

Language-as-Resource for Whom? Foreign Language Planning in Higher Education: Its Goal and Implementation

IINO Masakazu*

Key words: **language planning, internationalization, Japanese education, American higher education**

It seems that issues involved with ethnic languages have attracted wide investigation in the academic field, while relatively little research has been conducted on the issues of foreign languages in the United States.

It is true that today English is recognized as a world language in most spheres of business and diplomacy. Therefore, it is not a difficult task to explain why English-speaking Americans traditionally have a low incentive to learn foreign languages, when English is considered internationally as a lingua franca and a language in power. However, there has been an emergent nation-wide trend and a growing awareness among “policy makers” for the past decade that “internationalization” is an urgent issue for the American education system and that foreign language education is the key to actualize that cherished goal. The University of Pennsylvania (PENN) is not an exception. The Provost’s council on international programs has recently released the “International Mission Statement of the University of Pennsylvania” as one of the on-going efforts of internationalization situated in the University’s Five Year Plan which was established back in the fall of 1988.

In this paper, I would like to attempt to clarify the position of foreign language education in the United States and then look into the current situation of PENN, particularly its Japanese language program as a case study.

The points I attempt to raise in this paper are the following two: 1) more attention must be paid to directing foreign language (FL)’s ontological position in a larger social setting; 2) an adequate allocation of resources should be considered.

Your Majesty, language is the perfect instrument of the Empire.

—the Bishop of Avila in responding to Queen Isabella (from Cobarrubias).

* 飯野公一: Lecturer, Oriental Studies, University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

Who should speak which language in what situation? If I, a foreign student from Japan, spoke Japanese in an American university classroom, this action might be taken as a mere joke, a sign of insanity, or as a rebellion to the class, in the worst case. In any event, speaking "a foreign language" in the Language Planning Seminar at the University of Pennsylvania is outside the norms which the participants have unconsciously assumed without any question. If it is true that education offered in the United States is generally assumed to be carried out in English, where does bilingual education fit in and what is the need for the English only movement? More fundamentally, what is the underlying difference between issues involving ethnic languages and those involving foreign languages? It seems that issues involved with ethnic languages have attracted wide investigation in the academic field, while relatively little research has been conducted on the issues of foreign languages in the United States.

It is true that today English is recognized as a world language in most spheres of business and diplomacy. Therefore, it is not a difficult task to explain why English-speaking Americans traditionally have a low incentive to learn foreign languages, when English is considered internationally as a lingua franca and a language in power. However, there has been an emergent nation-wide trend and a growing awareness among "policy makers" for the past decade that "internationalization" is an urgent issue for the American education system and that foreign language education is the key to actualize that cherished goal. The University of Pennsylvania (PENN) is not an exception. The Provost's council on international programs has recently released the "International Mission Statement of the University of Pennsylvania" as one of the on-going efforts of internationalization situated in the University's Five Year Plan which was established back in the fall of 1988.

In this paper, I would like to attempt to clarify the position of foreign language education in the United States and then look into the current situation of PENN, particularly its Japanese language program as a case study.

Context of Foreign Language Planning

Intralanguage Planning and Interlanguage Planning

Language planning can be divided into two broad frameworks¹ depending on its relationship to the language(s) at issue. One is intralanguage planning, which deals with acquisition and corpus planning within one language. This first category is concerned with issues such as pedagogy, literacy, standardization,² graphization, modernization and renovation (e.g., purification). And the other is interlanguage planning, which focuses on the planning of the status that would be assigned to one language in relation to other

¹ R. Lambert used the terms "unilingual policy" and "multilingual policy" in the same fashion. I use "intra-" and "inter-", because I attempt to emphasize the relationship between the languages at issue.

languages. In short, as I mentioned earlier, the issue concerned with “which language should be used by whom and in what situation” falls under the interlanguage planning category. For example, officialization,³ nationalization, or standardization⁴ of one language in a specific situation is done under interlanguage planning. In this sense, I will deal mainly with interlanguage issues in this essay, that is, I am not writing this for the purpose of a foreign language pedagogy.

Ethnic Language and Foreign Language

Interlanguage planning deals either with “Ethnic Language” (EL) or with “Foreign Language” (FL). This distinction, “ethnic” and “foreign” was first made by R. Lambert (1990: 1), as subcategories of “multilingual policy.” EL and FL are sometimes overlapping. For example, Spanish can be both EL and FL in the United States. Spanish spoken in a Puerto Rican neighborhood in Philadelphia is considered as EL, while Spanish taught at PENN is considered as FL. By the same token, French is both EL and FL in Canada.

In the following paragraph, I will attempt to elaborate this distinction in order to clarify what is the underlying difference of the people’s orientation, which will be discussed later in this paper, toward languages “different” from their own. The chart below summarizes the characteristics of EL and FL in the context of the United States.

As you see in Table 1, I made three subcategories in order to compare EL and FL. The first one is to look at the use of languages, i.e., the way the language is used in interactive context with Standard English; the second is concerned with the users of the language; and the third one is about the attitude toward the language by the society in general.

(A) Uses of Languages

The most distinctive difference between EL and FL lies in its characteristics of interaction with the mainstream language, i.e., so-called Standard⁵ English or any varieties (e.g., Black English Vernacular) of English spoken in the United States. EL is always in contact with English, as we see, for example, South-Asian languages used in elementary schools in West Philadelphia, Korean in North Philadelphia, and Spanish in

² The term “standardization” falls into this category only if the deviation from standard and non-standard is perceived and recognized within the same language by the general opinion. For example, Southern English or Black English Vernacular has distinctive linguistic difference from so-called Standard English, yet they are still perceived as English in general.

³ Officialization can be both a domestic and an international issue. For example, officialization of English and Hindi is a domestic issue in India, while officialization of six languages in the United Nations is an international issue.

⁴ Standardization under this category means the deviation from standard is conceived as a different language. For example, if China decided to standardize its languages to Mandarin, this could be interlanguage planning.

⁵ See M. Silverstein (1987) for the definition I use here.

Table 1 Context of Two Different Frames of Language Planning in the United States

Ethnic Language	Foreign Language
Uses of languages	
domestic (majority vs. minority)	international (dominance vs. subordination)
local (geographical space)	remote
immediate (time)	non-immediate (future oriented)
visible in daily life	invisible (problem itself foreign)
overt conflicts	covert conflicts (no lawsuit)
User of languages	
low socioeconomic status	elite
elementary education	higher education
involuntary	voluntary
individual (drop out)	institution (loss of international competition)
Attitude toward languages	
subtractive (seen negative)	additive (seen positive)
unity as goal	diversity as goal

South Philadelphia. Those languages are seen on the billboards, broadcast on the mass media, printed in papers, or spoken in a grocery store where English-speaking people also go to shop. There is no wall between EL and English. In this regard, the contexts of EL are visible in daily life and are domestic and local in terms of geographical space. Therefore, the consequent problems arising from these contacts take the forms of overt conflicts such as lawsuits⁶ mainly between the majority (English speakers) and the minority (EL speakers). Those problems need immediate solutions because of the above factors.

On the other hand, the contexts surrounding FL issues are invisible in daily life (in fact, this issue itself may be foreign to many people), remote from their neighborhood. They have no overt conflicts (e.g., no lawsuits), therefore their issues are rather future-oriented. The possible conflicts are at the international level, i.e., the conflicts between nations, of which languages are often perceived as symbols or indices of their power relationship.

The question remains in the case of classical languages such as Latin education in the United States. If Latin is taught purely as a tool of mental discipline in education, Latin can fall under a domestic rather than an international issue. This issue is crucial in the case of English education in Japan, because English has been taught in the same way as Latin until quite recently as a means of discipline and of selection for entrance examination (mainly by reading and writing), and its usability in international aspects has been often neglected.⁷

⁶ e.g. Lau vs. Nichols case in California (1974).

⁷ It is true that in today's Japan there are many private "conversation" schools of English for those few people who need to speak with English speakers.

(B) Users of Languages

Just as you cannot choose your parents, you cannot choose your native language(s). Speakers of EL did not choose to speak their EL, but EL choice was always involuntary. EL is also often indexed with those people's lower socioeconomic status in the United States, and the issue is most salient in the domain of elementary education⁸ because the children of newly arrived immigrants do not have enough time to acquire English. The failure of acquiring English skills results in the individual's failure in his/her career, and that person is often labeled as deficient or as a drop-out from the society.

On the contrary, a person can choose not only whether or not to learn a FL (except as it is required in the school) but also which language to learn.⁹ Therefore, FL choice is usually voluntary. With this optional characteristics, FL issues tend to be at the level of higher education, and the learners are often in the group of elite in the society. The failure of FL acquisition results in the discussion of the loss of international competitiveness in political and economic spheres, therefore, the responsibility is more often attributed to the institution of American society rather than to an individual (except for the failure in fulfilling academic requirements).

(C) Attitude Toward Languages

Attitude is a highly subjective matter to discuss. However, if we consider the English-only movement and its legal implementation through the legislature in the United States, or, on the other hand, FL education improvements acts and supportive reforms in schools, it may be fair to say that there are negative attitudes to EL and positive attitudes to FL in the contemporary United States, supported by a majority of people. English is used as a symbol of national unity of the United States, and EL is regarded as an obstacle to that goal. Therefore, EL is considered something that should be eliminated from the society (subtractive).¹⁰

On the other hand, FL is regarded as an emblem of education, and as capital to promote international business and diplomacy. At the same time, FL is believed to foster cultural sensitivity to others and to contribute to the goal of diversity of the community. Consequently, FL tends to be seen as positive and something that should be added to the society (additive).

The distinctions between EL and FL as outlined above will be critical in order to understand the term FL as it is used here. This dichotomy may explain the discrepancy in many levels of language policies in the United States. For example, some pol-

⁸ This is the case in an elementary school in West Philadelphia, where children of immigrants from Southeast Asian countries merge with English native students after three years of ESL training.

⁹ There is always a limit of choices which causes another issue. For example, European languages such as French, Spanish and German are highly represented and available in all levels of education, while people rarely have an access to Less Commonly Taught Languages.

¹⁰ The terms, "subtractive" and "additive" were first used by Wallace Lambert (Lambert and Tucker, 1972).

icies concerning FL, such as the reports of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (1979), have tended to encourage the study of FL in the schools, while at the same time discouraging continued study of languages represented by those ethnic minorities (cf. R. Troike, in Thompson, 1973: 229).

In the following section, we will look more closely into the differences in orientation to EL and FL, which have been already raised in the last paragraph, especially in part (C) Attitude toward Languages.

Differences in Language Planning Orientations

Orientation in language planning, according to Ruiz (1984: 16), refers to "a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society." It is, though largely unconscious, a basic and a fundamental argument about language planning. It is "related to language attitudes in that they constitute the framework in which attitudes are formed" (ibid.). Therefore, different orientations lead to different policy positions, and "decision[s] as to language-planning goals will necessarily be influenced by the orientation held by decision makers" (Hornberger, 1990: 24).

In any event, orientation is the philosophical backbone to carry out the entire planning, the importance of which cannot be too strongly emphasized. Although orientations in EL have been discussed widely in this field, it seems that those in FL have not gotten enough attention. I would like to show some examples of FL orientations in comparison with EL orientations in Table 2, by using three major categories, language-

Table 2 Differences in Orientation

(Ethnic) language-as-problem inefficiency of communication	FL-as-problem Esperanto, TESOL (Type A)? English in China, Iran (cf. against national unity, Tollefson, ch. 4) (FL-as-obligation) language requirement (<i>suffering students</i>), job, military training
language-as-right basic human right	FL-as-right international conference, negotiation
language-as-resource multiculturalism FL learning opportunity for <i>peace and tolerance</i>	FL-as-resource motivated students <i>school administrators</i> political slogan interdependent economy job opportunity, promotion multicultural sensitivity, tolerance, humanization cultural enrichment (film, literature, opera, etc.)
<i>oppression</i> (by majority)	dominance (business, military, tool of domestic segregation), <i>school as business</i> , language teacher, translator

as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource, which were first introduced by Ruiz (1984).

(A) Language-as-Problem

Under the orientation of (ethnic) language-as-problem, “language is seen as an obstacle standing in the way of the incorporation of members of linguistic minorities into the mainstream” (Hornberger, 1990: 24). It is important to keep in mind that the “language problems are never merely language problems” (Ruiz, 1984: 21). They represent more general social issues as indices of the language speakers, and conversely, the outcomes of the treatment have “a direct impact on all spheres of social life” (Karam, 1974: 108).

This framework of orientation applies to the FL cases as well. During China’s Cultural Revolution and the Iranian revolution, English education was banned in both countries because FL was seen as a symbol against their goal to pursue national unity (cf. Tollefson, 1991: Ch. 4). The philosophy behind the creation of Esperanto can be seen as FL-problem orientation, because its idea is to overcome the inefficiency of communication in a multilingual world while avoiding the issue of which modern language should be chosen. Even some TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) orientations (type A¹¹) can fall into this category, since their idea is that all the non-English speakers need to learn English for their socioeconomical benefit, backed by the assumption of accepting the current condition that English is the language in power in today’s world and it is too naive to protest that fact.

As a subcategory of FL-as-problem orientation, there is FL-as-obligation orientation for those who have to learn FL against their will. For example, this group includes suffering students¹² on campus who have to clear their language requirements, or employees of government (including military) or business firms who need FL for their jobs.

(B) Language-as-Right

Language-as-right orientation considers each language as a basic human right. As for the EL cases, “The right of linguistic-minority members to speak and maintain their mother tongue is defined as a human and civil right” (Hornberger, 1990: 24).

¹¹ Jordan (1985: 146) classified attitudes toward the acquisition of foreign languages into three basic types; Type A—“if we need to communicate, let them learn my language” type. “This was the unenlightened attitude that described a shockingly high percentage of the American public until recently” (p. 146), Type B—“looking for a quick fix” type. For example, the title of textbooks—*Japanese in 30 Hours*, or *Japanese for Busy People*—well illustrates this type. Type C—“acknowledging the need for systematic study of FL in depth” type.

¹² It should be noted that outside the United States, students of satellite nations are required to learn languages of dominant nations, e.g. students in Poland and Hungary learn Russian. In Japan, English is a compulsory subject from the seventh grade.

As I have pointed out earlier, FL issues do not take the form of overt conflicts. Therefore, FL-as-right has not been claimed in actual domestic cases. However, at an international conference or at an international business negotiation, one may claim that he/she has a right to speak his/her language. Or, a foreigner (not an EL speaker, not a U.S. citizen) may have a right to speak his/her language in the U.S. court. These cases might be under the FL-as-right orientation.

It should be noted that this orientation “creates a situation in which different groups and authorities invoke their rights against each other,” and “the controversy could be seen as one where the rights of the few are affirmed over those of the many” (Ruiz, 1984: 24). And these statements are also true for the language issues in international situations.

(C) Language-as-Resource

Unlike the above two orientations, language-as-resource orientation regards language minority communities as important sources of expertise, where “the importance to the nation of conserving and developing all of its linguistic resources is emphasized” (Hornberger, 1990: 24). The fundamental idea behind this orientation is to foster the multiculturalism, sensitivities and tolerance to other cultures among people, which would lead to peace as an outcome. There is no denying that this orientation is the ideal end of the goals that all language planning should pursue, from my personal point of view. However, at the same time, answers should be prepared to refute the following two major, albeit not exhaustive, challenges.

(a) This orientation can be criticized as “a form of cultural-linguistic conservatism,” i.e., preserving every linguistic and ethnic heritage as if to keep it in a live anthropology museum in a larger real society where movements toward standardization of language and culture are dominant. This orientation is also against the voluntary and rational choice of people to acquire the Standard and to become full-fledged members of the mainstream society, if we look at the orientation from the point of view of free market economy theory (cf. “Free to Choose,” Milton and Rose Friedman, 1980: 25). Also, it is unnatural “from the lessons of biological evolution about extinction of species” (Silverstein, 1987: 19), which tells us that we should look at uncountable historical facts that the rise and fall of dominant languages and cultures are natural and inevitable, and that socially weak and minor languages and cultures are in the fate of extinction in the face of dominant and major ones.

My answers to this challenge are as follows, though they are by no means exhaustive. Although these metaphors borrowing ideas either from rational choice economics theory or from biological evolutionalism sound persuasive at a glance, they are very dangerous by nature. Remember that those ideas were most popular during the period of imperialism (e.g., colonization) and fascism (cf. Hitler, an ultra-Darwinist, who used the idea evolutionalism to rationalize his policy). However, there is a fundamental difference between economics and biology, and language and culture. In the free-market economics world, every participant in the market accepts the rather explicit rule of the game (“lose or win” capitalistic rule) willy-nilly. As for biology, people are helpless

(even with recent bioengineering technology) to manipulate the path of evolution, which might be governed at best by invisible laws. At the same time, biological strength has nothing to do with social strength, because social power is always created by the members of society. Therefore, we should question the validity of the evolutionistic metaphor. Also, when we talk about the fate of language and culture, the distinctive differences from economics and biology lie in the fact that the notion of *power* itself is still highly debatable and the legitimacy of power has not yet been established in the United States today. The majority of the American people know that political fascism is injustice, and that each human right should be observed. Post-structuralistic views also fuel the anti-homogenization idea. But at the same time, the value of efficiency is important in free-market economy. In short, the minority language issues, just like other ecological issues,¹³ are often argued in the social framework (e.g., high value of efficiency) constructed by those in “power”—the power that people in society perceive. This debatable and unstable position of language in a society seems to derive from the ambiguity of its nature, i.e., whether language is a “given” entity as is the skin color for which nothing can be done, or language is something to be chosen and learned by effort in spite of the initial difference. Both statements here are correct in some sense, and that makes the issue more subjective. In today’s U.S. society, it is supposed to be incorrect to discriminate based on people’s naturally inherited characters, so the first statement cannot be used by multilingual bashers. Therefore, those who tend to take the principle of the free-market economy (rational-choice theory) rationalize their idea by assuming that language is something that any people can acquire by their own effort at any stage of their life, i.e., language deficiency depends on an individual’s choice (cf. the earlier discussion on EL and FL). In “Discourse on the Origin and Foundation of Inequality Among Men,” Rousseau says:

I conceive of two sorts of inequality in the human species; one, which I call natural or physical, because it is established by nature . . . ; the other, which may be called moral or political inequality, because it depends upon a sort of convention and is established, or at least authorized, by the consent of man. The latter consists in the different privileges that some men enjoy to the prejudice of others. (from Cobarrubias, 1983: 70)

In other words, those who negatively see minority languages reject the “given” factors of languages. Therefore, it should be called upon to be thoughtful of the non-standard speakers, including EL and dialect (e.g., BEV) speakers, in discussing the type of orientation.

(b) The next challenge is more cumbersome, because it is kept consciously unpublicized by those who intend to abuse the original and peaceful goal of the language-as-resource orientation. Even though those people, usually in the majority group, advocate plurilingualism and facilitate bilingual education, it is possible that their deep-rooted intention is to separate minority groups from the dominant culture by letting the minority cohere in their own community. While children are taught both their EL and Eng-

¹³ Also in ecological issues, the conflicts lie in the choice between efficiency of economy and preservation of species, based on the social construct of the people.

lish, the children in the majority could have more time to spend on other content classes such as math and science.

The pitfall of this discussion is that multilingualism is based on the assumption that the members of minority groups learn the language of the prestige, not the other way round. When I use the term "language-as-resource," what I really would like to emphasize is the aspect that those in power learn minority languages. In this way, sensitivity to and appreciation of other groups could be cultivated, and oppression by the majority could be eased, even if seen as symbolic at first. It may be as valuable to learn BEV as to learn Shakespearean English in the American society.

The reason I discuss the above issue rather thoroughly is that FL education is always welcomed at the surface level backed up by language-as-resource orientation. However, if we look carefully at its deep structure, some parallel can be found with what we have seen in the above discussion, i.e., FL-as-resource for dominance with a cosmetic wrapping paper called "peace." FL is in most cases advocated with slogans such as that FL creates an atmosphere of tolerance to other cultures, and that it gives opportunity to enrich people's lives through appreciation of other cultural heritages such as film and literature. Also, under the interdependent global economy, FL is said to play an important role in facilitating communications with other people for peaceful purposes. At the same time, we should not be too naive to ignore the fact that under the name of these cherished orientations, there exist military language training to dominate other countries,¹⁴ business people to compete with foreign companies, and schools to make profit out of FL. It may be true that we can get funds more easily if we say that that money is to be used for the national interest. We should be aware of the fact that there are two types behind what appears to be the same FL-as-resources orientation.¹⁵ This confusion may lead to an inadequate allocation of resources as a result.

Based on the discussion so far, now we will turn to the case of FL planning at the PENN. The points will be on how FL planning is processed and implemented at the concrete levels with special attention to the Japanese language program.

¹⁴ In the United States, the relationship between FL education and the military cannot be overlooked. R. Lambert (1984: 9), reviewing the history of U.S. FL education, mentioned this point as follows; "It was the unanticipated Soviet launching of the satellite Sputnik in 1957 that made the federal government realize that it had a major stake in creating and sustaining a substantial body of experts who could follow events in other countries using materials in the languages of those countries, and who were familiar enough with those societies to interpret these materials. The subsequent enactment in 1958 of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) to create and maintain such a pool of expertise immensely encouraged the growth in the number of specialists trained on the campuses and sponsored the creation and maintenance of a substantial number of organized programs roughly following the ASTP [the Army Specialized Training Program established in Dec., 1942) model."

¹⁵ In terms of Kant's criteria, I believe all language planning should stay in the domain of "moral and rational," not in that of "immoral and rational" (cf. Cobarrubias, 1983: 80).

Foreign Language Planning Processes at PENN

“Internationalization” is a widely accepted, positive, and fanciful term the validity of which no one would dare to question in today’s free economies. If someone opposes its ideal, that person would be regarded as an isolationist or a xenophobe. Within “internationalization” goals, FL education is usually advocated as one of the most important elements along with other international and regional sciences.

As part of PENN’s five-year planning, a Working Group on the International Dimension was established in the fall of 1988 (cf. *Almanac*). Chief among the programs was the Provost’s Council on International Programs (established on October 1, 1990), the members of which consist of graduate students and faculty from all the related institutions on campus. The council released a 124-page *Factbook* in March, 1992. The following report is based on this *Factbook*, other documents, and interviews with twelve faculty members¹⁶ on campus and eighteen students enrolled in the Japanese language class at PENN.

Goals of “Internationalization”

The Council’s mission statement seeks three main goals:

1. the preparation of its students and faculty to be members of a more cohesive world;
2. the generation of knowledge on a more global orientation;
3. provision of its academic resources, to the extent feasible, to nations and to institutions involved in international activities.

In order to accomplish the above goals, the university will strengthen the international nature of its *people*, its *pursuits*, and its *programs*.

From this statement alone, the motivations behind “internationalization” cannot be read clearly. In *Almanac, XIV Supplement*, as part of the Five-year planning report, two more broad but fundamental motivations were stated. The first one is to train students to take “a responsible role in a society where America’s advantage, its ability to compete successfully and to exercise some form of leadership, depends upon an understanding of the international arena.” And the second one is to strengthen a knowledge of how other people think and live, beyond the dictates of international politics and business. These two types of motivations can also be seen in many of other “internationalization” promotion statements publicized in the United States such as the report to the President from the President’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*. As I have already discussed in the previous section, these two types of goals are distinct in their

¹⁶ I thank all the members who willingly accepted requests for interview with my classmate Kristin Loheyde and me: Provost, Dr. M. Aiken; Director of Penn Language Center, Dr. M. Lenker; Oriental Studies Professors, Dr. Hartwell, Dr. R. Allen, Dr. W. Lafleur, Dr. Chance, Dr. Segawa, Ms. H. Kimura; Office of International Program Foreign Study Director, Mr. Gee; English Language Program Director, Dr. K. Billmyer; Career Planning Office Director, Ms. Rose; and Admissions Office Director.

orientations, even though they seemingly promote one FL education in practice.¹⁷ We will come back to this argument later in this paper.

Strategies: Guidelines for Implementing the Goals

According to the Council's *Factbook*, the following are the strategies toward attaining its goals (p. 2). Some of the concrete plans are added by the author in brackets.

* reinforcing the international character and sensitivity of the university's people by recruiting and supporting faculty and staff with international expertise, and encouraging and valuing the presence of nationally culturally diverse students and scholars on campus;

* deepening and expanding the University's international pursuits, by

- promoting foreign language study¹⁸ across the University [encouraging undergraduate schools to strengthen their foreign language requirements and to use foreign languages as an integral part of standard course work],¹⁹ [supporting Penn Language Center], [establishing satellite communications],
- internationalizing the curricula,
- increasing the libraries' international holdings,²⁰
- encouraging inter-school and inter-departmental collaboration on international projects and programs,
- supporting internationally-focused and international area studies, centers, and programs [establishing new initiatives in East Asian and African Studies];

* amplifying the range and diversity of the University's international programs, by

- establishing inter-institutional linkages [with major research universities],
- providing multidisciplinary assistance in the development of educational programs and professional service programs in developing nations, through such inter-institutional linkages,
- developing faculty and student exchange programs [facilitating undergraduates' participation].

¹⁷ Interestingly, Neustupny (1982: 124) classified purposes of FL study as follows: 1) maintenance of current educational system, 2) hobby, 3) symbol, 4) skill formation, 5) cultural understanding, 6) communication.

¹⁸ A major theoretical issue still remains on this point. There is no empirical evidence on the relation between language study, national interest and the cultivation of sensitivity to others. Actually, some cultural encounter theories showed negative consequences (creation of hatred) once two different cultures encounter. One professor of Oriental Studies commented that "the goal of studying FL is to deAmericanize the people's thinking," which seems to me to be against the short-term national interests (nationalism) which some business and political people are claiming.

¹⁹ As a recent outcome, the Wharton undergraduate program adopted a FL requirement in the fall of 1991.

²⁰ Some areas are behind other leading institutions. For example, "the combined size of our Japanese, Chinese, and Korean collection is 21st of 42 universities listed in the 1990 Committee of East Asian Libraries Task Force on the Survey of Library Resources" (*Factbook*, p. 42). The library is actually seeking donations from Japanese companies such as Honda (a professor of Oriental Studies).

Implementation

Implementation of the above strategies is "basically up to each of the university's schools" (Provost). The council's function is mainly to coordinate international activities among the various schools. In addition to the schools and the libraries of the University, other major actors are listed in the *Factbook*: the Office of International Programs, the Task Force on Study Abroad, and Ad Hoc National and Regional Groups.

Comments on Internationalization Planning

PENN has a long tradition of cosmopolitanism, beginning with its founder Benjamin Franklin, and already has a strong foundation as an internationally recognized research and educational institution. In order for PENN to maintain and improve its important position, it is necessary to constantly vitalize its international activities. In this regard, the Provost's Council plays an important role in guiding the future of PENN.

However, behind the publicized goals of internationalization, some implicit goals could be read from the *Factbook*, and a certain kind of skepticism was heard among some faculty members as well. The following are examples of another interpretation of internationalization.

(A) New Sources of Funding

Within the 124-page long *Factbook*, only 43 pages were spent for the agenda concerning the goals and current situations of international programs of PENN, and the rest of the pages were devoted to profiles of PENN's international alumni and potentials (as sources of donation) for international development activities. It appears that the Council's hidden agenda is to cultivate new sources of donation from outside the United States, especially from Asian countries (over two-thirds of the total gifts were from Asia, headed by Japan, [*Factbook*, p. 89]) when finding new resources is becoming more and more difficult in a limited and slow domestic economy.

(B) Competition with Other Universities

The *Factbook* also emphasizes a comparison of international programs with other institutions in the United States, and stresses that aspects of internationalization must be reflected in the school's pamphlet to recruit better students. For example, the number of students who study abroad seems to be an important factor to attract incoming students. There is nothing wrong with study abroad programs in themselves, and the increase of the opportunities should be promoted. However, some programs such as the "ten-day tour in Japan"²¹ started at Wharton Undergraduate are raising stern criti-

²¹ This is a newly started program held during the spring break. Thirty students were selected (by an essay) from among about seventy applicants of Wharton undergraduates. Only a few of them have taken a first-year Japanese class. They went to tourist spots in Tokyo and Kyoto with some field trips to Japanese firms, staying at the most expensive hotels in these cities. It is estimated that the total expense for this tour per student is \$5,000, while students had to pay only \$1,500.

cism from other schools. “Such a program is the worst case of window-dressing and is totally a waste of resources” (a professor of Oriental Studies). As we can see in this case, an adequate allocation of resources is highly expected and those who donate to the university should also be informed of how the resources are used at the implementation level.

(C) Increasing the Efficiency of the University's Management

If there are six students in a language class taught by a TA (teaching assistant), it is said to be financially manageable. For example, \$600 per student is transferred to Penn Language Center from the student's home school because of PENN's “responsibility budget system,” so that a TA's salary (\$3,300 per semester for a class meeting four hours a week) can be covered by six students' tuition (\$3,600). In any event, considering the fact that most of the language classes are taught by TAs and that there is a large number of students in each class (e.g., about 25 students per class in Spanish and French, 22 students in Japanese), FL education as a requirement is a profitable business for the University. Some unprofitable LCTs (Less Commonly Taught Languages), such as Tibetan or Armenian, were, as a result, moved to Penn Language Center, where the teachers are paid according to the number of the students (in case there are no more than six students, but the salary cannot go beyond \$3,300 even if the class has more than six students). “Unlike the language programs where cheap TAs are teaching a large class, it is being criticized by the administration that highly paid professors with tenure teach small classes,” (a professor of Oriental Studies). The most serious problem is how to keep the quality of education high, while it relies on TAs. Criticism from students is now becoming articulated even in a student paper (*The Daily Pennsylvanian*).

(D) Satisfying the Ethnic Diversity by Foreign Students Instead of Domestic Minorities

“It is true that many foreign applicants are well-qualified for admission. They are mostly individually funded. So, competition for the scholarship among American students can be eased if the university has more foreign students, rather than domestic minority students who have to depend on some kind of scholarship in most cases. In this way, the university can satisfy the quota of ‘diversity’ on campus” (a foreign student of the college). If this information is true, it is certainly a well-functioning mechanism in terms of management of the university. However, it should be noted that domestic problems of a multiethnic society that the University has to face cannot be solved by a cosmetic treatment of statistics.

A charitable interpretation on the above implicit agenda is, at its best, that they are necessary means to accomplish the publicly spoken *goals*. Since the internationalization plan is still in the beginning period, we cannot evaluate the final outcome at this moment. However, it is necessary to keep a close eye on its implementation and to raise awareness in PENN's community, so that constant feedback at all levels, including goals, strategies, and implementation, are available. Recent erosion of the Japanese program seems to me quite contrary to what has been proposed in the plan. For ex-

ample, there has been no Japanese history professor on the entire PENN's campus for more than three years, and the graduate program of Japanese studies will be closed beginning in Fall, 1992 due to the lack of professors (currently enrolled students in the Japanese program are going to transfer to other universities, such as Columbia and Yale), in spite of the increasing demand for Asian area studies. Having witnessed this kind of situation in the past, some faculty members of the Oriental Studies Department (its name will be changed to the East Asian and Middle-Eastern Studies Department from summer, 1992) are skeptical about the proposed planning, saying, "We have not heard any concrete plans from the Council. We cannot expect much from this plan, because area studies in humanities are, in a sense, a financial burden for the University. We cannot do anything if there is no fund."

In short, the major weakness of this plan seems to lie in the confusion of *means* and *goals*, and in the lack of concreteness, i.e., the lack of a clear statement about the budget.

PENN's Japanese Language Program

Finally, I would like to show the current situation of PENN's Japanese language program as a case, in order to investigate what is really happening there in the movement of "internationalization."

PENN's Japanese language program has been given a reputation as one of the best programs in the United States.²² Along with Japan's economic growth and its presence in international trade,²³ the number of the students enrolled in the Japanese language program has increased dramatically in the past ten years,²⁴ and the PENN supported study abroad program has also been growing. Also, by making good use of PENN's international resources (foreign students and scholars), ELP (English Language Program) has a successful "language-partner system"²⁵ and Business Japanese courses have opportunities to invite Japanese business people (e.g., from the Wharton graduate school) as guest speakers. In spite of the drastic increase of the students which gives an impression of success at first glance, some feeling of dissatisfaction and even a kind of apathy were observed among teachers of the program. The following are some examples of issues articulated through my interviews with those teachers. The quotations are from instructors and the director of the program.

²² According to a professor of the Japanese program, PENN's Japanese program is now ranked among the top third in the United States.

²³ This is a good example of the "cultural diffusion" factor which leads a social change and a consequent influence on language (cf. Cooper, 1980: 166). Also see Bourdieu (1977: 651), employing an economics theory of capital and the market, "linguistic competence (like any other cultural competence) functions as linguistic capital in relationship with a certain market."

²⁴ See Appendix.

²⁵ Japanese students studying English at ELP are paired up with American students studying Japanese to be given an opportunity to use the target languages outside the classroom.

Lack of Resources

(A) Large Classes

Each class has about twenty to twenty three students. "With this high number of students, it is difficult to introduce proficiency orientated (e.g., Communicative Approach) curricula which require close interactions with students in a classroom. Every year, we have to cut about 30 students at registration,²⁶ and tell the freshmen to wait for another year. It is practically impossible to have more than 20 students in a language class, especially for non-cognate languages like Japanese."²⁷

(B) Limited Course Offerings

Although a "Business Japanese" course has been offered for two years at Penn Language Center, there are still other demands for Japanese, e.g., less-intensive classes (one c.u. per semester instead of the current two c.u. intensive one), and advanced courses.²⁸ It is true that FL enrollment is affected by the social change and therefore the administration cannot expand the program so easily. The Chinese language program once had about 150 students after U.S.-China diplomacy was reopened under the Nixon administration, but now it has only 50 students each year. At the same time, without an appropriate and timely implementation, the University cannot take an initiative in the field.

(C) Poor Facilities

It was surprising to know that there is no copy machine in the department, no video equipment for the Japanese program, and no computer for the first-year Japanese office. Actually, the office of the first-year Japanese instructors was taken away for three months in the fall, 1992, and now the small office room is shared by six teachers.

²⁶ Cooper (1989: 159) defined three types of means of attaining acquisition goals; to create or to improve the 1) opportunity to learn, 2) incentive, and 3) both opportunity and incentive. According to this typology, even if the University gives the students an incentive (language requirement) to learn, it is not sufficient unless an opportunity (enough seats) is given.

²⁷ Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic are listed in "Category 4" (most difficult for English-speakers to learn) according to the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State. "It is estimated that 1,320 hours of instruction in an intensive program in a Category 4 language are required to bring students to the same level of proficiency reached after only 480 hours of instruction in a language in Category 1 (which includes French and Spanish)" (Jorden, 1991: 3).

²⁸ It should be noted that more and more students have taken Japanese in their high schools recently. Fifth year Japanese is registered under "independent study" supervised by a volunteering instructor. This treatment was done by the instructor's goodwill (without being paid by the department for teaching those students) after a claim was actually articulated by one of the parents whose student felt dissatisfied with the cancellation of 5th year Japanese.

(D) Lack of Teachers

PENN's Japanese language program, especially the largest first-year classes, heavily relies on the native Japanese teachers on campus who are students at the Graduate School of Education. It is true that this kind of program gives those graduate students teaching experience and a small stipend²⁹ which are resources for teachers, but at the same time, this system is functioning as a mechanism of exploitation. Since foreign students cannot work off campus under immigration law, the school can enjoy a monopoly business dealing with those students. Most of the teachers quit teaching after two years because of the completion of their study and because of recruitment from other universities (with an offer of H-1 working visa), and this low retention rate fuels the vicious cycle of exploitation. If it is looked at from the point of view of administrators, this system is such a well-designed and efficient one that there is no incentive to change it. In this regard, FL is truly a resource for the administration of the university. However, considering the fact that they are still using a textbook which was published about 30 years ago because there is no staff, no time and no money to change the course materials with the current lack of resources, it seems necessary to review the program's poor condition. "This phenomenon is seen not only at PENN but also at other universities in the United States. Language programs are basically supported by the charity of the teachers. Japanese native teachers are especially loyal to their jobs and they don't usually complain about the conditions.³⁰ I am sorry for them to be used in this way" (a senior professor of the department).

Inter-school Barriers and Misallocation of Resources

Since PENN has adopted a "responsibility budget system" which requires each school to manage on its own resources, the "North-South" (the rich and the poor) problem among schools is rather serious. As I pointed out earlier, the discrepancy between the "ten-day luxurious Japan tour" of Wharton undergraduates and the poor condition of the Oriental Studies department well illustrates this point. Also with this responsible

²⁹ Since there is no written contract between the university and the teachers in this school, some details could not be revealed. Part-time teachers are paid about \$25 per class hour, but they have to share the burden of checking assignments and exams outside classrooms without being paid for this voluntary work. Full-time teachers salaries have been cut for the past few years from the already low salary when compared with other institutions: starting salary of full-time instructor, PENN \$15,500; Columbia \$34,000; Princeton \$24,000; Ursinus college outside Philadelphia \$28,000 with fringe benefit such as housing. "No good teacher would come to PENN from outside even if we posted a job opening. We have to rely on the graduate students, but it is very unstable" (a professor of the department).

³⁰ Peter Patrikis, Director of the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning who works with teachers in 45 languages nationwide, also pointed out as follows; "Japanese teachers work harder and are generally more skillful than teachers of other more commonly taught languages. As a corollary of this, Japanese teachers are usually less politically active and so have less power within the institutions. There is no easy solution to this paradox either" (from the memo of the conference held on November 7-10, 1991).

budget system, the teachers from the Graduate School of Education³¹ are treated unfairly,³² because they cannot get the tuition exempt benefit which is usually the case for the students of the School of Arts and Science. This fact should be brought to the attention of the administrators of GSE so that this issue can be discussed at the inter-school level. The lack of coordination of the language programs on campus is another serious problem, e.g., some language courses are offered exclusively for Lauder Institute, and some non-credit language courses offered at Wharton are taught by inexperienced native speakers hired from a commercial language school. Considering the fact that the majority of the students enrolled in Japanese courses are from Wharton school, an adequate allocation should be made if the University is seriously concerned about the quality of FL education.

Schism between Language Teachers and Literature or Japanese Studies Teachers

Currently, the first-year Japanese classes are taught mainly by native Japanese graduate students with a few part-time non-student helpers, and the second-year classes are taught by a Japanese senior lecturer and a few part-time helpers as well. Beyond the second-year, classes are taught by an American assistant professor of classical Japanese literature and a Japanese lecturer of modern literature. Business Japanese courses offered at Penn Language Center are taught by two Japanese graduate students. Often criticized is the fact that literature teachers teach small classes and they are not so interested in teaching language classes which consume a lot of energy and time, because they are under pressure of the obligation of publishing in order to get tenure. Also, what makes the situation more complicated is that the director of the language program is not a language teacher but a Japanese study professor. In short, "the language program has been always considered as a subordinate in this school." A full-time language coordinator seems to be needed to improve the situation. Also, another schism was pointed out through the interview which was that between native and non-native speaking teachers.

New Language Requirement

After the language requirement is strengthened (especially in Wharton school in 1991) according to the plan, more students are expected to enroll in Japanese classes because about 85 percent of the current students in Japanese are pursuing their career in business. "Those students classified as 'language-as-obligation' are less motivated and show a high attrition rate after finishing the minimum requirement" (a language teacher

³¹ A full-time teacher can get a partial support from the School of Arts and Science. But there is an unfair treatment between the students of the Art and Science and the students of the Graduate School of Education (GSE), because the latter have to teach twelve hours a week in order to get a full-time position, while only six hours are required for TAs of its department to get almost the same amount of the benefit. In other words, only a student of Arts and Science can become a TA of the Japanese program which is situated under the School of Arts and Science, while a student of GSE can become only a part-time or a full-time lecturer.

³² Among the teachers of Japanese, GSE is called "a colony" of the university.

of Japanese). Also, they sometimes disturb class management. It was pointed out that “internationalization in terms of increase of the number of the students in the program may not be always successful in maintaining the quality of education.” Most of the faculty have a cynical view on the language requirement; “well, it’s better than nothing, but it’s not a sufficient condition for internationalization, maybe a necessary condition, though” (Career Planning Office). In this regard, we require a careful needs-analysis of the students and a follow-up study of graduates to investigate what is really needed in FL education in the University. At this point, we have to come back to the initial questions I raised in this paper, i.e., who needs FL, anyway?

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As we have seen above, PENN’s newly released Plan is not yet at the stage of implementation, except for a few points (e.g., purchase of a satellite dish by Annenberg School of Communication). Therefore, I cannot evaluate its overall outcome at this moment. But the points I attempted to raise in this paper were the following two: 1) more attention must be paid to directing FL’s ontological position in a larger social setting; 2) an adequate allocation of resources³³ should be considered.

Otherwise, planning will end up with no successful implementation.³⁴

Just as modern science can be used for making weapons to kill people as well as for the welfare of human beings, FL can be a tool of oppression once it is abused. Let us hope that FL will be a tool for peace and tolerance.

³³ Language planning is nothing but “the authoritative allocation of resources to language” (Fishman, 1980).

³⁴ cf. the case of Quechua in Peru (cf. Hornberger, 1988 and 1991).

Appendix

Enrollment of the Japanese Language Program
at the University of Pennsylvania

Fall/Spring

Course # Year	081 (1st)	082 (2nd)	480 (3rd)	582 (4th)	585 (RMJ)	583 (CJ)	483 (BJI)	581 (BJII)
1980-81	10/7	12/11	7/6	3/3				
81-82	32/25	5/3	10/9	7/4				
82-83	26/23	15/12	5/6	2/4				
83-84	44/34	16/12	8/7	2/1				
84-85	49/42	18/13	9/6	2/4				
85-86	49/46	28/21	10/10	5/4				
86-87	63/57	26/22	14/14	10/8				
87-88	88/78	30/29	11/10	13/14				
88-89	96/90	69/50	18/10	6/6	5/5	2/2		
89-90	119/110	50/29	29/19	9/8	not offered	not offered		
90-91	105/96	78/54	19/15	12/10	7/n.o.	2/2	8/10	
91-92	110/96	64/50	25/10	9/11	(3) */n.o.	(2) */n.o.	16/5	n.o./12

RMJ=Reading Modern Japanese, BJ=Business Japanese, CJ=Classical Japanese,

* Independent Study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bourdieu, P. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchange. *Social Science Information* 16 (6): 645-68.
- Cobarrubias, J. 1983. Ethical issues in status planning. In *Progress in language planning*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Cooper, R. 1989. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, J. 1980. The sociology of bilingual education. Lectures at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Friedman, M. and R. 1980. *Free to choose: A personal statement*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Hornberger, N. 1988. *Bilingual education and language maintenance*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- . 1990. Bilingual education and English-only: A language-planning framework. *ANNALS, AAPSS*, 508.
- . 1991. Five vowels or three? Linguistic and politics in Quechua language planning in Peru. Forthcoming in *Language, power, and inequality*, ed. J. W. Tollefson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jorden, E. 1985. Japanese language education and science: A new wave? *Japan Quarterly* 32 (2).
- . 1991. *Japanese language instruction in the United States: Resources, practice, and investment strategy*. Washington, D. C.: National Foreign Language Center.

- Karam, F. 1974. Toward a definition of language planning. In *Advances in language planning*, ed. J. Fishman, The Hague: Mouton.
- Lambert, R. 1984. *Beyond growth: The next stage in language and area studies*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Universities.
- . 1990. *Language policy: An international perspective*. The National Foreign Language Center.
- Lambert, W. E. and G. R. Tucker. 1972. *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. 1979. *Strength through wisdom: A critique of U.S. capability*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ruiz, R. 1984. Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8(2): 15-34.
- Silverstein, M. 1987. Monoglot "standard" in America. In *Working papers and proceedings of the center for psychosocial studies*. Chicago: Center for Psychosocial Studies.
- Thompson, R. 1973. Language resources and the national interest. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, ed. Kurt R. Jankowsky. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Tollefson, J. 1991. *Planning language, planning inequality*. Harlow: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Almanac Supplement XIV*, February 28, 1989.
- Almanac*, March 24, 1992.
- Factbook about International Programs at the University of Pennsylvania*. March, 1992. Provost's Council on International Programs.
- The Daily Pennsylvania*, April 1, 1992.

ネウストプニ, J. (1982) 『外国人とのコミュニケーション』, 岩波書店.