal that there was a conflict between the teacher’s plan to celebrate the Japanese summer festival in her classroom and the school’s overall Christian philosophy indicates that influence from school management does not always work positively towards interculturality.

As students interact with the social context of their schools, a struggle within themselves emerges as they confront new ideas, interact with other students, and compare these experiences with those of their family and earlier schooling. As students move from primary into secondary school, they come to acquire or reject the hegemonic nature of school knowledge and social relationships.

All the high school and university students who were interviewed experienced the power of language to challenge and inform their worldview and identity construction (Fairclough, 1989; Lakoff, 1989; Suslak, 2000; Talbot et al, 2003). The data show that the students became more aware of how their learning in the foreign language classroom was creating a new cultural environment. They described how it felt to be outside of their comfort zone while learning the Japanese language. Fairclough (1989:38) uses a school as an example of the social structure of an institution to discuss the power of language.

The school has a social order and an order of discourse which involve a distinctive structuring of its ‘social space’ into a set of situations where discourse occurs (class, assembly, playtime, staff meeting, etc.)…what each participant is allowed and required to say, and not allowed or required to say, within that particular discourse type…So discourse in turn determines and reproduces social structure.

The students learnt how to be ‘successful’, learning this discourse through their school years, in other words, by ‘producing’ the cultural responses that created success for them. However, the successful discourse in the language class was
different from that outside of the language class. Lakoff (1989:13) argues that language is politics. He explains that

…how well language is used translates directly into how well one’s needs are met, into success or failure, climbing to the top of the hierarchy or settling around the bottom, into good or bad relationships, intimate and distant.

In the Japanese language classes, the students came to understand that the Japanese language did not follow the same cultural and grammatical rules as English. Through this experience, they also realised that there are different social systems within the Japanese language culture, and they learned to negotiate within themselves to agree or disagree to the new language culture. The negotiation process was their experience of ‘struggle’. The experience of getting inside another culture was difficult, because this was a difficult interplay between their conventional self and the new experience of meeting with ‘otherness’. Bakhtin (1981:345) explains this as a ‘struggle’. He argues that when thought begins to work in an independent, experimenting and discriminatory way, what first occurs is a separation between internally persuasive discourse and authoritarian enforced discourse, along with a rejection of those congeries of discourses that do not matter to us, that do not touch us. The struggle occurs when internally persuasive discourse enters into an intense interaction, and our mind opens up. He says:

…when someone else’s ideological discourse is internally persuasive for us and acknowledged by us, entirely different possibilities open up.

Bakhtin (1981:345)

The students were initially caught between the family and the school environments as conflicting sites of cultural production, rather than recognising an opportunity to find newer ways to mean. An interesting contradiction is that the school community can reinforce the tendency to reject ‘otherness’, but at the same time, the school can also provide the concrete experience of ‘struggle’ to enable students to find their own new meaning. One high school student explained his experience when using *Hai* incorrectly (Yes in English); he had to sing a song as penalty when taking part in a language game during a class activity. The high school students discovered that by merely changing words from English to Japanese they do not always achieve the same level of communication as when they used those same words in English. An example was given by a student who
used the wrong rule when replying to a question. The question was ‘Are you not going to school?’ In English the answer is ‘No, I am not going to school’, however in Japanese he had to say ‘Yes, I am not going to school’. He said ‘It is very confusing’ and ‘saying ”Yes” to ”No” does not make sense’. The students seemed repeatedly confused, struggled to accept the reasoning in the Japanese language, and the difficulty was to accept that saying ‘Yes’ to ‘No’ was legitimate in the Japanese language. This was one example to show that the students found a new meaning by experiencing the ‘struggle’, and found the internally persuasive discourse that opened up for the new culture for him. The student could not avoid this struggle, because it was a school subject. Such a concrete experience created a valuable space for getting inside another culture. Indeed, the Japanese language subject provided a space to counteract the tendency in the school community to reject ‘otherness’.

The students’ initial feeling of dissonance while learning the language was demonstrated by the way they related how they had to initially accept the need to say things that seemed incorrect, although they definitely showed they understood and agreed later. Fairclough (1989:46) argues that power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants. For example, there are constraints on what is said or done; there may be unequal social relations between people who enter into discourse; and the ‘subject positions’ people can occupy has an effect. Their own cultural background, which protects them, or cocoons them, as they acquire their native language skills, did not prepare them for their initially dissonant experiences of ‘other’. The second language learning process as a part of the school curriculum assisted them, almost forced them, to create a new culture within themselves. However, cultural production may not have been possible if the students did not have a safe environment within which to experience such difficult encounters with ‘struggle’ and ‘oppression’ (dissonance).

It is crucial to note that although they felt powerless in the Japanese language classes, the high school students all mentioned that they gained confidence by learning the Japanese language from their primary school age; they thought they were more able than other students as they could write, read, and speak Japanese
and other students could not. Gaining confidence while being in unfamiliar territory seems crucial to later development of the foundation of intercultural awareness. Hughes, Bellamy & Black (2000: 225-247) discuss building social trust through education. They argue that social trust differs from personal trust in that it has to do with attitudes to strangers and casual acquaintances, and it develops through familiarity. Considering the Japanese language learning experience ensured that the students were going to encounter ‘others’, the students need to feel secure in the ‘other’ encountered in the Japanese language classroom. The school and the teachers work together to provide this environment.

Giddens explains (1991:38) that ‘basic trust’ forms the original nexus from which a combined emotive-cognitive orientation towards others can emerge, and is fundamental to the connections between daily routines and normal appearances. Considering the adolescent students’ experience of opening/widening their comfort zone, the confidence they gained while learning the Japanese language at primary school apparently affected them positively. Positive experience was necessary to prepare the ground for the challenging experience, the next step of the cultural production of the student’s widened identity at the school.

The language classroom can produce a new cultural ‘reality’ where the students share their real feelings of ‘confidence’ together with the ‘struggle’ and ‘oppression’. The classroom site together with the school curriculum were vital elements in the students’ attempts to break out from their shelter of family and school pre-established habits and customised ways of thinking. The data confirm Giddens’s (1991:188) argument that negativity towards the ‘other’ tends to emerge from the refusal to seriously entertain divergent views and ideas.

Reay also argues (2004:39) how schools and family are reproducing the middle class. He explains that for many middle class parents, the imperative to reproduce their privileged class position in their children is profound, and the children of the middle-class feel it necessary to prove themselves to be self-perpetuating. The private school that these high school students attend is certainly one of those that attract middle class parents.
Students and young people generally are clearly subjects-in-process (Fitzclarence, Green and Bigum, 1995, Hayles, 1990, McLeod, 2000). Thus Bourdieu’s use of ‘habitus’ offers some highly useful ways of interpreting the interaction between forms of schooling and the formation of identity. These critical understandings of social and cultural reproduction in education lead usefully beyond the view of education as an autonomous or neutral activity. The high school students who participated in this study obviously showed their frustration between their self and others when meeting with knowledge and social relationships that were outside of their comfort zone. This notion of cultural capital as the differential value given to different cultural and linguistic forms in education can be related to Pennycook’s (2001:124) viewpoint. Pennycook (2001:128) discusses cultural politics in language classes, and claims that cultural politics have to do with whose versions of reality gain legitimacy, and whose representations of the world gain sway over others. From his perspective, classrooms become sites of cultural struggle, contexts in which different versions of the world are battled over.

The classroom culture emerges from the struggle that ensues when existing sets of meanings encounter alternative sets of meanings. From Bakhtin’s point of view the struggle is identified as:

a dialogic encounter, which engages in an ongoing play of voices – voices which emerge from specific historical, political and social contexts, carrying with them traces of specific experiences.
(Bakhtin 1981:291)

Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia provides an environment for working towards the development of an imagination that is genuinely dialogic. The high school students’ experience of the struggle created the genuine dialogue between their self and other, and found another set of meanings outside of the ‘habitus’.

The Japanese language classroom as a site of cultural struggle provided the students opportunity to create the new version of meaning, which is ‘real’ to them. Bakhtin’s further discussion (1981:345) suggests that the new voice, the internally persuasive discourse, not the externally authoritative discourse, creates the possibility of an imagined real self.

When someone else’s ideological discourse is internally persuasive for us and acknowledged by us, entirely different possibilities open up. Such
discourse is of decisive significance in the evolution of an individual consciousness: consciousness awakens to independent ideological life precisely in a world of alien discourses surrounding it, and from which it cannot initially separate itself. The process of distinguishing between one’s own and another’s discourse, between one’s own and another’s thought, is activated rather late in development.

While following Japanese language rules, the students were creating heteroglossia, and placing themselves outside of their routinised habitus. The language rules in Japanese are quite different from their own in English, but they needed to follow the rules in order to make genuine communication. The interesting contradiction is that they sometimes do not feel genuine to themselves; they experienced a struggle with their idea of self identity, when they followed different social rules. Their oral dialogue, using Japanese, allowed the students to negotiate between their own subjectivity and Japanese ways. When a Japanese person praised their Japanese language by saying ‘You speak well in Japanese’ in Japanese language, they had to think whether they like to say simple ‘thank you’ in Japanese, or reply by using a phrase ‘No, not at all’ in Japanese language that they learnt as socially appropriate in a Japanese society. They were frustrated by learning kanji because it does not follow their everyday language rules and is different to alphabets that they were familiar with. The kanji scripts are difficult to remember. Also composition of meaning often caused disagreement within themselves. A student showed an example of the kanji for ‘cheap’ which is comprised of a character of a woman and a character of a house. This female student did not agree with the Japanese meaning of this character that combines a woman and a house to equal the word cheap. To her way of thinking, this was demeaning the woman who chooses to work at home. Students needed to listen more carefully than when listening to their own language, otherwise they might miss out on a lot of information, because the context of culture, the language rules, and even the pronunciation and tone of voice are different from their everyday English. All these experiences challenged the conventional self which was developed within their comfort zone. Within the comfort zone, their subjectivity is always the signifier of dominance.

The university students clearly indicated that they identify themselves from the place of the ‘other’ as Hall explains. The high school students also indicated their
self development through the viewpoint of other people. The high school environment together with their family environment seemed to direct them as to who the ‘others’ are, and provided them with the protection to maintain the signifier of dominance. However, the high school students also indicated that the high school was a place of cultural struggle, struggles between the different versions of the world, the version that their environment seemed to nurture and the new version, that ‘something’ they struggled to accept. The student’s struggle when meeting with the ‘other’ is explained by Bakhtin(1981:346);

Our ideological development is just such an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values. The semantic structure of an internally persuasive discourse is not finite, it is open; in each of the new contexts that dialogize it, this discourse is able to reveal ever newer ways to mean.

Compared to the closeness of a high school as a place of cultural production and re-production that the high school students experienced, the university seemed more flexible and open to these university students fresh from high school. Unlike the high school students, the university students indicated their identification of others as those of equal position rather than from the position of dominance. They expressed themselves in a philosophical and inclusive manner rather than an emotional manner. This attitude assisted the students to conceptualise their position. The students understood that while they were in an English speaking context, they could locate themselves in that dominant context, and when speaking in Japanese they felt that they were in part of the subordinate group. The important point here is that they could explain the two different positions. So, when the language students see a sign, their signifier operates, not only from the view of dominance, but also with the ability to conceptualise the other side of the operation, understanding more of the position of the Other. The university students observed that the language community is a heterogeneous arena, and it is wrong to suggest that all people who belong to the Japanese speaking community possess one homogenized signifier.

Although university is a place which encourages critical thinking rather than spoon feeding information, consideration of recent theorist arguments in regards
to the university as a place of cultural production/reproduction is interesting. As a general consensus, middle- and upper-income parents tend to send their students to universities, while working-class parents send theirs to second-tier universities and more vocational education institutions, with lower levels of resources, higher rates of dropping out, and access to a lower tier of occupations (Lareau, 2007: 326, Grubb and Lazerson, 2006:304). The argument can be expanded with Reay’s argument (2004:35) that ‘becoming yourself’ within higher education is even more complicated when compared to the high school environment. For working-class students authenticity most often meant being able to hold onto a self that is rooted in a working-class past. However, within prevailing discourses the authentic self has to be realised as a self seeking one, to maximise its own powers. All these arguments explain that university is a place which produces students who maintain their middle class self, as well as translocating the students with a working class background into the middle class. Giddens’ (1991:6-8) position on producing difference, exclusion and marginalisation in modernity, shows closely meshed arguments of class and inequality that lead us to think that this type of university education may create more conformity and also more inequity within society.

On the contrary, these university students indicated that their choice of written and spoken language was not conforming with society’s expectations, but individual, and their representation of the language conventions are also individual. The students learnt this, and were able to reflect upon their self in relation to the Japanese language and its society. By learning the language they learnt social rules, which are interwoven into the language.

It is interesting to note that a high school student as well as a university student commented that they can share their opinions with the Japanese language classmates much easier than with students from other classes. These observations suggest that there might be a possibility of the Japanese language students creating yet another site of cultural production than that found elsewhere at the primary school, high school and the university. Kanno and Norton (2003) discuss the ‘imagined community’ that bilingual or multilingual people create. When the primary school students mimic a Japanese sumo wrestler they are in their
imagined Japan. Some students see their interest in Japanese animation, others might show interest in Japanese pop culture and so forth. However, they can see their future education is connected to Japan. They argue that humans are capable of connecting with communities that lie beyond the local and immediate and that investment in such imagined communities strongly influences identity construction and engagement of learning. This assists in explaining how the language classroom differs from the other classroom. The students within the language community connect to each other outside the mainstream reality. Bakhtin’s notion of hybrids that structure the image of a language (1981:360), also explains the possibility of creating such a community. In a way, the students’ comments that they can share their own ideas with their Japanese language classmates more easily than to their classmates from other subjects demonstrate an imagined community.

Bianchin (2003) discusses a concept of non-natural societies, and argues that language is a condition for the constitution of society because it supports the intersubjective coordination of actions and action plans, the interpersonal integration of individuals in social units ordered by common norms and values.

These arguments support a possibility of the language class as an arena of cultural production of ‘reality’ where they find their own real voices free from pre-nurtured views.

### 7.4 Language education for interculturality

This section analyses the findings relating to developments in language education for interculturality, and the gaps between the curriculum recommendations, teacher education, and the perceptions and beliefs of teachers and curriculum developers interviewed for the research.

#### 7.4.1 The gaps between language education and the curriculum recommendations

The participating student groups showed intercultural development while learning the Japanese language, although the signs were different in each group. The
Japanese language learning experiences acted as an agent for each group, and caused a softening effect on the primary students’ cultural boundary. It assisted the students to interact with otherness. In the case of the high school students, the learning experiences worked as the catalyst to explode their comfort zone, which made possible their interaction with the Other. This study found the resistance and the struggle that the students experienced while learning the Japanese language were crucial for development of their interculturality especially with the older student groups. The confrontation and experiences of struggle were identified more strongly with the high school students, while the university students indicated their ability to monitor their struggles and confrontations and find solutions for most conflicts. However, the high school students and the university students’ reflections on their primary school experiences also indicated the initial struggles that they experienced when they started Japanese studies at primary age, although the primary school participants in this study, with the fun activities suited to their age group, showed only positive experiences from their Japanese language studies.

**Table 7-1: Development of interculturality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How they observed Themselves when learning Japanese</th>
<th>Japanese language acted as:</th>
<th>Resulted in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fun, great confident</td>
<td>A substance to cause Softening effect to the boundary</td>
<td>Softening the boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Challenging confident</td>
<td>Catalyst to self explosion</td>
<td>Opening up their self to other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Challenging humble</td>
<td>An objective conceptual views</td>
<td>Establishing equally positioned objective view of their own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed, this study found that the students developed their interculturality while learning the Japanese language, and that schools can provide the opportunities to experience the resistance and the struggles in a safe environment. Such experiences can become sources for the students to produce a new intrinsic
negotiation of their own viewpoint. However, the results of this study only show the organic development of the students’ interculturality, rather than the result of being deliberately taught. One student who indicated only limited development of this ability might have shown a different result if he had been taught this ability consciously as a part of the school curriculum.

Teaching culture is widely discussed within the foreign language teaching and learning arena (Lo Bianco & Crozet, 2003; Kramsch, 1993; Liddicoat & Crozet, 2000; Byram, 2005). It is quite clear that teaching invisible culture and intercultural competence is a focus of the debate, as visible cultures have been always taught in the foreign language classroom as a crucial part as language learning. The NSW LOTE syllabus published in 2003 reflected that importance, and aimed to permeate teaching practice with the concept. In the intercultural language teaching report by Liddicoat et al (2003:43-46), a clear link was made between language, culture and learning. Moreover, the ALPLP (see Chapter 3) demonstrated both theoretical reasoning and a practical approach to the intercultural language teaching. However, there are gaps between and within the language education and the curriculum recommendations in terms of developing the students’ interculturality. It seems the gaps have to be filled not only from language education, but from school education as in general.

Observing interculturality within the big picture of school education curricula, interculturality is a vital element acquired during students’ school years. The government documents in regard to the education of young Australians, such as the Report from the Prime Minister’s Youth Pathways Action Plan Taskforce in 2001, describes the National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century (2001:15-16), and interculturality is stated clearly as the crucial skill. However, the documents only use the language of superficial expressions. For example, the following passage is the first point in the mentioned document.

1. Schooling should develop fully the talents and capacities of all students. In particular, when students leave schools they should have the capacity for, and skills in, analysis and problem solving and the ability to communicate ideas and information, to plan and organise activities and to collaborate with others. (P15)
If skills in ‘analysis and problem solving’ are to be useful tools within the society as a whole rather than skill to solve Mathematical or Science matters, then they cannot be enhanced unless interculturality forms an important part of the foundations. The ability to ‘communicate ideas and information, to plan and organise activities and to collaborate with others’ cannot be developed unless the ability is based on interculturality. This study found the students showed this development of interculturality while learning the Japanese language, and that it appears that the development is incremental. The findings also indicate that the Japanese language learning contributed to this development. What actually developed and how it developed need to be noted and inserted into the curriculum document. It is time to realise that the only expression in the documents that show the national goals of schooling do not help teachers and students to develop any such ability, because the documents do not clearly explain interculturality. Another point from the same document shows a similar superficial expression:

3. Schooling should be socially just, so that students’ outcomes from schooling are free from the effects of negative forms of discrimination based on sex, language, culture and ethnicity, religion or disability, and of differences arising from students’ socio-economic background or geographic location….all students understand and acknowledge the value of cultural and linguistic diversity, and possess the knowledge, skills and understanding to contribute to, and benefit from, such diversity in the Australian community and internationally. (p.16)

In this study it was found that this national goal is not widely transmitted into school environments. The Christian school’s misinterpretation of a lantern-making activity indicates a lack of understanding and acknowledgement of the value of cultural diversity. The unfortunate incident was caused by a lack of sensitivity to interculturality within the school. Another example of a fundamental lack cultural understanding has been given in this thesis about the experienced primary school teacher who used the incorrect explanation of Ramadan as ‘Turkish Christmas’. One primary school student said she thought ‘all black people were bad people, but my friend is not’. The organic meaning of interculturality has apparently not been understood by the community in general, and the language within the documents does not indicate its actual meaning; hence it does not permeate the school environment.
As this study indicates, the students need agents and reasons to observe themselves as well as others. This process seems intrinsically crucial to the development of interculturality. One of the university students observed her experience when sitting between her mother and her father when her parents separated. This student found *the persuasive voice* within herself by observing both sides of her parents’ viewpoints. She said she could relate that experience to Japanese language learning. Her understanding indicates that some students have the ability to apply one experience to another situation, and so develop their intercultural understanding. However, not all students will make similar connections. Making connections needs to be developed by an intentional plan.

A civic and citizenship education program, *Discovering Democracy*, was published in 2000 by the Federal Government. One of the aims of the program is to develop young Australians who can participate in society as informed, reflective citizens as discussed in Chapter 3. Although the program articulated values such as ‘tolerance, respect for others, freedom of speech, religion and association’, it only focused on the history, and contemporary operation, of political and legal order in Australia; the articulation of values is only an expression on paper. Hughes, Bellamy and Black (2000:242) also argue that the draft conceptual design of that program did not refer to the values of empathy and altruism, or the skills of taking account of the feelings of others.

As discussed in Chapter 3, The National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools published in 2005 is another example of a document that indicates the Australian government’s stance on interculturality as the crucial skill to develop within school education in Australia. In the case of New South Wales, although the importance was transmitted in the HSIE syllabus as well as the LOTE syllabus, it does not seem to be regular practice in everyday teaching. Three main reasons are identified. Firstly, HSIE is near the bottom of the hidden subject hierarchy within the current school environment. Secondly, there is a noticeable lack of understanding of the concept of interculturality among teachers. Thirdly, the syllabus structure itself hinders teaching practice of this concept.
Although HSIE is one of the six compulsory key learning areas in New South Wales, it was noted in Chapter 3 that HSIE seems not to be regarded by teachers as a priority subject. In Phase I of the study, it was seen that the Japanese subject was timetabled every Monday afternoon from 2:00 to 3:00 at Group B as a part of the HSIE program for the Year 4/5 composite class, but more than half of the program was cut during the observation period of two school terms. It was a different case with Group A. This school particularly embraced Multicultural education as the school’s education philosophy, and a part of HSIE was taught in foreign languages. This is a special case, and it does not seem to follow the usual tendency in this subject. However, even in this school, interculturality was perceived differently by the teacher from what was written in the syllabus.

The concept of culture and interculturality seems to shift meaning from the point where the theorists deliver the concept to the point where the practitioners deliver it as a classroom exercise. One crucial issue to be emphasised is that many teachers whom I encountered while this study was being conducted do not perceive contexts such as the above mentioned student’s experience of her parents separation as a path to develop interculturality, which deeply links to one’s subjectivity. As discussed in Chapter 2, it is a space of enunciation in Bhabha’s term (Bhabha, 1996:58). It is a place where new worldviews with new ‘internal forms’ for perceiving the world are created (Bhakhtin, 1984:360). Ian Anderson (1994) contested the term ‘hybrid’ upon himself and his people, but it is the position where he constructed the cultural authority according to the contingent positionality of his subject.

The LOTE syllabus in NSW published in 2003 introduced a new objective, ‘moving’ between cultures, which indicated the Board of Studies’ positioning on culture. However, it seems that the syllabus has been translated in many different ways, and often the translation does not correspond with the syllabus writers’ intention. The gap was seen even among the syllabus developers at the in-service programs I participated in during the consultation period of the proposed syllabus. Although I attended a series of seminars conducted to introduce the intercultural language teaching, initiated by Asian Languages Professional Learning Project,
one of Queensland’s Japanese language consultants indicated there was a long way to go before interculturality permeated into language teaching.

Since the beginning of the study in late 2002, I tracked the developments in teachers’ perceptions. I have found changes in teachers’ perceptions of culture, culture in language and interculturality. One of the participants of the teachers’ in-services during 2002 commented that ‘multicultural education has come back again’, but this perception was different to that of the participating teachers at a conference conducted by the Modern Languages’ Teachers Association’ in NSW in 2006. However, it seems that culture and interculturality still needs to be comprehended in more organic ways, because if the teachers are not clear about this concept, it cannot be woven into the fabric of the subject. Although interculturality is not a concept that can be taught directly, the language classes have to be conducted in ways which develop and enhance this quality. One way this study found to develop this quality is to provide the students with the opportunity to create dialogue between their own self and other, from which the students create their own voice, internally persuasive voice as this study found.

An interesting suggestion on how to assess cultural understanding in the context of foreign language instruction has been put forward by Schulz (2007). She argues that there is no agreement on how culture should be defined operationally in the context of the foreign language curriculum in terms of concrete instructional objectives. Then she proposed the five fundamental objectives based on her conviction of a comparative approach, which compares the learners’ culture and the target language culture. This echoes scholars such as Byram (1999), Kramsch (1993), Liddicoat, Lo Bianco and Crozet (1999). Her proposal includes learners’ development of awareness and recognition of stereotypes and generalisations about the home and target culture; how each language and culture has culture-conditioned images and culture-specific connotations of some words and gestures; some causes for cultural misunderstanding between members of different cultures; how situational variables shape communicative interaction and behaviour in important ways; and an awareness that geographic, historical, economic, social and political factors can have an impact on cultural perspectives. These objectives suggest that a language class no longer teaches only traditional
and static culture. The objectives indicate a tidy summary of what the student can learn out of culture learning within a foreign language class, and that this type of articulate indication is necessary. However, if these visible objectives are focused without considering how the students shift their subjectivity, the objectives only end up with a simple list that has to be ticked. What still need to be considered is how to focus the learners’ subjectivity.

Murakami (2005:109) explains how the language system affects the speaker’s self identity by comparing Japanese language speakers and the English language speakers. In Japanese, the personal pronoun is often not supplied, and in general the verb and adjective only indicate the speaker’s mental activities. Thus, the sentence ‘gun\textsuperscript{tai} techo\textsuperscript{o hiki dasu no ga wakaru} (gun\textsuperscript{tai} techo\textsuperscript{o} = regimental tally-book, o = object marker, hiki dasu = to take out, no ga = nominaliser + object marker, wakaru = to notice)’ is ambiguous. It can mean either “I notice that he takes out my regimental tally-book” or ‘He (Kato) notices that he (the soldier) takes out his (Kato’s) regimental tally-book’ – the former is the character’s monologue, and the latter is the narrator’s voice. Hence, in Japanese, the character’s and the narrator’s different voices are merged in one sentence without clear distinction. It is difficult, if not impossible, to articulate this kind of ambiguity, which covers two different voices, in languages that have a different system. Murakami notes that a language such as English, which requires the almost mandatory use of personal pronouns and has a rigorous tense system, the listener/reader does not have to decide the subject and tense of the text as the language inherently identifies this. The Japanese listener/reader must consciously decipher the text in order to pinpoint the subject and tense. Therefore, the Japanese speaker may well have a greater sense of self-identity. On the contrary, Japanese authors such as Amamiya (2007) argue from an opposite position that it might be right to say that self-identity consciousness or individuality is specifically strong in English-speaking people as a result. These are very interesting propositions that need to be explored further.

Murakami(2005:108) also explains that a foreign language produced by uniquely foreign ways of articulating experience cannot adequately express indigenous ideologies, desires, emotions or psyches articulated in an indigenous manner. To learn a foreign language requires deconstructing one’s indigenous experiences
formulated by one’s native language, and re-expressing them in terms of the foreign culture. The LOTE syllabus introduced the new objective ‘moving between cultures’, aiming to assist students’ intercultural competency. This objective cannot be fulfilled unless the concepts of ‘culture’ and ‘interculturality’ are understood by the people who implement the syllabus. This provides the students with opportunities not only to analyse the target language culture, but importantly also to look at their own self/ culture from a shifted perspective.

Moreover, the notion of ‘the third space/spaces’ and the term ‘moving between cultures’ may also contribute to the confusion in the LOTE syllabus (2003). This syllabus echoed the theorists such as Lo Bianco, Liddicoat and Crozet (1999) who suggest the possibilities of creating the comfortable third places between their self and others by learning a foreign language. However, teachers need to be cautious not to make a superficial assumption that simply moving between the learners’ own culture and the target language culture can lead the students to achieve ‘the third places’. This study did not show that the students created ‘the third space’s while learning the language, but what this study demonstrates is that the students need a tool to develop interculturality, and the Japanese language learning experience served as one of these tools.

The syllabus structure in NSW may serve to hinder the implementation of foreign language learning. LOTE in NSW is quite vague in terms of its position in the school curriculum. LOTE is included in the HSIE key learning area in the NSW school curriculum. This means, all the primary school students in NSW are supposed to learn a language during their primary school studies. However, in contradiction, LOTE has its own syllabus with goals separate from those of HSIE. It is stated that, while 200 hours of LOTE in during Years 7 and 8 is mandatory, it is not mandatory for primary school. This is a contradiction that should not be ignored since interculturality is an important concept which needs a conscious effort to be developed. Moreover, this study indicated that the language specialist teachers in primary schools are often not aware that LOTE is included in HSIE subject contents. This is another contradiction. The LOTE syllabus recommended a different set of specific objectives from the HSIE objectives, which resulted in the separation of LOTE from HSIE, rather than articulating the
importance of learning the language while viewing the language learning as providing indispensable skills for communication within HSIE.

The ALPLP was introduced in 2004 by DEST under the Australian Government Quality Teacher Program (AGQTP). The initiative was planned to achieve ‘a whole of school’ participation in developing a bigger picture of language teaching in the school curriculum. The intention was to combine Values Education together with LOTE as a way of encouraging a sense of interculturality across the school. However, informal email communication between the author and one of the participants showed that at one particular school, only the principal and the Japanese teacher were enthusiastic about implementing this project. Other teachers in the school showed clear annoyance at the introduction of language into their classes. It must be noted that even this energetic Japanese language teacher did not know that LOTE was a part of HSIE content. I felt the difficulties might have arisen when she was trying to incorporate the language teaching as a part of a school project, rather than as a requirement of the HSIE subject.

In order to implement interculturality within a school curriculum, the concept of interculturality must be understood by all the school community, not only the language teachers. While intercultural competency is discussed as an important skill in this globalised world (DeVoss et al, 2002; Housen, 2002; Roux, 2002; Kymlicka, 2003), teaching this skill does not appear as an important issue in the school curriculum/community. This is because interculturality is still thought of as merely a conventional superficial understanding of culture.

Finally, the limitation of the study must be noted. This section discussed how the Japanese language learning experiences promote the students’ interculturality and its contribution as a crucial element to citizenship and values education. However, the concept is a complex notion that is at the core of our very being, a core aspect of human interrelationships in our diverse society. This study cannot claim that only Japanese language learning was responsible for the development of the students’ interculturality. Rather, this study indicates that students who experienced Japanese language in various stages developed awareness and insight of their self and other; therefore the language learning experience can be a tool to
develop interculturality, which is clearly valued in the school curriculum. Interculturality is in many respects an abstract notion and potentially understood only idealistically; therefore, it is important to find avenues where the teaching of interculturality can be applied. As discussed, although the acknowledgment by NSW DET of the importance of developing interculturality in school years is apparent, very few instructional tools for teaching were identified. The argument presented in this section is that Japanese language education can be an effective instrument for developing interculturality.

7.4.2 The gaps between the curriculum recommendations, the developers and the perceptions and beliefs of teachers.

The new language syllabus in New South Wales recognised the importance of the intercultural competency that students can develop through the language learning experience. The new syllabus was supported by the language teaching community, but it seemed that the teachers were not aware of the new introduction because they did not see the difference between intercultural teaching from the culture teaching which was implemented previously. However, even the teachers who noticed the differences were not quite sure how it could be implemented.

The students broadened their subjectivity by learning the language, because the learning experience assisted them in developing their interculturality. If this is what the LOTE syllabus is expecting the students to develop while learning the language, firstly the schools and the teachers have to conceptualise this notion in order to influence their teaching, thus the students’ learning.

As the interview results demonstrate, the teaching of language is a very subjective matter, and the teachers indicated they understood the teaching of culture and interculturality in language teaching differently. T3 clearly stated that a teacher’s own interpretation of culture affects the teaching. Her experience indicated that her Master of Education study of culture in context was a major contribution to the learning that she experienced. From that professional development, she learnt
to theorise her practice as a language teacher, and took back this knowledge to her classroom.

T1 felt that Japanese language teaching could assist the students to develop a broader view, because the students can experience cultural differences through language. However, she expressed her uncertainty about the efficacy of teaching culture through Japanese language in Australian schools. At her school she was expected to teach all of the HSIE syllabus, including LOTE, in Japanese. While the arrangement should have been a very positive and meaningful way of fulfilling the intercultural purposes of the HSIE/LOTE curriculum, she indicated her discomfort, saying it seemed to block her from teaching Japanese culture through the language. It appeared that she was only considering culture as part of a skill set of teaching the language, rather than seeing it as an opportunity to teach language in a holistic way within a school curriculum (Lo Bianco, 2004:54).

T2’s professional identity is based on her perception of herself as a primary school teacher rather than a language teacher, and she teaches the language as a part of the HSIE syllabus. However, the Japanese language subject was a victim of the primary school’s crowded curriculum, and it was the subject T2 cancelled whenever she had to accommodate co-curricula activities. It appears that T2 regarded HSIE or LOTE subjects as less important in relation to other subjects.

T1 and T2 are both in a fortunate position where they, together with their students, can explore their interculturality and develop it through language learning, by teaching the language as a part of the big picture of their teaching program. In this way, they could provide a contextual factor that could foster the students’ intercultural exploration through their daily school learning by linking the learning with the foreign language learning, where the students can personalise and individualise the experience of interacting with otherness more effectively. Rather, they place the foreign language learning in isolation from the other school curricula. These cases imply two major gaps between the curriculum recommendations and the teachers’ perceptions.
Firstly, interculturality is pointed out as an important quality within the school curriculum. However, if the teachers cannot articulate the concept of interculturality, they cannot teach it. T2 is not confident in teaching HSIE in the Japanese language, because she does not have the tools to rationalise the importance of doing so. T2 offers valuable teaching content to the students for their Japanese learning, but she also does not articulate that what she is doing is pedagogically valuable; therefore she cannot expand her teaching program to reach its potential.

Additionally, the general perception of both HSIE and LOTE subjects as of less importance than subjects such as Mathematics, English, Science and Information Technology does not encourage the teachers to understand that what they are doing in the class is as valuable as any other subjects. Thus, T1 and T2 want to maintain the Japanese as fun, and this perception hinders them in expanding their valuable ideas. Although as this study indicates providing a fun environment is crucial, there is an important difference between providing a fun environment in order to fulfil the objectives and having fun as an objective. This hidden hierarchy in the school curriculum also seems to contribute to the teachers’ lack of confidence in their teaching.

Interestingly, the struggles of T1 and T2 are a mirror image of T3’s initial attempt. They were all skilful language teachers in practice, but they were lacking in theoretical reasoning, which hindered their confidence. The fact that the school environment for T2 and T3 did not seem to value language subjects and HSIE very highly, also contributed to their difficulties.

It became clear that, although the three teachers were aware of the new syllabus development, only T3 acknowledged the new objectives of ‘moving between cultures’. T1 participated in a Japanese language teachers’ in-service to prepare for the introduction of the new syllabus, but was not aware that the core concept of the new objectives was intercultural competence. Interestingly, T1 and T2 stated they did not have time to read the new syllabus document.
The additional gap was indicated by informal interviews with other language teachers that I conducted during this study. The enthusiastic language teachers who were trying to introduce the syllabus, and improve their teaching, were over confident in teaching culture in the language classes. Most of the teachers commented that they were well resourced in regard to the culture component of the syllabus. However, their idea of culture was the traditional notion of material culture only, and it seems the term ‘moving between cultures’ did not provide a new understanding to the teaching of culture.

Other gaps were identified in regard to some of the syllabus distributors from the Board of Studies and the Department of Education and Training. It was noticed, during the draft syllabus consultation period, that they only discussed the School Certificate and the Higher School Certificate component of the syllabus, and completely ignored the Kindergarten to Year 6 part of the syllabus. Some teachers who also taught the language at primary school raised some questions, but the distributors focused only on the high school components. Even though ‘moving between cultures’ was the new addition to the then new syllabus, the intercultural part of the syllabus was hardly discussed in the meeting.

Lo Bianco (2004:36) explains that culture learning requires an intellectual effort because culture is not always accessible, not always noticed, analysed or taught. T3’s postgraduate study assisted her in realising that she needed to make the effort to put together the link between the theory and the practice. In T1’s case, she was provided in-service education to assist her to find the link, but the in-service education did not assist her. I attended the same in-services that T1 mentioned and, in my view, the presentation focused quite clearly on intercultural competence in the new syllabus. This is to say that much depends on the teachers’ interpretation, which in turn is influenced by their experiences, pre-learnt knowledge and perceptions of culture and intercultural teaching. For the development of interculturality, the teachers must be able to put together the theory with their own reflections on their experiences to articulate their position. The K-10 syllabus inscribes the students’ intercultural growth. However, it is as yet poorly understood and even resisted by many language teachers as also found in this part of the study of teachers in the professional development courses.
Trujillo (2002) indicated his experiences of developing interculturality through language teaching when he was an English as Foreign Language teacher in Spain. He claims that the gap between intercultural theory and practice in language teaching can be filled in with the help of a task-based framework, building on three complementary ideas: cooperative learning, generative topics and critical thinking. He suggests that the learners and the teachers must analyse their representations of ideas, conceptions, hopes, doubts and values in dialectic interaction with their opposite interlocutor. This idea seems useful as it suggests the need to observe the learners’ self in depth, as well as the other. However, if all these analyses were done within their comfort zone, the result of the analysis would be produced only from the dominant position as seen in the high school students’ interview results. It is crucial to make sure the students’ self and others are in equal position. Teachers intellectual effort, as Lo Bianco explains, seems crucial to translate Trujillo’s idea into action.

The proposal of how to teach culture by Lo Bianco et al (1999) indicates the importance of finding an intermediary space, and the methodology of finding the place/places is expressed as Intercultural Language Teaching. They explain that negotiation of differences is a personal and inter-personal creative process which cannot be controlled by external forces, thus, it cannot be ‘taught’ by a language teacher. The LOTE syllabus in NSW agrees with this ILT methodology of language teaching. However, it was understood insufficiently by the teachers observed in this study.

The language educators who teach foreign languages reflect upon different cultures and the different ways of thinking when they teach, and the learners learn the differences and become able to command the language, so that they can exchange ideas from people of different cultures and communicate with them. Therefore, intercultural language teaching does not seem to be a new concept to many of the language teachers, thus they may not feel the necessity to change their paradigm of language education. Most of the teachers I spoke to while conducting this study stated clearly that their language teaching program covered
the culture component fairly well. Consequently, as this study indicates, the teachers feel that they are doing the right thing, thus continue their old style of language and culture teaching. Some teachers are confused with the introduction of the new language teaching approach, as they do not think it is a new approach.

7.5 Conclusion

This chapter has centred around the three major themes: self-identity; schools as sites of cultural production; and developing language education for interculturality. The students’ school is a crucial location for the development of interculturality, where the curriculum can be planned to provoke their subjectivity, which is an important process in the development of this quality. The discussions were grounded on the theoretical arguments of identification of young students’ self identity while schooling, which becomes the foundation of the development of interculturality, as discussed in Chapter 2.

This study identified that government policy in regard to school education in Australia stipulates that interculturality is crucial, if one is to be ‘a good citizen’ of Australia. The documents also clearly state the importance of LOTE education in developing Australian primary students’ interculturality. In spite of these findings, it was also found that there are gaps between the documents and the practice. Diverse interpretations of ‘culture’, and therefore ‘intercultural’, and the hierarchical placement of subjects within school curriculum were found to be the main reasons for these gaps. Nonetheless, the government’s search for unity as a nation was seen in the current progress of Values Education in New South Wales and other states. Here again, interculturality is indicated as vital. However, there was once again little connection identified between the Values Education documents and everyday practice at schools.

The document statements, as well as researchers in the area of citizenship education, indicate that citizenship education/ values education are not separate
subjects and they are best taught as interconnecting with all key learning areas and
as a part of everyday schooling. However, although the researchers’ arguments
are clearly understandable, teachers who have the key role of translating the aims
of school education into classroom action, need to be informed and understand
clearly what interculturality is, how it is important, how it is developed, and how
it is integrated into their teaching program. Most importantly, the need for
developing interculturality has to be manifested, not as a by-product of schooling,
but should be purposefully directed. The tools to promote and develop
interculturality must be presented to the teachers.

This study indicates that the Japanese language learning experience affected the
students’ as well as the teachers’ subjectivity. The result suggests that Japanese
language learning can be a tool for the students’ development of interculturality.
However, at the core of this implementation, the teachers’ understanding of
culture and interculturality was missing. As this study indicated, the teachers
were also seeking their own self-identity. It seems that the teachers need to learn,
as their students have to, the meaning of culture.

When I started this study, I was going to implement the LOTE syllabus and see
how to assist the students to develop their own third place/places, as the syllabus
directs. My understanding of the third place/places was that it was intercultural
competency that helps people from other cultures understand each other. ‘the
third space’ is supposed to be the place where the students can share, and use their
intercultural competency. The result of the incomplete action research plan in the
first phase of this study was the motivation to find out how students develop their
third place/places while learning the Japanese language. However, the interview
results suggested a more intrinsic way to understand intercultural competency.
The third place notion is described as the overlapped space between the two
circles, one circle showing one’s own culture and another showing the target
language culture. The overlapped space is the shared (third) space between their
own culture and other cultures.

It seems many other language teachers understood ‘the third space’ the same way
as I did. This was a reason many teachers thought that simply to teach the target
culture and to compare it with the students’ own culture would fulfil the objective of the syllabus requirement for teaching culture. However, in practice, the two circles of the students’ own self and that of the others were separated, there was no overlapping third space. This third space may have emerged eventually; however the Japanese language learning provoked their understanding of their own self-identity, which further assisted them in generating their own voice, persuasive voice. This voice was free from the conventional voice, deeply influenced by their comfortable environment within the family, their school and their community. Nevertheless, this persuasive voice, their own voice, seems crucial in order to interact with others.

Questions and recommendations for further research and/or ideas for future educational development that arose from this discussion will be highlighted and taken up in the following final chapter.
Chapter 8  Conclusions and Recommendation

8.1 Introduction
The research area of ‘interculturality’ addressed in this thesis has been investigated through a selection of literature on wide ranging theories of culture, citizenship, globalisation and language, and explored their significance in the educational context, particularly in relation to language education, citizenship education and values education. Australian education, in particular the curriculum of Primary schooling in New South Wales, was examined as the contextual background of this study. The methodology which was used for this empirical research was a qualitative paradigm. Case studies of several sites of Japanese language learning and teaching explored perceptions and beliefs regarding the research questions from the points of view of students at various stages of their learning, and of teachers and other stakeholders. This Chapter revisits the research questions posed in Chapter 1, links the findings in Chapter 7 to some conclusions, and provides final recommendations.

The research questions were:

**The focus question:**
How does a language learning experience influence development of interculturality?

Sub questions are: -

1) What contribution do Japanese language classes make to identity construction?
2) How does Japanese language teaching and learning in New South Wales impact on children’s development of interculturality?
3) What are the interrelationships between interculturality, identity and citizenship?
The conclusions and recommendations are presented according to the results of the study.

### 8.2 Overall impact of foreign language learning experiences

The following conclusions summarise the results in regard to each question.

The focus question was How does a language learning experience influence development of interculturality? Before moving into the more detailed responses to the sub-questions for this focus question, a few general conclusions are summarised here.

This study concludes that the language learning experiences of the students had a significant impact on the students’ sense of identity and their understanding of ‘other’ and ‘otherness’. The experience worked as an agent to change or dissolve the boundaries around the students’ self or others, and then interculturality developed, based on this foundation. This study shows that three different groups of students indicated that their signification system had shifted since learning the Japanese language. The primary school students reported a softening effect on their cultural boundary, which assisted them in shifting the signifier, whereas they previously tended to have negative perceptions about otherness. There is some evidence therefore that the students’ previous perception toward otherness moved from negative towards positive, which enabled them to alter their stereotypical ideas of otherness. This assisted the students to find their own voice in regard to others, because they were no longer bound by understandings previously assumed. This is the starting point for the primary school students to develop their interculturality.

Although the in-depth interviews with the high school students are only indicative of what a larger study might reveal, this study concludes that as students develop greater maturity once they move from primary to high school, they seem to be able to move through the old boundary between self and other and create a
dialogue between their subjectivity and others, thus forming a genuine interrelationship between self and other. These tentative conclusions are further reinforced by the results from the interviews with the university students, who had been able to develop more reflective conceptual views about the relationships between their self and other.

The clear finding from this study was that by focusing on interculturality, the students were assisted in finding their own voice, as well as in understanding and creating a genuine interrelationship with others. When compared to the teaching of exotic exchange of traditional culture, which was encouraged in earlier models of multicultural education and culture teaching within language education, the differences in responses by the students are marked. The mere exchange of traditional culture only touches the periphery of otherness, thus encouraging students to defend their own identity rather than opening up to others. The conclusion from this study is that the focus of the interrelationship between one’s self and others needs to be encouraged if educational experiences are intended to foster improved interrelationships between cultural groups, as citizens of Australia. An examination of previous curricula frameworks of education for multiculturalism in Australia indicates a failure to address the concept directly.

Furthermore, it appears that while previous models of culture learning encouraged acceptance and respect between cultures, the absence of an emphasis on interculturality as the focal point resulted instead in developing a misconceived notion of ‘tolerance’ as a focus. ‘Tolerance’ as an attitude tended only to encourage people to feel a sense of superiority, not acceptance. Tolerance emanates from one’s comfort zone, and usually fails to establish a genuine or equal interrelationship, and rather results in feelings of self satisfaction, one-sided satisfaction. Therefore, there were gaps created between the two parties. The gaps were even further reinforced by students’ schooling experiences, where students shaped their subjectivity by being taught to reproduce their identity rather than creating their own self awareness. Therefore, the racism that existed intrinsically in Australian society amongst different cultural groups could not be removed merely by attempting to enforce a nation-wide policy of multiculturalism and multicultural education.
Intercultural awareness learnt through a LOTE learning experience is different from the usually more superficial experience of visiting a non-English speaking country, or working in English with others in a foreign country. The experience of tasting unfamiliar food, or travelling, for example, does not provide self-training. With LOTE, the concrete experience assists students to develop an intrinsic knowledge of others; we train ourselves to be patient when listening to others, to try to understand what the speakers say, by trying to understand the position of others when learning unfamiliar language structures that do not make sense to us initially, to observe our feelings when we do something very different. Also, importantly we can observe how we feel when we are in a minority position, because when learning a foreign language, the target language speaker always holds a more authoritative position in relation to the learner. Plus, the language learning environment provides different dynamics in terms of the students’ power relations amongst the class members when compared to other subjects, because the students’ presentation of themselves is deeply affected by their ability to operate in the target language.

This study concludes that a LOTE classroom environment provides a direct experiential context, placing the students in the position of ‘other’; with the experience of ‘being’ the other. While struggling in this experience, they learn that there are relationships between their self and other that they were not aware of previously. Eventually, they find their own voice, which is new and different to their conventional idea of self. One of the primary school children from Group A commented on one kanji 駅, which represents ‘station’; this was very impressive to me, as a Japanese native, as I cannot recall any similar comments on a kanji character.

I love this kanji, I am carrying this (a letter on a card) everywhere I go. This is my pet.

This new voice is organic, was created by her own experience of difference from her everyday encounters, and this voice was different from that of Japanese native people.
Bhabha (1996:54) demonstrates how a new part of one’s subjectivity develops when meeting with others. He also explains that a culture that develops on new soil must be bafflingly both alike and different from the parent culture. This new culture will be complicated sometimes by whatever relations are established with the original ‘home’ country, and further by immigration from other than the original source. In this way, peculiar types of culture-sympathy and culture-clash appear.

Bhabha writes:

This ‘part’ culture, this partial culture, is the contaminated yet connective tissue between cultures – at one the impossibility of culture’s containedness and the boundary between. It is indeed something like culture’s ‘in-between’, bafflingly both alike and different.

This ‘part’ culture as connective tissue between cultures was created by the experience of interaction between members of the dominant culture and the migrants; however the relationship between the cultures was usually in the context of unequal power relations, the superior group and the subordinate. If we expect authentic connective tissue between the cultures to be created by the school education system, the appropriate setting has to be provided. This study concludes that the language learning experience should be able to serve that role.

In Australia’s case, ‘the third culture’ does not seem to be the connective tissue between cultures. As seen in this study, it seems that self-created boundaries still surround most cultural groups. The primary school students’ comments suggest that this was nurtured by their families and their school environment. The Australian migrant family retained their proud national identity. One primary students’ comment ‘I have Greek in my blood’ is an example of how the parents’ voice influenced the child’s sense of identity. These children have created their identity, a mix between their parents’ culture and the ‘other’, the Australian culture. However, the boundary is still protecting themselves or excluding others, rather than creating the hybrid identity of their own that can be the connective tissues between cultures. They are not connecting with others, rather they are
creating a hard boundary around this new identity. This was exemplified by the series of recent racial riots involving Australian youth.

The study indicated that the Japanese language learning experience provided the students with a dialogue between themselves and otherness, which assisted them in creating their internally persuasive voices that facilitated the softening of the boundaries around them. Softening the boundaries assisted them in developing their interculturality.

The complexity of individual growth and their family, school and social environment that might have influenced their development of interculturality must be acknowledged. Nonetheless, this study only investigated the Japanese language learning experiences, therefore, the discussion is limited within the Japanese language learning experience of the participating students.

The grounded theory approach to this research resulted in the discovery of a new way to re-conceptualise interculturality, bringing the theory of interculturality to a new dimension. The detailed diagrams discussed in Chapter 5 illustrate how the participants underwent an awareness-raising process of becoming conscious, integrated and authentically empathic. The new conceptualisation of interculturality, invokes a vision of individual cultural boundaries in terms of hard and soft shells that can be cracked open from the inside out, thus providing the conditions to bring forth a state of being that is interculturality.

8.3 Constructions of identity, interculturality and citizenship

The responses relating to the sub questions provide more focused insights and support to the conclusions made in this study.

Sub questions were:

1) What contribution do Japanese language classes make to identity construction?
2) How does Japanese language teaching and learning in New South Wales impact on children’s development of interculturality?
3) What are the interrelationships between interculturality, identity and citizenship?

1) What contribution do Japanese language classes make to identity construction?

Our capacity to think in language is not innate. How people speak identifies them as individuals, and it is the most significant way in which individuals project and defend their sense of self to others (Corson, 1988; Fairclough, 1989). Through the Japanese language learning experience, the students find their organic voice, their persuasive voice, from within their self. This voice presents their subjectivity. While producing their own voice, they developed their own identity, rather than one reproduced by their protectors.

We see in everyday life powerful participants controlling and constraining the contribution of non-powerful participants (Fairclough. 1989). No writer has written more expansively on theories of power, and discourse, than Michel Foucault: “What gives power its hold” writes Foucault, “what makes it accepted, is quite simply the fact it does not weigh like a force which says no, but that it runs through, it produces things, it induces pleasure, it forms knowledge, it produces discourse” (Foucault. 1979: 35). The students gained firsthand opportunities to observe how this power functions and how it shifts when they are becoming a member of the Japanese speaking community. While going through this experience, they equated their position with others. Previously, their voice was coming from their self, created within the protective cocoon of the familiar; therefore, their view came from a dominant position. The Japanese language classes contributed to the students’ identity construction, while identifying themselves through an awareness of otherness. It is claimed as a result of this study that the language learning experience facilitated the emergence of what Bakhtin (1981) calls ‘an internally persuasive voice’. 
2) How does Japanese language teaching and learning in New South Wales impact on children’s development of interculturality?

It is concluded from this study that students from the primary school group, the high school group and the university students’ group all developed interculturality to increasingly deeper levels of meaning while learning the Japanese language. Their interculturality developed because the Japanese language experiences impacted fundamentally on their subjectivity. The softening effect of the primary students’ subjectivity seemed to be a crucial foundation for the ‘hammering effect’ to occur on the subjectivity of the high school students. In our daily lives we are constrained by ‘subject positions’ (Fairclough 1989, Talbot, Atkinson and Atkinson 2003), and our social roles are created for us and by us through language. The language learning experience provided the students with the opportunity to learn how their subject positions shifted when they were using Japanese language, as a contrast to their own language system. They also experienced a shift of power relations among the people they encountered when they were using this language.

Japanese language learning provides a concrete opportunity to think what you actually want to say, what you actually need to achieve. Even using a simple word such as ‘thank you’ requires the students to think about the kind of appreciation they want to express. Then they have to think how to express this appropriately, in order to understand and apply the correct context for this simple gesture. Going through this experience, along with all the other examples that arise during the language learning process, the students organically developed their interculturality, although this study also identified possible hindrance to development of interculturality while learning the language.

The impact on their subjectivity occurred when they were going through the process of noticed, compared, observed, negotiated and then found what they wanted to say/do as discussed in Chapter Five. While they were speaking, writing, reading and listening Japanese language they have noticed the differences and they noticed their feeling while experiencing the difference. Going through the
negotiation process, they found their own voice. This process was very similar to a pathway for developing intercultural competence, described by Liddicoat (2002). The emerging themes; feeling empathy to others, crossing boundaries between us & them, developing affection toward the language and culture, being accepting towards other peoples view points and developing confidence by being able to do something very different, and showing consideration towards other people, were identified as a result of going through this path.

For all groups studied, the Japanese language learning experience created a dialogue between their self and others, and acted as an agent to realise themselves and otherness. The development was shown differently by the three different groups of students; the primary students, the high school students, and the university students. The participants of this study are students who started Japanese learning when they were in primary school. This study, is one indication of how the students may develop over the period of time from primary study through to university. However, it needs a same participant’s longitudinal study to prove that. It is also indicated that the language learning experiences were only an agent for the development, and it does not ensure this result entirely. There needs to be a facilitator to enhance this development. Therefore, the classroom instructor plays a crucial role in this development.

The NSW LOTE syllabus clearly values the students’ development of interculturality while learning language. There have been many teachers’ inservices programs to enhance the teachers understanding of interculturality. However, it was found in this study that teachers experience some ambiguity around their understanding of interculturality. One conclusion that can be summised is that teachers and syllabus writers alike express the concept in very vague terms, and are apparently still rather confused as to how to facilitate change among their students.

Developing interculturality is a subjective matter, whether the teachers facilitate the development of new attitudes and subjective emotions or not. Unless the teachers fully understand this concept, they cannot be successful facilitators. The
three Japanese language teachers who participated in this study demonstrated that their identity as a Japanese language teacher in Australia also influenced their teaching, and establishing their identity as a Japanese language teacher assisted them in fostering the students’ interculturality.

The university students demonstrated a more mature attitude when observing themselves in relation to Japanese culture, and this attitude extended from their relationship with Japanese culture to their wider dealings with other cultural groups. This may have been enhanced by their primary and high school Japanese language learning experiences, although a longitudinal study is needed to prove this developmental of interculturality. Since the development of interculturality needs to deal with students’ subjectivity as this study indicated, this study brings to the forefront the need to build a positive foundation to deal with otherness early in life. Primary school learning provides a foundation to achieve a positive result from the challenges that students experienced during their high school years.

This study identified three issues in terms of curriculum development: the concept of culture; the misrepresentation of interculturality; and the relationship between LOTE and HSIE as key learning areas in the primary school syllabus. Firstly, the understanding of the concept of culture may vary between the policy makers, the syllabus writers, and teachers. Policy makers’ understanding of language learning, the syllabus writers’ translation of the syllabus, and the teachers’ implementation strategies all vary, and there is a strong legacy of the conventional understanding of ‘visible’ and static culture, rather than seeing culture as fluid. Teachers seem to struggle to shift to a new dimension of culture teaching that the LOTE syllabus identifies as an objective. These issues lead to the second point, the simplification of interculturality.

Second, this study concludes that interculturality is misrepresented and oversimplified by many teachers. In current LOTE teaching in NSW, much is made of interculturality as [a] third place/place[s] between the learner’s culture and the target language culture. These representations tend to imply that there are three distinct ‘places’ or ‘spaces’, rather than a shift in attitude and identity formation, as found in this study. The teachers’ realisation that Japanese and
English cultures are visibly different can lead teachers to overestimate the importance of teaching about obvious cultural matters rather than deeper notions of culture. Unfortunately, the results of this study point to the conclusion that such an approach tends to embed stereotypical ideas, rather than creating the intercultural space within one’s self. In other words, reducing the notion of interculturality to a representation of two overlapping circles representing the shared space/spaces between students’ culture and the target language culture does not seem to assist teachers in understanding this concept. Revisiting the way to present this concept is crucial to language teachers.

The third issue is the syllabus structure relationship between HSIE and LOTE. The Human Society and Its Environment subject in NSW focuses on developing students to become positive members of this human society. Using language to express ourselves in this society is crucial, therefore LOTE is included in the HSIE syllabus in NSW as part of the HSIE Key Learning Area. What is missing from this structure is articulating the interrelationship between the two syllabi. However, most of the schools who employ Japanese language specialists are independent or private schools, and the specialists do not always see the importance of language as fitting within the syllabus structure of HSIE. Thus, teachers tend to teach only those language skills that detach language from society. It wastes an important opportunity for young people to develop interculturality; society urgently needs to forge harmonious interrelationships among the community. Unless these issues are resolved, the successful implementation of developing interculturality might remain a challenge rather than an achievement.

3) What are the interrelationships among identity, interculturality, and citizenship?

One’s own sense of identity is the subjectivity that changes according to time and space. Identity is an expression of culture itself that individually develops while influenced by people we encounter. Interculturality, then, is manifested through an individual’s intention to connect oneself with other people that one
communicates with. Interculturality is a quality that is a necessary part of citizenship, wherever we live.

The voice created by the language learning experience was different from that created through other school activities. For example, in a team game, or when the students achieve success with group work activity in Science, the group members can find a positive voice from the successful experience, and this voice might be common to other group members, thus connecting the students with each other. However, their team connectedness was not created by the students’ consideration of difference or otherness or observation of others. Each individual did something together, and the each person had same common feeling, but they connected with the same feeling within the same group. The language class provided opportunities to create their new voice by forcing the students to observe themselves as well as others, learning to appreciate and recognise deeper connections they may not have understood before.

Citizenship, as described in this study, promotes young people to reflect upon their place in society in relation to other members of that society (Donald, 1996; Wilkins, 1999), rather than placing them into the mould of ‘a good citizen’, which can be interpreted subjectively differently. An education system is intended to encourage the students’ inquiry as democratic citizens: observing their environment, and considering the people they are dealing with, while agreeing on basic values (Wilkins, 1999, Smith, 2000). Interculturality is an indispensable quality for young students to find their identity as a citizen who can connect with others in an organic way.

The participating students showed the interrelationships over identity, interculturality and citizenship as follows.

1. Language learning influenced the students’ subjectivity by assisting them to create their own internally persuasive voice, by providing a challenge to their identity.

2. This experience assisted in developing the students’ interculturality.
3. The cultural boundary around their subjectivity and others and the boundary around the students’ comfort zone were ‘hammered from within’ then softened and cracked.

4. The students found the connective tissues. These connections were constituted with mutual respect between their culture and the Japanese culture. This attitude was different from patience or tolerance, the feeling evolved from within rather than being forced, manipulated or assimilated.

5. The students created their own identity by finding their own voice, rather than reproducing the voice.

6. The students could identify themselves not only within a perimeter, but also within a society where they live with other cultures, because they were no longer bound by a conventional identity that was given and nurtured.

7. The students found an expanded quality of citizenship.

Observing racial conflicts facing Australian society, such as the Cronulla riots in 2005/2006, the recent rejection of the development application for the establishment of the Muslim school in Camden in NSW and anti-Semitism activity at a exclusive private high school in Sydney, we see the same boundaries around those people involved in each matter as we saw among the students observed for this study. Their voice came from within their comfort zone, from within the same strong boundaries. This, along with antisocial behaviour, such as graffiti vandalism in NSW that costs state and local authorities millions of dollars to clean up, stresses the idea that the classroom is not the only site that requires a better interrelationship with others in order to create a better version of citizenship. Nevertheless, because the ‘attitudes’ element of citizenship education covers the everyday basics, such as ‘listen to others’, it has the potential risk of becoming routine and of losing effectiveness. The teachers still need some structural guidance to implement the objective, interculturality, effectively.
8.4 Recommendations

This study indicates that reaffirming LOTE Education as a key tool for students’ intercultural development is crucial. In order to fulfil the aim of LOTE education in NSW, developing intercultural competency, the recommendations are presented in three main areas according to the research outcomes: the position of language education in the school curriculum; teachers’ initial training and ongoing professional development to enhance their interculturality; and classroom practice on how to facilitate students’ development of interculturality.

8.4.1 The position of language education in the school curriculum

LOTE should be a key learning area within the primary school curriculum. Typically, a foreign language is taught in isolation by a specialist teacher, and only focuses on very traditional attitudes to language teaching, and this results in language education primarily being offered at privileged primary schools, rather than at every primary school as a requirement of HSIE. This study reaffirmed the importance of LOTE learning in primary school education by providing the new dimension to language education as a tool to connect people who live in this human society. The two subject areas, LOTE and HSIE, should support LOTE teaching in primary school as the syllabus written by the Board of Studies clearly indicates support for its implementation.

The result of this study shows that the students developed interculturality while learning Japanese. It is not to say the language study guarantees interculturality development. However formal language education can play a significant role in enhancing such development. Language teachers, and primary teachers generally, need clear indications on why it is crucial for language to be introduced as a key learning area. The current description of LOTE as a part of the HSIE syllabus does not emphasise the importance of language teaching. The current mandatory requirement of 200 hours during Years 7 and 8 may not be sufficient when considering their intercultural development. It is recommended that when considering the Syllabus from K-10, that the current mandatory 200 hours for
Years 7 and 8 in the secondary school be expanded to include mandatory hours in the primary school.

Educating young people as a ‘good citizen’ needs to provide opportunities to reflect on their self as a member of the society in relation to other members where they belong, as discussed in Chapter 2. The negotiation process that was indicated by the students is the reflection process on their self in relation to Japan and Japanese culture. The students used their skills to question, inquire and observe about themselves and Japanese culture while negotiating. In the university student U4’s case, where she used negotiating skills when she was placed between her mother and father, she was able to develop these skills to apply to Japanese study. U4 has done it all by herself. However, this result indicates an educational implication for students who are not competent enough or not able to identify the skills within themselves.

Reflecting on the curriculum development government documents in citizenship education and language education, it seems clear that the importance of intercultural understanding as discussed in Chapter 3 has been stressed. However, the intercultural understanding mentioned here was only an outward looking concept rather than organic meaning of intercultural understanding that can establish mutual respect amongst people within the community where we belong. Indicated by the participating students, Japanese language learning experience provided them intrinsic understanding of Japan and Japanese as others to their self by experiencing the negotiation period.

Interculturality indicated by the participating students should be fostered by an educational system as a part of the curriculum. The HSIE syllabus(1998:3) as well as the Language syllabus (2003) in NSW aims to develop this quality. However, the constraint the teachers having to fulfil overwhelming daily teaching requirements in each of the subjects often means that HSIE and the foreign language element within the curriculum are neglected. This is in contradiction to the government documents as at least HSIE is included as a key learning area, and the language is a component.
The study has concluded that interculturality will develop through a dialogue between the students’ self and others, in order to generate their own persuasive voice. Although this study does not prove the link between primary school, high school and university students, the study has pointed to the crucial and cumulative impact that language learning experience can have on the primary school students as well as the high school and university students. A key consideration here is that it takes time for students to come out from their comfort zone to create their own identity, and to develop a greater awareness of their subjectivity. The students’ sense of trust which was established during language class also enhanced the possibility of creating their own space to connect with each other. This point must have consideration within the school curriculum, if we really need students to develop their interculturality, to understand each other, and be a citizen who enables the establishment of equal and fair interrelationships with others within their society.

It is recommended that the foreign language syllabus documents emphasise awareness of a new approach to citizenship: that the language learning classroom become a safe community where the learners can develop interculturality and participate as an apprentice of citizenship within the community. Thus a planned curriculum with clear objectives should be presented to the teachers in order to achieve the desired result.

Xenophobia and racism still exist in multicultural Australia. The people’s sense of belonging to civic culture is often interrupted by these prejudices as well as their own defensive self identity. Education needs to focus consciously on developing the citizens of multicultural Australia in order to establish and maintain equitable and respectful interrelationships. It is recommended that language education be specifically designed to contribute to this goal, and that it is designed to be personally meaningful and socially beneficial (Kennedy, 1997:7). Interculturality does not develop when a hard boundary exists. It is crucial to recognise language education as an indispensable element of the Australian school education from primary school on.
The same argument can be expanded to university education. University graduates are not only expected to gain specific knowledge from their specialised area. In Australian universities, the agreed desired attributes of all graduates, as well as the school students, include statements to the effect that students must be able to understand and communicate with people of this diverse society. Moreover, although internationalisation is a widely discussed goal of universities in Australia, the manifestation of ‘true’ internationalisation among the student and faculty bodies is more difficult to achieve. There is often a gap between the intended genuine communication and the expressed communication. I refer to the authentic, heartfelt inner sense of communicating with others as ‘intrinsic communication’. Unless we train ourselves to intrinsically communicate with people of other cultures, ‘internationalisation’ can only be a meaningless word. The connection between ‘internationalisation’ within an institution and ‘language learning’ has been seen only at surface level, the ability to use the language. However, as this study indicated, language learning can teach us to make an organic connection with people within this human society. It is a quality of utmost importance when discussing ‘internationalisation’.

Language learning should be a core subject within formal education.

8.4.2 Teachers’ initial training and professional development in the development of interculturality

Teachers need facilitators to develop their interculturality, just as their students do. Knowing how language learning impacts the students’ subjectivity is of utmost importance as not only a language teacher, but as a teacher within school education. In order to do that, the teachers need to be able to understand interculturality and ways to enhance intercultural intrinsic communication. Unless they see what interculturality is within themselves, they cannot assist the students to develop this quality. It is the teachers’ cultural intelligence as well as their pedagogy that will make the difference in their daily teaching.

---

9 One definition of intrinsic, copyrighted from Princeton University (2006) Wordnet 3.0, says meaning 1 of intrinsic as adjective is: “belonging to a thing by its very nature; “form was treated as something intrinsic, as the very essence of the thing” (John Dewey). http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/intrinsic. Accessed November 5 2008 (???)
Examining the school students’ experience in shifting their conventional perception towards otherness by learning Japanese indicates the importance of their teacher’s role. This is crucial for language teaching as it suggests the importance of language learning in a school from a viewpoint of not only the language development, but also of their personal development as a citizen of Australia. It is recommended that in both initial training and in-service teacher education a different vision of the teachers’ role is inculcated for the language classroom as part of the whole picture of language education. The potential of a language teacher for influencing and effecting substantial change is unique. From here, a new theory of teacher education in language teaching can emerge.

T3’s responses suggest the importance of theoretical grounding to assist in clarifying what interculturality is, and what language education can actually offer to the students. Considering the current position of LOTE as a minor subject in the school curriculum, teachers tend to lose confidence in teaching the language, and need to build their self-esteem and confidence as a language teacher. As this study indicates, not only learning a foreign language, but teaching a foreign language is also quite a subjective matter. The teachers, like their students, also need to come out from their comfort zone. The theoretical foundation should assist the general classroom teacher like T2, who could not see her potential as a language teacher. T1’s attendance at the language teachers’ in-service did not assist her to understand what intercultural language teaching means. This indicates that unless teachers understand actually how interculturality develops while learning a language, their interpretation of the instructors at the in-services may not reach the aims and objectives of the in-services.

It is also crucial to present the teachers with an example of how the students can shift their subjectivity. This helps the teachers to prepare themselves to facilitate the students’ dialogue between their subjectivity and others, and maximise the students’ potential to develop their interculturality. The result of the students’ interviews in this study can be an example of this.
Based on the results of this study, the following points are indicated for language teachers in order to assist the students to develop interculturality based on the teachers understanding of the concept of interculturality.

**Recommendations for teachers**

- Provide a positive learning environment.
- Provide learning activities so that the students can individualise and personalise the experience.
- Encourage students to think consciously of what they want to say, and then lead students to find its equivalence in the Japanese language.
- Provide discussions that create a dialogue between ‘s elf’ and ‘other’.
- While teaching the language, facilitate the students’ discussion on stereotypical ideas of the Japanese language and culture, so that they can distinguish the generalised and the stereotypical ideas.
- Give the students the opportunity to reflect upon their learning experiences.
- Guide the students’ work to reflect their character rather than mimicking the target language speaker.
- Allow the students to deliberate on how the language works, and observe the grammar within the language. When students find the differences and begin to ask questions, encourage them to discuss rather than learn by rote.
- Examine how well they express themselves as a facilitator of the target language learning experience.

**Classroom teaching – how to facilitate students’ development of interculturality**

In order to have a positive influence on students softening the boundaries surrounding them, it is clear that the students need assistance in creating a dialogue between themselves and others. Based on the study’s first phase of developing an approach to language teaching, it is recommended that a genre-based curriculum cycle be developed, as this approach assists the teachers in observing the culture within the text as well as the students’ culture, in the set format of their teaching cycle. The four stages of the teaching and learning cycle developed by Susan Feez(1998) is shown in Appendix 1. The most important
reason for recommending this teaching program is that the teachers are in this way almost forced to include culture observations and discussions as a context of culture in the text, before and during the actual text reading. During this cycle, the general culture behind the text can be observed and analysed. As discussed, the teachers’ perception of culture and interculturality is crucial in order to meet the full potential of the language teaching objectives. This cycle systematically guides the teachers to include a path of noticing, comparing, observing, negotiating, and finding their own voice in their teaching program.

The genre-based curriculum cycle provides both the students and teachers with explicit assistance in learning the sort of language needed for success in the society where the language is needed (Ramzan & Thomson 2009, forthcoming). It provides opportunities for the learners to observe both their own culture and the culture of the language they are learning. As Martin (1997) explains, a genre is a staged purposeful social process, goal oriented and works towards these goals in steps. He emphasises that genres are not innate but learned through social interaction and they can be taught by using a variety of techniques. It guides the teachers to facilitate the learners to see the differences between the cultures. Christie (2005:134) defines genre as follows:

> Genre refers to any staged, purposeful, cultural activity and thus it includes oral language genres as well as written language genres. A genre is characterized by having a schematic structure – a distinctive beginning, middle and end.

A genre approach is not especially developed for intercultural awareness, but it sees the text in a specific cultural setting, and allows the learners and the teacher to draw out the specific cultural environment within the text as well as the cultural differences between the class members. This teaching approach shows how to guide the students towards learning cultural practice through the teaching program.

Reflective questions for teachers to address while using this approach.

- What was my perception of accommodating this teaching program to enhance intercultural awareness in the Japanese language class?
- What were the intended/ unintended effects?
- What were the constraints? Why?
• What changes have occurred in the implementation of the intercultural approach?
• What contradictions are there between the framework, syllabus, the teaching, the learning, and the curriculum?
• What further changes do I think could be taken to alleviate these conflicts and what resistances do I anticipate? How do I intend to involve others in these changes?

8.4.3 Future research needed

This study identified how the language learning experience influenced the development of interculturality. However, this study could not observe the developmental link from primary schooling to a university as the three cohorts of the participants were different students. A longitudinal study by observing the same students’ development of interculturality while learning the language may provide an important set of data for future modifications to language education theory and practice.

Teaching staff seem to encounter difficulties in accommodating the new image of language teaching. In order to assist classroom practice, a genre approach to language teaching is recommended. Future research should be conducted in such a way that the outcomes are directly useful to classrooms. It is essential to build on this research to explore further, preferably through action research, how the recommended teaching program can be improved, by concentrating on helping the teachers to be facilitators, and helping students to develop interculturality. This study indicated that teachers are finding it difficult to teach culture in a way the current theorists expect and the syllabus reflects.

The recommended action research is presented as follows.

Initial Reflection phases

The teachers’ reflection on interculturality should be examined. Also the school environment should be examined, in order to articulate the issues that language teachers face. How language teaching is perceived by the school environment needs to be examined in this phase.
Planning phase
A genre teaching program should be planned, focusing on interculturality while reflecting the school curriculum.

Action phase
Implementing the genre cycle curriculum.

Observation phase
This phase assesses the effect of the Genre teaching program. Interviews with the teacher and the students will take place to evaluate how well the students personalised and individualised the experience.

Reflection phase
Reflection on what has happened to the students and the teacher. Whether the dialogues between the students and others were created? Did the teacher facilitate the students’ discussion on the way that the students create their own voice? What is needed to improve the teaching program. As a result of this reflection, ideas will arise for the next cycle of this research. The revised program will be implemented for the second spiral.

Comparing the action research results among specific cultural groups, such as a school with Aboriginal students, a Muslim school, may provide an interesting result.

8.5 Concluding reflections
This study was triggered from my experience of being a Japanese language teacher in Australia. I taught at primary schools, high schools, university and some adult education institutions. Observing the students of the Japanese language classes, I always felt that they were learning more than the Japanese vocabulary, expressions and grammar. I felt they were personally growing while learning the language. This feeling became clearer when I taught a Japanese immersion program under Education Queensland management during year 2000. Still I could not articulate the reason for this.
The draft framework for LOTE was published in 2001. I was excited to see the
different presentation of the culture component and the new presentation of
language teaching as creating comfortable places between the cultures. I felt this
concept was the one I was searching for to articulate what I had experienced when
teaching the language. I started this study in early 2001. The year 2001 was an
unforgettable year for people around the world. September 11 shocked the world.
Since then, it seems that once tame stereotypical ideas about Muslim people
sprouted out, and racial conflicts arose.

My previous experience indicated to me that the students learned a lot more than
language skills. It was an indistinct idea, and this study was able to adopt a
grounded theory approach to explore the idea further. My original plan for the
study was to create a teaching program to achieve the objectives of the new LOTE
syllabus. Considering the world’s turmoil, especially after September 11, I felt
that people must know how to understand each other organically, in a permanent
way, so that this understanding does not fade away. Racism was not only the
reason I felt this way. Recalling the primary school students’ often unformed and
stereotypical attitudes and connecting these thoughts with the new syllabus, I
thought that language teaching might be able to make a genuine contribution to
improved human interrelationships.

I anticipated working with primary school teachers to develop teaching materials
to enhance the students’ interculturality, but during Phase 1 of my research I
realised that the teachers, even those skilful and experienced teachers, did not
perceive the concept of interculturality as the syllabus directed. Teachers need to
know how a language learning experience influences the development of
interculturality. This then became a focus question for the next phases of the
study and the direction of the study changed accordingly.

Three primary schools were chosen as the participating schools, and the teachers’
and the students’ interviews were taken after two school terms of classroom
observation. The themes that emerged from this phase were categorised, and,
following grounded theory, the high school students and the university students were then recruited for the next phases.

It has been 7 years since I started this study. I summarised the answers to the research questions and the recommendation were made according to the results in this chapter. But what I found was more than these answers. Most importantly, I feel I became a better language teacher. This study taught me how important it is to consciously facilitate the students to think; how I feel, how other people feel, what do I want to say, what do they want to say, who am I, how do I represent myself when communicating with people from the Japanese language community, what is my place in this community?

Our identity or identities are not pre-given wholes but are rather multiple (Pennycook, 2001:148; Ajayi, 2006; Norton, 2000). Pennycook notes that subjectivity is seen to be produced socially in language through discourse, at conscious and unconscious levels, and as a site of struggle and potential change. Unless the learning activities touch the students’ subjectivity in some ways, the students cannot find their persuasive voice. If the persuasive voice cannot be produced, real interculturality cannot be developed. As this study indicates, the Japanese language learning experiences worked as an agent for students to develop their interculturality, and the students need this agent. The students produce the persuasive voice themselves, then interculturality develops within themselves. We can only provide the agent, but supplying the agent to students is something that school education should focus on consciously. Interculturality is a philosophical concept rather than practical, and the potential for teachers to intrinsically understand this concept and then facilitate the concept among their students can drive the development of interculturality within school education.
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Appendix 1
Appendix 1-1  HSIE Term 3 program for Group A
Appendix 1-2 Lesson 1 What is a Rainforest? (prepared for Group A lesson)
### Appendix 1-3  An example of the activity sheets to go with Lesson 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ねったいうりん</th>
<th>名前：</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ぼく／私がしらべた熱帯雨林</td>
<td>[the rainforest that I researched]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ねったいうりん</th>
<th>なまえ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>熱帯雨林の名前</td>
<td>[name of the rainforest]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>どこにありますか？</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Where is it?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>かれ</th>
<th>形</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[shape]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>きこう</th>
<th>気候</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[climate]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>しょくぶつ せいそく</th>
<th>どんな植物が生息していますか？</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[What kind of plants inhabit there?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>どうぶつ せいそく</th>
<th>どんな動物が生息していますか？</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[What kind of animals inhabit there?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>どんな人々が住んでいますか？</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[What kind of people live there?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>とくちょう</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>特徴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[characteristics]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2
### Appendix 2-1: Stage 3 – Theme/ Family

**Duration**: one hour per week for 4/5 weeks.

**かぐやひめ (Bamboo princess)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes (Japanese K-10 Syllabus Stage 3)</th>
<th>Focus cultural aspects/ languages (developed by the researcher)</th>
<th>Learning activities (developed by the researcher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moving Between Cultures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Reading ‘Bamboo cutter’s tale”, and discuss about the text organization. (orientation, complication, and resolution. Or Initiating event, main event, and final event.) and traditional Japanese life and their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC2.1 identify connections between cultures and language use</td>
<td>Using おじいさん for old man instead of Mr.--------.</td>
<td>Discussion of Ojisan, Obaasan, Bamboo &amp; Moon in Japanese culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC2.2 recognise the contribution of culture to a sense of identity</td>
<td>Traditional costume/ beauty, house structure of Japanese, and other countries.</td>
<td>Cultural focus, “Family ties” in Japanese culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC3.1 demonstrate understanding of cultural values and practices in the Japanese speaking communities</td>
<td>Moon in Japanese life compare to Australia and other countries</td>
<td>- Kaguyahime had to return to her own family at the last although she loved the old couple so much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC3.2 describe and compare values and practices across cultures, based on knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>Father &amp; Mother / family to us. (family values in Japan, Australia and other culture)</td>
<td>Some “aesthetics” in Japanese culture. – Bamboo, moon-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression of gratitude.</td>
<td>• Identification of borrowed words in Japanese.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLC2.1 identify ways in which meaning is conveyed by the sounds and symbols of spoken and written language</td>
<td>Read and write family members in Japanese language.</td>
<td>- Identify familiar English words in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC2.2 Explore the relationship of other language to English and identify borrowed vocabulary</td>
<td>Identifying some English words in Japanese language.</td>
<td>Making a concept map of Kaguyahime family. – class work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC 3.1 compare and copy patterns and features of spoken and written Japanese</td>
<td>Identify difference between spoken and written Japanese.</td>
<td>- discussion of names in Japan. Eg. Toyota, Honda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC 3.2 develop skills in the correct and appropriate use of Japanese.</td>
<td>Describe their own family members in Japanese</td>
<td>Individually making their family tree in Japanese.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Introduction of borrowed words in Japanese. - Identify familiar English words in Japanese

- Making a concept map of Kaguyahime family. – class work
- Discussion of names in Japan. Eg. Toyota, Honda

Individually making their family tree in Japanese.

Introduction of borrowed words in Japanese. - Identify familiar English words in Japanese

Presentation of a romaji list of...
Using Language
- **UL2.1** listen and respond to instructions and requests in Japanese
- **UL2.2** identify meanings of key words and phrases in written Japanese in context.
- **UL2.3** interact with others by sharing specific information in Japanese
- **UL2.4** organise and provide specific information in Japanese by selecting key words and phrases

**UL3.2** Identify and organise key points of information in written Japanese for response in Japanese or English.

**UL3.3** organise and use specific language to present personal information and initiate communication

**UL3.4** write phrases or short sentences using well-rehearsed Japanese to convey information

Katakana words, and the class read the words and guess what is actual English mean for each word.

Making finger puppets in Japanese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Using Language</strong></th>
<th><strong>Katakana words, and the class read the words and guess what is actual English mean for each word.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Making finger puppets in Japanese.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL2.1</strong> listen and respond to instructions and requests in Japanese</td>
<td>Asking and saying about their family members</td>
<td>Introduction of some vocabulary to express personal appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL2.2</strong> identify meanings of key words and phrases in written Japanese in context.</td>
<td>おいしいさん、おばあさん、たけ、つき、かんない、うれしい、やさしい、きれい、きびしい</td>
<td>Vocabulary enhancing games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL2.3</strong> interact with others by sharing specific information in Japanese</td>
<td>なんにんかぞく？なまえなに？なにが好き？</td>
<td>Joint construction – making a family leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL2.4</strong> organise and provide specific information in Japanese by selecting key words and phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent construction - Writing about their family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL3.2</strong> Identify and organise key points of information in written Japanese for response in Japanese or English.</td>
<td>Identify meaning of the focus statements. かぐやひめは月（つきの子です。おじいさんとおばあさんはうれしいです。おじいさんとおばあさんはかんないです。かくやひめは月にかえります。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL3.3</strong> organise and use specific language to present personal information and initiate communication</td>
<td>Reading words in Hiragana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL3.4</strong> write phrases or short sentences using well-rehearsed Japanese to convey information</td>
<td>Speaking about their own family members in Japanese.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asking and saying about their family members in detailed information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading a short passage about a bamboo cutter’s family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write about their family in Japanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2-2: An example of the Feez Teaching cycle developed by the researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Sequence of activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Building the context. In this stage students are introduced to the social context of an authentic model of the text being studied.</td>
<td>A Japanese picture book of “Bamboo cutter’s tale-Kaguyahime”, Comparison worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reading ‘Bamboo cutter’s tale-Kaguyahime’, and discuss about the text organization. (orientation, complication, and resolution. Or Initiating event, main event, and final event.) and traditional Japanese life and their own. (First, showing a picture book of Kaguyahime – Bamboo cutter’s tale, and read it in Japanese. The teacher should try to recall the students’ learnt knowledge in Japanese. Then, read the story in English. Discussion of Ojiisan, Obaasan, Bamboo &amp; Moon in Japanese culture. Discussion on each development of the text. Eg. Orientation – introduction of ojisan, obaasan &amp; Bamboo, (おじいさんとおばあさん、たけ、つき) Introduction of special meaning of “bamboo” in Japanese culture, and the words Ojiisan &amp; Obaasan in Japanese culture. Complication - Initial event – Ojiisan finding a shining bamboo Particularization of Kaguyahime. Main event – discovery of origine of Kaguyahime Focus sentence 1,2 &amp; 3 in Japanese: 1.かぐやひめは月（つき- moon）の子（child）です。 2.おじいさんとおばあさんはうれしいです。 おじいさんとおばあさんは か な し い (sad)です。} - Sequel event – the old couple’s agony Final event – Kaguyahime’s departure 3.かぐやひめは月に かえります。 Cultural focus, “Family ties” in Japanese culture. • Kaguyahime had to return to her own family at the last although she loved the old couple so much Some “aesthetics” in Japanese culture. – Bamboo, moon- Introduction of some vocabulary of description. やさしい(kind/tender)、きれい（beautiful）、きびしい (strict)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2. Making a concept map of Kaguyahime family. – class work - discussion of names in Japanese. (the students can connect some Japanese family names with a car and etc.</td>
<td>Example concept map of Kaguyahime family for the class to start the work. Vocabulary focus in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Modelling and deconstructing the text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### In this stage

**students:**
- Investigate the structural pattern and language features of the model
- Compare the model with other text type.

### Honda, Toyota, Matsuda etc)

3. individually making their family map.  
なんにんかぞく？ なまえなに？ なんさい？ なにかすき？

- Introduction of borrowed words in Japanese.  
  - Identify familiar English words in Japanese

- Presentation of a romaji list of Katakana words, and the class read the words and guess what is actual English mean for the each word.

- Examination of spoken and written text by using table of Language features. (Text to introduce “Bamboo cutter’s family” in spoken and in its formal form – students only need to identity the differences.

4. vocabulary enhancing games.  
Dice talk, Sign hunting, Karuta, Nan-nin kazoku?  
Labelling, Reading passages,

### Japanese; おじいさん、

- Concept map sheet  
ぼくの／わたしのかぞく (My family)

- a list of borrowed words.

| 3. Joint construction of the text | The students to make a family leaflet in Japanese.  
Joint construction | A family leaflet |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| In this stage:                 | - Students begin to contribute to the construction of whole examples of the text  
- The teacher gradually reduces the contribution to text construction, as the students move closer to being able to control the text independently |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Independent construction of the text</th>
<th>Writing about their family, and tell the class about their family in Japanese.</th>
<th>A writing sheet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In this stage:                         | - Students work independently with the text  
- Learner performances are used for achievement assessment |  |
**Appendix 3: An example of the four stages of the teaching and learning cycle using the genre approach by Susan Feez (1998).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: building the context of field of the topic or text type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This stage enabled students to explore cultural similarities and differences that the students were going to be experiencing when reading a particular genre. What they are reading/writing, who the readers are; this is where the negotiation starts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2: modelling the text under focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This 2nd stage examines the text as a whole by looking at the illustrations, photographs, headings and sub headings. This stage allows us to find the meaning within a text as a whole, and see how language operates at the text level, not at the level of individual words and sentences in isolation. This is the way that we can observe the meaning in depth within the cultural mode. The subject matter of the text, the expectations of Japanese readers, and the author’s intentions are examined by the students. Following the model reading, students are then guided through a deconstruction of the text. The purpose of this deconstruction is to look at the schematic structure and grammatical patterns of the text. The students were able to familiarize themselves with the particular structures and the language features of the genre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3: a joint construction of the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of this stage is for students to review the special features of the genre that they examined in the first and second stages, and try to see if they can apply their knowledge of this type of genre. The students revise what they are discussing during the process. It enables students to clarify the social purpose, schematic structure, and features of the genre, by paying special attention to the Japanese society. As a result, it is expected that students would realize the cultural variation in the organization of the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4: an independent construction of the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>which involves the activities of information gathering, draft writing, conferencing with peers and the teacher, editing and re-drafting, and publishing. Stage 5, the final stage links the students with related texts. This cycle clearly explains how the genre approach accomplishes the notion of scaffolding as the way to engage students in maximum development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>