

Foreign Language Acquisition: Fostering Social Justice and Internalization within Web 2.0 Environments

Florence Lojaco¹

ARTICLE INFO

Available Online November 2013

Key words:

M-Learning;

Foreign Language

Didactics;

Social Justice.

ABSTRACT

In the field of mobile teaching the winds of change are coming from the “Steve Job Galaxy” confirming the vision Illich described in *Deschooling Society* (1971). The success of mobile learning is primarily due to easily searchable databases. Therefore a Copernican Revolution is on the go and will revise the way educational contents are accessed. In this paper we discuss a specific aspect of this the radical shift: collaborative teaching through globally networked learning environments. Within educational institutions, collaboration means the ability to harness ideas, resources and educational practioners from across boundaries. While it is clear that collaboration is acknowledged as a required win-win practice for any business organizations, in the field of education the most important outcome brought by Web 2.0 tools is social justice, in terms of equity in mobility and cross-cultural experiences. Therefore this paper describes practices aimed at fostering social justice within a language learning framework. Internet-based tools are analyzed in terms of hardware and software requirements as well as in terms of second language acquisition theories and cognitive approaches. In sum, this paper is aimed at serving the innovative teacher in the exploration of collaborative teaching in a Web 2.0 context.

1. Introduction

This paper is teacher-practice centered and is aimed to foster a reflection about the different ways social justice is implemented until now, as well as to explore new ways of implementing social justice in foreign language education. The chosen focus underlines, on the one hand, telecollaboration as a means of meeting this goal, and, on the other hand, internalization as a global context as well as a requirement for higher education institutions worldwide. Telecollaboration in a globalized world means a web of connections. This web of connections, in education, implies teaching enhanced by technologies. ICT is of paramount importance when it comes to implementing social justice through intercultural awareness, especially in cross-border teaching. This chapter does not propose any list of web-based activities or web-based tools. The educational practitioner community agrees that ICT enables students to work individually, cooperatively and collaboratively. This statement is a starting point, not a proposition that needs to be demonstrated. The goal is to outline a philosophy of the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), with special attention to the impact of ICT on a teacher’s role and on teaching. In summary, the goal of this paper is to explore the collaborative learning process which, according to Palloff and Pratt (2001), helps learners achieve a deeper level of knowledge construction, bearing in mind that “teaching world languages for social justice is a journey, not a destination” (Osborn, 2006, p. 15).

2. Telecollaboration: a major social change

2.1. A Knowledge-based Society

Summer 2011, the special double issue of the Harvard Business Review magazine is entirely dedicated to collaboration. October 2011, iPhone 4 is number one on Google Trends, which means that the well-known smartphone was the most searched item among Internet surfers. Mobile technology is already part of our day-to-day lives and cloud computing is gaining more and more users every day. When it comes to education, collaboration is a trend topic as demonstrated by major professional association conferences. In

¹ Vice Dean for International Relations, Faculty of Translation and Interpreting, University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

2009, CALICO Monograph Series was dedicated to *The Next Generation: Social Networking and Online collaboration in Foreign Language Learning*. The 2009 EUROCALL conference dealt with *New Trends in Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Working Together*. More recently, in 2010, Peter Lang published the first volume of a new series on Telecollaboration in Education: *Telecollaboration 2.0: Language, Literacies and Intercultural Learning in the 21st Century*.

2.2. The Steve Jobs Galaxy

One of the major outcomes of the Google era is the free, ubiquitous and easy access to various educational databases. *Gallica*(<http://gallica.bnf.fr/?lang=ES>) and the *Project Gutenberg*(<http://www.gutenberg.org>) as well as educational radios such as *Canal Académie*(<http://www.canalacademie.com/>) are successful attempts of broadcasting knowledge without any restrictions of time, space or an end user's profile. Last but not least, podcasts are now streaming into our society, including into schools and universities, as demonstrated by the success of iTunes University and alike. Therefore knowledge, for the first time in history can be accessed by anyone, from anywhere, free of charge. This is the revolution initiated by ICT technologies and brought to the masses by Steve Jobs. As a consequence, in our connected world, the concept of space has been de-contextualized. Due to the fact that space now has little to do with determinate geographical locations, in education, the concept of the classroom has changed from brick and mortar to any connected place, including mobile places such as trains and planes.

As often happens in education, the innovation came from outside the pedagogical world. Thanks to ICT, Illich's vision of the educational revolution described in *Deschooling Society*(1971) has been made possible. Illich's "deschoolized society" describes a society where schools are everywhere, where people learn from each other, where knowledge flows between all willing participants regardless of their geographical or social position. A nurtured reflection on education in relation to Web 2.0 capabilities should remind us that many years ago, in Cuernavaca, Mexico, a group of people led by Ivan Illich decided that the "educational web" would be the core concept of a renewed pedagogy. This 40-year old vision is an exact description of our Web 2.0 world. The only difference between Illich's vision and today's world is that the "deschooling" phenomena did not come from politics but from informatics. What 40 years of communicative teaching did not succeed in setting up, is now deeply rooted in our day-to-day life, as well as in our educational practices, after only a few months of iPod exposure.

We switched from the "Gutenberg Galaxy" (McLuhan, 1962) to the "Steve Jobs Galaxy". This upgrade opens new horizons in the field of ubiquitous teaching and, consequently, in the field of distance education and cross-border collaboration. The large success of portable multimedia players is primarily due to easy-to-search and customizable databases. On one hand, portable media players combine mobility with an easy and ubiquitous access to pay-to-download and free content stores (iTunes Store, Amazon). On the other hand, database management software and podcast managers (Juice, Window Multimedia, iTunes, Winamp) pioneer new trends in terms of content delivery. The newness for end users consists in the way cultural and entertainment contents, especially music and games, are now located, chosen and bought. New consumer behaviors opened the way for radical changes in academic contents delivery. As a consequence, it is now common to find a wide array of educational contents ready to be downloaded onto PC or portable devices as demonstrated by the growing number of iTunes lectures offered by Higher Education institutions. A podcast called "Mac Learning" is a vivid example of the consummate fusion between mobile technologies and learning/teaching practices.

2.3. From secret mazes to open networks

The school beyond the walls desired by Illich consists of free of charge educational networks and easy-to-search databases, such as the Google Books Library Project. This initiative, aimed at broad casting the largest online corpus of human knowledge freely is doing more for promoting the democratization of knowledge than any current law or pedagogical theory. The project has been criticized by the publishing industry and by writers' groups for potential copyright violations. But copyright is only the tip of the debate-iceberg. Copyright, at first sight a matter of common sense and highly acceptable reason, is in fact the last barrier that can reasonably (i.e. in a politically correct manner) be built between exclusive knowledge and John Doe. This is where Illich (1971), again, was an extraordinary visionary: "Schools are designed on the assumption that there is a secret to everything in life; that the quality of life depends on knowing that secret; that secrets can be known only in orderly successions; and that only teachers can properly reveal these secrets." (p. 129). Isn't Wikipedia often felt as a threat among teachers? As a consequence, if a teacher's mastery is not built on a privileged access to knowledge anymore, on what could a teacher's authority be built? In a society where students are given access to the same knowledge as

scholars, where examinees can find answers on the web quicker than a seasoned teacher in his books, obviously there is a need for a deep reflection on educational practices, as well as on assessment (Lojacono, 2009). The antithesis of a web-based schooling does not rely on chalk on a blackboard in a brick and mortar classroom, but on Jorge's library described in Umberto Eco's *The Name of the Rose*. The debate can be reformulated in this way: should knowledge be and remain a secret, should the sources of knowledge remain dark mazes, meandering into nightmarish libraries? The debate between defenders and opponents to the Google Books Library Project or any similar initiative is rooted in these two options: should the access to knowledge remain a secret for an exclusive happy few or should this access be freely open to anyone? Jorge or Steve? Open access to the sources of knowledge is the ultimate step towards a society based on effective equal opportunity and, thus, towards social justice: "What are needed are new networks, readily available to the public and designed to spread equal opportunity for learning and teaching" (Illich, 1971). It is true that, as Kramsch (2002, p. 86) argues: "Network technologies have helped to initiate a significant pedagogical shift moving many language art educators from cognitivist assumptions about knowledge and learning as a brain phenomenon to contextual, collaborative and social interactive approaches to language development and activity." Nevertheless, none of these pedagogical theories were able to initiate a real pedagogical shift. Research on learning theories keeps educational practitioners from reflecting on teaching practices and, on a larger scale, on the social impact brought about by free and easy access to knowledge.

3. Social Justice: a needed educational change

3.1. Social Justice: a New Concept?

The emergence of social justice as a research field, as well as a true concern within educational practitioners, pointed out a twofold approach: on one hand, social justice appears as the ultimate trend in education, as shown by the recent literature on this topic; On the other hand, hasn't social justice always been here? Social justice in foreign language education relies heavily on fostering intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997) through the use of Computer Mediated Communication (CMC), usually between classes with different vehicular languages, such as the MIT Cultura project (<http://cultura.mit.edu/>). At this point, an important question arises. Does social justice rely on technological "must have" and accordingly "must teach" practices? Didn't Voltaire's *Candide* (1759) deal with teaching social justice? Yes, it did and still does. Telecollaboration and social justice are surfing today, hand in hand, on cybernetics highways. But are CMC-based cross-border educational initiatives so different from collaborative teaching practices pioneered by French teacher Celestin Freinet? Almost one century ago, Freinet promoted cooperation among students from different institutions and fostered a culture of shared resources. So, is cross-border and collaborative teaching really such a new idea? More likely the idea is an old one, but the packaging is new (see "New Tools for Old Tricks" by Paul Whittaker in Byram, Nichols & Stevens, 2001). This chapter intends to explore social justice in foreign language education, not as the latest trend, but as the ongoing and evergreen aim of education in general and of foreign language education in particular.

Social justice arose in the public consciousness when globalization became embedded in our day-to-day lives. We acknowledge that "globalization is a highly contested term" (Kramsch & Thorne, 2002, p. 85), nevertheless a globalized society can be described as a Janus-faced artifact: technically connected and politically neoliberal (Gray, 2002). Unsurprisingly, the concept of social justice, which arose from globalization, is an even more political and controversial topic. In the globalized world which was depicted in Bosh's Hell (Berger 1998-99), some researchers advocate for the authoritative implementation of an institutionalized social justice (GuibetLafaye, 2005). Social justice, both in society and in education, built its rationale and practices on the refusal of positivism of all kind. For Guibet Lafaye, democracy is no longer the appropriate setting to foster social justice. To ensure the realm of social justice she argues that "arguments must be weighted and the best argument wins rather than votes and majority of votes." According to Osborn (2006) in education, the postmodern approach stresses the importance to "resist positivism" (p. 60) and, therefore, to resist the concept of language acquisition as a "fragmentable phenomena" (preface X). This is also the position of Kumaravdivelu (2001) who underlines that human beings are not acting based solely on a reality that is absolute, external, fragmentable, and controllable. Between the two faces of globalization, between the technically connected world and the neoliberal political system there is, nevertheless, a common ground from which we could take advantage of: communication. Communication, through electronic information highways is "among the keywords of the global age" according to Cameron (2002, p.71). Thus, delocalization, both in industrial and in educational fields, is the core concept and can be seen

as the major consequence of globalization. Delocalization comes along with the growth of supra territorial relations (Scholte, 2000) and the emergence of non-territorial communities. Couldn't delocalization then be applied to the classroom and, literally speaking, be called "deschooling"? If globalization brought spatial and temporal delocalization, if globalization frees us from geographical and temporal boundaries, globalization has also brought us a way to build a bridge between these delocalized entities and this bridge is called collaboration. Collaboration is achieving changes in the world of social enterprise (*Harvard Business Review* n°89, 2011, p.38) and no doubt that collaboration will change (and indeed, is already changing) teaching practices. Within educational institutions, collaboration means the ability to harness ideas, resources and educational practitioners and to free them from boundaries of all kinds. Collaboration and internalization are key competences in our knowledge-based society. Anderson (1988, p. 197) stresses the link between internalization and the learning process itself: "Meaningful learning demands that we internalize information: we break it down, digest it and locate it in our pre-existing, highly complex web of interconnected knowledge and ideas, building fresh links and restructuring old ones." Furthermore, these new competences, coupled with intercultural competence and intercultural mediation, are core requirements within the European Higher Education Area (Clouet, 2008). While it is clear that collaboration is acknowledged as a required win-win practice for any business organization, in the field of education, one of the most important outcomes brought on the tide with Web 2.0 tools is the concept of social justice, in terms of equity in mobility (both virtual and in person), as well as in terms of cross-cultural experiences.

3.2. Social Justice and Foreign Language Education

The concept of social justice, as it is known today in foreign language education, has grown within the broader concept of globalization. Recent publications, such as Curtis and Romney (2006) and the 2006 *TESOL Quarterly* special topic issue, "Race and TESOL", demonstrate an increasing concern about how social justice is fostered in education. Intercultural competence is not a need for an upcoming globalized society anymore, although it was twenty or thirty years ago. Now it's the primary requirement for a contemporary networked and delocalized society. Language learning was originally only focused on linguistics and then the focus was put increasingly on both linguistic and cultural competencies. The last trend in Second Language Acquisition is to focus on linguistics, culture and politics, which is now called social justice (Garrido, 2008). Thus, in foreign language education, social justice now comes hand in hand with seasoned language goals such as linguistics and culture. Speaking of teaching culture in a language course, the MIT Cultura website stresses that "dimension of culture is a very difficult one to teach because it is very elusive, abstract, implicit and essentially invisible. The famous American anthropologist Edward Hall referred to it as "the silent language", the "hidden dimension"" (see <http://cultura.mit.edu/home/what-is-cultura/>).

Exactly the same can be said of teaching social justice. For researchers such as Kubota and Osborn, the paradigm shifts from a general acknowledgement of the intercultural competence to a vigorous claim for social justice. Critical thinking is part of this approach, especially towards the collateral effects of the globalization phenomena. Globalization in education is often seen as the diffusion of "global" norms for effective communication (Kubota, 2003) from dominant to subaltern cultures (Cameron, 2002, p.70) and, as a consequence, a social justice approach is aimed at reflecting on these "global" norms. To react against this understanding of globalization, researchers such as Osborn (2006, p. 7) state that "Consumerism and market ideologies should not be the primary sources guiding the determination of educational requirements or programs in language education."

3.3. Two Ways to foster Social Justice: ICT and Curricula

Where is the place of social justice in foreign language education today? By what means could social justice be implemented in a foreign language course? So far, two scenarios are usually envisaged: the first one, conducted by means of a computer enhanced methodology, focuses on cross-institution and cross-border communication, as illustrated by the MIT Cultura project, the second one focuses on curricula development, such as the specific activism-oriented curricula described by Osborn in 2006 (see also the "savoir s'engager" described in Byram, Gribkova & Starkey 2002). The impact of social justice on Foreign Language Acquisition is therefore twofold: on one hand, focused toward internalization (see the MIT Cultura project) and, on the other hand, focused on social changes (Osborn, 2006). Literature in the field demonstrates that the first option is, by far, the most common one. In fact, when it comes to social justice, the battle on the foreign language field has been fought almost entirely in the realm of ICT technologies. What are the characteristics of each option? This is what we will analyze now.

The rationale of using CMC to foster social justice in Foreign Language Education is both a consequence and a response to a globalized world. Massive industrial delocalization (a matter of concrete space) merged with

unlimited virtual capabilities (a matter of abstract space) and gave birth to ubiquitous communication practices (where abstract locations are the setting for concrete practices). Then, the emphasis of Foreign Language teaching is put on the challenge of engaging learners from different geographical locations, usually two institutions where different vehicular languages are spoken, to collaborate together by means of CMC. The challenge is not on setting up a CMC (this is the easiest part). The challenge relies on how students can take advantage of this cross-border exposure to gain intercultural competence and social justice awareness. Which activities should be suggested? How could teachers access this process? Unsurprisingly, for O'Dowd (2007, p. 17) telecollaboration is synonymous with online intercultural exchange. This approach was chosen by most researchers. B. Meyer and M. Bo-Kristensen (2010, p.196) state that "one of the major challenges of second and foreign language learning is therefore thinking about how technology can mediate or create connections between the teaching's formal and more informal learning environments." Md. Mokter Hossain and Hasan Aydin (2011, p. 118) declare that the Web 2.0 is "an appropriate technology to build many local and global virtual communities among people in different cultures to help them practice effective multicultural skills." A vast volume of literature has been devoted to deal with the influence of the use of ICT in the teaching / learning process from many different perspectives. However, in the 21st century, ICT for its own sake, understood as the mere opposite to traditional teaching and learning without any technologies, is not enough to convey social justice; neither is the mere use of ICT enough to be the core of a research. Beatty (2003) states that "one area of declining interest includes studies which focus on the need for computers in the classroom. Another area of less interest belongs to those studies that attempt to make direct comparisons between CALL and traditional learning in terms of effectiveness." (p. 13). For many years (MIT's Cultura project was designed and created in 1997), research on the learning and teaching of languages and cultures as enhanced by technology has analyzed the uses and the outcomes of CMC. These studies were, and still are, mostly focused on asynchronous text-based exchange such as questionnaires, forums and emails, as shown by the more than thirty projects archived and available on MIT Cultura's project website. The ICE project conducted by Chun and Wade in 2002-2003 (Chun & Wade, 2004) describes the collaborative effort between German classes in California and partner classes in Germany as an initiative based on the MIT Cultura project. The constructivist model and sociocultural perspective provide the theoretical support to these approaches. Their methodology consists of filling out questionnaires and synchronous online threaded written forums. Unfortunately, CMC practices does not automatically imply any gain in intercultural communicative competence nor does CMC automatically lead to a major awareness about social justice issues. O'Dowd (2003, p. 118) states that "The belief that contact between cultures automatically leads to intercultural learning and to the development of positive attitudes towards the target culture has already been rejected by many (Allport, 1979; Coleman, 1998; Fischer, 1998)."

In summary, the ICT approach to social justice fosters the use of Internet-based collaborative learning aimed at engaging students in cross-border interactions. Nonetheless, we should bear in mind that "cultural needs and cultural differences need to be taken into account at every phase of the design and delivery of online materials." (Brennan, McFadden & Law 2000, p. 8). Outcomes are analyzed in terms of their contribution to social justice awareness. This common and well documented approach of fostering social justice awareness in the foreign language classrooms begs three important questions. The question is: why should a cross-border CMC be more efficient in fostering social justice than the Pencil Mediated Communication was, i.e. the exchange of manuscript letters sent to a pen pal via snail mail? If we agree with Kramsh (1998) that cultural meaning is created through the actions and interactions of speakers in social contexts the innovation brought by ICT can be measured in terms of quantum leaps, in terms of time: instantaneous answers versus 3 weeks-waiting for answers. Does ICT add more "authentic context", or do we interchange instantaneous communication for real communication, therefore instantaneous communication for authentic communication? The second question is: is ICT free of values? Is ICT neutral enough to convey social justice? Researchers, such as Kubota, examine the hidden built-in values in CMC. The third question, by far not as popular as the first two questions, is nonetheless perhaps the most important: how can ICT free and universalize knowledge access? And what will the necessary change in teaching practices introduced by the ubiquitous and free access to knowledge be? At this point, the practitioner could take advantage of an accurate and renewed understanding of Illich, Freinet, Alain and Reboul.

If the ICT approach envisages social justice as one of the goals of FL education (see Álvarez Inma, Tita Beaven & Cecilia Garrido, 2008), the curricula approach envisages teaching social justice by means of "world languages" (Osborn, 2006, Preface). Speaking about "world languages" is considered by Osborn more appropriate than speaking about "foreign languages", i.e. less offensive against the

“foreigners.” Unsurprisingly, words and vocabulary are the roots of his curricula’s approach. Osborn’s main objective is “to implement a course that primarily emphasizes socio-political awareness and critical reflection” (2006, p.60). The author refuses to give his own definition of social justice because his own definition may be filtered by his own experience (p.16). His position on social justice is defined as “a position [...] that includes the evaluation of curricula based on their effects on promoting positive cross-national and cross-cultural understanding.” (p.17). The main guideline of his pedagogy is to resist positivism as a source of over control (p.26), to resist “technicist precision” (p.21) and to promote inspiration as the core of teaching practices (p.21). Thus, words are given such an extraordinary importance in this approach, which could be called a semiologist approach. “In a dialogic classroom, we want to focus on grammar and vocabulary in a way that enables us to resist positivism, talk about values, continue the inquiry with students and community, learn to listen to the stories in the community and classroom, connect to social movements, and move into conflict” (Osborn 2006, p.61). Words can also sometimes hide a more complex issue: the sentence, as a tree, can sometimes hide the forest. Osborn (2006, p.9) recognizes that language courses are unique because they stress the fact that “words embody concepts and culture in a way that does not always include a one-to-one correspondence with words in other languages”. Is not this statement a little bit naïve, in particular when the author underlines “not always”? Is not this vision completely denied by research in linguistics (Saussure, Martinet, Jakobson to quote a few)? Is not this perspective of language the biggest barrier against social justice? Thinking that the main difference between languages can be reduced to the fact that sometimes there is not a “one-to-one correspondence” between words is refusing language complexity. In order to learn a new language it is not enough to put new tags on well-known objects; all is about learning how to analyze a common reality in a different way (Martinet, 1967). Describing, in English, an old movie as a “black and white” movie is not better, or worse, than describing the same movie in French as a “white and black” movie. It’s only a different way of ordering the same reality, as stressed by Martinet. Teaching this complexity, explaining that each language creates its own puzzle despite originating in the same reality could be the starting point of a social justice focus in Foreign Language Education. We should also ask why the word “culture” is singular in Osborn’s statement.

To teach social justice, Osborn presents the four pillars of his world language course (2006, p. 64, table 4.1). “With further refinement, the list can be organized as four thematic pillars of world language education for social justice: identity, social architecture, language choices and activism” (2006, p.62). This table presents four columns: 1.Vocabulary Themes, 2.Sample Structural or Grammar Topics, 3.Dominant Language Skills and 4. Relationships to Social Justice. These four columns are divided into four pillars (lines): 1. Identity, 2. Social Architecture, 3. Language Choices and 4. Activism. Learning contents listed in these four columns are listed from the easiest to the most difficult. For example, the Dominant Language Skills (column 3) are presented in a chronological list: Speaking and listening / Reading and listening / Reading and writing / Writing. This four-pillar curriculum has given rise to various comments.

- The first comment is that this development is linear and extremely conservative. Since the Middle Ages, writing was the most prestigious capability, esteemed above other capabilities, and this is still the case. Low (easy) skills are for low-class people and high (difficult) skills for the upper class people. This is maybe a configuration that cannot be changed and, if this cannot be changed, we need to reflect on the true impact of any progressive teaching.
- The second comment relates to the order in the acquisition of the learning contents, such as the imperative tense. This tense is studied at level four (the top level, which is also the writing level) alongside the themes of law, rights, and activism in general. Does it make sense to learn the imperative tense at the end of a language class when, in real life, we learn it with our first footsteps?
- The third comment is more general. The four pillars of Osborn’s curriculum apply perfectly to American students, thus, to a small portion of human beings on the planet. But are these four pillars appropriate for people struggling every day with bombs and riots; for people walking five miles a day to go to a school without any books or often without any walls? How could a child learning a foreign language, speak about consumerism when they are under nurtured? How can we explain to this child that a major concern of wealthy people is the choice between their ten brands of morning cereals? The concept of social justice sometimes seems to be a trend within the western and wealthy world. Nevertheless, if teaching foreign language for social justice is worthwhile, this should be as worthwhile for wealthy and emerging societies as for the fourth-world. “Globalization” doesn’t rhyme with “westernization” for nothing, as researchers have stressed.
- The fourth comment asks a question: is teaching for social justice synonymous with engaging students to be activists? Is critical thinking synonymous with being critical? If teaching social justice is teaching activism, this isn’t new either. Wasn’t Plato a social activist? Wasn’t he an educator? Didn’t he pay with his life for public and social commitment?

Osborn’s approach consists of lists of recommended words and themes, but we should remember that the word “knife” does not cut. As language teachers, should we determine which words are “appropriate” for our students? In this case, teaching for social justice has a lot to do with teaching language for specific purposes. Can any form of social justice be rooted in censure? Furthermore, who chooses the appropriate words? Osborn does not speak about this choice as a collaborative task. These choices are highly political as shown by the title of chapter 4: Politics of Grammar and Vocabulary. This curriculum could be used to foster social justice of any kind and we all remember terrifying examples of social justice leaders.

4. A Third Way is Possible: the Non-linear Pedagogy

In SLA theories there is a well-known and everlasting debate between the explicit and the implicit focused approach with the clear victory of the latter under the name of communicative approaches. As we know, the major difference between these two approaches can be clearly observed in the way grammar is taught. The explicit approach, based on behaviorist theories, heavily relies on the use of explicit grammar followed by drills. At the other extreme, in an implicit approach, grammar and rules are deduced from a set of examples presented in an authentic context. The first one, the explicit approach, due to its lack of connection to real-life needs has been tagged as meaningless. On the contrary, communicative approaches emphasize the importance of a real-life context in which learning contents can be embedded. Decontextualized drills were seen as pointless with regard to the speech act theory.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING THEORIES		
	Explicit approach	Implicit approach
Description	Grammar is focused on decontextualized presentation of rules followed by drills	Grammar is focused on speech acts embedded in an authentic context
Methodology	Behaviourism	Communicative approaches
Researchers	Skinner - Bloomfield	Canale&Swain - Hymes - Moirand

In general didactics, explicit learning can be defined by “learning on the basis of conscious knowledge, insights and hypotheses” (Schmidt, 1995, p.1) and implicit learning as “learning based on unconscious processes of generalization and abstraction” (p.1). The debate between supporters of explicit and implicit approaches was, and still is, very strong. In Foreign Language teaching, explicit teaching is considered out-of-date. Since the general adoption of the communicative approach theories, it’s become viewed as a “Neanderthal” approach (Schmidt, 1995, p. 3) and, in all cases, a “reactionary” approach (p.46). Currently, there is a return to explicit grammar instruction, but embedded in a communicative framework. This dichotomy can be applied to the way social justice is fostered in foreign language education: 1) The explicit approach: fostering social justice by means of curricula development (especially through social themes and socially specific themes and words) and 2) The implicit approach: fostering social justice by means of ICT (especially in the field of CMC) and via a specific course design. ICT is not as neutral as it appears at first sight. For some researchers such as John Gray (2002, p.134), ICT leads to imperialism through the imposition of determinate logical thinking and language. The nuts and bolts of both networked technologies (implicit approach) and meaning-focused curricula (explicit approach) needs to be carefully examined if the aim is social justice teaching.

SOCIAL JUSTICE in FL TEACHING PRACTICES		
	Explicit approach to social justice	Implicit approach to social justice
Methodology	Based on specific curricula	Based on ICT
Social commitment	Against cultural imperialism broadcast by the marketplace	Against the logical imperialism broadcast by the use of ICT
Description	Words are seen as the main means of fostering social justice	CMC is seen as the main means of fostering social justice
Main question for the teacher	WHICH themes / words should I choose?	HOW should I implement a cross-border CMC?
Examples and projects	Osborn's curriculum	MIT Cultura project eTwinning initiative eTandeminitiative

The famous explicit-implicit dichotomy for which the bell has finally been tolled has been a shadow over the field of FL teaching for decades. The pitfall here is not the debate between two opposite positions, but the fact that until now, it was much more a dichotomy than a real debate. As for all dichotomies, there is no room for any “third” theories. The spotlights are on option A (explicit) or option B (implicit), with no room to question the rationale of the dichotomy itself. We argue that this dichotomy, which acted for so many years as a didactical imperialism, finally blew up. Yes, there is room for other possibilities, yes we can leave the pendulum swing era, when the pendulum pointed alternatively to option A and option B. Should we, therefore, foster social justice by setting specific curricula with specific lists of words? Perhaps. Should we foster social justice by using a CMC-based methodology? Perhaps. Both options are linear, and the curricula development option is the more rigid of the two. We would like to advocate a non-linear pedagogy with open, easy and free access to knowledge databases as the main means of fostering social justice. Goals of a non-linear pedagogy move beyond learning linguistic components of a language to developing students' intercultural communicative competence, known as intercultural competence. A non-linear pedagogy is aimed at fostering social justice by offering a wide array of learning paths, where students can go not only forwards but also backwards, in order to reinforce a determinate skill, or sideward to complete or further their understanding. These learning paths are part of a learning map with clear objectives, clear lists of learning topics, links to helpful and classified resources, as well as carefully designed learning activities. Telecollaboration is mostly used in learning activities, but why not use telecollaboration and cross-border teaching to embed social justice not merely by means of ICT, nor by means of a list of “good” and “bad” words, but by experiencing it. So far, cross-border activities are mostly CMC written exchanges, with a preference for asynchronous exchanges such as forums and emails. In some cases, asynchronous exchange comes via different formats like audio or video. Synchronous exchanges are also well-known and consists of real time audio, or audio and video exchange (such as with Skype). It's a fact that broad band high speed Internet connection does change how we communicate, but not what we communicate. The main difference is that in CMC communication we should be aware about the frequent misunderstandings created by the absence of intonation and excessive use of abbreviations which can, in fact, change the entire meaning of the communication exchange. Being quicker, *per se*, is not a pedagogically significant difference. This is where Illich can bring us a new take. A cross-border exchange, if aimed at fostering social justice, should teach by its example. To be efficient and credible, you need to walk your talk, in social justice as in any other field. Cross-border initiatives are encouraged all over the world as part of a necessary internalization of higher education institutions. But cross-border teaching is not single-focused on email exchange between classes oceans apart anymore. Cross-border teaching, as a part of a true effort towards internalization, signifies much more than this. To foster social justice we need to show our students that we walk our talk, and this could mean for higher education institutions, giving full access to “invited” students to all educational resources, for example. Sharing resources as well as fostering mobility is the core of the OECD programme (2004). Beyond the explicit-implicit dichotomy, academic mobility is the third way to promote mutual understanding and equal access to knowledge, two requirements of any social justice outcome.

“An increasing number of students are being offered and taking advantage of, a new option – taking a degree or other post-secondary course offered by a foreign university without leaving their home country. Programme and institution mobility has grown over the past decade and is likely to meet a growing demand in the future. Programme mobility is the second most common form of cross-border higher education after student mobility.” (OECD, 2004, p. 3). Unfortunately, copyright law, privacy concerns, higher institutions own policies and fears of all kinds are still a severe handicap to a free and easy access to knowledge databases. Nevertheless, global networking could be an effective way to do away with the “hidden curricula” which is the root of social injustice. According to Denscombe(1982), the hidden curriculum of schooling

consists of encouraging the teachers to encompass their job in such a way that the need to acquiesce to official authority, to tolerate boredom and to accept the right of specific individuals to be the final arbiters of knowledge becomes mandatory.

5. Conclusion

Today, there is no doubt that the ultimate goal in the field of Foreign Language Acquisition is to lay the foundation for a cross-cultural communicative environment in order to develop intercultural competencies. In a globalized world, our students, as part of the future workforce, need to be able to navigate efficiently through cultures and therefore, fostering social justice is a much needed skill. Fostering social justice in the western world, as well as in less privileged zones, does not rely solely on a specific teaching approach, as seen before with the ICT or the curriculum approaches. Fostering social justice means providing access to the sources of knowledge to anyone. This is what ICT can do for human beings: give them the key to knowledge, regardless of who they are, where they live or how much money they have. Therefore, the whole teaching system is experiencing a radical change. Through Globally Networked Environments or podcasts, learning contents are now widely broadcasted, giving everyone the same access to knowledge. In the 21st century, the need for a global knowledge society, merged with the huge success of portable media players, has made the "deschooled" society come true, because now education is everywhere. Illich dreamt it, ICT made it.

References

- Álvarez I.&Beaven T.&Garrido C.(2008). Strategies for Acquiring Intercultural Competence.In Stella Hurdand and Tim Lewis (ed.), *Language Learning Strategies in Independent Settings*.Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Anderson, T.G. (1988). Beyond Einstein. In Ambron, S. and Hooper, K. (ed.), *Interactive Multimedia*. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Press.
- Beatty, K. (2003). *Teaching and Researching Computer-assisted Language Learning*. Harlow, Essex, England: Pearson Education.
- Berger, J. (1998/99). Against the Great Defeat of the World Order, an Introduction. In *Race and Class*, 40, 1-4.
- Block D. (2002).McCommunication A Problem in the Frame of SLA. In *Globalization and Language Teaching*(pp. 117-133).New York and London: Routledge.
- Block D.&Cameron D. (ed.) (2002).*Globalization and Language Teaching*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Byram M.&Adam A.&Stevens D. (ed.). (2001). *Developing intercultural competence in practice*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (1997).*Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. &Gribkova B.&Starkey H.(2002).*Développer la dimension interculturelle de l'enseignement des langues*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
- Cameron, D. (2002). Globalization and the teaching of communication skills. In *Globalization and Language Teaching* (pp. 67-82).New York and London: Routledge.
- Chun, D.&Reeder Wade E. (2004). Collaborative Cultural Exchanges with Asynchronous CMC. In *Teaching with Technology*. The Heinle Professional Series in Language Instruction.

- Clouet, R. (2008). Intercultural language learning: cultural mediation within the curriculum of Translation and Interpreting studies. In *Iberica*, 16, 147-168.
- Denscombe, M. (1982). The 'Hidden Pedagogy' and its Implications for Teacher Training. In *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3(3), 249-265.
- Eco U. (1980). *Il Nome della Rosa*. Milano: Bompiani.
- Egbert, J. (2005). *CALL Essential. Principles and Practice in CALL classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- GimenoSanz A. (ed.). (2009). *New Trends in Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Working Together*. Proceedings of the annual conference of the EOROCALL. Universidad Politecnica de Valencia, Gandia Campus 9-12 September 2009.
- Gray J. (2002). The Global Coursebook in English Language Teaching. In *Globalization and Language Teaching* (pp. 151-167). New York and London: Routledge.
- GuibetLafaye, C. (2005). Institutionalization of Social Justice and Constitutionalization of Socio-economic Equality. In *Archives Ouvertes Pluridisciplinaires*. Paris: Centre pour la Communication Scientifique Directe. Retrieved from <http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00375146/en/>.
- Hauck M., Youngs B. (2008). Telecollaboration in multimodal environments: the impact on task design and learner interaction. In *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(2), 87-124.
- Harvard Business Review. (2011). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation, 89, July-August.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kramsch C., Thorne S. (2002). Foreign language Learning as global communicative practice. In David Block and Deborah Cameron (ed.), *Globalization and Language Teaching* (pp. 83-100). London: Routledge.
- Kubota, R. (2003). Japanese Language and Literature. In *Critical Teaching of Japanese Culture 37*(1) Sociocultural Issues in Teaching Japanese: Critical Approaches. 67-87. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3594876>.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). *Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537-560. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588427>.
- Lojacono, F. (2009). Le rôle de l'enseignant, enfin du nouveau? In *Cuadernos de Lingüística de la Universidad de Puerto Rico* 2, (2), 33-39. Puerto Rico: Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- Martinet, A. (1967). *Éléments de linguistique générale*. Paris: Colin.
- McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Meyer, B., Kristensen B. (2010). Developing Location Aware Games for Language Learning: Mobile City and Language Guides. In *New Trends in Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Working Together* (pp. 195-199). London: Macmillan.
- Mokter H., Aydin H. (2011) A Web 2.0-based collaborative model for multicultural education. In *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal* 5. 116-128. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/february2011/review2.pdf>.
- Palloff, R.M. & K. Pratt. (2001). *Lessons from the cyberspace classroom: The realities of online teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

- OECD. (2004). *Internationalization and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/33/60/33734276.pdf>.
- O'Dowd, R. (2003). Understanding the 'Other Side': Intercultural Learning in a Spanish-English email exchange. In *Language, Learning and Technology*7(2), 118-143. Retrieved from: <http://llt.msu.edu/vol7num2/pdf/odowd.pdf>
- O'Dowd, R. (ed.).(2007). Foreign Language Education and the Rise of Online Communication: A review of Promises and Realities. In *Online Intercultural Exchange: An Introduction for Foreign Language Teachers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Osborn T. (2006). *Teaching World languages for Social Justice. A Sourcebook of principles and Practices*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Rosell-Aguilar, F. (2009). *Podcasting for Language Learning: Re-examing the Potential*. CALICO 8.
- Scholte, J. (2000). *Globalization. A Critical Introduction*. London: MacMillian.
- Schmidt, R. (ed.).1995. *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*. University of Hawai'i Press: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.