THE LEARNER DEVELOPMENT JOURNAL
学習者ディベロップメント研究部会誌

ISSN: 2433-5401
https://ldjournal.ld-sig.org

The Learner Development Journal Issue 5: Engaging with the Multilingual Turn for Learner Development: Practices, Issues, Discourses, and Theorisations

Author: Huw Davies

Title: Imagining Fair Language Policies: A Practice-Related Review of Piller's *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice*

Date of publication online: 2021

Author contact: <davies-h@kanda.kuis.ac.jp>

Published by the Japan Association for Language Teaching

Learner Development Special Interest Group, Tokyo

http://ld-sig.org/

Copyright 2021 each respective author

The APA citation reference for this paper is:

Davies, H. (2021). Imagining fair language policies: A practice-related review of Piller's *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice*. In A. Barfield, O. Cusen, Y. Imamura, & R. Kelly (Eds.), *The Learner Development Journal Issue 5: Engaging with the Multilingual Turn for Learner Development: Practices, Issues, Discourses, and Theorisations* (pp. 136–146). Tokyo: The Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) Learner Development Special Interest Group.

Articles are published in the Learner Development Journal under a Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY), of which CC BY 4.0 is the most recent version. Under this agreement, authors grant users the right to unrestricted dissemination and re-use of the work. They ask only that proper attribution is given to the work.

Imagining Fair Language Policies: A Practice-related Review of Piller's (2016) *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice*

Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics. Ingrid Piller. Oxford University Press, 2016. 283 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-993726-4

Reviewed by

Huw Davies, Kanda University of International Studies, Japan

<davies-h@kanda.kuis.ac.jp>

Linguistic disadvantage is a global phenomenon produced by policies which connect languages to nation states. Japan is commonly (and erroneously) seen as a monolingual country, and native-speaker models are endorsed there for learning other languages. In this practice-related review, I contend that a shift to a multilingual perspective can create more harmonious learning spaces, and better achieve the Japanese government's aims and objectives for education. Using Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice to provide a global perspective on language issues, I explore themes such as language discrimination faced by migrants, and how schools tend to promote monolingual attitudes despite stated commitments to multilingualism. I then refocus these themes and apply them to my situation as a university educator and as a parent. I visualise what ideal multilingual education policies might look like. I argue that a greater focus on fostering participation by all students regardless of proficiency, and greater incorporation of minority cultures and languages into the syllabus would be beneficial. Future scholarly inquiry should examine the objectives of education systems in order to push for language policies that are inclusive.

言語的不利益は，言語と国家を結びつける政策によって生み出される世界的な現象である。日本は一般的に（誤りではあるのだが）単一言語国家だとみなされ，ネイティブスピーカーモデルが様々な言語を学ぶ上で支持されている。この実践的な書評では，多言語の視点に移行することで，より調和のとれた学習空間を創造し，日本政府の教育の目的や目標をよりよく達成することができると主張する。言語問題に対するグローバルな視点を提供するために，Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice を用いて，移民が直面する言語差別や，多言語主義へのコミットメントを表明しているにもかかわらず，学校が単一言語の態度を促進する傾向にあることなどのテーマを探る。そして，これらのテーマを再訪し，大学の教育者として，また親としての自身の状況に当てはめてみる。また，理想的な多言語教育政策とは何かを視覚化する。言語運用能力にかかわらず全ての学生への参加を促すことに一層の焦点を合わせること，そして少数派の文化や言語をより一層シラバスに組み込むことが有益であると主張する。今後の研究では，包括的な言語政策を推進するべく教育システムの目的を検討する必要がある。

Ko te ngoikoretanga reo he āhuatanga ā-ao i hua mai i ngā kaupapahere e tūhono ana i ngā reo ki ngā iwi whenua. Ko te kitenga whānui (me te hē hoki) o Hapani hei iwi reo tōtahi, ā, e whakamanatia ana ngā tauira kaikōrero-tangata whenua i reira mō te ako i ētahi atu reo. I roto i tēnei arotake whai pānga ki te mahi, e tohe ana au mā te hūnuku ki tētahi tirohanga reo maha ka hangaia pea ngā mokowā ako reretau ake, me te whakatutuki pai ake i ngā whāinga o te kāwanatanga Hapanihi mō te mātauranga. Mā te whakamahi i te Reo Kanorau me te Tika Pāpori hei whakarato i te tirohanga ā-ao ki ngā take reo, ka tūhura ahau i ngā kaupapa pēnei i te whakatoiharatanga reo e tūtakitia ana e ngā manene, me te tikanga i roto i ngā kura o te whakatairanga i ngā waiaro reo tōtahi ahakoa ngā pūmautanga whaikī ki te reo mahatanga. Kātahi au ka arotahi anō i ēnei kaupapa, ā, ka whakahāngai ki taku āhuatanga hei pouako mātauranga, ā, hei mātua hoki o ngā tamariki reorua. E whakakite ana ahau i te āhua o ngā kaupapahere mātauranga reo maha e wawatatia ana. E tohe ana ahau ka whai hua te aro nui ake ki te akiaki i te whakaurunga o ngā ākonga katoa ahakoa te matatau, me te whakauru kaha ake i ngā ahurea me ngā reo o ngā tokoiti ki roto i te marautanga. Me āta tirotiro ngā pakirehua mātauranga anamata i ngā whāinga o ngā pūnaha mātauranga, e whakahau ai mō ngā kaupapahere reo e noho whakauruuru ana.

Keywords

multilingual education, linguistic justice, language policy and planning, community engagement in schools, English education in Japan

多言語教育，言語的正義，言語政策と計画，学校におけるコミュニティ・エンゲージメント，日本の英語教育

mātauranga reo maha, tika reo, kaupapahere me te whakamahere reo, te whakaurunga hapori i ngā kura, te mātauranga Ingarihi i Hapani

There is a scholarly debate about language policies and pedagogical practices in language education which would benefit from being looked at in a different way. Policy makers and practitioners remain fixed in the mindset that connects a language to a nation state, thus prioritising native-speaker models as the (unattainable) embodiment of the language. As a result, activities in language classrooms are required to be performed only in the target language, and the use of other languages and dialects is viewed with disfavour. The multilingual turn is a movement towards understanding that languages are fluid and the purpose of using language is to negotiate social functions, and away from the nation-state mindset which fosters an inferiority complex in language learners and devalues their existing linguistic repertoires (May, 2014; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). In *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice*, Ingrid Piller deconstructs the nation-state mindset and pushes for a greater understanding and acceptance of the multilingual turn and translanguaging practices in all aspects of social life, arguing that linguistic equality is a social justice issue.

Framing linguistic injustice as a big issue that affects everyone is timely. As Piller maintains throughout her narrative, there are problems with language policies at all levels: global, national, local and institutional. These policies and the attitudes attached to them are having a detrimental impact on people on a daily basis. The consequences of linguistic discrimination can be devastating, as exemplified by the suicide note left under Piller's door by her student who was expecting to fail a class. In this book, Piller shows that diversity is a social reality that exists already, and it needs to be accepted, understood, and promoted. In one part, Piller illustrates that the way people speak in Sydney in Australia, with code switching and using languages differently in different situations, means that the labels or names we have for languages are redundant and each person utilises their linguistic resources in unique ways. While it is widely seen as a homogeneous country, the same linguistic diversity as Sydney can be observed in Japan (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015). Furthermore, it has been observed that the cultural heterogeneity of Japanese society is beyond the categories created to describe it (Tsuneyoshi, 2011). As I am a part of the linguistic and cultural diversity in Japan, Piller's interpretation of multilingual practices and their effects are of personal interest.

In this review, I respond to Piller's book in two ways. In the first section, I utilise a traditional book review format, giving the background to the book and its author before scrutinising the contents chapter by chapter and evaluating their relevance for the readership of this journal. In the second section, I share my personal response to the issues raised in the book. I reflect on my early career as a teacher and relate the issues raised by Piller to practices and policies in my work context, a language learning space in a university setting in Japan. I then draw on my positionality as a parent to consider English education in Japanese elementary schools. I ruminate on two puzzles: What appropriate policies for language learning spaces are, and how language activities in primary education in Japan could be more inclusive. In doing so, I attempt not to find definitive answers but to identify areas for further exploration and discussion.

An Overview of the Book

Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice is an absorbing selection of stories and voices from around the world, woven into an anthology that highlights the social consequences of a range of linguistic injustices. The fundamental argument presented is that linguistic disadvantage is systemic and a universal social issue. During her career, the author, Ingrid Piller, has researched bilingual education, multilingualism, language policy, and intercultural communication. Piller was born in Germany, and is currently professor of applied linguistics at Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia. She is the editor of the journal *Multilingua*, and, since 2009, has managed the *Language on the Move* portal which she co-founded with Kimie Takahashi. *Language on the Move* hosts a blog where researchers can disseminate their findings on topics related to multilingualism in short posts (Language on the Move, n.d.). Much of this book originates from Piller's blog posts.

Chapter 1, *Introduction*, details the notions of linguistic diversity and social justice, and Chapters 2 and 3 explore how multilingualism is conceptualised in society. In Chapter 2, *Linguistic Diversity and Stratification*, Piller explores hierarchies of languages and multilingual competence in different communities. She critiques the concept of contemporary superdiversity and looks at how national language policies help societies to allow themselves to be viewed as monolingual and monocultural. In Chapter 3, *The Subordination of Linguistic Diversity*, the theory behind Piller's understanding of social justice is explained, and the reader is encouraged to think beyond languages belonging to a territory or nation state; how language is used to make judgements against people, and segregation by language are also pertinent topics discussed here. This chapter offers useful insights for those whose jobs involve assessing people's language ability.

After the early chapters develop the concepts behind the issues, the middle chapters look at the barriers to and potential for linguistic diversity in various areas of life: Chapter 4 focuses on the workplace, Chapter 5 education, and Chapter 6 general participation in social life. Chapter 4, *Linguistic Diversity at Work*, largely addresses migration to Western, English-speaking countries, but it does question some widely-held beliefs about migrants in the workplace. Examples are given to show that statements such as, "migrants who cannot speak the language well are exploited," or "work is the best way to develop language proficiency" (Piller, 2016, p. 64), are overly simplistic and that the reality is far more nuanced. Piller suggests that it is not low language proficiency that diminishes access to jobs, but the ability to play language games to sell yourself in the right way, for example, by using humour.

Chapter 5, *Linguistic Diversity in Education*, is apposite for language educators in Japan: It describes issues surrounding immersion programmes, diagnosing language proficiency, and testing. The most compelling argument in Chapter 5 is that while schools often claim to value multilingualism, their true agenda is monolingual, "to maintain and perpetuate the socioeconomic order" (Piller, 2016, p. 99). The examples given of this "hidden curriculum" should be mandatory reading in training for language educators; they would help teachers to reflect on the difficulties that linguistically diverse students often face with teaching methods and materials.

Chapter 6, *Linguistic Diversity and Participation*, covers micro-aggressions towards study abroad sojourners, gender issues surrounding language, and discrimination across different ares of community life, and linguistic and cultural alientaion—for example that more Asian Americans reported experiencing prejudice based on their language choice rather than their race and that Polish mothers in London were able to join local parental networks but not access the professional opportunities they aspired to, finding themselves members of a lower socioeconomic group than they had been in their home country. The chapter could be

improved by extending the focus beyond participation through the dominant language in the target community. However, it provides detailed scrutiny of the lack of support for and isolation of women with low language proficiency, which is a global problem. Additionally, Piller questions whether the inclination for migrants to seek out home-country media is because they feel excluded, rather than nostalgic.

The closing chapters focus on the universal dimensions of multilingualism and social justice. Piller's understanding of social justice is that it transcends nation states, yet she is forced to deal with examples in Chapters 4 to 6 where justice is viewed by policy makers as a territorial entity. In Chapter 7, *Linguistic Diversity and Global Justice*, the focus moves to global justice, in which English as a global language is discussed in detail. Chapter 8, *Linguistic Justice*, then briefly explores linguistic privilege, examples of linguistically just communities in action, and the connection between globalisation and nationalism.

A strength of this book is that by having such a rich, varied and global scope, it addresses a broad range of issues surrounding linguistic justice across history that a book detailing a research project could not cover. It adds to existing literature on the multilingual turn by making connections across settings, communities, and cultures. As readers, we are enriched by engaging with the stories shared in *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice* and comparing them to our own experiences.

However, in one section the narrative moves away from being empirical evidence-based scholarship. Although this book's stated aim is to look at linguistic diversity and injustice through comparison and exploring alternative situations, in the final chapter the notion of "perfect justice" is discussed. Studies that call for activism in the name of social justice have been criticised for being dangerously dogmatic rather than rigorously scientific (Pluckrose & Lindsay, 2020). However, struggles and fights are the means Piller suggests are necessary for achieving justice and promoting linguistic diversity. In spite of this, the examples of linguistic utopias given, Isfahan in early 17th-century Persia and the contemporary public libraries of Vienna, were created by authorities within existing systems. This call for revolution is a weakness in the argument, and the book would benefit from a more thorough and nuanced discussion on how linguistic diversity can be celebrated and promoted within existing social systems.

A Personal Response

I came across *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice* while undertaking a research project into the language policy in the university self-access centre where I currently work. I had already been reading about Nancy Fraser's (2008) three-dimensional concept of justice, and Piller's use of it to frame an argument about multilingualism emboldened me to do the same. Fraser conceptualises social justice as requiring economic redistribution, cultural recognition and political representation. In education, this could mean to "strengthen schooling as a good in its own right, as well as in positional terms (redistribution), work with and value cultural difference (recognition) and accord students a voice (representation)" (Lingard & Keddie, 2013, p. 428). The multilingual shift has allowed language educators to better recognise linguistic injustices in their classrooms, but what Fraser first alluded to, and Piller builds on in this book, is the need to go beyond merely recognising differences. There needs to be a concerted and methodical approach by educators to empower students and reimagine pedagogy so that it suits all students' needs.

I am interested in the connection between language loss and culture (see Piller, 2016, p. 28), an interest stemming from a language change in my family around a century ago, and deepened by my experiences as an educator working with migrants and with English learners

in Japan struggling to develop an English-speaking identity. As a result, my teaching is informed with a desire to maintain and respect other languages. Existing knowledge is key to building knowledge in the target language. As a result, I was surprised by the prevalence of English-only policies, spaces, and activities in English education when I first came to work in Japan. I had anticipated that a shared first language would be utilised to learn English effectively. My previous teaching experience had been in New Zealand where I had believed communication in English was the only option because it was the one language that everyone shared. However, on reading Piller's book, I reflected on my early career and came to realise that the most successful interactions between students happened when they were able to draw on their knowledge and experiences using languages other than English. This realisation leads into the first of two puzzles on policies and practices in language learning based on issues in *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice* that I explore in this section.

Puzzle 1: What is a Just Policy in a Language Learning Space?

My first teaching experience was working as an ESOL tutor for Te Wānanga o Aotearoa (TWoA) in Auckland, New Zealand. This was formative for my principles as an educator and researcher as it led me into exploring and valuing equity in education. TWoA is a Māori-led organisation which aims to share Māori knowledge and values (see Te Wānanga o Aotearoa, n.d.). Therefore, as well as teaching English, part of my duty was to share Māori stories, culture and language with students, and advocate honour and respect to all. The students I taught were long-term migrants to New Zealand who had already acquired permanent residency or passports, and the rationale of the course was to support migrants and provide them with the communication skills to lead a fruitful life and take a fuller part in their local community.

In order to take a fuller part in community life, students need to take full part in classroom activities. In the classroom, dialogue must be encouraged among students as equals, and value be given to the knowledge and opinions each person brings. This can be done by incorporating the idea of participatory parity. Participatory parity means a situation where all are given equal power, and everyone can act as peers (Fraser, 2008), which is far more effective in eradicating hierarchy than giving sympathy and other platitudes to marginalised people (Fraser & Honneth, 2003). In a typical class of mine at TWoA, over half of the class were Chinese and a third were Korean, meaning that the other members might be the only person from their country, or the only European, the only Muslim, or a Taiwanese person who did not identify as being Chinese. Creating mutual respect and understanding at TWoA was complex, and this complexity was amplified by me, the teacher, being the youngest person in the group, a substantial proportion of whom may have held Confucian values and beliefs, where age begets status.

One memorable success with this class at TWoA was when we focused on food and eating habits. This topic helped to create an environment where participatory parity and *kotahitanga* [group unity] could flourish (see Te Wānanga o Aotearoa, n.d.) and respect be inspired among students who had not previously found a way to connect. We explained how to make simple dishes from our home countries and for weeks after students were thanking each other for sharing recipes that their families had enjoyed. On reflection, I now realise that as well as successfully communicating in the target language, students had also communicated to their peers some of their own culture in both English and their own languages. For example, as well as sharing the English and Chinese word for spring onion, one student asked how to say it in Korean, Bulgarian and Japanese, building her relationship with classmates from different backgrounds in the process. Hence the classroom, at its most successful, was a productive,

vibrant and just space because different languages were used and accepted to develop community.

Learning spaces in Japan have tended to have English-only policies based on the belief that students have little opportunity to use the language elsewhere in their everyday lives (van der Walt, 2013). Perhaps this suggests that the way language learning in Japan has been understood does not incorporate community building or sharing one's own knowledge and culture, and therefore is a situation that requires some criticism because it is at odds with the aims and objectives of education in Japan, set down by the government. A stated aim of government policy is to cultivate individuals who participate in society, and one objective includes fostering "the value of respect for other countries and the desire to contribute to world peace and the development of the international community" (Basic Act on Education, 2006). English-only policies run counter to the fundamental principles of education in Japan because they suppress respect for countries and peoples deemed not to be English-speaking.

I work at a university in Japan, in an informal language learning space that recently changed from having an English-only policy to a multilingual approach. Research suggests that students there prefer to have an English-only area (Davies, 2018), yet their observed behaviour demonstrates that they inhabit a multilingual space (Imamura, 2018; Wongsarnpigoon & Imamura, 2020). I contend that students report a preference for a monolingual learning environment because they believe using English only will make them more proficient in that language; in other words, they feel that speaking only in English is what they ought to be doing.

Another explanation for why university English learners self-report a preference for a monolingual learning environment is that they are unaware both of their own multilingual practices and of the benefits of translanguaging. In my workplace, I often see people doing Spanish homework while sending a message to a friend using Japanese and having a conversation in English; when asked they usually say that they are just doing Spanish homework, which suggests a lack of awareness of their multilingual habitus. It is important that language educators raise awareness about translanguaging and encourage learners to embrace their multilingualism.

Based on the message in *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice*, a just language policy in a language learning space would accept that all users of the space are diverse, and discourage thoughts that groups of users and the languages they use are homogeneous. The ethos of an ideal space would be to find, celebrate, and respect differences in those who visit and their language choices. In addition, a just policy would ensure that participation within the space is open to all, regardless of language proficiency, "acknowledg[ing] that everyone has the right to be heard and to be listened to" (Piller, 2016, p. 162). One criticism of English education in Japan is that the myth of native-speaker competence remains, exemplified by the exclusive use of Californian accents in school textbooks (Kubota, 2018), which perpetuates an inferiority complex in many students because they are led to believe that there is one correct way to speak English.

Puzzle 2: What is the Purpose of English in Primary Education in Japan?

Recently there has been a policy shift concerning foreign language instruction in Japanese primary schools. English instruction has been brought forward two years so that it is part of the curriculum from age eight and a formal assessed subject for students in their final two years of primary school (see Nemoto, 2018). As a parent of two young children, this is of great interest to me. Here I will describe the change in policy, then consider its justness based on my own observations and connect it to descriptions of policy in Piller's book, and finally imagine how a linguistically diverse language activities curriculum could be realised.

The previous curriculum's objective was to develop "the understanding of languages and cultures through various experiences, [and foster] a positive attitude toward communication" (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, 2009). There was no directive that this experience of language and culture should be English so there were opportunities built in to explore any language or culture, and to embrace the multilingual turn. The new curriculum is for English rather than "language activities," the rationale being that English is a required skill in the globalised world and a greater focus on English in the early years can help develop this (The Mainichi, 2017). However, I argue that the previous curriculum had more potential to prepare children for a globalised world than children learning English as a formal assessed subject two years earlier because there is more of a scope to generate and follow interests, rather than be forced into exploring English in a Californian accent (Kubota, 2018). If English were the right language choice, it might be more appropriate to look at English as a tool for communication in Asia and accept varieties of English using voices from the region.

I contend that compulsory foreign language education in Japan needs to look beyond English. It is important that prominent minority languages in Japan, such as Korean, Portuguese, Chinese, and Vietnamese, are promoted in the wider community rather than being viewed negatively (Kubota & McKay, 2009), and a presence in primary schools would be an effective way to achieve this. Languages and cultures could be brought into the primary classroom through engagement with the community, for example inviting members of minority groups to showcase arts or customs and share stories from their own lives. Additionally, a focus on culture rather than language proficiency can reduce the pressure on teachers and young learners.

There is a danger that focusing purely on English in foreign language activities in primary school will devalue minority languages and cultures. There is a precedent for this in Japan, where "invisible" Korean residents have been pressured to assimilate (Okano, 2011; Tsuneyoshi, 2011). There are similar cases of languages and cultures being marginalised in China, and I will explore this using the voice of a current student of mine, Saran (pseudonym) who comes from Inner Mongolia (see Baioud, 2020 for an overview of the situation there), in tandem with a case study from Piller's book of a person from a Russian-speaking minority. Saran is an ethnic Mongolian who, because she went to a Mandarin-speaking school, has not been able to develop full literacy in her own language. She states:

> When my father was young, he suffered a lot, lost many chances because he can not speak Chinese very fluently. So he hoped that if he sent me to the Han school, I could speak fluent Chinese and I would have many chances. And as my father hoped, now I can speak Chinese better than most Mongolian people. But on the other side, I lost my language. (Saran, personal communication, 25 September 2020).

She talks of a pressure for Chinese citizens to be able to speak fluent Mandarin, and found that the only opportunity she had to use Mongolian was at home. Wei Ru's story appears in Chapter 7, *Linguistic Diversity and Global Justice*. She grew up in a Russian-influenced area of China and had a high proficiency in Russian and Chinese. However, during her high school days the curriculum in China was changed to recognise only English proficiency for entry to mainstream higher education, the social capital of her Russian skill became worthless, and she was denied entry to a mainstream university and had to enroll in a *minzu* university, or a university for ethnic minorities. Due to language policy in China, Saran has lost access to her own culture, and Wei Ru has been denied access to participate in mainstream society. Similarly, school students in Japan should not be forced to assimilate in a way that alienates them from their heritage, nor should their otherness prevent them from the capacity to be successful within the Japanese system.

Piller issues two stark warnings about school language policies that could be applied to the primary curriculum in Japan: the "hidden" purpose of schooling is to maintain the status quo, and the promotion of English benefits only the urban elite. English functions as a gatekeeper in education (Price, 2014, as cited in Piller, 2016). Language should be used to promote communication and understanding, not neoliberal values. As parents and as educators, we need to see past the rhetoric of global skills in order to push for a curriculum that works to promote linguistic diversity and multilingualism, and is accessible to all.

One approach to create a multilingual curriculum flexible enough to suit the local needs of a particular location, classroom or student, while being stringent enough to become a national policy, would be a portfolio (Benson & Lamb, 2021). Students would be able to explore community or home languages and cultures of their choice and be assessed on their responses to this (done in the school language or visually if appropriate), rather than on acquiring set phrases in English. A portfolio would give students the right to, and ownership of, their language learning (Melo, 2021). It would have the potential of developing in students self-learning skills, independence, and an interest in their diverse community. In a primary school, there may be a need for the teacher to make some of the learning choices for the students. However, in my experience of developing and running a university class where all students were learning different things, but at the same time keeping reflective journals and talking with peers in a structured way (Stevenson & Davies, 2019; Edlin, 2018), having learners make different choices does not create extra work for students or teachers. This pedagogic approach is not novel in compulsory education in Japan: School students have previously been encouraged to keep personal records of their own learning (Nishioka, 2017), and *seikatsu tsuzurikata* / 生活綴方 [daily life writing] has been long employed to encourage students to reflect on their lives and communities, then share their perspectives with peers (Kawaji, 2017). A multilingual portfolio is a natural successor to previous teaching and learning styles in Japan, and it fits the government's objective of "developing individuals' abilities, cultivating creativity, and fostering a spirit of autonomy and independence" (Basic Act on Education, 2006). For minority and non-minority children alike, having a multilingual approach to language education that involves the local community has many benefits that exceed those given by learning stock phrases in English that are not directly connected to the lives of the individual learner or their community.

Concluding Thoughts

In this practice-related review, I first gave an overview of the themes in Piller (2016), and related them to learner development issues. I then examined two puzzles I developed based on the book and my experiences as an educator and a parent. From this examination, I propose that further exploration and discussion is required in the following areas:

- how language learning and practices in schools can be accepting of, and connect to, the the lives of all of the student body and diverse communities in the local area;
- how to produce appropriate local responses to local language issues, that fit in with the ethos of the school and education system; and
- how inclusive pedagogical practices which respect and promote multilingual knowledge can be further developed.

Through reflection and scrutiny on these three overarching themes of this review, educational practitioners can consider how to minimise linguistic disadvantage in their setting.

For those specifically interested in learner development issues in language education, I recommend reading Chapters 3, *The Subordination of Linguistic Diversity*, and Chapter 5, *Linguistic Diversity in Education*, of this book as essential reading. In these chapters examples are presented that show the danger of connecting language to territory and the problems that arise in education from a monolingual mindset. Chapter 7, *Linguistic Diversity and Global Justice*, develops these ideas further, focusing particularly on the English language, and will help English educators reflect on their own practices and policies. I contend that in Japan there needs to be an adjustment in the way language learning is talked about both by professionals and laypeople, in order that English learning becomes easily accessible for beginners, based on more realistic models and attainment goals.

Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice has encouraged me to think more deeply about language-learning policies in my work context, and the importance of raising awareness about being multilingual—and its benefits—to students. Issues raised have encouraged deeper reflection on the effects of language policies in tertiary and compulsory education in Japan. Future discussions, practitioner research, and scholarship should appraise the objectives of education in order to actively and appropriately shape and reflect society, and to examine how valuing minority languages and communities can be a part of a just curriculum.

Author Bio

Huw Davies is a learning advisor at Kanda University of International Studies. He holds an MEd from the Open University, and is a PhD candidate at Lancaster University. His working day is centred around learner development. He has published papers on language learning strategies, learner autonomy, and advisor professional development.

Huw Davies é conselheiro na aprendizagem de línguas na Kanda University of International Studies. Possui Mestrado em Educação pela Open University e atualmente é doutorando pela Lancaster University. Seu trabalho centra-se no desenvolvimento do aprendiz, tendo publicado artigos sobre estratégias de aprendizagem de línguas, autonomia do aprendiz, e desenvolvimento profissional do conselheiro.

Review Process

This paper was blind peer-reviewed by members of *The Learner Development Journal* Review Network and Journal Steering Group. (*Contributors have the option of open or blind review.*)

References

Baioud, G. (2020). Will education reform wipe out Mongolian language and culture? *Language on the Move*. https://www.languageonthemove.com/will-education-reform-wipe-out-mongolian-language-and-culture/

Basic Act on Education of 2006, Act No. 120. (2006, December 22). https://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/lawandplan/title01/detail01/1373798.htm

Benson, P., & Lamb, T. (2021). Autonomy in the age of multilingualism. In M. Jiménez Raya & F. Vieira (Eds.), *Autonomy in language education: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 74–88). Routledge.

Davies, H. (2018, February 10-11). *Responding to non-participation with a language policy* [Paper presentation]. CamTESOL-UECA Regional ELT Research Symposium 2018, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

Edlin, C. (2018). A nested MOOC elective course: MOOCs for learner development, and learner development for MOOCs. *Relay Journal, 1*(1), 133–141. https://doi.org/10.37237/relay/010113

Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of justice*. Columbia University Press.

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange*. Verso.

Imamura, Y. (2018). Adopting and adapting to new language policies in a self-access centre in Japan. *Relay Journal, 1*(1), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.37237/relay/010120

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters.

Kawaji, A. (2017). Daily life writing in school: Creating alternative textbooks and culture. In Y. Yamasaki & H. Kuno (Eds.), *Educational progressivism, cultural encounters and reform in Japan* (pp. 109–124). Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2018). *Eigo kyōiku gensō* [Misconceptions of English language teaching and learning]. Chikuma Shinsho.

Kubota, R., & McKay, S. (2009). Globalization and language learning in rural Japan: The role of English in the local linguistic ecology. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(4), 593–619. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00188.x

Language on the Move. (n.d.). *Language on the move.* https://www.languageonthemove.com/language-on-the-move/

Lingard, B., & Keddie, A. (2013). Redistribution, recognition and representation: working against pedagogies of indifference. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 21*(3), 427–447. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2013.809373

The Mainichi (2017, February 15). New curriculum guidelines must not rigidly control schools' education [Editorial]. https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20170215/p2a/00m/0na/017000c

May, S. (2014). Introducing the "multilingual turn". In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn* (pp. 1–6). Routledge.

Melo, M. (2021). Pedagogical violence and language dominance. In C. Friend (Ed.), *Hybrid teaching: Pedagogy, people, politics* (pp. 55–61). Hybrid Pedagogy.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2009). *Foreign language activities*. MEXT. https://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/___icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/03/17/1303755__011.pdf

Nemoto, A. K. (2018). Getting ready for 2020: Changes and challenges for English education in public primary schools in Japan. *The Language Teacher, 42*(4), 33–35.

Nishioka, K. (2017). Hama Omura's unit learning practice for Japanese class. In Y. Yamasaki & H. Kuno (Eds.), *Educational progressivism, cultural encounters and reform in Japan* (pp. 139–154). Routledge.

Okano, K. H. (2011). Ethnic Koreans in Japanese schools: Shifting boundaries and collaboration with other groups. In R. Tsuneyoshi, K. H. Okano, & S. S. Boocock (Eds.), *Minorities and education in multicultural Japan: An interactive perspective* (pp. 100–125). Routledge.

Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the city.* Routledge.

Piller, I. (2016). *Linguistic diversity and social justice: An introduction to applied sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Pluckrose, H., & Lindsay, J. (2020). *Cynical theories: How activist scholarship made everything about race, gender and identity—and why this harms everybody*. Pitchstone.

Price, G. (2014). English for all? Neoliberalism, globalization, and language policy in Taiwan. *Language in Society*, *43*(5), 567–589. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404514000566

Stevenson, R., & Davies, H. (2019, June 8). *Using MOOCs in class to meet student needs and motivations* [Poster presentation]. The Sixth Annual Conference on Global Higher Education at Lakeland University Japan, Tokyo, Japan.

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa. (n.d.) *Ngā uara* [Our mission, vision, and values]. https://www.twoa.ac.nz/te-whare/nga-uara

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2011). The 'new' foreigners and the social reconstruction of difference: The cultural diversification of Japanese education. In R. Tsuneyoshi, K. H. Okano, & S. S. Boocock (Eds.), *Minorities and education in multicultural Japan: An interactive perspective* (pp. 149–172). Routledge.

van der Walt, C. (2013). *Multilingual higher education: Beyond English medium orientations.* Multilingual Matters.

Wongsarnpigoon, I., & Imamura, Y. (2020). Nurturing use of an English speaking area in a multilingual self-access space. *JASAL Journal, 1*(1), 139–147. https://jasalorg.com/journal-june20-wongsarnpigoon-imamura/