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FOREWORD

The 15th Annual Korea TESOL International Conference was held at Sookmyung Women’s University on October 27-28, 2007. The theme for the 15th International Conference was *Energizing ELT: Challenging Ourselves, Motivating our Students*. The 15th Annual International Conference offered two plenary sessions, nine featured-speaker sessions, and 163 presentations. The conference attracted presenters from more than 15 countries, who gave presentations and workshops on ELT topics and themes as progressive as computer-assisted language learning and as perennial as classroom management.

In *Proceedings 2007*, Atsushi Asai examines learners’ guessing strategies while taking multiple choice reading exams; Allison Bill and Shawn DeLong contribute their findings on a peer observation project; Izumi Kanzaka & Edwin K. W. Aloia discuss EAP tasks which combine effective reading skills and speaking activities; Izumi Kanzaka & Shigeyo Yamamoto collaborate on a professional development project and share their insights from teaching classes in English-only; James Life & Haeyoung Kim survey university students to uncover trends in students’ motivation to learn English; Giulio Perroni introduces us to his experience with Reading Circles; and Lawrence White evaluates the process of assembling and producing one’s own textbook.

The 16th Annual Korea TESOL International Conference was held at Sookmyung Women’s University on the 25th and 26th of October 2008. There were approximately 1200 attendees at the 16th International Conference, making it the largest KOTESOL International Conference to date. The theme for this conference, reflecting the ever-changing world of language teaching, was *Responding to a Changing World*. The conference was designed to address the realities of the changing world outside the classroom, and to look at how these changes impact the classroom. There were two plenary sessions, eleven featured speakers, and 169 presentations.

Seven presenters contributed papers to *Proceedings 2008*. Charles J. Anderson researches the potential of mobile phone learning (m-learning); Atsushi Asai’s study asks readers to rethink the core vocabulary from which our students typically study; Peter Carter surveys learners to get a better understanding of what tertiary students desire in their educational materials; Jon Mitchell shares the results of a three-stage teaching cycle based on narrative theory; Paramarat Wiriyakarun offers a case study on strategy training; Johanathan Woodworth examines the distinction between Global Englishes and International Englishes; and Johanathan Woodworth’s second paper tackles the complex dichotomy between native English speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) in the ELT profession.

Together, here are the fourteen papers collected from the KOTESOL’s International Conferences in 2007 and 2008. We hope you enjoy reading them.

Maria Pinto
David E. Shaffer
Supervising Editors
KOTESOL Proceedings 2007/2008
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An Evaluation of Guessing Strategies in Reading

Atsushi Asai
Daido Institute of Technology, Nagoya, Japan

ABSTRACT

This study proposes an idea for estimating a guessing factor employed by students in multiple-choice tests. First, six different reading tests were given to measure the English proficiency of college students. Next, the EFL learners’ forms of behavior for changing answers to the same question in reading lessons were traced for one year. A net rate for correcting the answers or veering from the correct answers was derived from the records. The present study presumed that the guessing, including partial understanding, resulted in the change to or from wrong answers, and the chance hit produced at a convoluted probability was approximately calculated as a function of proficiency. Thus, the new 3-parameter item response model improved the power of discrimination as mass behavior in comparison with the conventional models. Assuming that learners’ guessing strategies are not a negligible factor in an objective test, this model can be useful particularly for efficient and effective assessment.

BACKGROUND

According to a traditional belief, young people in Asia have a reputation for hard work, and are dedicated to their studies. However, many educators and researchers report that young people who have grown up in an affluent society tend to exhibit a lack of patience and motivation for studying. In Japan as well as in Korea, we currently find ourselves in a situation in which some universities and colleges have difficulty meeting their student quotas. Nearly every high school students can enter a university or college by studying only during the classroom hours if he or she has no intention to enter a school with higher academic standards. In line with this trend of declining academic competition among students, some students likely employ guessing strategies rather than apply careful consideration to their answers. Copious research has certainly investigated test-taking strategies (Attali & Bar-Hillel, 2003; Christenfeld, 1995; Huibregtse et al., 2002; Masutani, 2004; Mattson, 1965; Plumblee, 1954; Shaw et al., 2000; among others). When guessing is recognized as one such strategy, the frequency of using guessing is influenced by the person’s experience and attitude toward studying. In addition, test wisdom might be culture-dependent. Yet few studies have surveyed the influences of guessing quantitatively in real EFL situations in East Asia and have found practical appropriate ways to assess performance (Alderson & Wall, 1993; Millman et al., 1965; Murayama, 2006; among others).
SURVEYS ON LEARNERS’ BEHAVIORS

This study attempted to estimate a rate of guessing which might influence the reliability of scoring in multiple-choice tests. The guessing factor, including true chance hits, tactical guessing, halfway thinking, and partial understanding, was obtained from the actual behavior of 143 students at a university in Japan in the following way. By the inclusion of the same question into a specific point of context within a passage, if a participant answers differently, he or she may correct or mis-correct the answer. Such a form of answering behavior was recorded in each reading lesson for one year. The reading lessons had been examined in terms of reliability and validity, including a high degree of adjustment to the learners’ test experiences and skills (Asai & Konishi, 2004). For example, the passage had an average length of 350 words, and the readability was adjusted to the proficiency of the high-beginning-level EFL learners mainly in reference to the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (Asai, 2004, 2005a; Flesch, 1948). Each lesson had nine questions, two of which were identical, but were placed in different locations. The inclusion of the same question was not instructed to the participants. During the lesson, the participants were not allowed to go back to questions they had already answered. The test time was only nine minutes. Thus, in truth, the participants did not have enough time to reexamine their answers. Such answering behavior was compared to the responses in a 4-point-Likert-type questionnaire by self-enumeration on the part of the participants, and the weak correlation between their behavioral records and perceptual responses suggests their self-judgment did not precisely represent their various forms of behavior as previous research has shown (Asai, 2005b; Kirk & Ashcraft, 2001). Therefore, we move now to an analysis of the traced records of their answers.

First, let us look over the theoretical grounds. Each question had four options, where one option was the correct answer and the other three were distracters. If a participant randomly chooses one answer for both the first time and the second time, he or she has the following five modes as a possibility: 1) a correct answer and the correct one again at (1/4)*(1/4)= 0.0625; 2) a correct answer to a wrong one at (1/4)*(3/4)=0.1875; 3) the opposite avenue at 0.1875 again; 4) a wrong answer to another wrong one at (3/4)*(2/4)=0.375; and 5) a wrong answer to the same wrong one at (3/4)*(1/4)=0.1875. Two random choices for the same question hitting at least one correct answer is at a probability of 0.4375, or in other words, near a 50 % chance. Some researchers on test development may insist on the reduction of lucky hits.

In the present study, six different reading tests of the same format were implemented to measure the English proficiency of the participants. Figure 1 shows the proficiency distribution of the participants. The normalized ability level 0 covers a t-value band from 47.5 to 52.5. In the same manner, the ability level 0.5 covers the next 5 points from 52.5. The traced records showed that the more difficult the question was, the more frequently the participants changed their answers. The population around the ability level 0 dominates the data. After aggregation, the total rate of changing answers was 0.170. More specifically, the obtained rate of changing answers from wrong to correct was 0.073, and the opposite way occurred at a rate of 0.068. At a glance, this very slight difference suggests that random choice strategy was employed at a low
rate, but a closer look at the ability level dependency revealed a different view. Figure 2 shows that the participants with higher ability level changed their answers less frequently. This kind of proficiency dependence agreed with previous research (e.g., Zimmerman, 1998), and a parallel test was conducted with a separate group of 126 participants with similar profiles to confirm this behavioral tendency.

**Figure 1. Ability Level Distribution of Participants**

![Ability Level Distribution](image1)

**Figure 2. Frequencies of Changing Answers by Ability Level**

![Frequencies of Changing Answers](image2)

W-W: A wrong answer to another or the same wrong answer  
C-W: The correct answer to a wrong answer  
W-C: A wrong answer to the correct answer

**Views About the Use of Guessing**

In fact, about 11% of the participants changed their answers between the two answering times at a rate of 0.4 or more as shown in Figure 3. Such
frequent changes implied some underlying strategic or unintentional guessing. A popularly employed guessing strategy written in the open-ended question of the abovementioned structured questionnaire was to pick an option bearing the most lexical or semantic similarity to the other options. Another familiar strategy was to find an option representing positive concepts in a refined style or in a non-assertive tone. Some learners thought these strategies did not belong to guessing. The participants who classified themselves, in the questionnaire, as a habitual type of rarely guessing actually changed their answers at a rate of 0.102 as shown in Figure 4.

**Figure 3. Distribution of Rates of Changing Answers**

![Distribution of Rates of Changing Answers](image)

**Figure 4. Rates of Changing Answers by Self-judgment Class**

![Rates of Changing Answers by Self-judgment Class](image)

The participants with high ability levels reached the correct answers more frequently than they swerved from the correct answers or hovered between wrong answers. This difference between the correction and the other modes implied some effects of thinking and understanding, for example by perceptual knowledge or abstract schemata. The gross rate for changing answers was used as the guessing rate here. A ratio of frequency of changing a wrong answer to a correct answer to the total frequency of changing answers was defined as the correcting rate. Note that, as shown in Figure 2, those with the ability level of
2 or higher seemed too often change their answers, but this fluctuation occurred owing to statistical inadequacy. This ability level encompassed only two participants.

Determining the Item-response Parameters

The surveyed behaviors can be empirically modeled as an ability-level-dependent curve. The chance-hit rate for an ability level was estimated as the product of the gross guessing rate and the correcting rate. This rate was roughly equal to 1) the average of the modes, 2) mis-correcting, 3) correcting, and 4) hovering described in the previous section, and covered not only true chance hits, but also overall strategic corrections. In order to take account of the real influences of guessing, we developed an item response model with the three-variable logistic function:

\[ P(x|t) = g+(1-g)/(1+\exp(-aD(t-b))) \]

where \( P \) = the probability of answering correctly; \( t \) = the ability level of a participant; \( aD \) = the discrimination parameter - \( D = a \) constant; \( b \) = the difficulty parameter; \( g \) = the guessing parameter; and \( x \) = 1 for correct answer and 0 for wrong answer. The guessing parameter \( g \) is an exponential function with two parameters of slope and chance hit rate at the ability level 0.

Figure 5 shows the curves smoothly plotting the guessing rate, the correcting rate, and the chance hit rate as a function of ability level in a question of an average scoring probability of 0.65. The vertical axis shows a probability of each event at an ability level. The chance-hit rate indicated with the thin solid line runs far under 0.25. Technically important, the constant guessing parameter, 0.25, which is used in the conventional 3-parameter item response model, does not reflect the actual behaviors of participants. On the other hand, the new item characteristic curve in this study can render the ability-level dependence of the learners’ scores in a more realistic way.

Figure 5. Curves of Observed Rates of Correcting or Estimated Rates of Guessing
CGP (dotted line): the constant guessing parameter at a 4-option question
ICC (bold line): Item Characteristic Curve

DISCUSSION ABOUT USABILITY

The participants at lower ability levels changed their answers more frequently. If the trend of declining academic level and motivation continues, the evaluation of guessing strategies will become an important topic in educational assessment and diagnosis.

The inclusion of the variable guessing parameter can improve the assessment as mass behavior. The resultant wider distribution in scores can be convenient and preferable when we would like to divide many students into proficiency-level groups. In the case of the data obtained in this study, the deviation increased by nearly 25% compared with the conventional 1- and 2-parameter models and penalty-base models. Surely, we should know the difficulty of the test passages and questions. Carefully selected materials only enable us to implement effective short time testing.

When we set the guessing parameter to a variable, the scores of lower-level participants receive a kind of penalty for their frequent guessing. When we shift our focus to individuals, this model inevitably leads to overcorrection in the scores of some learners who do not use guessing strategies. This issue about individual differences may be resolved with confidence-level checking as demonstrated in earlier studies of this topic (e.g., Ichikawa et al., 2007; Shizuka, 2000).

The short-time testing condition in this study follows the trend of pursuing a variety of tasks in limited classroom hours. As a next step, further study in an ample-time testing condition is expected in the future as a basis for more psychologically appropriate modeling.

This study was an attempt to draw a concrete figure of guessing in a narrow sense along the educational trend. Guessing itself may be respected in educational settings from a viewpoint of developmental or cognitive psychology. Further research of guessing is also expected.

SUMMARY

College students in Japan participated in the surveys. The forms of behavior for changing answers to the same question in English reading lessons were traced. This study presumed that the guessing resulted in a change between the answers, and the results inferred the use of guessing. A chance hit was estimated to occur at a low rate but to have a clear dependence of proficiency. The quality of guessing should be researched further from the viewpoint of educational psychology and cognitive science. However, the quantity of guessing was thus evaluated to the extent that the new 3-parameter item response model with the variable guessing parameter approximated the real guessing behaviors of learners, and improved the power of discrimination as mass behavior in comparison with the conventional models.
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In Someone Else’s Shoes: Teacher Development Through Classroom Observations

Allison Bill and Shawn DeLong
Jeonju University, Jeonju, South Korea

ABSTRACT

Classroom observations are often used as evaluations, but they can also be used as a means of professional development. A group of native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers at a Korean university set out to use a peer observation project to build team spirit, integrate ten new teachers, and improve their teaching skills. This paper describes that project and some of the feedback garnered from that effort. We hope to show how peer observation affected teacher confidence and can foster a wider perspective on a variety of teaching styles. This paper will show how teachers felt being observed and will give insight into how to set up a similar peer observation program of your own.

INTRODUCTION

Korean universities are in a unique position when it comes to the qualifications of English instructors. Korean English instructors often hold doctorates, though they may be in language and literature, rather than in pedagogy. Native-speaker instructors may have bachelor’s or master’s degrees, some in the field of education, and some in unrelated fields. Overall, there is a lack of specific training in methodologies for how to teach a language to students. Continued professional development is very important to teachers in Korea. We need to show that we are professionals and that, in spite of varying levels of experience, we are working toward being excellent English teachers. Many unqualified and under-qualified teachers are interested in improving their skills, but are not sure where to start, and do not have easy access to training. The need for more qualifications has been felt more strongly in recent years, as there is more competition for jobs in the tertiary sector. The Korean EFL market is becoming more competitive and the expectations from politicians, administrators, parents, and students are higher than they were just a few years ago.

Traditional post-graduate education is not always a feasible path for someone working in Korea, but there is a way for teachers to improve themselves and their teaching without paying expensive tuition fees or traveling abroad for higher education. One possible solution, which is self-directed, easily accessible, inexpensive, and effective, is to use peer observation. Peer observation, when properly done, provides a low-stress way to learn more from our colleagues who teach in an identical context. Cosh (1999) reminds us that our most valuable resource is other teachers. As
something done locally, teachers can use peer observation to focus on issues that directly affect them and their students, and that are current issues in their classroom. Bailey et al. (2001) define peer observation as the “the act of being openly and attentively present in another teacher’s classroom, watching and listening to the classroom interaction primarily for reasons of professional growth (rather than supervision or evaluation)” (p. 157). Peer observation is simply a small group of teachers visiting each other’s classes to observe and collect data about what is happening in each other’s classrooms, and then using that data to improve how we teach and how students learn.

First, it is important to distinguish evaluative observation, usually done by a supervisor, from peer observation, carried out by colleagues. It can be difficult for teachers to dissociate the two and not to feel threatened by the prospect of having another teacher in their classroom.

There seem to be so many positive reasons to do peer observation; one would think it would be an obvious choice for serious teachers. However, Richards and Lockhart (1994) found that teachers were reluctant to participate, not seeing the benefit in it or listing time constraints as a reason not to participate. Mento and Giampetro-Meyer (2000) found teachers questioned the spirit behind peer observation, what would be observed, and who would have access to the results.

**RESEARCH CONTEXT**

After reading about other peer observation experiences, the authors felt that replicating the Richards and Lockhart (1994) study would help in our current context - the need for a way to integrate new teachers, and the desire among some teachers to be doing some professional development. As well, the department had gone from 8 native speakers on English and 8 Korean instructors to 20 native speakers and 10 Korean instructors over just a couple of years, and there was a perceived need to work on building a stronger team dynamic.

This study was completed at a large Korean university, located in a medium-sized city that has three universities and a variety of junior colleges. There are approximately 10,000 students, and all students (regardless of major) have to take six courses in a foreign language before graduation. Though Japanese and Chinese courses are available, most students choose English. The Korean faculty teaches English grammar classes and lower-level English conversation classes, while native-speaker instructors teach reading and writing, listening, and intermediate/advanced English conversation classes.

**METHODOLOGY**

We asked a group of 30 teachers, comprised of five different nationalities, to face their fears. Around 76 percent of the teachers involved in our study had previous experience being observed, but many of those observations had been done by or as a supervisor. The purpose of us asking them to participate in a peer observation project was as an attempt to build team spirit, and
integrate 10 new colleagues (the semester this study took place was the first semester for these 10 new colleagues).

The teachers working in a general English program at a Korean university were grouped in threes. Groups consisted of one Korean English teacher and two native-speaker teachers - one new hire, and one previous employee. Team members observed the other two teachers in their group and those two teachers observed them in return. Teachers visited the classrooms of those in their group. The issues to be observed were chosen within each team. Possible topics included student interactions, use of L1, teacher movement in the classroom, etc. The intent was to get constructive feedback from, and share ideas with peers, not to be criticized by a superior. As this was on a voluntary basis, not all teachers were motivated to participate.

An email message was sent to each person we hoped would participate with a link to an online survey. This was to be completed before meeting with the other members of their group. A binder with possible forms (including samples from Jim Scrivener, 1994) that could be used during the observation process was placed on the communal table of both offices that housed English teachers. This model of providing a bank of observation sheets was suggested by Cosh (1999). Inside the binder were written instructions on how the observations were to take place and advice on how to provide effective feedback to the observee. Some of the people in our office chose to participate while others resisted. Another email message was sent out explaining that the intent of the project was for personal growth and our research, and restating that there would be no involvement by the administration. Finally, via email and bulletin boards, everyone was asked to fill out a post-observation survey, once again to be done online.

**Findings**

Looking at the data from the pre- and post-survey results and the feedback written on the observation forms as well as seeing who chose to participate or not participate can give us some insight into how an average teacher might feel about the use of peer observation as it relates to the stated purposes of the study. What are peoples’ attitudes about peer observations? How does peer observation affect teacher confidence, assist with new hire acclimation, create departmental unity, and foster a wider perspective on a variety of teaching styles?

**Pre-survey Results**

Prior to heading into another teacher’s class or inviting a colleague into their own, we asked how our informants felt about the project. Of the 30 instructors, 17 took the time to respond (2 Koreans and 15 native speakers). Some of the participants were quite positive about the chance to do observations; over 14 percent of those who responded to the survey strongly agreed that the project was something they were happy about and another 28 percent agreed that they were excited for the chance. That excitement also
translated to a fair amount of nervousness for 50 percent of the respondents, who indicated their feelings as such. Most people were not scared, angry, or bored. However, several people, 28 percent, indicated they were annoyed at being asked to participate. Our informants had the following to say when asked to elaborate on their strong feelings about the observation project (underlining added for emphasis by the authors).

- “I think there is something unsettling about being watched by your peers while you teach, even if it isn’t a critical evaluation.”
- “Teacher observation is for my own personal growth and benefit. Why should I be angry about it?”
- “Members of the hiring committee participate in these observations which may down the road affect one’s job.”
- “I think it would be nice to get a ‘fresh perspective’ and a ‘native perspective’ as my classes may be a little rote for me by now.”
- “I think it is a great opportunity for me to think about my classes and reflect on how to be a better teacher.”

The informants on this project also indicated how these observations might help them to grow as a teacher. Over 85 percent of the people that responded agreed that this project would be useful for their professional development. Another 26 percent said that this was important for their continued growth. This quote from one of our colleagues sums it up well:

This is neither a high or low priority for me . . . though that could change depending on how these visits are done. If they make people feel bad, create competition or a sense of antagonism, or spying/policing others, then I don’t encourage them . . . if people have a real collegiate spirit, and use them to connect with their colleagues (especially the Korean professors) and better their own teaching (and not a tick-list of what xxx does wrong) . . . well, it could be really good and next time I’ll be the biggest proponent!

THE OBSERVATIONS

Of the 30 potential participants, 12 actively participated. Only one person did all that we asked of them. Two Koreans, one fifth of those asked, took part. Six people, three fifths of the previous teachers, did something. Four people, two fifths of the new hires, took part. The new hires were more likely to be observers. Only three of the ten groups really did much for the program. Participants were provided templates and ideas for suggested topics to watch during the observations. The topics teachers choose to observe were:

- Staging and Classroom Management / Classroom Interactions
- Objectives and Planning / Teacher Behavior / Staging and Classroom Management (x2)
- Learners Behavior
- Use of L1 / Error Correction (x2)
- Thoughts and Questions / Stolen Ideas (x3)
This is a sample of how one of our informants chose to conduct their classroom observation. The topic they were observing was the use of L1 in the classroom. See the example below.

Though not all teachers chose to participate, the observations that did take place were reportedly well received, with teachers talking more to each other in the office about sharing ideas, and asking for feedback on current classroom situations.

**Post-research Survey Results**

After the designated period for observations was finished, we asked the teachers to complete a post-observation survey, regardless of whether or not they had actually participated in any observations. Of the 30 instructors, 16 completed the survey (5 Koreans and 11 native speakers). Many of the people that were asked to take part in observations did not do so. On the follow up survey, we asked them to give some reasons as to the cause of this. Their responses included:

- “Being a newer member of staff, I expected one of the others to approach me if interested and I was never approached.”
- “I sent two emails to my “group,” talked to one of them, but no one seemed particularly interested. I didn’t pursue it further.”
- “I have been teaching the classes for years. I don’t really want to change my methods. I have opinions, and I don’t want to argue or
justify why I do things a certain way. Again, especially if my boss
doesn’t care, it just causes stress, and it is extra work for little payoff.”

Our informants indicated that after having participated in the project, they
generally felt happier and less nervous to observe or to be observed. Around
37 percent of those that participated said they would definitely be willing to do
so again. Another 43 percent indicated that they would perhaps take part
again. Only three people suggest they would not take part in peer observations
in the future. Some of the participants were even inspired to do their own
action research projects. The project seems to have met some of its goals. The
respondents to the post-research survey suggested that it was helpful in
acclimating new hires: 69.3% responded "yes" when asked about that end.
Slightly less than half said that it helped in building a team spirit: 46.2%
responded no. However, 38.5% returned with an answer of "yes." This leads us
to have questions about the actual harmony within our department. An
astounding 84.6 percent said this project did lead to teacher development and
growth.

As well as surveys, there was a lot of discussion that took place, in
particular, among those who did not want to participate. Several instructors
approached us with strong concerns and surprised us by their anger about this
project. Through these conversations, the authors learned a lot about
undercurrents in the office that they were previously unaware. In particular,
they were unaware of the fact that the Korean instructors had previously
refused to be evaluated by a native speaker, and they felt that this was a
back-door attempt to evaluate them. This was an unanticipated factor in the
choice of teachers not to participate in this study.

**DISCUSSION**

“Not surprisingly, professors like peer evaluation of teaching only in the
abstract. We want it for everyone but ourselves.” (Mento & Giampetro-
Meyer, 2000)

When asked individually about participating in peer observation, many
teachers agreed that it was a good idea. However, in reality, many factors
contributed to the struggles encountered in this project. Some teachers did not
want to upset their non-participant teammates by participating in the project.
Some teachers were sick on days they had scheduled observations, as a spate
of flu and broken bones ran through the office. Though our three goals for
doing this project were to integrate the new teachers, to build a team spirit
within our department, and to provide personal and professional development,
we realize more needs to be done to achieve these goals.

There are a number of things that we would do differently if trying peer
observation again. First, we would do it strictly on a voluntary basis, and try
to allow teachers to pick their partners, though we told teachers they had the
option to opt out, the next time it should be an opt in process. In addition,
due to time constraints, we had chosen the groups, which made teachers feel
pressured to participate. Second, we would have a training session where we
would explain the process for pre-observation meetings, observation etiquette, and post-observation feedback sessions. Third, we would put more effort into helping cross-cultural teams.

It is important to have realistic expectations of peer observation programs. Though we had hoped for a large rate of participation, in reality having 12 of 30 teachers participate is actually quite good. As well, though there were struggles, and some grumbling, the fact that 81.3% of the participating teachers were interested in participating again says that the next time there might be more ownership and participation that is more active. Peer observation can be done in an office of two teachers or an office of fifty-two, as long as it is done with respect for each other and a goal of development in mind.

This project met with a lot of resistance, but it seems to have opened the door to more professional development in our office. In fact, after this project was introduced, other instructors proposed several action research ideas, and continue to take place. Teachers are working together more on preparing presentations, and are seeing more opportunities to analyze programs and projects in the department.

Finally, though some of the results were unexpected, they were still useful. We learned that our office was not as much of a team as we expected - and that we need to work on this. As well, this experience has led to some good discussions about other ideas for professional development. Finally, good intentions can be misinterpreted, so one should not take it personally if there are strong reactions to the idea of peer observation.

Our plans for our office are to look for other ways to approach building more of a team spirit, to continue trying peer observation, and to work on Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker cooperation.
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APPENDIX

SURVEY QUESTIONS

Pre-observation Survey
1. Where are you from?
   - Korea
   - Other country - if so, country given

2. Have you ever participated in a peer observation experience?
   - Never
   - As a student teacher (pre-service)
   - As a qualified teacher (in service) - please describe what the circumstances were

3. How do you feel about Peer Observation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For any questions for which you chose "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree", please feel free to explain your feelings.

5. How ..... do you think this is for your growth as a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very...</th>
<th>slightly...</th>
<th>not very...</th>
<th>not at all...</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. You have been placed in a random mixed group (1 Korean, 2 Native Speakers) for your peer observation experience. How do you feel about possibly being observed by a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Angry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Speaker of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The current experience is not about being evaluated. However, how would you feel about being evaluated by a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Angry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS of English colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS of English supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Which of these topics/themes do you think you would ask another teacher to observe in your classroom?

9. Are you currently involved in professional development? Which of the following have you participate in/done recently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>this month</th>
<th>in the past 6 months</th>
<th>in the past year</th>
<th>in the past 5 years</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>published a research paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>done action research in your classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentored or coached another teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kept a reflective journal on your teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presented at a workshop or conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended a conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joined or renewed your membership in a teacher's organization (e.g., KOTESOL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been an officer in a teacher's organization or conference committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participated in a university committee (textbook, hiring, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (please explain in the box below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If you would like to give more details on your answers, or have pursued professional development in a way not listed above, please describe here:
Post-observations Survey

1. Where are you from?
   Korea
   other country - if so, country given

2. Did you participate in this peer observation experience?
   No, I was not able to
   Yes, as an observee (another teacher watched my class)
   Yes, as an observer (I watched another teacher's class)
   Yes, as both an observer and an observee

3. How did you feel about Peer Observation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For any questions for which you chose "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree," please feel free to explain your feelings.

5. How ..... do you think this has been and will continue to be for your growth as a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very…</th>
<th>slightly…</th>
<th>not very…</th>
<th>not at all…</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Our goals were to help acclimate/integrate new hires into our department, to build a stronger team, and to offer a chance for personal/professional development. How well do you think this project achieve its goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>not very</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acclimate new hires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build a team spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. You were placed in a random mixed group (1 Korean, 2 Native Speakers) for your peer observation experience. If you actively participated in the study, how did you feel about

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Angry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>observing a Korean teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being observed by a Korean teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observing a Native Speaker of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being observed by a Native Speaker of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. If you didn’t actively participate in the study how would you feel about

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Angry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>observing a Korean teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being observed by a Korean teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observing a Native Speaker of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being observed by a Native Speaker of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Would you be interested in being involved in peer observation again in the future?
   Absolutely yes
   Perhaps
   Not sure
   Probably not
   Absolutely not

10. Please give us your feedback and comments:
Combined Tasks for EAP and Communication Skills

Izumi Kanzaka and Edwin K. W. Aloiau
Soka University, Tokyo, Japan

Abstract

As EAP instructors in a Japanese university, we often encounter students who read inefficiently by paying too much attention to unnecessary details and missing the main ideas. These problems are often caused by the entrenched translation habit that the students have acquired and the lack of basic note-taking and summarizing skills. While we take these deficiencies as serious problems, our students’ major concern is still their speaking competence. This paper presents teaching techniques for teaching effective reading skills, combined with speaking activities that are used to support students in developing both basic academic skills and communication skills.

Introduction

We are currently teaching English for academic purposes (EAP) in the English-medium economics program at Soka University, Japan, which aims to produce students graduating with abilities to use English in English-medium academic, vocational, and professional environments. Most of our students initially express that they are worried about their speaking skills but not so much worried about their reading skills. As EAP instructors, however, we often encounter students who read inefficiently, paying too much attention to unnecessary details and missing the main ideas. These problems are often caused by the translation habit that the students acquired in their previous learning experience and the lack of basic academic skills such as note taking and summarizing. While we take these deficiencies as serious problems, our students’ major concern is still their speaking competence.

In this paper, we will explain our current teaching context, theoretical foundations of what we do in our EAP classrooms, and then present techniques for teaching effective reading skills, combined with speaking activities that are used to support students in developing both basic academic skills and communication skills. Finally, we will report how students’ reading habits have changed after trying the combined tasks.

Current Teaching Context

We are currently teaching an intensive English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course in the English-medium economics program at a Japanese...
university in Tokyo, Japan. The activities presented in this paper are from the first two semesters of the EAP course. This course focuses on developing students’ study skills, EAP skills, and English communication skills so that students can successfully function in the program’s economics courses and in undergraduate classes when they study abroad at English-medium universities.

The average class size is between 16 to 18 students per class. The students in this course are highly motivated, and they have TOEFL paper-based test scores of 450-500, which is considered to be at the high-intermediate level of English proficiency. Although their test scores and proficiency level is relatively high, their experience with western-style classroom instruction is little or none.

One of the skills needed to survive and do well in an academic program is reading. Therefore, much time is spent in class helping students to develop effective reading skills and strategies so that they will be able to comprehend the readings that they will encounter in their undergraduate studies. In order to help our students develop effective reading comprehension skills and strategies, instruction needs to start from where they are currently at, that is, how they currently approach reading and comprehend written text. Because of their secondary education, students come to the university with the following reading habits:

- They tend to translate written text word by word.
- They are not able to distinguish between main ideas and details.
- When they highlight a reading passage, they only highlight unfamiliar words.
- They are not aware of and do not consider the overall structure of the written discourse.
- When they finish reading a passage, they do not remember much of what they have just read.
- When they take notes from a reading passage, they just copy down words or phrases, translate part or all of the passage, or create a word list of unfamiliar words without considering the context of the reading.

Students have these habits because of their previous learning experiences, especially in high school. Much of their high school study is focused on studying to pass university entrance exams. This involves the rote memorization of lists of facts with little consideration of the context or significance of these facts. There is no instruction in reading for information or for meaning. There is little or no instruction in basic academic study skills such as how to read and react to academic material effectively or how to write an essay. Essentially, “reading” in Japanese high school education is sentence level translation from English to Japanese. The reading text is used as a medium for grammar and vocabulary study. The focus is not on comprehending the meaning of the text but on analyzing the grammatical structures in the text and the vocabulary used in the reading.

Because of students using the reading skills that they acquired in their secondary education, they have almost complete incomprehension of the readings that are required in the program’s English-medium economics content courses. They “read” but do not comprehend what they are reading, and they do not connect what they are reading to any previous knowledge or other related information that they have learned or are learning in their other
economics courses. Not only are they dysfunctional in reading at their home campus but also at universities abroad. While studying abroad, they are unable to complete their reading assignments, become overwhelmed with the quantity of readings, and cannot perform satisfactorily in their courses.

In order to help students excel in their studies, make the most of their academic experiences at home and abroad, and enable them to make some of their dreams come true, our mission is threefold:

- Introduce students to a more effective approach to reading comprehension
- Provide students with opportunities to improve their communicative competence
- Establish the foundation for learners to comprehend and communicate in English at the university level and beyond

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The theoretical foundations for the design of the activities that are introduced in this paper consist of current theories on teaching reading, communicative language teaching, and Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives in the cognitive domain (1984).

To design effective reading comprehension activities, the literature on teaching reading was reviewed. According to Mikulecky (1990), for readers to read effectively, they need to be able to do the following.

- Activate their schemata or previous knowledge about a topic, subject, or style of writing
- Recognize the structure of a paragraph
- Recognize the topic of the paragraph
- Identify the topic sentence of the paragraph
- Distinguish main ideas from details
- State the main idea of a paragraph
- Recognize the organizational pattern of written text

Edge (1983) claims that effective note taking is essential for successful reading comprehension. However, according to Ma (2006), “Just do it!” does not work. Just taking notes is not enough: Students need to be exposed to a model of how to approach effective note taking. They need to be shown how to take notes effectively, given opportunities to practice those procedures, provided with feedback on their performance, and given lots of opportunity to apply and enhance the skills and strategies they have learned.

Activity designs are based on the literature on communicative language teaching, which identifies two types of communicative activities (Littlewood, 1981). One type of communicative activity is functional communication activities, in which the teacher creates an information gap or problem-solving situation for learners. The second type is social interaction activities, which simulate the kinds of communication that students may encounter outside the classroom. In these activities, learners need to pay attention to both the social and functional aspects of language use.
The EAP courses focused on in this paper employ social interaction activities, where the classroom is a social context and the target language is used for classroom management, as the medium of instruction, and the medium of conversations and discussions during the lesson.

Students are also provided with many opportunities to engage in role-playing to extend their communicative competence beyond the classroom. Role-playing involves learners in imagining themselves in a situation that could occur outside the classroom. They adopt a specific role in these situations and behave as if the situation really existed (Littlewood, 1981, p. 49).

Finally, activity designs are based and graded on Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives in the cognitive domain. According to Bloom (1984), there are six cognitive competencies educators should aim to develop in their students:

- **Knowledge** - Learners are required to recall information
- **Comprehension** - Learners understand what is being communicated and can make use of the information
- **Application** - Learners apply what they have learned to concrete situations
- **Analysis** - Learners break the information down into parts to clarify and understand the organization of the information
- **Synthesis** - Learners combine separate parts together to form a whole that did not previously exist
- **Evaluation** - Learners judge the value of the ideas, materials, or methods with which they are presented

Activities are designed to guide students in developing their competence from knowledge to application and from analysis to synthesis. Based on these theoretical foundations, activities and tasks combining EAP and communication skills have been devised.

**Combined Tasks**

When we choose reading passages for tasks, the topic should be suitable for students’ needs and interest, in terms of both level and content. Considering students’ great interest in developing their ability to communicate in English, their need for learning to read effectively, and the nature of our course, we developed combined tasks for fostering reading strategies and communicative competence at the same time. The reading passage was taken from an EFL textbook, “Communicating with Americans” (Kitao & Kitao, 1991).

Combined tasks used in our class are divided into three stages: (a) pre-reading, (b) reading, and (c) post-reading. In the pre-reading stage, we do speaking activities to activate schemata or background knowledge. First, we briefly introduce the topic of the reading, and then let the students discuss what they know about the topic in pairs and groups. After that, students move to the actual reading stage. The reading stage emphasizes the development of cognitive competence and effective reading strategies through note taking. In the post-reading stage, students present and discuss what they have read, and
then practice speaking based on what they have learned. Pre-reading tasks and post-reading tasks are always done in pairs or groups, but the reading is done individually.

In order to help students deprogram their word-by-word translation habit and acquire skills for reading effectively, we encourage our students to make an outline of the text while they are reading. Outlining is a good way of training students to identify main ideas and details. A good outline helps them make a good summary. However, as we mentioned earlier, in order for them to develop good note-taking strategies, just having them take notes would not be enough. They need to be exposed to a good model. Therefore, we do lots of modeling by using "think-aloud" techniques, that is, oral demonstration of reading and note taking by verbalizing the cognitive process of reading and outlining of our own, in front of students. After that, students try guided-reading by using a skeleton outline worksheet as practice. By being exposed to a framework given by teachers, students get an idea of what their notes should look like, and they can practice not only finding missing information but also thinking about how the text is made up of the main ideas and supporting details. Through this process, they gradually develop the ability to make their own outline and prepare for the opportunity for them to read something new.

After reading and making an outline, students form a group, discuss what they have read, and give a presentation based on what they have learned about the topic, only by looking at their outline. In the case of having them read the same reading passage, for example, students compare their outlines and discuss the contents as well as the structure of their notes. In the case of having them read different materials, students can share what they have read in the oral presentation style. In either way, they practice giving an oral summary of the text, by only looking at their own outline, but especially in the latter activity, their comprehension level increases, as they have to teach others who have not read the reading passage that they are presenting.

Finally, they do speaking activities to develop their ability to apply what they have learned. When they learn about invitations from the reading passage, for example, the post-reading activity is practice of inviting people to events they have organized. They are also encouraged to use what they have learned outside class. All of these tasks help students to deepen their comprehension of the text by analyzing, synthesizing, and applying what they read.

**Results**

Because of doing these combined tasks for EAP and communication, students showed positive changes in their reading habits. They started to look for the essential parts of the passage, and they became able to identify the main ideas and details. They also began to articulate the main idea and discuss the contents of the passage.

In addition, they started to use the expressions and strategies they learned immediately. Furthermore, they started to apply their techniques of note taking for reading to note taking for listening to lectures and presentations. They also started to link the outlining skills to their speaking. They started to organize
their speech logically, in order of main ideas and details. This was also reflected in their writing.

**REFLECTION**

Before, our students just wanted to finish the reading assignment without understanding it. However, by using reading tasks relevant to their needs, they became more interested in the content of the readings. By providing attack strategies for comprehension, they were better able to extract meaning from the text. By creating an environment that required them to discuss and present what they read, they began to read and take notes more seriously as well as articulate what they have read. Finally, through these tasks, they acquired skills to gain information from the text and the opportunity for practice in using the expressions and conversation strategies articulated in the reading, which they then applied to other situations.
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**ABSTRACT**

This paper reports on a collaborative professional development project that two Japanese teachers of English conducted at a university in Japan. This action research project explored pedagogies and rationale for the use of L2 as the medium of classroom instruction by non-native speaker (NNS) teachers of English. In the practice of teaching English to Japanese students in English, the two teachers faced a number of problems, but they discussed the problems, shared ideas for solutions, and coped with them by collaboratively reflecting on their teaching practice and beliefs through keeping journals and having weekly discussion sessions. The paper describes how the two teachers developed professionally through teaching in English and reflecting upon their practice, and how their own development enhanced their students’ development. Various teaching ideas for an English-only classroom will be also introduced in the presentation. The paper concludes with a proposal for guiding principles for NNS teachers teaching English through English.

**INTRODUCTION**

We are both non-native speakers of English, teaching English in English at a university in Japan. In this paper, we will share how we developed professionally as English teachers through teaching in English, and how it helped our students develop their language proficiency.

**CURRENT TEACHING CONTEXT**

We are working in an English-medium EFL program in a university in Japan, and most of our colleagues are native-speakers of English. Our university has students with a wide range of English proficiency and offers many different levels of EFL classes. Placement for EFL courses is based on the Institutional TOEFL scores. The English classes we are currently teaching are all elective courses, but there are also Japanese-medium EFL courses. Therefore, if students do not want to speak English in class, they have the option to choose classes taught in Japanese; or in some departments, students can choose to learn other foreign languages if they do not want to study learn English.

We communicate with our students exclusively in English in class and
outside of class. We also encourage our students to communicate with each other in English.

**ADVOCACY OF ENGLISH-ONLY POLICY**

We advocate the English-only policy for two reasons. One reason is that our students want to develop their communication skills, but they have almost no chance to use English in their daily lives. English-medium classes provide opportunities to use English, not just to study about English. The other reason is that we believe interaction to be indispensable for language development, and that the English-only classroom will provide opportunities for genuinely authentic interaction that facilitates acquisition.

Our classes are designed based on our beliefs in Krashen and Terrell’s notion of "i + 1" (1983), Swain’s output hypothesis (1985), and Long’s modified interaction theory (1983). According to Krashen and Terrell, language is a tool for communicating messages, and language acquisition takes place only when messages are understood in the target language (comprehensible input). Language acquisition is facilitated when input includes a structure that is slightly higher than the learner’s current level of competence (i + 1). Swain claims that requiring both input and output is critical for full language development. Long argues that input is made comprehensive through modified interaction, which is necessary for language acquisition.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF NNS TEACHERS**

Literature suggests that some characteristics of non-native speaker teachers are favorable for facilitating language acquisition. First, we experienced the learning process as learners, so we can predict what kinds of support will be necessary. Second, we are also familiar with students’ previous learning experiences including the national curriculum and entrance examination systems, so we are aware of linguistic features of English, which are difficult, particularly for Japanese learners of English. Moreover, we experienced not only the language learning process itself but also a transition from Japanese-medium English instruction to English-medium English instruction as both learners and teachers of English. Therefore, we can provide lots of i + 1 by adjusting the level of classroom input. In addition, we can serve as role models.

**PROBLEMS FACED IN THE ENGLISH-ONLY CLASSROOM**

In carrying out the English-only class, we faced some common problems. Those problems can be mainly divided into two types. One is related to listening skills; the other is related to speaking skills.

As for listening skills, we found that students often misunderstood task instructions. Tasks were not completed as we intended. Some students missed deadlines for assignments. Furthermore, they did not confirm whether they understood or not. When a teacher gave an instruction, students looked
puzzled, and they started talking with each other in Japanese. They did not even try to ask or confirm with the teacher the meaning in English.

As for the problems related to speaking skills, we found that students were not actively engaged in group and class discussion. We thought that the primary reason for this was that they were not used to classroom discourse in English. Their lack of speaking skills and anxiety about speaking seemed to influence their poor participation. They were self-conscious of their own behaviors in class. When they hit upon the expressions, which were hard to explain in English, they gave up and switched to Japanese immediately.

Considering these two types of problems, we looked for solutions from the viewpoint of linguistic support and psychological support.

**SOLUTION 1: LINGUISTIC SUPPORT**

In order to help our students to survive in the English-only classroom environment, we provided various linguistic support. First, we wrote down instructions and important announcements such as the deadlines for assignments on the blackboard. Second, we gave them handouts to promote discussion and classroom discourse in English. In addition, we modeled expressions needed for class and group work. In addition, we gave many opportunities to practice explaining things in English through English-English vocabulary tasks.

**HANDOUTS OF USEFUL EXPRESSIONS**

First we provided handouts for students to learn English expressions frequently used in class and group work. These expressions included: *Excuse me, but I don’t understand; Could you say that again please? How do you spell that word? Let me go first; Why don’t you go first? Let’s skip this; My answer is xxx. How about yours?*

To help them become familiar with expressions needed for discussion about grammar, we also provided lists of grammar terminology, monolingual or bilingual, depending on students’ levels, and worksheets for grammatical explanation. The monolingual grammar terminology list that we used in class is "Words for talking about grammar," which is downloadable from the Oxford University Press homepage on the Internet. Here is an excerpt:

> **Singular:** for example, chair, cat, man; **Plural:** for example, chairs, cats, men
> **Past tense:** for example, went, saw, stopped (simple past); was going, were eating (past progressive)

The bilingual grammar terminology list simply lists grammar terminology in English and Japanese, but we found it particularly useful because our students had learned English grammar and its terminology in Japanese in their previous learning experience. We created a bilingual list so that it would function as a transition from the L1-medium learning stage to the L2-medium learning stage.
WORKSHEETS FOR GRAMMAR EXPLANATION

We also developed a worksheet for grammar explanation, based on a Longman TOEFL preparation coursebook (2004). Here is an excerpt from worksheets for grammatical explanation.

Example sentence: I forgot my coat, _________ I got very cold.
Grammar explanation: In this sentence there are two (______), I forgot my coat and I got very cold. This sentence needs a (______) to join the two clauses.

Students did this kind of worksheet as homework and practiced explaining grammar in groups in class.

ENGLISH-ENGLISH VOCABULARY TASKS

We also provided a number of opportunities for students to establish and strengthen the English-English-mode in their brain though two types of English-English vocabulary tasks. The first one was an oral vocabulary quiz in pairs and groups. The idea was taken from "Pakkun Eiken," an oral vocabulary quiz used in an educational TV program produced by NHK that was popular among students. In this task, one student gives the definition of a word, and then the other member or members answer by giving the word. Questions are selected from basic words that students already know, or words learned in previous classes using English-English vocabulary lists provided by the teacher. Here is an example:

Q: What is the English word for “sweet food served at the end of a meal”?  
A: Dessert.

We always encouraged our students to try one of the following five ways to explain words: definition, synonym, antonym, example, or example sentence. For example, students may know what reptile means but may not be able to give a dictionary definition, which would be "an animal which produces eggs and uses the heat of the sun to keep its blood warm." In such a case, students can give examples of reptile, but we encourage them to not only give examples but also produce a sentence such as Snakes and turtles are examples of reptiles.

The second task goes in the opposite direction: One student gives a word, and then the other member or members answer in English using one of five ways: by giving the definition of the word, a synonym, an antonym, an example, or an example sentence. This task was developed because when we asked the question "What does XX mean," so many students answered in Japanese at the beginning of the semester. We explained that if they can explain the meaning of a word only in Japanese, they cannot communicate with people who do not speak Japanese. In this task, basically, students have to prove that they know the meaning of the word without using Japanese, so this activity is ideal as training and preparation for communication with non-Japanese speakers.

Students enjoyed these activities very much, especially when they had to
explain easy words that they had never thought of having to explain. Through these tasks, students gradually developed their ability to function in an English-only environment.

**Solution 2: Psychological Support**

As we mentioned in the section on problems we faced in the English-only classroom, we think that one of the reasons students do not speak much in class is that they are self-conscious of their behavior.

To solve that problem, it is important to lower their affective filters. We have to make a positive atmosphere, which enables students to speak spontaneously without any stress. According to Krashen (1982), successful second language acquisition depends on the learner's feelings. The affective filter is an imaginary barrier preventing learners from using input. Negative attitudes, such as lack of motivation or lack of self-confidence, or anxiety, are regarded as an affective filter. We teachers should remove that barrier. One of the ways to remove that barrier is to give them group work activities. The group work provides the security of a smaller group of students where each individual is not so starkly on public display. The student who has little confidence can also get the teacher's or other members' feedback before making a presentation in class. They are not exposed to public display in the whole class without confidence.

According to interaction theory, language is acquired as learners actively engage in attempting to communicate in the target language. Learners will acquire the language when they engage in tasks that “push” them to the limits of their current competence, so group work gives them many opportunities that push them to produce output through interaction in the target language.

When our students seemed to hesitate to speak English due to their lack of confidence, we tried to share our own experience of learning the language. As we shared our feelings as learners, our experience seemed to reduce their anxiety and encourage them to speak English more often in class.

We also tried to make it more comfortable for students to ask questions. We emphasized that asking questions would be a great contribution to the class as it would help other students who might have the same questions.

While the questions from the students gradually increased, when we asked whether they had any questions, often they merely indicated which part of the textbook or worksheet they had a question. They merely said, “Number 11,” for example. Considering their level of competence, especially in the intermediate or higher levels, we were convinced that they could speak at a more complex sentence-structure level. Therefore, we always tried to push them to produce questions or requests at the sentence level, not the word or phrase level. Then, in almost all cases, students became able to produce sentences such as *I don't understand question number 11. Please explain.*

**Evaluation**

We kept giving these linguistic and psychological supports for one
semester, and we observed improvement in students’ performance in class. First, students’ use of Japanese in class significantly decreased. Now it is almost zero. Even when students say something in Japanese, it is only a slip of the tongue, and they immediately rephrase it in English. Second, they have started to talk much more, and the quality of their utterances, such as complexity of sentence structures and accuracy, has improved greatly. Finally, they have started to participate more actively in group work, and even their writing has improved.

On the questionnaire given at the end of the semester, students responded positively about the English-only policy. They said because of the English-only environment, they became not only more competent but also more confident in using English. Most of them expressed that they are now highly motivated to keep studying by taking English-medium classes. Those who felt they were not able to make the most of the English-only environment said they should have tried harder.

Here are some comments that intermediate students wrote in English (no corrections have been made).

Student N: “It was helpful to take class all in English because we could learn the vocabulary: when to use and how.”

Student T: “If I did not know the word that I wanted to use, I tried to express it by using other words. Therefore, my ability to survive the English-only world improved. I think that English-only is a good idea.”

Student F: “Some students may not understand what teacher is saying, so, they forget every homework. Understanding is most important in classes. However, I don’t think it is a problem. If someone doesn’t understand the lesson, he should more study until he understands . . . English-only environment is very good.”

Basic-level students wrote these comments on the course evaluation sheet in Japanese, which we have translated into English:

• English-only class enabled me to get used to listening to English. At the beginning of the course, I hardly understood the lessons in English, but at the end of the course, I could understand most of them.
• I could increase my English vocabulary.
• This class encouraged me to study English more because I noticed that lack of vocabulary was one of my obstacles to listening comprehension.
• Thanks to this English-only class, I felt that I have become somewhat good at speaking English, and I was able to overcome negative feelings about using English.

**Reflection on Teacher Development**

Here is our reflection on the process of improving our teaching through collaborative discussion, reflection, action, and evaluation. First, we were able
to give opportunities for genuine linguistic interaction that facilitated language acquisition. Second, students were able to feel a sense of achievement by exchanging information genuinely needed for surviving a course and by internalizing the strategies. Third, our experience as learners of English played a significant role in educating our students in the English-only environment. The third point was particularly important as everything that we do as teachers now is linked to what we have been doing as learners, i.e., non-native speakers of English.

Most importantly, we developed professionally through teaching in English. As non-native speakers of English, substantial preparation was necessary to be able to provide classroom instruction in English and to help students to understand what we spoke in English. While we taught not only conversation patterns but also reading skills and grammar rules in our classes, the explanation of grammar rules was particularly challenging. Through the preparation for English-medium classes, we developed our own ability to explain things in English. This preparation stage also helped us greatly to understand more about the learning process.

**Teachers’ Roles in the English-Only Classroom**

Through our practice of teaching English through English, we came up with the following list of roles of NNS teachers in the English-only classroom. (a) By using our knowledge and experience, we can fill the gap between the L1-medium learning stage and the L2-medium learning stage. (b) We can diagnose what is needed at each phase of the learning process and provide appropriate tasks and opportunities for input, output, and interaction according to the learners’ needs at each phase. (c) We can support learners in getting ready to attend and make the most of classes taught by NS teachers. (d) We can prepare our students for communication with other NNS that they may encounter in the future. (e) We can serve as role models as learners of English using English.

**Conclusion**

The following is a summary of significant points learned from the study. These points can function as guiding principles for non-native-speaker teachers of English to design English-medium course tasks. First, learners need to be explicitly taught basic skills and vocabulary needed for the English-only learning environment in order to benefit from classroom instruction and interaction. Second, teaching in English provides an acquisition-rich environment that helps learners to acquire English through real and meaningful communication. Third, for NNS teachers, teaching in English helps them develop both as learners and teachers of English, and through their own development, NNS teachers can serve as role models for their students.
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**ABSTRACT**

How do you motivate Korean college and university students to learn English? First, you need to know their views on learning English, what interests them, and what preferences they have. Instructors have many views on this subject but are these views valid or are we tainted by old views, assumptions, and generalized motivation theory. In developing this paper, we surveyed the opinions and preferences of 303 students presently taking post-secondary ESL training in Korea. The students were freshman and sophomores from a community college and two well-known universities in Seoul. Through our survey analyses, we hope to dispel some of the more dated views on what motivates Korean ESL students and highlight changing trends so that the ESL instructor will be better able to anticipate and utilize this information in their overall approach to ESL learning at Korean colleges and universities.

**INTRODUCTION**

It is impossible to state precisely what motivates a generalized group. We can only suggest tendencies and back these with actual experience and observations, current thoughts within the discipline of learner motivation, and with sample surveys of the group in question. The authors of this paper are both seasoned ESL professors with experience in the instruction of Korean students in college and university English studies.

**MOTIVATION THEORY**

*Motivation can be facilitated or constrained, but not imposed.* (Schunk, 1991, pp. 76, 202)

Motivation is what inspires a person and directs their activity. It is often tied to factors such as interest, need, value, attitude, aspiration, and incentive. Students with an interest in a subject tend to pay attention to the topic. The student who has a need is one who lacks something that a given activity can provide (the need can be for achievement, affiliation, or dominance).
values are a whole class of goals that are considered important in one's life. Types of values include theoretical value (truth for its own sake), economic value (wealth for its own sake), aesthetic value (beauty for its own sake), political value (power for its own sake), social value (welfare of others), and religious value (mystic unity with the supernatural world). The student's attitude toward something consists of their feeling for or against what they perceive to be the issue. Attitude involves emotion, direction, an objective, and cognitive elements. A student's aspiration is their hope or longing for a certain kind of achievement, and drives the student to try. Without it, they will not make an effort. An incentive is something the student perceives as having the capability to satisfy, or in the case of a disincentive, something the student perceives as worth avoiding.

THE SCOPE OF THIS PAPER

In his article specifically on ESL student motivation Oz (2005) concludes with the following:

*Teachers can generate motivation by using strategies such as learner centered activities, cooperative learning, informal/formative assessments, and open communication. They can maintain and protect motivation by fostering self-confidence and learner autonomy. It is important to talk with colleagues to get support and feedback, to learn from other's experiences, to be open to trying new strategies, and to seek out professional development opportunities which provide teachers with fresh ideas about instruction design and strategies.* (para. 13)

Like many papers on motivation, he discusses and summarizes general motivation theory and creates an idealistic guide, but fails to relate it directly to specific practical application. In this paper, the authors will resist the temptation to do the same, as this really gives us little insight specific to the students and educational system that we work directly with. This is not a paper on motivation theory per se but instead addresses the specific responses given by Korean college and university ESL students to specific questions related to their preferences and perspectives on specific education issues. The findings are related to aspects of their learning environment and ESL education that tend to act as motivators with minimal reference given to motivation theory in general.

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The survey questions match various aspects of motivation by viewing students' opinions and preferences on ESL education in Korea. The sample survey questionnaires were given to specific sub-groups within the general classification of Korean college and university ESL students. A logical aggregate group analyses was done proportionally representing the results from 303 students surveyed. By reviewing the sample survey results with a healthy
knowledge of motivation theory and years of practical experience with the general subject group, the authors feel relatively confident in the results and broad generalizations presented in this paper.

LIMITATIONS IN THE SURVEY

Sample surveys such as the one used in this paper, offer a glimpse at a specific group at a specific time in response to specific questions. What it does not tell you is how well the group represents the larger classification, what effect the time and place where the survey was given had on the results, and how well the questions represented the learning issues they are being compared with. Other variables may also affect the results, such as how well the question was understood or interpreted and to what extent outside factors affected them, particularly in relation to their personal lives. There is also the potential for human error in the completing of the survey and the compiling the results. Finally, and most importantly, there are the biases or incompetence in the drawing of meaning and conclusions by the authors of the survey. The bias of the authors should be considered and balanced by one’s own interpretation of the statistics as presented in the raw data from the survey itself. Because of these limitations, it is always important to remember that survey results can only identify general trends and should be tempered with practical experience and common sense.

It was the choice of the authors to compile the results of the survey questionnaires personally. There are always errors in compiling results regardless of whether they are compiled by computer, students and assistants, or by the authors themselves. We preferred to compile the results directly for three reasons. This allowed for (a) logical judgment calls when necessary, (b) immediate correction of gross errors in the survey or responses that may not otherwise be detected, and (c) a chance to observe unexpected trends in the results that may be apparent when viewing the raw data directly but may not be apparent in the overall survey results. Being intimately involved in the calculating of the survey results also gave the authors more confidence in the validity of the survey findings.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE SURVEY GROUPS

The same survey questionnaire was given to all the students surveyed. The survey was given in Korean so that the students would easily understand the questions. The authors did not find any specific problems in the understanding of the questions as the students did not appear confused by the questions when completing the questionnaire nor did there appear to be unusual responses or confused responses when analyzing the survey results.

The following were the groups involved in the survey:

• CS - college sophomores from a community technical college in a Tourism English program (53)
• US - university sophomores from a well-known university taking a
higher-level (track 1) general University English program (41)
• CF - college freshmen from a community technical college in a Tourism English program (70)
• UF - university freshmen from a well-known university taking a general University English program (77)
• UF2 - university freshmen from a well-known university taking a lower-level (track 3) general University English program (62)
• AS - a proportional aggregate group representing the general classification of college and university Korean ESL students (303).

Two to four classes were surveyed for each represented group. The sample survey questionnaire developed for this paper was given in the second week of the first semester, in March 2007.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The survey questionnaire was four pages long with 15 individual questions, two composite questions on teaching style and English application, and one final question addressing problems in ESL education in Korea. The first two questions and the categories for problems in the ESL education system in Korea were borrowed from a previous study on Korean ESL student motivation by Sewell (2006). Students generally took five to ten minutes to complete the form. This would suggest that the questions were generally easily understood and the answers relatively clear for the student to discern. There was an impressively high rate of completion on the questionnaire, and there was little confusion in analyzing of the results.

STUDENTS’ CONFIDENCE IN THEIR EDUCATION AND THEIR GENERAL ENGLISH ABILITIES

GENERAL ENGLISH CONFIDENCE

The following data show how good an education the subject students thought they were given by the general school system prior to their post-secondary studies. The second question addresses their general confidence in their English abilities.

Table 1. General English Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Out of 100 points, how good was your English education until the end of high school?</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Out of 5 points, how difficult is it for you to learn English?</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings show a level slightly above the median in appreciation for their general education prior to post-secondary studies and a level below the median in belief in their general ability to learn English. Freshmen appear to be slightly more optimistic about their general education compared to sophomores, although there is generally little variation from the norm. This is encouraging, as students need to have confidence in the general educational environment to feel secure enough to risk learning new information and ideas.

As might be expected, track 1 university sophomores show the most confidence in their ability to learn English, while college students and track 3 university freshmen have the least confidence. A student's confidence in their abilities to learn is a part of self-efficacy and considered one of the major motivators for a learner. Self-efficacy is the internal growth of the self, focusing on ability and confidence in one's abilities. "Self-efficacy fosters mastery experiences which, over a period of time, provide self-satisfactions conducive to growth of interest" (Bandura, 1986, p. 243).

**COMFORT LEVEL WITHIN THE CLASSROOM SETTING**

Students will not be motivated to learn if they are not reasonably comfortable with their ability to learn or do not have confidence in their ability to display their knowledge and understanding. The following questions address the use of their English skills inside the classroom setting.

**Table 2. Comfort with Using English in Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Out of 5 points, do you like answering questions in class?</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Out of 5 points, do you like having to speak English in class?</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1 shows a slightly below the median in comfort level in answering questions in class with the second question showing a slightly above the median in comfort level in speaking English in class. University students tend to be more comfortable in using their English skills in class than college students, with the lowest comfort level being displayed by the college sophomores.

**COMFORT LEVEL OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT**

The classroom is an artificial environment for using English and does not necessarily reflect the complications and insecurities of using English in a more natural setting. The following looks at the students' general confidence in their ability to apply their English skills in an English-speaking environment foreign to them or in a less stressful situation where Korean is the more common language of discourse. The last question represents their general enjoyment in learning English.
Table 3. Comfort with English Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Out of 5 points, how comfortable would you be using English in a foreign country?</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Out of 5 points, do you like to use English outside of your English class?</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Out of 5 points, do you like learning English?</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students appear to be generally neutral in their comfort in using English outside the classroom environment but noticeably less comfortable in their ability to use English in a dominantly English-speaking environment. University students appear to be the most confident in their ability to use English in a foreign country with college freshman being the most confident in using their English in a Korean environment and in their general enjoyment in using English. As may be expected, the track 3 university freshmen were generally the least confident in all three areas. The third question directly asks the student if they are motivated to learn English to which a majority gave a positive response. The next section will expand on this by addressing personal goals related to student English skills both in the class and in their lives.

**PERSONAL GOALS IN LEARNING ENGLISH**

**THE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING ENGLISH IN THE CLASSROOM**

Students need to feel that what they are learning is relevant in their lives and helping them attain their individual goals. They must believe that English is important to be motivated to learn it. The more important they feel their studies are during class time, the more likely they will be to give a sincere effort to learn in class. The following illustrates how they rate the importance of learning English in class in relation to social needs.

Table 4. The Importance of Learning English in Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Out of 5 points, do you think it is more important to make friends in class than to get a good grade?</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Out of 5 points, do you think it is more important to have fun in class than to learn a lot of English?</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses show that generally students are slightly more interested in learning and good grades in comparison with making friends and having fun. The exceptions are university freshmen both in the general program and in track 3, who show a slight preference for the social needs of making friends and having fun.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING ENGLISH IN THE STUDENTS' LIVES

How important English is to students in the classroom tends to determine how attentive they are during the class, but it is really how they judge the importance of English in their lives that will motivate them beyond class time. The second question addresses the opinion of their family in motivating students to act. The third question addresses the individual perception of how important English is to them in their future.

Table 5. The Importance of Learning English in Your Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Out of five points, do you just want to pass the course or is it important to pass with a good grade?</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Out of 5 points, is it important to get a good grade in English to make your parents happy?</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Out of 5 points, do you think English is important for your future life?</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students clearly consider learning English and getting a good grade more important than one might conclude from the previous section. Sophomores tend to be more concerned about good grades than freshmen are, but it is interesting to see that track 3 freshmen appear to be slightly more concerned about good grades than other freshmen. Question 2 shows that achieving for their parents is important to Korean students but may not be as important as one might think given the strong traditional background of the family unit in Korean culture. This is particularly true with the track 3 university freshmen who appear neutral on the subject. All groups strongly believe that English is important in their future, with a slightly stronger opinion coming from freshmen, suggesting that this belief in the importance of English is not likely to change in the near future.

THE PREFERRED USE OF ENGLISH

There are distinctly different skills in English that a student may or may not be motivated to learn. Which skills they prefer to learn or not learn is
often reflected in their preferred uses of English in their lives. The following shows the most common uses of their English skills in everyday life and their preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Reading English books or magazines</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Listening to English music</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Watching English movies or TV shows</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Writing English stories or emails</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Speaking in English with friends</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows clearly a preference for listening and watching English. However, this may be a little deceptive, as their answers may be showing more of an interest in the entertainment value of English (i.e., a preference to the rhythm and sounds of music as opposed specifically to the lyrics) and a preference to the visual aspects of movies and TV shows as opposed to the actual dialog. The visual component may also affect their preference for reading magazines, etc., although this is clearly a less preferred way of using English. Track 3 university freshmen seem to be the least interested in the entertainment value of English. Writing and speaking English are the least preferred ways of using English, but all groups for all categories gave a positive response, showing that students want to apply their English skills in their lives. It is clear through the authors’ experience that the Internet is also a common mode of using English, but this was not included specifically in the questionnaire as it was considered a use of more general rather than specific English skills.

**The Preferred Learning Method**

Students are not only motivated by what aspects of English they see as important to them but also by the learning method. The following shows the major methods of learning in ESL. It should be noted that regardless of what styles the student likes or dislikes, some would be more appropriate than others, depending on what is being learned. In addition, students generally prefer a certain amount of variety in instructional styles as even their preferred learning style can become boring and monotonous if it never changes. This section of the questionnaire received the greatest variation in responses from within each group.
Table 7. Preferred Learning Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Lecture style</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Audio-visual style</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Grammar exercises</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Individual projects</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Individual presentations</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Group projects</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Group presentations</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Class projects</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Class presentations</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preferred method of instruction appears to be lecture style, supported by audio-visual aids rather than grammar exercises, projects, or presentation work. College students tend to show a stronger preference to the straight lecture style and grammar exercises with university students showing a stronger preference towards audio-visual support, projects, and presentation work. All groups showed a preference for group work over individual work with track 3 freshmen showing the most marked preference.

Preference in Instructor’s Abilities

One of the strongest motivators in learning is the personal ability of the instructor, both as a teacher and role model. The questions below address the three general abilities students usually consider most important: friendliness, knowledgeability, and comfort/understandability. Of course, other qualities make one instructor more appealing to the student than another such as gender, age, appearance, general kindness and honestly, appearance of success, etc. However, these are combinations unique to each instructor, and their relative importance is subject to the individual taste and biases of the student. These other qualities were not considered in this study.

Table 8. Preference in Instructor’s Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Out of 5 points, how important is it to have a friendly teacher?</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Out of 5 points, how important is it to have a knowledgeable teacher?</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Out of 5 points, how important is it to have a teacher that has a comfortable teaching style?</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three characteristics of the instructor are obviously important to the student with knowledgeability being generally the most preferred. This is particularly true with the college students, with university freshman giving a slightly more positive response for friendliness. This follows the general trend where students tend to favor learning over the social aspects of education. The high response in the first question and lower responses in the second and third questions by the general university freshmen may imply that this group considers the instructor less important as a factor in their general learning of English.

PROBLEMS IN ESL EDUCATION IN KOREA

Perceived inhibitors to learning are equally as important as motivators. In the study done by Sewell, he left this question open-ended to allow the student personal discretion in how they responded. From their responses, he categorized the answers under 28 generalized responses of which we used 27. Below are the results with the responses given as a percentage of the group’s responses. Each respondent was asked to choose three areas of concern. The percentages are rounded off to the nearest 0.5 percent, as there was flexibility in the calculation of the student responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Choices</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Instruction is too grammar centered</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The system encourages memorization not integration</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Teachers lack enough English ability</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Teachers have poor pronunciation</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The English that is learnt is not practical</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Teachers are not good at teaching the basics</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Classes focus on passing the university entrance exam</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) No listening practice in school</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The English education system is poorly organized</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Students need to be placed by ability</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table, we further limited the results to the problems in ESL education in Korea identified as most significant in the responses to the survey.

**Table 10. The Most Significant Problems in ESL Education in Korea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Question Categories</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>UF2</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Classes focus on passing the university entrance exam</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students consider the focus on university entrance exams as the greatest general problem in Korean ESL education. The top five problems show a concern that ESL education focuses on theory rather than the practical application of English skills. This seems to be the strongest message that the students are making regarding ESL education in Korea. The top four questions received a consistently strong response from all groups. It is interesting that in the fifth problem, the responses were high with the marked exceptions of the response given by the college sophomore and freshman groups. The students in these groups tended to be local, suggesting that the high schools in the area of the college may give more emphases to conversation practice or it could simply be that their expectations for conversation was lower than those entering university.

The next major concern seems to be the general apathy of the instructor in both their approach to interacting with the student and the course curriculum. The third area of concern is that the instructor and class or boring. Other problems in the ESL system appear to be relatively less significant.

**Summary of the Results From the Survey**

The following are the general findings of the survey for the average Korean ESL student in post-secondary education (using a proportional aggregate average):

- Students are slightly above the median in their appreciation for their English education prior to entering college/university but are below the median in their confidence in their ability to learn English.
- Students prefer to speak English in class and slightly prefer not to answer questions.
- Students are medial in using English outside of the classroom but generally lack confidence in their ability to use English in a foreign country.
- Students generally enjoy learning English.
- Students have a slight preference to learning English over the social aspects of the class.
• Students are more motivated to obtain good grades to meet their own goals rather than the goals of their parents.
• Students strongly believe that English is important for their future.
• Students are interested in using English in their everyday lives.
• Lecture style supported by audio-visual aids is the preferred method of learning with group activities being preferred over individual work.
• Students slightly prefer that the instructor be knowledgeable rather than friendly, although both are considered very important.
• Students consider the emphases on theory and examinations over practical application of English to be the biggest problem in Korean education followed, by instructor apathy to students and the curriculum.

**COMMENTS ON THE SURVEY RESULTS**

We do not believe that this survey shows any major revelations that would separate Korean student preferences from the general preferences of other EFL students in other parts of the world. What is probably most valuable is that the results tend to dispel some commonly held beliefs about Korean student motivation and help support others.

Andrew Finch (2004), a well-known educator in Korea, notes:

> **Even advanced EFL students, who have successfully jumped through all the hoops required of them by the education system, and who often go on to study in America as “straight A” students, seem convinced that they are “poor” learners. As for the high school graduates who find themselves in third-rate universities or colleges, and who see only a life of non-achievement ahead, the EFL classroom holds no promise.** (p. 24)

Korean students are still slightly pessimistic about their abilities to learn English and using their English skills in a natural English environment. Fortunately, the survey helps illustrate that Korean students tend to have a more optimistic view regarding the ESL education system in Korean and a strong appreciation for the value of English in their lives. This includes students considered poorly motivated.

Hazzard (2006) published the results of a program she taught in which her Korean ESL students created short movies. She asked the students for feedback on the project and noted the following:

> **Nearly 80% of students felt more motivated to study English while making the movie and after the movie. Ninety-eight percent of the students enjoyed making the movie and eighty-two percent of the students would rather make a movie than have a regular test even knowing that they will spend a lot more time making a movie.** (Results, para. 3)

Our study tends to confirm that students prefer group work to individual work and that students appreciate the entertainment value of English, as illustrated in the strong preference for English music and movies. However,
the results of Hazzard’s experience may be misread in that there are also other factors involved. Our study suggests that students still tend to prefer lecture with audio-visual aids as the preferred method of study and prefer learning to the social aspects of the classroom, although skillful use of mixed instructional styles and utilizing the social nature of a classroom can be good motivators in a very specific situation.

Each year around Hangul Day, which commemorates the promulgation of the Korean alphabet, newspaper articles and editorials complain about foreign words that are "contaminating" the Korean language and about professors who "overuse foreign languages." The Korean language, these writers claim, must be protected "from an all-out invasion of foreign languages." It should come as no surprise, therefore, that many college students harbor conflicting feelings about learning a second language. One college freshman told me in confidence that she was afraid of forgetting her Korean if she spent too much time studying English. (Neiderhauser, 2007, Sources, para. 7)

In the above quote, Janet Neiderhauser notes the fear that learning English contaminates the purity of the Korean language. Language mixing often concerns the more conservative elements of all societies, including English-speaking societies. It is unlikely that this is still a concern of the vast majority of Korean ESL students, as it was not mentioned in the Sewell study as a concern with any of the students he surveyed. Students tend to prefer to learn English and use English in their personal lives, showing that they generally enjoy English and see the study of English as a means of meeting their own personal goals.

Many involved in Korean ESL education emphasize the influence of Confucian thought on motivating trends for students. Cheng (2000) in his well-referenced paper helps dispel some of the perceived influence of Confucian thought on Asian student motivation. Many think that because of the historical influence of the family unit that students were more inclined to get good grades to please their parents rather than to please themselves, but our study shows this probably is not the case. Students also appear to consider their own goals above the goals of their parents and the social acceptance of others. Weiner (1990) notes, "it is evident that the self is on the verge of dominating motivation" (p. 621).

**INTEGRATING CURRENT STUDENT PERCEPTIONS INTO PRACTICES IN KOREAN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION**

The integration of students' perceptions into practices in Korean post-secondary education is a bit difficult, as effective instructional methodology is very specific to the needs and character of each individual group and only broad general recommendations can be made here. First, we recommend abandoning preconceived ideas on the relationship between Confucian teaching and traditional Korea annotative beliefs, and the opinions and motivation of Korean ESL students today. Second, although there are different levels of
preference between the various groups of Korean ESL students, generally the
groups fall within a small variation of preference for most questions asked.
This suggests that the overall approach to instructing Korean ESL students
should be similar regardless of the level of training the student has received or
their general potential to learn. There is substantially more variation within
the sub-groups than between the sub-groups and the aggregate results, so
generalizing about group motivation should be considered secondary to the
opinions and needs of individual student or the specific class you are
instructing. Third, instruct from the premise that students generally want to
learn English and want to use their English in class and, more importantly,
outside the classroom and in their future life. Finally, and most importantly,
students want to practically apply their English skill and understand how they
can do so. This should be the overriding motivator to consider when
developing your instructional methodology.

CONCLUSION

It is the hope of the authors that the results of the sample survey and the
general trends in student preference and confidence will help instructors
design ESL program and individual class teaching methodologies more
appropriate to learning English in today’s Korean post-secondary education.
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Reading Circles - More Than English Acquisition
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ABSTRACT

Research is clear that reading promotes second language acquisition. Vocabulary grows, as does appreciation of everyday speech and the target culture. It is also a lot more interesting than grammar for most students. I did not realize how significant reading was until I saw its effect among my students when I started teaching. My pleasure readers are far ahead of their peers in all English abilities. I decided to lead a reading group as a way to encourage reading. I found much more happens in our informal discussions than just learning English. The power of literature and reflection is evident. This qualitative paper describes my experience and my students’ experience with reading groups.

INTRODUCTION

When I first came to Korea, I taught an advanced sophomore English speaking class. I just could not get them to talk. I tried different exercises and games. I tried cajoling them. Finally, I pushed the desks back and put us all in a circle - and discussed why it was so difficult to speak. We had a good talk. The point that touched me the most was that one student said, “This is the first time in my life I have ever talked to a teacher like this.” She was a university sophomore and had never talked with a teacher to be listened to, to give an opinion, to have a discussion. They all agreed they liked it and wished there were more of it.

This year’s conference theme is Challenging Ourselves and Motivating our Students. Reading groups fulfill this objective. When you meet a small group of keen students to discuss a book, you have no idea what will happen in any session: a delightful challenge for any teacher. Further, when the students have an insight, or when they realize they have been talking in English for a half hour without realizing it, they get excited.

This paper gives a qualitative description of my experiences with three reading groups here in Korea. Reading accelerates and grounds language acquisition. The purpose of my paper is to encourage more reading by students, demonstrate the value of reflection on reading, and provide an idea of the kind of wonderful experiences that await the leader of a group of interested students.

First, I give some background on how I got interested in reading groups; then I describe our procedure and weekly roles. I call them “Reading Circles” to convey the idea of sharing and openness. I quote some of the students on their expectations and their reflections on the process. I touch on a bit of
theory; then give my own observations on what has transpired.

BACKGROUND

I first started teaching English in 2003. I was in Wuxi city, China, near Shanghai. After a month or two, I noticed a few students were just far ahead of the others. It turned out they were pleasure readers. They read English books because they liked the books, not because they were studying. They were reading for fun. It took me a while to find this out. At the time, I had no background in teaching, although I had done many presentations during my work life. This unexpected link between reading and language ability really stood out in my mind.

It is not just in China. Just last semester, one Korean student was so far ahead of her peers on the oral exam, I asked if she had lived in Australia. No, she simply liked reading English books. By this time, I was not surprised. This semester I helped some children from our school, two eleven year-old girls who can speak English quite well. Their parents have had them reading English books and watching English videos since they were very young. It shows.

In China, I discovered I really liked teaching, and it was a perfect fit with my interests in culture and travel. I returned to school to get my Master's degree in Education at the University of Ottawa, in Ottawa, Canada. While there, I did not forget the exceptional students. I asked one of my professors, Marjorie Wesch, about reading and learning a second language. She said there is no question. The research is clear that reading is a significant positive factor in language acquisition.

Professor Judith Robertson was doing research into community reading groups at the time. Her course, Pedagogies of Difference, was most challenging because we had to put disparate materials together to discuss what we were learning from the course. We would read a book, discuss it as a group each week, and then watch a movie. We had to write how the movie demonstrated the ideas of the book.

One of the books we read was Reading Lolita in Tehran by Azar Nafisi, which describes a reading group of Nafisi’s students and the effect of discussing literature on them and their lives within an oppressive regime. The book is profound in its simple humanity and its demonstration of the power of literature.

Reading for pleasure works. Not just for practicing and improving English, but dramatically. Why is it not a necessary course for first and second year university students? I am not aware of any novel/story reading classes in my department at Jeonju University. Remembering Nafisi and her students, I decided to encourage reading by forming my own reading group in the hope that the students’ experience would plant a seed to increase reading and help them learn English. I called it a Reading Circle. We read a novel together and met weekly to discuss it.
READING CIRCLE STRUCTURE - HOW DOES IT WORK?

The nature of the group is informal, but in the beginning, procedures and roles make things easier. People have their own tasks and know what to do when we meet. It also gives them a way to start participating without having to think of something to say or “look intelligent”. This is especially true for teacher-oriented cultures like Korea where the student expects to be told what to do.

It is important to establish an atmosphere of trust and exploring. We are not just learning English; we are exploring ourselves, the “leader” just as much as any other group member. We do not know what is inside us, but reading a good book and reflecting on it constellates deeper things within, and brings them to the surface. The group must be supportive and familiar so that each member can express these deeper clusters without fear of others’ criticism – especially sensitive in Korea. Everyone has something to contribute. The individual’s disclosure of his or her feelings and thoughts trigger further responses in the other members. We all learn about ourselves and gain new perspectives on our own living context and our identities.

The teacher or leader must address shyness and the fear of mistakes. Make it clear we are all in the same boat, we all make mistakes, and we all get nervous about saying something in front of others – wondering, “What will they think of me?” This is normal. However, we are here to learn and help each other learn. Just do it.

I have found that beginning with the roles, a two-hour meeting with three or four people goes by very quickly indeed. You need to be disciplined. It would be ideal to have an afternoon, where you could relax and explore things in more depth and at ease. [For a description of the operation of the Reading Circle, see Appendix 1. For reflections from students on their experiences while participating in the Reading Circle, see Appendix 2.]

MY OBSERVATIONS

At the time of the Conference, I was leading my third Reading Circle group. In 2006, in the first group we read The Old Man and the Sea by Hemingway. I picked this book because the language is relatively simple and it won the Nobel Prize for Literature. In the second group, we read Jonathon Livingstone Seagull by Richard Bach. I picked it because it is a well-known but small book and the students less mature. In the third group, we are reading Anil’s Ghost by Michael Ondaatje, author of The English Patient. I picked Anil’s Ghost because of the excellent writing. It is about the government and insurgent atrocities in Sri Lanka in the 1980’s and 90’s. The book talks about a distant place, yet there are many connections to Korea, such as the influence of foreign powers, and insurrection. It is also about the nature of history and discovering one’s self. Ondaatje was born in Sri Lanka and now lives in Toronto.

My first group consisted of Jeonju University students. It went well, although it took some time to get started.

The second group was also Jeonju University students. There were four
people; however, two were not committed, so I cancelled the group after a short time.

The third started after I met two Chonbuk University English Education students at the local KOTESOL chapter meeting. I mentioned reading. They were interested and, on their own, got a group of five students together. It worked very well. All were in English Education and wanted to become English teachers. Of the five, four had lived overseas. These students all had a very heavy course load and will take the Korean English Teacher Exam. Their motivation for learning and appreciation of the opportunity that the group offers was clear.

One of my tenets of teaching and learning is the discovery of the disconnect between what we think and what is. Learning inherently constellates change. Learning is change. When we learn something, we become different. We have enlarged and therefore changed our position.

It is impossible to determine the nature of an individual or a society by linking together a collection of snapshots like a puzzle. Just because I see you every day at work, does not mean I know you. Watching CNN does not mean you know anything about Muslim people.

Ignorance lies in believing one picture is the correct one and claiming a privileged position for this belief. This certainty of point of view, this “I know”, not only denies the limitation of the specific angle from which we are observing, but also precludes further exploration. It leads to complacency. Certainty is a protective wall forged by fear. People will kill rather than change their ideas and co-operate. Just think of the Christian-Islam hostility that has been going on for a thousand years. This complacency weakens a person and a society. This myopic world-view can be cracked open by exposing the contradictions that result from the rigidity, or closure, of one's self-satisfied perspective. Derrida (as quoted in Phillips, undated) calls this deconstruction. What I thought was true, is not. Certainty becomes “I want to know.”

Teaching is a form of love. We show the student it is “OK” to let in a new idea. There is nothing to be afraid of.

While reading Anil’s Ghost, I asked the group about the parallels with Korea and government violence. Kwangju immediately came up. I asked when it happened. There was some discussion about the year. One woman looked at me and said, “You know what - I want to read some history! In school we just memorize it, then forget it as soon as we can. I don’t know anything.”

This person is 28 years old and has quit her job to become an English teacher. This woman had a strong feeling. Spontaneously, she realized she did not know something. Her complacency had crumbled and she wanted to know. This event is a signal. She will remember it and as a teacher, she knows what will make students want to learn. This happened because the Circle provided the opportunity to discuss and be heard.

In our group discussions, I lay these contradictions on the table as they arise, and ask people what they think about them. I just listen. I do not need to say anything.

Following, I describe three observations as the groups progressed.

(a) Before I began, I expected there would be a lot of grammar and vocabulary work. In fact, there has not been much grammar at all. Nevertheless, vocabulary does play a significant part in the group work. Vocabulary is how learners demonstrate their communicative skills. In every
area of English, you cannot understand or communicate if you do not know or
do not have the word you need. When reading a novel there is a lot of
vocabulary that people do not know, especially how a word is used and when
there are multiple meanings. I could see one reason for the difficulty when I
 taught an English camp this summer. When looking up a word in the
dictionary for an exercise, every student chose the first meaning listed. The
correct answer was in fact the second meaning. They were satisfied with the
first one. I find I do a lot of explaining about five things:

- Multiple meanings,
- Shades of meaning and context,
- Connotation,
- Slang meanings and
- Cultural associations.

All students agree on the vocabulary challenge.
Here is an example of how one small question can lead to greater things.
A student pointed out that in Anil's Ghost the sentence “The hollows that
seemed gnawed at.” was not grammatical. I had to smile - “So?” I mean this
is literature! The phrase of course is not a complete sentence, more a thought
fragment. What ensued was a discussion of text complexity, cultural difference,
and the English language learning process. First, I pointed out it referred to
the previous sentence: “She saw the sadness in Ananda’s face below what
might appear a drunk’s easy sentiments.” This fragment describes not only a
physical description but also a sensitive insight about the drunk. Anil, the
main character, sees behind the drunk’s persona that something deep is
bothering him and that is why he drinks.
The fragment is powerful. What does ‘gnawed’ mean? As a native English
speaker and my western culture, the word ‘gnawed’ brings to mind a dog at a
bone or a rat feeding. The rat is unpleasant. However, these few words
describe the person and that the problem and his drinking are wasting him
away - eating at him, and that he is powerless. As I explained this to the
group, I felt a lot of pity and compassion for Ananda.
The students learned that grammar rules are not sacred in English writing.
They all learned how an English speaking reader experiences the text, something they could have no idea about, and how powerful writing and
literature could be emotionally.

(b) I ask for feedback. One student said to me, "I am really glad you
talked about that kind of thing. We never talk about that. We talk about
fashion, our friends and getting married. That’s all." Some feedback I got from
two different students was that they really appreciated the opportunity to
express their opinion in English. This is quite difficult for them to do, and
they were appreciative of the opportunity to practice.

(c) What I did not anticipate when I started was that the deeper value of
the group was the discussion and wide range of things we get into. I will
broach more controversial topics and topics where I suspect there may be
strong feeling. Therefore, I ask about family relationships, women’s issues,
government action and foreigner experiences. Following are some topics we
have discussed.

In the very first session of Jonathon Livingstone Seagull, one girl burst
into tears when talking about the book. She loved the book and had read it several times in Korean. She hates the university program she is taking. She must take it because her parents said she must take it. When she finished explaining, no one said a word. Literature can touch us deeply.

During The Old Man and the Sea, when the young woman said the old man was really fighting himself, everyone went "ooooh!" This was just terrific for two reasons: first, it was a deep insight, spontaneously arrived at, and spoken out. I was impressed, as everyone was. Second, who listens to women in Korea? Who listens to a young university undergrad? The Reading Circle provided the space and opportunity for this reaching into the depths and bringing it up into the light of day. Where else could this happen?

Not one girl understood the arm wrestling competition in the story. This led to a discussion of what is a man, what does it mean to be a man. Every young woman agreed, Yes they did want a strong man for a husband.

(Religion) The Old Man and the Sea is full of biblical references. Biblical knowledge helps English learners. You do not have to be a Christian of course, but you have to know the stories and the general teachings. It is the same in Korea. If I do not know Confucianism, I will have no clue about Korean culture, people, and their values and behavior. Jeonju University is a Christian University. Every student in the group said they were Christian. Yet NOT one knew that Christ was a fisher of men! Obviously, Koreans and Western people read the Bible differently.

(Politics) We discussed Kwangju, Tiananmen Square and government influence, and control of the media and people. There had been a story in the newspapers recently about many Koreans' resentment of the disproportionate number of Christians in the government. We discussed this. I asked the students, Where does the money for these candidates come from? Who is funding them? It struck them that they did not know AND they did not know where to find out.

(Sexuality) One girl talked about her uncomfortable feelings when reading about Anil talking about her affair with her married lover. As a foreigner, I was surprised. What about all those motels? There are hundreds of them! Moreover - they have huge neon signs announcing their presence. Who do you think uses them - high school students? Yet sex and illicit love is clearly secret, even though a multitude of obvious rendezvous is not secret at all! We all talked about this for a while. It came down to the discomfort with it being public, being discussed, instead of veiled.

(Korea) We discussed history. Anil's Ghost talked about the deterioration of history and the destruction or hiding of records. This touched one person because of the Korean lands taken by China. There are few if any documents in Korea, the documents are all in China. So some of Korea's history has disappeared, land has been lost. All feel strongly about this: the records have been lost; and because ancestors and the land are so important in Korea, they have lost part of themselves.

**Benefits of Reading Circles**

These benefits are provided by holding Reading Circles.
• Increase in vocabulary, understanding of multiple meanings, synonyms and appreciation of shades of meaning depending on context,
• Not only Western cultural awareness but also awareness of own culture,
• Dramatically increased English fluency through the opportunity to practice speaking English,
• Increased self-confidence in speaking English, and in speaking in front of others,
• Increased ability in expressing an opinion, feeling, or experience,
• Experience of literature and appreciation of writing as art. Why did the author choose this word? How is the language use interesting, out of the ordinary?
• Understanding that writing can and does touch us.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we do not need research to tell us of the value of reading for English acquisition. I would add that reading something you want to read is motivation to keep reading. When we meet as a group and start our discussion, very quickly participants forget they are speaking “English” and just talk. Mistakes are ignored and fluency goes up noticeably.

I ask the reader to try it. There are many books. Pick what you like, but be sensitive to the level of the students and their interests. What do the students want, need; what are they looking for?

It is enjoyable talking with students. Just listen. Notice where there is some energy and go with that. We talk about everything – culture, boy/girlfriends, politics, status of women, feelings... As they come to know you and realize there is no judgment and they can say anything, they become more and more relaxed, open up more and more, and speak more and more fluently. As I said, they forget they are speaking English. The book is the vehicle, the catalyst that facilitates the conversation.

Lead Reading Circles, it will make a difference to English learning in Korea.
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**NOTES**

The following papers are good resource material for starting and running Reading Circles.


APPENDIX 1: READING CIRCLE PROCEDURE AND ROLES

**Definition**
A Reading Circle is a small group of people who meet regularly to discuss a book they are reading and their reactions to it. This was originated by the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1970).

**Objectives**
- a) Provide a structured situation to speak and practice English where we support each other in trying to improve our English and communicative abilities;
- b) Promote English reading comprehension and speaking fluency;
- c) Provide opportunity to practice speaking in front of others and build self-confidence;
- d) Promote awareness and understanding of Western culture;
- e) Increase understanding of one’s own culture as a result;
- f) Encourage self-discovery through discussion;
- g) Read good literature and critically evaluate what we read.

**Procedure**
- a) Initially the group leader chooses a text. Later the participants will agree on further texts.
- b) Each week the group meets to discuss the next chapter of the book.
- c) Each person shares with the group what they think of the book, the author and the story. How does it affect them? How do they feel? What do they think?
- d) Each person explains how this relates to their own experience - both personal and community?
- e) We comment on each others’ comments. As a result, our insight into the text, each other and ourselves grows.
- f) The Reading Circle is done entirely in English so that the ease of speaking in English and the understanding of vocabulary, grammar and culture grow quickly.

**Student’s Responsibility**
- a) Before we start, write a short essay on what you expect to get out of the Reading Circle and what you think will happen.
- b) When we finish, write a short essay on your reflection/reaction to how the Circle went for you: what surprised you, disappointed you, what you liked, disliked etc. What you learned most, thought was the most valuable. What you would have liked to have got but didn’t. Suggestions to make it better.
- c) Keep a weekly journal with 2 entries per week - the first containing reflections on what you have just read, the second reflections on what happened at our meeting. **NOTE:** this is not for marking. It’s just so you can articulate how you feel and think about things in English. I am very interested in what you think and feel and how you respond to the reading. **NO ONE WILL READ THIS.** I will keep a journal too.
- d) Take turns being leader in the meeting for discussing the text.
Suggested starters are: some words or sentences you didn’t understand right away, or your reactions: how is this like me and my life, how is this like other stories I have read, how is this like Korea/Korean people and culture, how does this relate to what is going on in the world?

e) The Group needs your commitment! Come every week. The freedom and confidence to speak our minds openly comes from our knowing and trusting each other. When we see each other and listen to each other each week, trust grows.

f) Roles

g) Each person will have a different role each week. He or she will perform the task for the role and present the relevant information or comments at the meeting for discussion.

h) Vocabulary - bring 10 words from the book you didn’t know and discuss their meanings.

i) Grammar - bring 2 or 3 interesting or puzzling sentence structures or grammar points for discussion.

j) Summarizer - summarize this week’s reading for us.

k) Passage Pick - read aloud to us a passage you especially liked and say why you liked it.

l) Culture - pick an example of culture from the book and discuss its utility. Say whether you like or dislike it and how it is different from Korea.

m) Criticism - do you think the reading (content, English etc.) is good or bad?
APPENDIX 2: GROUP REFLECTIONS

From their reading journals and their initial and final essays, the students themselves speak. I quote.

EXPECTATIONS

Yutana:
I remember a woman who was sitting in the subway and reading some book written in English. When I saw her, I felt jealous because at that time I had never read a English book. It seemed like a juicy fruit on the top of the tree which I couldn't reach. First of all, I am excited that I will read the whole book. No matter how long it takes, and no matter how hard it is, I will finish reading it after all. If someone asked me what's the book you read recently, I would answer proudly, "Anil's Ghost."

JiNi:
Because I expect that i can change my passive attitude whenever i read books . To be honest, i rarely read books especially novels. i hope i can have opportunity that i can think deeply rather than just follow what is written itself. I wonder if you can understand what i want to say because my lack of ability to express my mind ^^

KeuRimShi:
You said we were going to study using the literature, for example "the oldman and sea" as you refered. I think that the literature is very long and we'll feel boring easily. So may be fed up with this meeting. I don't want that this situation will happen. I prefer to choose the magazine or newspaper article.

DURING THE READING

??:
I wondered what the lion means in this novel. I became knew the meaning. That is the power having human, so he dreamed about a lion. He couldn't be a powerful man really, but he could be a real man in his dream through the lion. Anyway, I learned the words 'hope' and 'patience' in this novel. A human being has a endless hope, and patience, so doesn't defeat.

Asian:
I really curious about why the old man did the arm wrestling with negro. I totally lost! I don't understand. And what mean that the old man said to his damaged hand. Why?

After the experience

HyeJin:
When we started this Reading circle, I was really nervous. Because actually I didn't like literature. When I was in high school, my worst subject was Literature. I couldn't understand why the writer thought like that or I didn't want to know the deep meaning of the story. So reading has been tough one for me.

After I read the whole story of the old man and the sea. I felt Hemingway is the greatest writer. For example, even though he didn't say anything to love of the old man to the young boy, we felt the real love.
EunMin:
Before this reading circle, I was confused when I met a foreigner, because I feel shy like many Koreans because of my speaking ability. But I had the self-confidence about my linguistic ability through this reading circle. I am satisfied with it. But the time was lacking to improve the English conversation skill I thought. So if I participate next semester too, I’d like to have the time to improve speaking skill enough.

Asian:
I can’t understand the paragraph totally. I totally lost. This novel was also very difficult for to read. So, I read them two times. The old man shows his very strong will. He didn’t give up for catching fish. The fish wasn’t ordinary. It was special. The catching fish was not only fishing but also it was fight with he and himself. Finally he won himself. Through this novel, I could get lots of vocabulary and the true meaning of life like the old man. I think the man is the real man who can win himself.
Rolling Your Own: Tailor-Making a Conversation Textbook

Lawrence White
Kookmin University, Seoul, South Korea

ABSTRACT

Commercially prepared conversation textbooks are fine productions, with glossy covers and all sorts of color pictures that reflect great expenditures of time, talent, and money. For the most part, however, they do not fit the Korean context of English as a Foreign Language, nor the constraints of the curriculum or schedule imposed upon the class. Additionally, as they are designed for many different locales to maximize profitability, they fit none particularly, and they are sanitized of any material that may be considered even slightly offensive (or not politically correct) in any market in which they may appear. Consider with this that the material is carefully graded with regard to vocabulary, restricting the text to the appropriate word list, contrary to what the student will encounter in actual language use. The result is an artificially bland product that starts with a high promise yet fails to deliver, requires a significant amount of classroom adaptation, and leaves most all involved with its use dissatisfied. There is a solution: write your own textbook. This paper will delve into the mysteries of assembling and producing a text that is informative, instructive, insightful, individualized, interesting, marvelously entertaining, erudite, exquisitely suited to the demands of the curriculum and schedule, and most of all expressing and reinforcing your particular instructional aims and goals.

PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

WHY

Producing a textbook is a daunting undertaking, and one must question the reasoning of attempting or pursuing such a task. There are several. First is boredom. One may just be looking for something to do. The afternoon soaps do not provide mental stimulation, so writing a textbook would definitely relive the ennui. Second, one may be overcome with a craving for masochism. Then again, one may feel an overwhelming sense of egotism and that anything produced would naturally be superior. However, one may feel a very strong sense of dissatisfaction with the material that is available. Then one may have the desire to provide his (or her) students with a textbook that will be excellently suited to them and their situation.

Commercial textbooks are inadequate for the instructor’s particular situation in several areas.

The first of these is content. Most all of the textbooks are intended for the
ESL market. In Korea, we have the EFL market. Then there is the number of lessons. Does the amount in the book fit the curriculum and schedule? Do you have twenty classes despite having fourteen lessons? Why not have the exact numbers you need? Are you teaching conversation or grammar? How many non-speaking activities are in the book? Do you want them or would you rather focus on oral production?

Now we come to an important decision: What is the focus of your class? Is it to be functional, task oriented, or communicative? Does your current or any available book offer you the choices that you need? What about time? Does the material in the book fill the class time? After completing a unit, are you left trying to fill 20 or 30 minutes? Why not have a book that fits perfectly with your allotted class periods?

How about your audience? Is it adults, university students, high school students, middle school students? Is there one book for all? How about ability? Do age and education matter? Are the groups the same? Can you find a book to fit?

One more point needs to be addressed: Is the material authentic? Would any native speaker ever use the dialogs in the text? Yes, what is there may be an idealized version of what people might say, but would anybody ever use it? Why not use material based on authentic speech?

How about the vocabulary? Is it too high, too low? Does it contain the words and expressions that native speakers would use? Is the context clear? Is it realistic?

Then there is methodology to be considered. Is it generalized? Is it suitable for your audience? Moreover, is it suitable for the instructor? Do you like it? Does it fit your abilities? Does it work to your strengths? Why not complement your abilities, and is it a pleasure to use?

**PART 2 - GETTING STARTED**

**DEFINE AND IDENTIFY**

To begin, several determinations need to be made.

**Objective**

What is the objective of the class? What audience are you trying to address? What is the purpose? What level of students is to be taught? What are their ages? What methodology do you prefer? How long should each class be? How many units or lessons do you need? All of these need to be ascertained at the start.

**Material Sources**

There are a variety of sources upon which to base the textbook: movies, television shows, plays, and the creative endeavor of writing your own. The scripts of the first three are frequently available on the Internet. The choice of which depends upon your objective. The amount of material for each unit is one scene. That is, a portion of the material that covers from two to three minutes of dialog.
PART 3 - ROLLING IT

This needs to be done for each unit to be used.

INITIAL

Several things need to be done initially. First, the scene needs to be selected. Second, an accurate transcription of the scene needs to be obtained. If it is not transcribed from the source, it needs to be carefully examined for accuracy.

SCENE ADJUSTMENT

The scene needs to be adjusted for length to fit the objective (see above), and then arranged so that the line layout reflects the pauses that would occur in natural speech, or in the manner that fits the instructional objectives.

BACKGROUND OR INTRODUCTION

For each scene, contextual background information needs to be supplied. This places the material into a frame of reference with which the learner can identify and relate. The amount and detail of this area again is dependent upon the objective and the audience.

VOCABULARY

If the material was selected properly, the vocabulary should be above the level of the group (Krashen, 1982). Identification of problematic words and phrases is beneficial. Definitions or explanations may be provided or can be left as an assignment or group activity.

LEXICAL EXPRESSIONS

Lexical expressions are a key component in developing linguistic fluency (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). These are selected from the scene and substitutable elements removed. A model may be supplied. Providing additional variations can be an in class exercise or out of class assignment. For example:

- I know you’re confused.
- I know you’re upset.
- I know you’re __________________.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

To assure comprehension of the scene and to encourage less structured conversation, several questions relative to the scene need to be prepared. The depth and complexity of these should be appropriate for the intended audience. The number of them can be adjusted for the time constraints or the focus of the class.
PART 4 - TESTING

Several components may serve as bases for evaluation.

VOCABULARY

The scene is a rich source of vocabulary items, and these are used with a particular sense in mind. Therefore, if the original context is presented as a test item, and the meaning of the identified word queried, the students will be encouraged to broaden their vocabularies. For example:

What does the word piqued mean as it is used in the following sentence?

My own curiosity was definitely piqued. ____________________________

Expressions encountered in the scene may also be tested either by explanation or by the substitution of an equivalent expression. For example:

In the following sentence, supply a substitute for the expression to knock out.

I knocked them all out in a week. ____________________________

or

What does to knock something out mean? ____________________________

DISCUSSION

One or more of the discussion questions from the scene may be selected and the students instructed to provide a written discourse on it. Although more time consuming, this could also be done orally.

PERFORMANCE

The student renditions of the scene may also be evaluated for pronunciation, prosody, fluency, and dramatic delivery (Cook, 2000).

PART 5 - USING IT

INTRODUCING A SCENE

The instructor briefly goes through the background material give additional information as required. During this phase, vocabulary comprehension can be evaluated and expanded, as well as providing any unusual contextual information.

LISTENING TO IT

If an audio recording is available, it may be played as a model. If not, the
instructor can read the script in a dramatic manner.

SAYING IT

The instructor models the scene, one line at a time, and the class repeats in chorus. During this time, attention can be paid to common pronunciation and prosodic errors.

DOING IT

Roles are assigned to match characters in the scene, and students are given an opportunity to rehearse their performance of the scene. The instructor moves among the groups observing and offering guidance on the accurate rendition of the material.

Following this, each group in turn goes to the front of the classroom and performs the scene. The instructor offers guidance and correction as needed.

TALKING ABOUT IT

Lexical Expressions
Groups can be formed in which the variations of the expression are discussed. The instructor then solicits responses from the class and evaluates their appropriateness.

Discussion Questions
The instructor presents each discussion question in turn, explaining it, and identifying key concepts within it. Groups are then formed to discuss one question. After each question, students switch groups so that each question is covered by a different collection of members.

PART 6 - CONCLUSION

DRAWBACKS

Making a textbook requires quite a bit of time and effort on the part of the instructor. The material must be carefully selected, organized, checked, and rechecked. Then it must be critically evaluated in terms of its adequacy of task: Did it do what it was supposed to do? Can you make it better?

Perhaps the most negative feature is that there is little or no remuneration.

BENEFITS

There are many benefits in the production of your own conversation textbook. First, it is tailor-made to your specifications, your audience, and your curriculum. Secondly, it is easily adjustable. If the entire book is not initially made available to the students, subsequent units can be easily modified to address any deficiency that is noted in the classroom during use. Thirdly, it is inexpensive for the student, with the total cost being just that of printing the
units. Fourthly, it is satisfying. You have created something that you will use, and you have done this in a manner that suits you best.

Finally, it works. Our class time is very limited, and this is the EFL situation. By creating and using your own textbook, you expose your students to authentic language and maximize the amount of it that is used in the classroom.

CAVEAT

There is a legal requirement that if you use copyrighted material you should obtain the copyright holders permission.
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Abstract

Faced with limited class time, language teachers often require students to engage in independent study. Unfortunately, conventional book based homework struggles to provide a rich, contextualized form of learning needed for language study. Many educators now utilize some form of technology, i.e., tapes, CDs, DVDs or computers to enrich homework, but overlook another potentially more powerful learning aid: the mobile phone almost every student carries. This paper will attempt to summarize how mobile learning (m-learning) has been previously been employed; the justifications given for its use; and the learning outcomes obtained. Finally, the potential mobiles offer for delivering homework that is more efficient will be discussed, and areas for further research will be explored.

Language learning takes time, and a semester of classes alone is unlikely to be of much benefit to students especially when all the other demands of Japanese university life are considered. In hopes of better learning outcomes, educators often give homework, which much of the research shows to be effective in enhancing learning (e.g., Cooper, Robinson, & Patall, 2006; Sharp, Keys, & Benefield, 2001). However, traditional paper and book homework are hard pressed to supply the rich learning environment current communicative constructivist theories of SLA require (Warschauer, 1997). In a search for solutions, educators have looked to technology in the form of personal computers (PCs) linked to the Internet to provide students with better learning opportunities inside and outside of class (see Salaberry, 2001 for an overview of technology in SLA).

The difficulties in employing technology to support an established curriculum became quickly evident in the first semester of teaching English at the tertiary level in a private university in Japan in 2007: students appeared to be learning little from an existing on-line computer facilitated program requirement. Two probable explanations emerged. Either students were not studying or they were doing so ineffectually. In an effort to ensure students were studying in a pedagogically sound manner (see below), students were required to study with their mobile phones (henceforth, “mobiles”). Positive initial impressions dictated the need for a literature review to understand the phenomenon.

Terminology

The recency of this field means that agreed-upon definitions for key
terminology have yet to be reached (Nichols, 2003; Tallent-Runnels et al. 2006; Salinas, 2006). To minimize misunderstanding this paper will use the following terms and definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Definition of Key Terms as Used in This Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended learning / Hybrid classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT**

This paper emerged from a year of teaching English at a private Japanese university, which requires all students to pass two semesters of English in order to meet the requirements for graduation.

**THE E-LEARNING CURRICULUM**

Classes may be considered to be blended in that students are required to attend weekly classes and complete on-line computer based course work. The software, provided by Net ALC Academy, was designed to facilitate learning of
material typical of the TOEIC Bridge Test.

**One Program, Two Tiers**

Students with placement test scores of less than 100 on the TOEIC Bridge are required to complete three semesters of vocabulary study, and one final semester of reading and listening practice. The vocabulary component is entirely on-line. Listening and reading material in the final semester is also on-line, but monitored through weekly in-class tests, which use dictations and cloze exercises to check comprehension. Students scoring in excess of 100 on the TOEIC Bridge Test are required to study listening and reading for all four semesters. As in the lower course, weekly cloze and dictation tests are administered to ensure student engagement.

**Students**

The majority of all students are recent Japanese high school graduates, with formalized English instruction through their last six years at school. While each student has individual strengths and weaknesses, it would be reasonable to describe the majority of students as demonstrating a lack of English ability in most aspects of language proficiency, and a lack of expressed desire to improve their English. Casual conversations before and during class indicate that students have low expectations of improving their English, as well as for English language study in general.

**Initial Learning Outcomes**

Initial testing and computer logs provided evidence that students were either too busy or uninterested in studying, or were doing so in an inefficient manner. “Busy” students had no time to visit the computer lab and lacked the time and/or resources to access the material outside of school. Uninterested students reported not wanting to study, but did not elaborate further. Students who *did* study, reported utilizing study skills, such as rote memorization, that were inefficient and ineffective as preparation for scoring well on the listening tests given, despite being informed of the form the test would take (personal experience, 2007).

**Intervention**

Informed by Swain’s 1985 output hypothesis (de Bot, 1996; Swain, 2000, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1995) that identifies the importance of output in language learning, students were required to practice by reading the material aloud with the aim of replicating the original recording as accurately as possible. In order to ensure the homework was being done, students were requested to use their mobiles to record and submit the sound files by email.
prior to the start of the next class. Students who did not submit the homework received an “Incomplete” on their homework mark for that week. This independent learning task was designed to require students to engage in vocal production, a pedagogically sound language practice (Nagata, 1999), in the hope it would provide students with a new, more efficient study technique.

**INTERVENTION OUTCOMES**

Test scores improved and a number of students noted spending less time studying than they had previously. A number of students continued using their mobile to study after it was no longer required, indicating some students may have found it useful.

**STUDY QUESTIONS**

In order to understand how this intervention may have assisted students, a literature review was undertaken to answer three questions:

a) What is the present consensus regarding the use of technology for educational purposes?

b) Is there any pedagogical justification or research that supports the use of mobile phones in SLA?

c) What further research needs to be done in order to understand how mobiles might support language learning?

**REVIEW**

Most of the research in m-learning emerges from prior e-learning studies, which in turn, are informed by findings in distance learning. Reviews indicate that all three approaches are as effective as the traditional face-to-face approach (Bernard et al. 2004; Kim, Mims, & Holmes, 2006; Russell, 1999; Tallent-Runnels et al., 2006; Swan, van’t Hooft, Kratcoski, & Schenker, 2007). Many researchers also note that any successful educational program must be supported by a robust underlying theory of how learning occurs (Lowerison, Sclater, Schmid, & Abrami, 2006; Nichols, 2003). Currently, many researchers feel that technology has a strong role in helping language learners engage in activities that support a learner-centered, constructivist, and cooperative theory of learning (Thornton & Sharples, 2005).

**E-LEARNING**

Initial e-learning forays, in which the established curriculum was digitalized, were judged to be less successful than later interventions, because they failed to consider the inherent strengths and weaknesses of e-learning (O’Reilly, 2004; Wagner, 2005) and utilize e-learning in pursuit of sound
pedagogical aims (e.g., Nichols, 2003; Tallent-Runnels et al., 2006). Claims made for e-learning are numerous, and controversial, but have included:

**Table 2. Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of E-learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces educational costs</td>
<td>High initial costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces learning times</td>
<td>Technological problems possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases learner retention</td>
<td>Not all skill can be taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initially attractive to students</td>
<td>Students may not initially accept it as educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and teaching on demand</td>
<td>Course development time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students control their learning pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived as valuable by many students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from O’Reilly, 2004)

**M-LEARNING**

M-learning is a very recent addition to the educational setting, made possible by advances in electronics and wireless networking. Early research utilized a broad range of devices including PDAs, notebook computers, iPods, and portable phones (for an overview see Kim, Mims, & Holmes, 2006). Later research tends to focus on mobile phones, with Prensky (2004) devoting an entire article to the position that they can be used to learn anything, as they now contain features previously found only in separate electronic devices.

**FEATURES OF M-LEARNING**

M-learning is seen by most as an important subcategory of e-learning, with mobiles viewed as small, mobile, internet-capable computers that support all e-learning approaches (de Jong, Specht, & Koper, 2008). A minority sees m-learning as revolutionary, arguing learners now have grown up in a networked world and thus process information in a different way (Baird & Fisher, 2005; Prensky, 2004). Both see mobiles as important because they buttress conventional e-learning with four powerful properties: popularity, mobility, hyper-communicativity, and multiple features.

**POPULAR**

Reviews of mobile use find a number of features to be evident: almost every adult has one (Thornton & Houser, 2004; Prensky, 2004); the university student demographic are as likely to use a mobile as a PC (Comscore, 2007); users are not threatened by the technology (Attewell, 2005), and are, in fact, confident and comfortable using it (e.g., Clark, 2003; Butler & Pinto-Zipp, 2005; Rekkedal, 2002; Attewell, 2005; Schwabe & Göth, 2005; Fryer, 2004); and the role they play in their daily lives means that using them to learn is
akin to “blending learning and entertainment” (Thornton & Sharples, 2005).

From a pedagogical perspective, parallels can be drawn with the argument that task value and attraction have a positive effect on learning intention and emotional state, with important knock on effects for learning (Boekarts, 1997).

MOBILE

Much of the literature stresses the importance portability plays in m-learning: they can be used anywhere and anytime (Prensky, 2004); providing learners with flexibility in how to finish homework (Thornton & Sharples, 2005); which in turn may encourage study in contexts that are richer and more natural (Lave & Wenger, 1990); and more immediately relevant to the learner (Peters, 2007), freeing learners from the restraints of location, technology and time, and expanding opportunities for student-centered learning (e.g., Fryer, 2004; Pettit & Kukulska-Hulme, 2007; Thornton & Houser, 2004; Sharples, 2000).

COMMUNICATIVE

The literature frequently reminds us that mobiles are designed to facilitate all forms of communication (Prensky, 2004). Synchronous (spoken and written) and asychronic communication (via email, blogs, or message boards) (Jones, Asensio, & Goodyear, 2006) support collaborative learning outside class time (Swan, van’t Hooft, Kratcoski, & Schenker, 2007), and full and active participation during in-class discussions (Kim, Mims, & Holmes, 2006). Mobiles help establish better lines of communication among class members outside of class (Virvous & Alepis, 2005; Oloruntoba, 2006); allow students to find real time help for problems that arise when doing homework (Aramatas, Holt, & Rice., 2005; Kim, Mims, & Holmes, (2006)); support the distribution, exchange and submission of learning materials (Kim, Mims, & Holmes, 2006), and deliver customized instruction when needed (Virvous & Alepis, 2005; Oku, 2001). Better communication builds stronger bonds between class participants, potentially increasing motivation (Rau, Gao, & Wu, 2006) and learning opportunities with an attendant improvement in learning outcomes.

MULTI-FEATURED

Current mobiles come loaded with a wide range of features that effectively replaces up to seven different electronic devices (Prensky, 2004): phone, music recorder/player, camera, video camera, PDA (Swan, van’t Hooft, Kratcoski, & Unger, (2005), PC, and electronic dictionary (Thornton & Sharples, 2005). Mobiles also support the exchange, storage and forwarding of text, sound, image and video (Oku, 2001; Monk, Ozawa, & Thomas, 2006) allowing students many ways in which to express themselves. Mobiles can utilize software too, though Keegan (2004) notes educational and training software has yet to emerge. Richer environments foster learning which mobiles’ multiple
features support.

**Potential Problems**

As with any technology, mobiles do have limitations to overcome. Trifonova (2003) notes that much of the discussion concerning mobile use has focused on its educational potential, while either minimizing or ignoring potential problems. Technical failures (Swan, van’t Hooft, Kratcoski, & Unger, 2005), screens too small to read on (Shudong & Higgins, 2005; Kukulska-Hulme, 2007), laborious data entry (Swan, van’t Hooft, Kratcoski, & Unger, 2005), and the wide variety of phones available can make their use problematic. Furthermore, mobiles are personal devices; data and learner privacy (Kim, Mims, & Holmes, 2006) need to be secure to ensure that learners feel comfortable in engaging with the material at hand. However, none of these problems are insurmountable, provided educators are aware of what they are, and take the required steps to neutralize them.

**Blended Learning**

Blending learning and multimedia use has now become the norm in language classes, as few teachers would want to return to a purely text-driven curriculum. Many textbooks come packaged with a CD or DVD, which is often used in class and/or as homework. Most research shows it to be effective because it enriches learning opportunities (O’Reilly, 2004; Moore, 2005). Mobiles offer more educational affordances than the static content available on CDs and DVDs, making them powerful learning tools provided they are used in pursuit of pedagogically sound goals.

**Mobile-Facilitated Homework**

The m-learning research lends support to the use of mobiles in supplying students with more appealing, richer, and more forms of homework that can be done at the learner’s convenience and in a form that may well result in better learning outcomes. What needs to be determined is how to accentuate the possible benefits of m-learning and minimize the inherent weaknesses.

**Directions for Further Research**

In order to determine the most effective use of m-learning numerous studies have been undertaken. The majority of this research focuses on descriptions of how m-learning was used in a particular educational setting, and how the participants perceived it. The initial positive impressions obtained indicate that mobiles can motivate students to study and learn. Educators now need to determine how to maximize the potential of mobiles in support of better learning outcomes. Empirical studies that compare the effectiveness of m-learning, e-learning and traditional approaches in supplying quality
homework to students are needed. Observations from classes that used mobiles have encouraged this researcher to undertake a more rigorous examination of the role of mobiles in improving learning through pedagogically richer homework. A more extensive study will begin in spring of 2008, to attempt to isolate and measure the effect m-learning has on learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION

It is ironic that we, as a species, are so adept at making tools, but so hesitant to use them. Tools do no more than the wielding hand wills, but so much more than would be possible without them. The traditional classroom is not a natural construct, but a tool that has proven adept at facilitating learning, especially when students are engaged in appropriate, meaningful activities appropriate to the classroom. Pedagogically sound homework can advance language learning as well, but may be difficult to implement. Current theories of language learning stress holistic learning in which students are regularly engaged in rich, contextualized, collaborative practice of personal relevance. Traditional book-based homework may address these goals, though doing so when a more suitable option - a mobile, is waiting in our students’ bags - seems churlish, and counterproductive.

So rather than fight the trend for kids to come to school carrying their own powerful learning devices - which they have already paid for! - why not use the opportunity to our advantage? (Prensky, 2004, p. 3)

Mobiles are a recent innovation to most educators, but a feature of life for our students. No research yet proves mobiles to be efficacious for learning, but there are indicators that they may help (Zurita & Nussbaum, 2004), provided they are used appropriately in pursuit of sound pedagogical goals. Mobiles promote collaborative and student-centered learning beyond the confines of the classroom; provide students with the learning resources needed as required, in a controlled, familiar, and appealing form, and with the flexibility to study in the manner, time and place desired. Our students have the technology, and show the skills and willingness to use it. All that is lacking is the permission and guidance on how to go about doing so.

All the answers are not yet known, and more research is needed to determine how, and to what degree mobiles can and should be utilized. However, as we await these findings, mobiles can readily replace much of the technology presently used for homework and replace it with more appealing, richer, engaging, holistic homework than was previously feasible. The potential is there, students are there, and now we, as educators, need to get mobile.
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Updating Basic Vocabulary in EFL
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ABSTRACT

In line with the trend in East Asia of shifting the fundamental design from a knowledge-based English teaching curriculum to a behavior-based one, teachers should rethink the quality of basic vocabulary for limited classroom hours. This study introduces a meta-analysis for the basic vocabularies of popular dictionaries and vocabulary lists by means of a new conflation approach that includes a factor involving the cognitive load for irregular conjugations and other inflections, as well as derivations for beginners who have struggled with learning English. The core vocabulary of English still changes slowly. However, a closer look at the word frequencies, genres, and influences on the first language texts has demonstrated the necessity for introducing new words. With knowledge of such basic vocabulary profiles, teachers can help such ‘repeating beginners’ to recognize what words should be learned first.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSES

The teaching of English is an area that has been emphasized the most for this half century in the school curricula in East Asia, and the development of EFL methodologies and tools has been quite active. The use of either paper-based or electronic-based bilingual dictionaries is a popular realistic learning strategy for reading inside and outside the classroom. For example, in Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, almost all colleges have the students learn English as a mandatory subject. Educators and researchers in language teaching are concerned about a situation in which some students have low motivation for learning. In this study, we pay attention to their students’ learning history, which consists mainly of remedial courses, and thus call them “repeating beginners.”

Teachers hope such students catch a reasonable hint of how to read English texts by means of dictionaries, which are the most common tool in the local EFL environment. In addition, less stressful learning is expected to develop the autonomy of students (Finch, 2006). The intent of this study is to show what characteristics the basic or important vocabularies in popular dictionaries and vocabulary lists have and what points teachers should notice and use in the classroom.
VOCABULARY SIZE

According to the current teaching guidelines of Japan, the educational ministry has decreased the required amount of knowledge and the level of skills expected of high school students. The required size of vocabulary in High School English II, which emphasizes reading activities, is presently 1,800 words. It was 2,000 words in the previous guideline, and was 2,250 words before that. In accordance with decreasing vocabulary size, teachers need to consider what words they should underline for efficient teaching with the limited classroom hours available to them.

What size of vocabulary is necessary in your classroom? Many ESL and EFL studies have focused on a vocabulary size of 3,000 to 12,000 words (Laufer, 1985, 1989; Nation, 1990; Ostyn & Godin, 1985; Schmitt, 2000). Here, this study proposes a question: How can teachers use a vocabulary of 3,000 or more words effectively in their classroom? The aforementioned teaching guidelines do not restrict teachers to teaching difficult words that are not included in such lists; however, current academic expectations may actually limit the vocabulary size to below 3,000 words without delineating whether this refers to active or passive vocabulary size or considering its dependence on the genre and properties of a text and the definition of a word. In a typical ESL environment, most classroom activities consist of basic words from the 0-to-1,000 or 0-to-2,000 or a little higher frequency level (Coady, Magoto, Hubbard, Graney, & Mokhtari, 1993; Laufer & Nation, 1995; Meara, Lightbown, & Halter, 1997). Many English-Japanese dictionaries set the most basic vocabulary sizes to around 1,000 words. Hirsh and Nation (1992) demonstrate data indicating that a vocabulary of 2,000 words and proper nouns covers about 95% of the words in the text of novels for teenagers or young readers of L1 and, presumably, general L2 learners. Nation & Hwang (1995) suggest that non-native speakers can go on to academic study with a 2,000-word-level vocabulary. Laufer (1989) draws a figure that if a reader knows 95% of the running words in a text, he or she can comprehend the context with sufficient accuracy. As for learning style, students showed higher achievement with assisted approaches than peers with a similar profile with unassisted approaches (Kuhn & Stahl, 2003).

It can be considered valuable for a certain group of today's EFL learners, namely, repeating beginners, to obtain and utilize a high-quality small-size vocabulary. The vocabulary size of around 1,000 words is suitable to the classes of all of the junior high schools, most of the senior high schools, and many of the colleges, workplaces, or continued learning organizations in East Asia. Basic vocabulary should be set up according to each classroom situation, taking into consideration its frequency, coverage or scope, availability, learnability, familiarity, and other factors (Murata, 1997). This study tries a systematic selection of useful words with meta-analysis for English-Japanese dictionaries and vocabulary lists.

WORD SELECTION

REVIEW OF WORD-COUNTING METHODS

We know many ways to count words (Bauer & Nation, 1993; Galvez, de
Moya-Anegón, & Solana, 2005; among others). For instance, many dictionaries arrange words that have the same spellings but have different etymologies and different meanings as well as organize different parts of speech into different entries (Clarke & Nation, 1980; Hosenfeld, 1977). Much research has discussed the effectiveness of word conflation or normalization (see, for example, Harman, 1991; Hull, 1996; Lennon, Pierce, Tarry, & Willett, 1981). A representative way of counting words is to count all inflectional and derivational variants as individual words. This headword system inevitably increases the number of words in a list. One particular merit of this token approach is its easy access to entries. The other ways of counting words create conflation processes for surface representations. One approach is to group verb conjugations into one basic form. With this stemming method, the size of the vocabulary can be reduced by about one third (Porter, 1980). Moreover, affix variants may be incorporated into one base form. On the other hand, one weakness of this way is the difficulty for beginners in finding the base form owing to the many kinds of affixations (White, Power, & White, 1989). Another idea of counting is the same as lemmatization in corpus studies. In this case, the word “good” should include its comparative form “better” as a word family member. Non-hyphenated compound nouns and, furthermore, hyphenated compounds may be incorporated into a single word root. Beginners invariably have difficulty associating a derived word that frequently appears and forms its own semantic domain with an original word that frequently appears and possesses another distinct semantic domain. In brief, each approach has both merits and demerits.

WORD CONFLATION

This section explains a new ground rule of word conflation. From the viewpoint of the learners’ psychology, words in the same form should be integrated into a single entry even though the words have different parts of speech, different meanings, different etymological sources, or different usages (Jackson, 2002). Beginners can follow the regular inflection rule relatively easily. Therefore, inflectional variants are grouped into one word if a verb is of the regular conjugation type and a noun is of the regular pluralizing type. In the Freiburg-Brown Corpus of American English (Hundt, Sand, & Skandera, 1999), often called the “Frown Corpus,” the base form “look” appears 434 times. The related forms, “looks,” “looking,” and “looked” appear 124, 234, and 404 times, respectively, according to the regular conjugation rule. Thus, the word family in this definition “look” appears at a total frequency of 1,196. In contrast, the verb “take” and its past form “took” appear 564 and 417 times, respectively. In this study, the two were handled as different entries because of the irregular conjugation’s possible heavy load placed on the beginners’ learning capacity (Bauer & Nation, 1993; Dulan & Burt, 1974; Schmitt, 2000). Furthermore, the comparatives of irregular types were counted as individual entries. The possessives and the contractions were included in the originals, but the irregulars, as for example “won’t,” were individual entries. One exception was the irregular form “cannot,” which was included in its original “can” because of the easy association with the base form.

Items that are more technical are briefly mentioned as follows. British spellings and other variants in global Englishes were grouped according to
their American counterparts. Non-hyphenated compound nouns were counted as individual entries. Idioms and colloquial expressions were incorporated into the words of the main components according to syntactic or semantic weight, or as a last measure, subjective judgment. We have treated derivatives of agent as individual entries. This can avoid a semantic collision or concomitance inside a word family, as for example with “employer” and “employee.” In addition, we have grouped adjectives and adverbs derived from nouns into different words. There are different and important rules for deriving adjectives and adverbs from nouns, and thus the memorization of those words is invariably a heavy load for beginners.

One value of this recollation is the consideration afforded repeating beginners. On the other hand, a major problem in this conflation is the difficulty in distinguishing homographs. In fact, a high frequency word is highly polysemous.

**WORD FREQUENCY LEVEL SETTING**

We shall now look at the quality of basic vocabulary. One general idea in foreign language learning is that learners should set a higher priority to learning higher-frequency words than lower-frequency ones. Based on this idea of usefulness, for frequency level setting, we have used the frequency data of the Frown Corpus after the above-mentioned conflation process, and reached a finding of a critical point of the token curve at a word frequency of around 20 as shown in Figure 1. Proper nouns and hyphenated words often appeared at this frequency level and below. We know low-frequency words vary by nature. The differences in the ratio of the token at a particular word frequency to the token at its adjacent word frequency increased around a word frequency of 19. This study has thus deleted the words appearing at a word frequency of 18 and below. The cut-off process for eliminating rare words and proper nouns decreased the total words from 996,264 to 794,114. The remaining body still covered 85.7% of the tokens in the original data of the Frown Corpus. The top 100 words in the recollapsed frequency rank showed almost no change from the original. In terms of a large jump between the ranks, the most frequent word of the regular inflection type was “work,” which ranked 98th in the original and 73rd in the recollapsed data.

**Figure 1. Tokens at Word Frequencies**

![Tokens at Word Frequencies](image-url)
SELECTION OF DICTIONARIES AND VOCABULARY LISTS

This study selected nine popular English-Japanese dictionaries in addition to four vocabulary lists made in Japan. For a comparison of chronological changes in basic vocabulary, one English-Japanese dictionary published in the 1970s was included in the selection. For additional references, the defining vocabulary lists in two English dictionaries published by British publishers, three vocabulary lists made in English-speaking countries, and another vocabulary list used by a broadcasting service for non-native speakers were considered.

Table 1 shows the references used in this analysis. EE means an English monolingual dictionary and EJ an English-Japanese dictionary, whereas EL indicates a vocabulary list made in an English-speaking country, and JL a vocabulary list made in Japan. The items referenced are the year of publication, the real number of words in the basic vocabulary, and the word coverage ratio to the Frown Corpus. The real number of words indicates the number of words after the conflation process in this study. The coverage to the Frown Corpus is a ratio of the sum of appearances of words placed in a basic vocabulary to that in the Frown Corpus (Asai, 2005) up to the rank of the least frequent word in the basic vocabulary. For instance, the number of words in the General Service List, or GSL, by West (1953) is 1,000. The words included in GSL appeared 616,711 times in total in the Frown Corpus. The appearances of words from the first rank to the 1,000th rank were 670,875 in the Frown Corpus. The ratio of 616,711 to 670,875 was 0.919. This frequency-rank scaling ratio indicates the power of coverage of the vocabulary. Note that the coverage may be over 1 with the folding effect of conflation. Figure 2 shows the coverage to the Frown Corpus on the sizes of basic vocabularies.

Table 1. Statistics Among Basic Vocabularies in Dictionaries and Vocabulary Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionaries</th>
<th>Virtual Name of Reference</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Real Number of Basic Words</th>
<th>Coverage to Frown Corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ1</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ2</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ3</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ4</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ5</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ6</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ7</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ8</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ9</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ10</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 2. Coverage to the Frown Corpus on the Sizes of Basic Vocabularies

![Graph showing coverage to the Frown Corpus vs. size of basic vocabulary]

### Discussion

Figure 2 shows that the coverage to the Frown Corpus does not depend on the size of basic vocabulary. This suggests how important the selection of basic vocabulary is. Next, this section describes a similarity analysis of the vocabularies surveyed. Figure 3 shows the configuration for plots for Boolean-processed data of the vocabularies according to Quantification Theory III (Hayashi, 1952; Komazawa, 1982). The configuration expresses numerical relations among the data sets in two dimensions, and the scales on both axes represent relative units. We interpreted the horizontal axis as showing efficiency in matching for the basic vocabularies. As a larger number of words in the basic vocabulary of a dictionary were shared with the other dictionaries, the plot for a dictionary was placed further to the left in the figure. When the vocabulary size of a dictionary was smaller at certain matching than those of other dictionaries, the plot was placed also leftward. A plot to the left indicated that its basic vocabulary consisted of high-frequency words. The vertical axis seemed partly to show a degree of regionality in the condition of the same vocabulary size. The British-corpus-based dictionaries were placed
above the horizontal axis, and the Japanese educators’ traditional selections were below the line. The sources that showed high matching with the Frown Corpus were placed near the horizontal axis, which meant the characteristic choices of words in American English. On the other hand, the $EL_4$ plot of the basic vocabulary for broadcasting was far from the others. This reflects a strong need of terms in politics, economics, and social development. Another characteristic is that the large vocabulary size sources tended to be placed toward the bottom. In short, this configuration suggests that basic vocabularies vary to a considerable degree, and teachers should make themselves aware of the fact.

**Figure 3. Configuration of Plots for Data of the Vocabularies**

The core vocabulary of English changes slowly. GSL is widely used as a standard of vocabulary reference even today. In detail, however, old dictionaries and lists, such as $E_{J10}$ and $E_{L1}$, performed relatively low word coverage as shown in Table 1. This could lead to inefficiency in vocabulary acquisition. New words appear in ESL and EFL materials every year. Some of the new words, such as “computer,” “access,” “click,” “file,” and “menu,” definitely come into the high frequent group. For example, “computer” appeared 92 times in our recompiled data of the Frown Corpus. These words become more important in this information technology age, and are familiar to Japanese college students, including repeating beginners, as loanwords in $L_1$ (Asai & Ishikawa, 2006). Also, “online” and “security” will often appear in the latest texts, and will be important after the students’ graduation. In this sense, teachers have to watch the trend of words in our everyday lives, and should positively update the vocabulary to meet the demands in the present day. One practical idea of updating basic vocabulary is to refer to a newly released corpus or incremental data of a large-scale reliable corpus as demonstrated here. Another idea is to check reports on socio-linguistic surveys at conferences or workshops and in magazines or journals. In any event, teachers
should be sensitive to the lexical trend in both L1 and L2 texts.

**CONCLUSION**

Our needs in the real world are changing. Teachers should rethink basic vocabulary, depending on their classroom situations. Word selection is based on careful consideration of the local curricula or academic or business usefulness, word frequency data from corpora recently published, or other sources. In particular, a small-size vocabulary is thought to be useful for repeating beginners. This study has introduced a new conflation approach for repeating beginners, and has demonstrated the word profiles of basic vocabularies by the indicators of word coverage and a similarity configuration. Dictionary use can be a better strategic choice in reading for struggling beginners to become successful learners than just guessing or skipping (Asai, 2007; Gu & Johnson, 1996; Luppescu & Day, 1992; Scholfield, 1999). Once repeating beginners notice the usefulness of a dictionary itself and its use, they will have a chance to go into autonomous learning. For better classes, teachers should know the profile of their students’ dictionary, and can give the students helpful advice.

**NOTES**

The dictionaries are commercial products, and therefore, neither their real names nor even their publishers are disclosed. If a reader is interested in more details, he or she should consult the author directly.
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ABSTRACT

Limited research has been conducted in Japan on learner preferences regarding EFL materials. A survey conducted at 10 private universities in Japan (N = 295) sought to elicit the views of tertiary level learners. The research questions were as follows: 1. What do Japanese tertiary-level students want from EFL educational media? 2. Do the student responses suggest underlying themes that teachers should consider when selecting texts?

Twenty-four items from the survey dealt explicitly with these questions, and the results are presented here. Reliability for the survey was calculated at .91. Further, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted, and a three-factor solution is presented. Factors underlying student preferences to EFL material are suggested as being: learning opportunities; attractiveness of text; and, home-study opportunities. These factors account for 58% of the observed variance.

INTRODUCTION

Textbooks and other educational media such as websites, CD-ROMs, and workbooks, are an unpleasant fact in formal education environments; however, the role they play is not limited to the transmission of knowledge. Textbooks are also believed to have a socializing function, in that they can either serve to transform the social order or help to preserve the status quo (Kalmus, 2004).

Japanese students at the tertiary level have been found to be critical of the materials they are presented with; they consider the instructor responsible for the texts, and maintain that passivity in the classroom is in part shaped by poorly selected materials (Schwalb & Sukemune, 1998).

Despite the ubiquity of textbooks and their apparent influence on learners, there is almost no agreement on best practice for the selection and use of texts. Summarizing the literature on the use of textbooks, Moulton (1994) noted that textbooks make more of an impact on student achievement than any other source of input; however, this is not to say that adopting a textbook will automatically provide successful learning outcomes. In fact, when classes were directly observed as part of a research agenda, findings included that teachers using the same texts had very different ways of using them, and that there were large discrepancies between the teachers’ accounts of how they used the materials and what the observers recorded.

In summary, textbooks in first language (L1) education are found to be both commonly used and implicated with successful learning. Within Japan,
student perceptions of the suitability of L1 texts apparently affect their performance in the classroom. Textbooks remain under-researched in terms of how learning actually occurs, and substantial differences between how teachers believe they use texts and expert observation exist.

L2 STUDIES

In a study comprising 50 experienced, qualified English teachers, and 997 tertiary-level language learners in Hong Kong, Spratt (1999) attempted to measure teachers’ awareness of student preferences. The survey instrument covered testing, types of feedback, reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks, and found statistically significant differences between student preferences and teacher perceptions in each category. Spratt found that teachers could only correctly predict which activities learners liked with 54% accuracy. Spratt noted that there was no systematic or predictable pattern to be seen in which teachers were reliable sources of knowledge regarding student preferences in second language (L2) learning activities (Spratt, 1999).

This lack of agreement among teachers as to what students find useful and interesting perhaps accounts for the strength of some of the views expressed in the L2 literature on textbooks’ usefulness and selection. English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) texts have been described as “vital and positive” (Hutchinson & Torres, 1994, p. 315) yet also “…the tainted end-product of an author’s or a publisher’s desire for a quick profit” (Sheldon, 1988, p. 239).

Practicing teachers frequently solicit feedback from learners about classroom materials and activities, and will often act on student comments. However, individual classes can differ greatly from each other, even when the same teacher presents the same material in the same way. For this reason, large-scale studies may perhaps provide more useful guidance in the end.

L2 STUDIES IN JAPAN

Two large-scale studies investigating learner attitudes in Japan are of particular relevance. Both Hullah (2003) and Long (1998) provide evidence that learners consider the textbooks they use a factor that affects their motivation to learn. Each surveyed students using a combination of Likert-type scale items and open-ended items that students could respond to if they wished. Hullah (2003) focused specifically on language learner texts, while Long (1998) chose to examine learner attitudes towards the English language program offered at his institution.

Hullah’s (2003) survey of 365 first year university students at 10 universities in Japan included five conversation texts (N = 193) and five content-based texts (N = 172), which he then compared in terms of student satisfaction. The survey consisted of two sections: the first consisting of eight items, focusing on enjoyment, difficulty level, age-appropriateness, and perceptions of improvement, using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Six of the items were positively worded, and were considered to deal with “satisfaction”, and the other two were negatively worded and dealt with “dissatisfaction”. 
Reliability estimates for the two constructs were given as .86 for satisfaction, and .91 for dissatisfaction.

On seven of the eight items, content-focused texts received more favorable ratings than the conversation texts; the exception being an item regarding difficulty: “This textbook’s English is too difficult for me” (Hullah, 2003, p. 16).

In the second section of the survey, students were offered the option of responding in Japanese to two questions; the first was “What is the best thing about this textbook?” and the second was “What is the worst thing about this textbook?” For the conversation texts, the most frequent responses related to difficulty level, in both positive and negative ways. Sixty-one respondents viewed the text they were using positively because “It’s easy,” while 63 claimed it was “too easy” (Hullah, 2003, p. 16). Unfortunately, Hullah did not separate the responses by classroom, so the reader does not know if members of intact classes were divided in opinion regarding the texts they were using or if in some classes there was a consensus that the text was too easy while in other classes the text was considered too difficult.

The comments for the content-focused texts were rather different, with the most frequent positive comment, made by 73 respondents, being that the text was “interesting”. The most common response to the item on the texts’ worst feature was “nothing,” given by 41 respondents.

Hullah (2003) concluded that teachers should consider the level of challenge and age-appropriateness when selecting texts, and suggested that a switch to content-focused materials might be in order for many classes.

A second large-scale study (Long, 1998) focused on the attitudes of students within one program, thus potentially providing a useful contrast to the more general study by Hullah. Long’s intention was to improve the quality of his workplace program through responding to students’ attitudes. Six hundred sixty-two first-grade technical college students taking a required English class were surveyed. The survey consisted of 48 Likert-type items, scaled from 1 to 5, and three open-ended questions. The survey aimed to learn about students’ opinions in three areas: teacher-related factors, education-related factors, and student suggestions. One item focused specifically on the perceived usefulness of the designated text used by all instructors, while several other items assessed the way the instructors approached the material. In common with other studies regarding educational media, the responses to the text were mixed. On the Likert-type item, 37% of students evaluated the text positively, while 27% viewed it negatively. In the open-ended questions, no positive comments were noted regarding the quality of the text itself, although some students asked for changes to the teachers’ pacing of the material. A limited number of negative views were expressed, notably that the text was boring, but also that some teachers planned activities that had no connection to the textbook.

Unlike Hullah’s (2003) survey, which was administered in English, Long (1998) made the choice to produce a Japanese version and an English version of his survey, and teachers could apparently select which form to use. However, Long made no mention of what proportion of the respondents used the Japanese language version. Some of the items were retrospectively considered too abstract for the students (Long, 1998, p. 26), although whether this could have been avoided by administering the survey only in Japanese,
and what other differences this might have made to the data collected is unclear.

Both Hullah (2003) and Long (1998) focused their surveys on Japanese students’ attitudes towards textbooks; their chosen topic was texts that the students were currently using. Their findings suggest that students have opinions on the topic of educational media, and appear to welcome the opportunity to express these opinions. Long aimed to investigate and improve his institution’s program, while Hullah wanted to find out how satisfied learners were with the materials they were using. Both articles make insightful comments on the role of instructional materials in Japanese tertiary language education. The issues pertaining to material selection and use, however, are too complex to be covered in any one piece of research. What follows is an attempt to build on the current understanding of students’ attitudes regarding EFL texts, largely by addressing questions that have not yet been asked by previous research inventories.

Both Hullah (2003) and Long (1998) reported descriptive statistics for their data, and included sample responses from the open-ended items. Although they each report the respondents’ attitudes, neither sought to gain a deeper understanding of the underlying issues that affect students’ attitudes towards educational media. Such an understanding would be perhaps more generalizable and therefore useful to classroom teachers than the studies conducted to date, and could be achieved by asking students their opinions regarding educational materials in general, rather than having them comment on the specific texts they are currently using. The benefit of a more general approach is this: if it is true that students care about the educational media they encounter in their language learning classes, teachers could then make responsible materials-related decisions based on their learners’ true preferences, as opposed to in reaction to materials the learners are currently using. To illustrate this point, had Long’s (1998) survey found that the students strongly disliked the text they were using, there was little guarantee that the survey format he used could have helped choose a replacement text that would have satisfied the students: one subjective choice would simply have replaced another.

**Research Questions**

Common findings from the studies reviewed so far have been that teachers do not understand student preferences well, and that students are less than satisfied with the textbook choices made on their behalf by teachers or institutions.

Furthermore, published studies to date conducted in Japan have only focused on obtaining feedback about a few specific texts, rather than focusing on aspects of texts in general that students consider positive, meaning that few of their findings can help teachers with selection. The purpose of this paper is to address these issues. In order to do this, the following two research questions are investigated:

a) What do Japanese tertiary-level students want from EFL educational media?
b) Do the student responses suggest underlying themes that teachers should consider when selecting texts?

Tertiary level students have shown clear individual preferences in previous studies regarding educational media, e.g., Spratt, (1999), including those studies conducted relatively recently in Japan (e.g., Hullah, 2003; Long, 1998; and Schwab & Sukemune, 1998). This study expects to find that opinions will be forthcoming and that research questions one and two will find variance in the students’ responses to the survey detailed in the next section. Descriptive statistics are expected to show whether some aspects of educational material are seen as more desirable than others to tertiary level learners. The survey itself will only yield ordinal data, that is, a rank ordering of an attribute. In the case of this study, the larger the number, the more desirable the attribute is perceived to be by the respondents; however, a figure twice as large as another does not mean that the more popular attribute is twice as desirable. Despite this, with a large enough number of respondents, a clear picture of which aspects of EFL texts students do or do not care for should emerge, and in doing so, should allow insights into which aspects are of particular interest to them.

Regarding research question two, again, given a sufficient sample size, an analysis of the data may reveal patterns that assist teachers with textbook selection. To this end, an exploratory factor analysis will be conducted. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) has been described as separating data “into its constituent factors, that is, dimensions or sources of influence” (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995, p. 107); in other words, if the items on a survey are considered as separate variables, EFA can be used to interpret the results by suggesting a limited number of new variables that help make sense of the data.

The survey was designed to ascertain whether certain features of educational media were considered important to students. The four predicted factors included in the survey are: text attractiveness: whether the materials are aesthetically pleasing or not to the students; home-study opportunities: features such as CDs, DVDs, and websites connected to the text; task design: whether certain tasks have greater appeal to students over other tasks; and learner development: whether or not students are motivated by the prospect of texts’ abilities to improve aspects of their language skills, such as vocabulary, confidence, and standardized test scores. These four factors are based on conversations with teachers, students, textbook authors, and my own subjective experiences.

In summary, two research questions have been formulated. The first: “What do Japanese tertiary-level students want from EFL educational media?” is similar to some extent to previous research conducted in Japan in that the question will be answered through looking at the results of student responses. Question one differs from previous research in that it asks students for their opinions on EFL materials in a general sense, rather than asking them to comment on specific texts they are currently using.

The second question “Do the student responses suggest underlying themes that teachers should consider when selecting texts?” builds on the first, and has had no large-scale equivalent study conducted in Japan to date. The data are expected to show that students will care about some aspects of educational media more than others, although no specific predictions as to which are
made. Without any previous research to consider, no predictions are made as to the four factors the survey aims to investigate: attractiveness, home-study opportunities, task design, and learning opportunities.

**METHOD**

**The Survey**

A 31-item survey on learner attitudes to EFL educational media was produced. Twenty-nine of the items used an agreement response scale (Palomba & Banta, 1999, p. 186), rated strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. These were later scaled 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively, for purposes of data handling. Items 1-24 focused on EFL texts in general, and items 25-29 asked students about their perceptions of their proficiency and motivation, and the text used in the current class. The two remaining items were open-ended, and sought student feedback on how texts in general could be improved, and for any other comment they wished to give.

The survey was translated into Japanese with the help of an experienced Japanese researcher (Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics), and assistance was given in proofreading the translation by two Japanese doctoral candidates (both Ed.D. in Education). The survey was progressively piloted at four private universities and one public university in Western Japan, with participants of the same background as the intended participants. After taking the survey, the participants in the pilot study were asked to indicate which, if any, of the items had been difficult to answer or had been unclear to them. Because of the piloting, the wording of one item, regarding task design, was altered.

The survey was intended to be simple to complete for two reasons: first, that it should not be onerous for teachers to conduct, and not require too much of their classroom time, and secondly, in order to obtain genuine data from the participants. The use of a Scantronic-type format was rejected, as I felt it would place a burden on the students by asking them to take care over how they completed the survey. I felt it would be fairer to the participants if they could mark the responses on the survey with relative ease and speed, and therefore the survey gave a generous amount of space for them to mark their responses. Ten to fifteen minutes were found to be sufficient for completion of the survey during the piloting stage. Data were manually entered into a spreadsheet program from the surveys for both the pilot and final versions of the survey.

**PARTICIPANTS**

Twelve native English-speaking teachers at 11 private universities in the Kansai and Kyushu regions of Japan agreed to conduct the final version of the survey, and 11 teachers subsequently returned data: a response rate of 92%. The participating teachers all held master’s degrees in TESOL or other education-related subjects, and had a mean of 6.2 years of experience at the university level. The criterion for inclusion was that the students were taking English communication classes. Each teacher was using an EFL textbook. All
students were either in their first or second year of a four-year program. The survey was conducted at the end of the academic year 2006 (i.e., in December 2006 or January 2007, depending on each institution’s calendar), and so each student had at least one year of exposure to tertiary level EFL educational materials. A brief, a 7-item survey was given to teachers, asking about the learners and how the text had been selected. Both teachers and students categorized the students’ proficiency as “low.”

**PROCEDURE**

Teacher participants chose a time suitable to them to administer the survey, i.e., at the start or end of a class. The teachers were asked to briefly introduce the survey, and then give the students 10-15 minutes in which to complete it. After completing the survey, the teachers then either handed back the surveys, or returned them by post.

All response scale data were entered into a spreadsheet program, and then imported into SPSS version 10, which was then used in the analysis.

**RESULTS**

Six hundred thirty five Japanese tertiary level students were surveyed on their attitudes towards EFL educational media. For the purposes of the exploratory factor analysis, it was decided to separate the data into two groups, following Field (2005), as this allows for the first set to be used to form hypotheses; the second set of data was to be used for a confirmatory factor analysis, which enables the researcher to ascertain the validity of the hypotheses (Field, 2005, pp. 629-631). The first data set comprised 295 students from intact classes from 6 of the 11 participating universities.

The means and standard deviations of the items were calculated using SPSS version 10 and are presented in table 1 below. Items 1-6 focused on home-study opportunities, items 7-10 focused on the attractiveness of the materials, items 11-19 focused on task design, and items 20-24 focused on learning opportunities.

**Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Learner Opinions Towards English Language Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 come with a CD for me to use outside of class</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 come with a DVD for me to use outside of class</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 come with a vocabulary notebook to use outside of class</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 include a bilingual vocabulary list in the back</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 have a website for students to use outside of class</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 give advice on how to study English</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 are very colourful</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the percentage of students who responded positively to each item, i.e., those who endorsed the item with either “agree” or “strongly agree.”

Table 2. Percentage of Positive Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  come with a CD for me to use outside of class</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  come with a DVD for me to use outside of class</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  come with a vocabulary notebook to use outside of class</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  include a bilingual vocabulary list in the back</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  have a website for students to use outside of class</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  give advice on how to study English</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  are very colourful</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  use photographs</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  use illustrations</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 use a lot of art (photos, illustrations)</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 give me instructions in English only</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>give me instructions in Japanese and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>let me work in small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>let me work alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>have easy tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>have challenging tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ask me to write in the missing words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ask me Yes / No questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ask me to check the order in which things happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>help me with my communication skills (speaking and listening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>help me improve my vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>help me improve my test scores (TOEIC etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>help me to improve my confidence with language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>help me learn about other countries' culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** $N = 295$
All items began with "I prefer books that..."

For factor analyses, a data set of 295 cases is acceptable. Bryant & Yarnold (1995), Field (2005), Tabachnik & Fidell (2007), all suggest around 300 cases as providing stability in factor analyses. EFA was selected as no hypotheses had been formed about the existence of the factors; no previous studies were found to aid in forming hypotheses, and therefore an exploratory approach seemed the best choice. Both the eigenvalues and the scree plot were used to determine how many factors to retain in the solution. Three factors were above the point of inflexion in the scree plot, and these all had eigenvalues over 1, and these were therefore selected for rotation. Principal Component Analysis was used to extract the factors, which were then rotated using a Varimax rotation. Varimax rotation was used to assist in interpreting the factors, as the four constructs included in the survey are believed to be unconnected to each other. After rotation, a factor-loading criterion of .45 was selected to assist in determining the factors. With regard to factor loadings, higher numbers are considered good: "The greater the loading, the more the variable is a pure measure of the factor" (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007, p. 649). A loading of .32 is considered the minimum acceptable loading, while .45 is described as "fair" (p. 649). Only one item from the survey does not reach the criterion of .45.

The three factors extracted and rotated via SPSS do not precisely match the four constructs the survey was designed to test. The items testing task design and learning opportunities have factored together, with one item missing the .45 criterion. These form the first factor, *learning opportunities*. The other two constructs, *text attractiveness* and *home-study opportunities*, have factored in the way in which they were envisioned in the survey design. The attractiveness items load on factors 1 and 2; however, the factor loadings load very highly on factor 2, and thus form the second factor. The home-study items form the third factor.
The reliability for the instrument as a whole was calculated as .91. Individually, the reliability for each factor is as follows: factor 1 = .95; factor 2 = .92; and factor 3 = .66.

Factor 1 explains 32.42% of the variance; factor 2 explains 15.89%; and factor 3 explains 9.99%, thus, the three factors explained 58.3% of the variance. More simply, whether the text provides chances to learn, is attractive, and can be used outside the classroom explains nearly 60% of the variation in the responses. Table 3 shows the factors, loadings, and eigenvalues of the EFA.

**Discussion**

Research question two asked whether there are underlying themes teachers should consider when selecting texts. The results of the factor analysis suggest that opportunities to learn are important to students, that the texts need to be attractive in design, and that opportunities for self-study outside of the classroom are important to them. The three factors uncovered by the factor analysis would appear to make sense. Students who care about EFL materials in general will be concerned that opportunities to improve their level exist, and doing so may involve a certain amount of self-study. It is also hard to argue against attractive materials, especially if the alternative is unattractive ones.

**Table 3. Dimensions of Learner Opinions Towards English Language Textbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Learning opportunities</th>
<th>Text Attractiveness</th>
<th>Home-study opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 come with a CD for me to use outside of class</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 come with a DVD for me to use outside of class</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 come with a vocabulary notebook to use outside of class</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 include a bilingual vocabulary list in the back</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 have a website for students to use outside of class</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 give advice on how to study English</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 are very colourful</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 use photographs</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 use illustrations</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 use a lot of art (photos, illustrations)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 give me instructions in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>ρ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>give me instructions in Japanese and English</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>let me work in small groups</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>let me work alone</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>have easy tasks</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>have challenging tasks</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ask me to write in the missing words</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ask me Yes / No questions</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ask me to check the order in which things happen</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>help me with my communication skills (speaking and listening)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>help me improve my vocabulary</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>help me improve my test scores (TOEIC etc)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>help me to improve my confidence with language</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>help me learn about other countries' culture</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of variance explained</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>15.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 295*

All items began with "I prefer books that..."

Research question one asked what Japanese tertiary-level students want from EFL educational media. Based on the results presented in tables 1 and 2, it would appear that in common with previous research carried out with similar populations, students do have opinions about EFL educational media, and the data support this argument when one looks at the means for the responses. For a 4-point opinion response scale, the spread of means is quite wide. Within factor 1, learning opportunities, the means ranged from 2.15 to 3.53, for example. The results are broadly in line with Hullah (2003) and Long (1998) in that student opinion can differ widely. For example, items 15 and 16 both gained received similar endorsement from students ($M = 2.79, SD = 1.21$; $M = 2.29, SD = 1.25$, respectively), but ask support for easy tasks and challenging tasks. One interpretation is that students hold incommensurable opinions on this topic; a second is that students in general like a range of task-difficulty within one text. Three clear themes emerge from the descriptive statistics. First, students seek support for their learning from textbooks. Items 20 to 24 received very strong endorsement, and these items form the
backbone of the first factor in the factor analysis. Second, students support an emphasis on vocabulary in EFL textbooks. 71.5% of students want access to a bilingual word list, 82.4% of students would like texts to include a vocabulary notebook, and 88.1% of students want texts to help them improve their vocabulary level. Third, there is somewhat limited support from students for additional media such as CDs and DVDs. 48.5% of students claimed to be interested in having a text with a CD, 40% stated a preference for an accompanying website, and 36.6% support the inclusion of a DVD.

Taken together, the results from the two research questions show some gaps between the current state of mainstream EFL publishing and students’ apparent preferences. A number of items ask support for opportunities to develop aspects of language competence. This is a subjective topic, as it is hard to quantify learning opportunities. Based on this finding, however, teachers and institutions should ask themselves whether the texts they use do provide chances for the students to develop their learning skills, or whether the texts are just good at keeping students occupied.

More concretely, students showed strong support for bilingual assistance; items 4 and 12 asked about bilingual word lists and instructions, respectively. In both cases, over 70% of students supported including these features. In contrast, only 29.5% of students want instructions in English only. Very few EFL conversation texts provide either word lists or instructions bilingually. For publishers it makes good financial sense to provide textbooks that can be sold in as many markets as possible, without any modifications to the text. As such, providing bilingual instructions may not be a desirable innovation. However, some steps can be taken at a local level, for example, by providing word lists in downloadable formats, on the publisher’s website in each country.

In addition to wanting bilingual support, the student responses showed a marked preference for help with vocabulary in general; over 80% of students support the inclusion of a dedicated vocabulary notebook. Although more vocabulary-related texts are being published nowadays (Folse, 2004), few conversation textbooks directly address the issue of vocabulary. A final difference between student opinion and currently available texts is the attitude towards technology. Many publishers seem to be interested in developing technology-focused additions to texts. The industry has moved in recent years from just providing a textbook to including digital media such as CDs, DVDs, and CD-ROMs with texts, as well as websites that are connected to the text. Although these may sound appealing, student responses to such additions were not particularly positive. If the students are to be believed, they would rather have assistance in learning vocabulary with a notebook connected to the text, than these rather more innovative features. Although opportunity for study outside the classroom is something students appear to want, the texts currently available do not seem to satisfy them in this regard.

**Further Research**

With regard to future research, it should be noted that the survey only included data at the ordinal level; although such data are quantitative, there is only a limited sense in which quantity is implied. Coding the responses to the
open-ended items, forming hypotheses and then factor-analyzing the remaining data in a confirmatory factor analysis is a next logical step.

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY**

The survey described in this paper attempted to improve the current understanding of Japanese tertiary level learners’ attitudes to EFL educational media. From an original sample of 635 responses, 295 had descriptive statistics calculated and were then factor-analyzed in order to learn more about student attitudes to such media. This combination of analyses attempted to answer the following research questions: 1. What do Japanese tertiary-level students want from EFL educational media? 2. Do the student responses suggest underlying themes that teachers should consider when selecting texts?

In common with previous studies involving Japanese tertiary-level learners (Hullah, 2003; Long, 1998; Schwalb & Sukemune, 1998) it is clear that students do have opinions to express, and are not currently wholly satisfied with the materials they are asked to use.

From the student responses, it appears that there are underlying themes, which could improve teachers’ ability to select texts, namely, the opportunities for learning that the text affords, the attractiveness of the materials, and opportunities for home-study provided by the text. Further, students want bilingual help with both vocabulary and instructions, and are relatively disinterested in technology-based media additional to the text itself. Teachers and institutions may benefit from considering these points when selecting materials for their learners.
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ABSTRACT

Storytelling is an essential human skill, the significance of which extends beyond the pedagogical confines of the EFL classroom to influence wider issues of self-identity and community. This paper describes an action research project wherein a three-stage lesson cycle was adopted to encourage learners to explore and create narratives for themselves. It concludes that, while storytelling can certainly be beneficial to students, care should be taken to ensure that learners do not feel constrained by the genre.

In his 1996 essay, “Culture, Mind and Education,” Jerome Bruner suggests nine principles by which an effective educational system should be organized. One of these is the narrative tenet. “Skill in narrative construction,” he writes, “is crucial to constructing our lives and a “place” for ourselves in the possible world we will encounter.” (Bruner, 1996, p. 28)

Bruner’s comments struck a particular chord with me. When I am not teaching English communication in Japan, I work as a screenwriter for a British film studio. I have always been fascinated by the power of stories - the way in which they can transform our understanding and help us to make sense of others and ourselves. However, I have had trouble in reconciling the two sides of my profession. The value of storytelling is often overlooked in the general English classroom. Either it is argued that stories have no place outside creative writing courses, or it is assumed that storytelling is an innate skill, which needs no further instruction.

This paper describes an attempt to address these issues and integrate Bruner’s narrative tenet into my setting. It starts with a definition of narratives, before discussing the ways they help mould self-identity and community. Following this, I will look at a short action research project revolving around a three-lesson cycle. I will set out its key components, and explore its findings. In conclusion, I will examine the implications of my research and some caveats, while also proposing some ways that the benefits of storytelling might be harnessed in the future.

A THEORETICAL GROUNDING

NARRATIVES: TOWARDS A DEFINITION

Defining narratives can be difficult. They encompass an incredibly wide
range of texts: oral and written, from 50 words to 500,000, comedies, tragedies, dramas. They run the gamut from *Mahabharata* to *Harry Potter* and you’ll-never-guess-what-happened-to-me anecdotes over coffee in the staffroom. This complexity may often deter teachers from using narratives in the EFL classroom. However it is my belief that all but the most radical narratives (e.g., *Ulysses*, *Gravity’s Rainbow*) can be defined thus: *A narrative is a chronologically-ordered text (spoken or written) which revolves around a problem and its solution.*

This definition is reflected at the macro-level of genre, where narratives are characterized by the following structure:

| Setting the Scene | When and where did the story take place?  
Who was involved? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Problem</td>
<td>What went wrong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Solution</td>
<td>How did the participants overcome the problem?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Narrator’s Evaluation | How do they feel about the events?  
How do they want you to feel? |

(Adapted from Butt *et al.*, 2000)

At the microstructure of lexis and grammar, narratives are dependent upon:

- past tenses
- conjunctions to relay the order of events
- emotive language to create interest in the listener or reader
- elements of speech or thought
- anaphoric referencing (for example “a young wizard” in the setting-the-scene stage will be referred to later as “he” or “the wizard”)

Even at this purely pedagogical level, narratives offer entire syllabi of lesson possibilities. For example, beginners could explore irregular past participles, while more advanced learners could examine how competent storytellers subvert generic norms for dramatic effect.

**Narratives and Identity**

The importance of narratives extends beyond the pedagogical; they are not merely grammatical resources to be mined for examples of past progressive or relative clauses. Stories are essential in the creation of our very selves. Social constructivists view identities as fluid and ever-changing phenomena. Our sense of self is not set in concrete, but rather shifts and emerges depending on time and context. Bruner argues that narratives are vital in this construction of positive self in that they “frame and nourish an identity.” (Bruner, 1996, p. 27). Stories allow people to “create a version of the world in which, psychologically, they can envisage a place for themselves - a personal world.” (Bruner, 1996, p. 27)

Janos Laszlo expands upon these notions in his 2008 book on narrative...
psychology, *The Science of Stories*. Quoting Paul Ricoeur, he surmises that identity is “nothing else but a continuously reconstructed biography.” (in Laszlo, 2008, p.174) These writers argue that we arrange our biographies into ordered stories so that we can make sense of who we are, and how we have come to arrive at where we are in the world.

This process, I feel, is particularly important for EFL students. Plunging into a foreign language classroom can be a stressful, fragmentary experience (one which I endure during my weekly incursions into Japanese classes). Learners are cut off from their regular communicative resources and familiar reference points. Therefore, it is vital for them to be able to reconstruct their identities when confronted with these challenges. Narratives offer two simultaneous benefits: they help us to learn a language, while also constructing our identities through the very medium of the new language itself.

**COMMUNITY**

Narratives contribute to the creation of a group consciousness. As Laszlo writes, story telling “shapes [the] internal world of humans and, at the same time, links them to their society and culture” (2008, p. 66, my italics). Firstly, the act of sharing a story is a bonding experience. Whether over a beer or at an A.A. meeting, stories create solidarity among people. Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, researching vocational learning settings, argue that telling a story “confers a sense of belonging” (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 104). It helps to make you feel like a member of the group in which you are communicating.

Stories not only support and sustain a community of practice, they also help to inculcate new members into the group: “learning is supported by conversation and stories about problematic, especially difficult cases” (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 102). Stories are a way to learn the community’s ways of speaking, or *discourse*. Once you have appropriated these ways, you, in turn, help newcomers through sharing your own stories with them. Stories are essential in creating self-supporting, self-perpetuating communities.

The second benefit of story telling on the community plane is the way in which it supports “communal forms of memory and reflection” (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 101) All groups have their histories. Soccer clubs have their tales of the good games and the bad. Families have their photo albums and accompanying stories of holidays, weddings and births. By sharing these narratives and contributing to them, we feel ourselves members of communities. All too often as teachers, we overlook the history of our own groups of learners. We view our classrooms as fleeting gatherings, which are shuffled and rearranged at the start of each new term. Stories can serve as an antidote to this ephemerality. Through encouraging experienced learners to talk with new students, or by gathering the tales of previous students and making them accessible to current learners, we can put stories to use as a collective resource.
THEORY INTO PRACTICE

The Setting

The milieu in which I conducted the following research was an eikaiwa in Japan’s second largest city, Yokohama. Eikaiwa are privately owned schools that teach General English to children and adult learners. The particular class, which I discuss here, consisted of twelve students, ranging in age from 20 to 64 years old. Their current level according to the school’s five-band system is “Lower Intermediate,” which equates to approximately Level 2 on the ALTE Can Do Framework.

This group was selected for this project due to a number of reasons. Firstly, they have lexico-grammatical weaknesses, which can be addressed by an exploration of narratives. The most serious of these include the differences between past progressive and past simple, use of conjunctions and reported speech.

The second reason revolves around issues of self-identity. The majority of the learners come from non-traditional learning backgrounds (homemakers without post-secondary education, retirees), and they have all expressed a lack of faith in themselves as students of a foreign language. I am interested in investigating whether narratives can help them to perceive themselves in a more positive light.

Finally, I believe that storytelling might assist them on the community plane. The learners tend not to interact with one another; rather, they direct their output solely towards the instructor. This inhibits a sense of group feeling from developing. The dilemma is exacerbated by the school’s streaming system, which prevents learners from interacting with students from different ability bands. As Lave and Wenger (1991) argue, contact with all members of the community promotes learning; students should be able to help the less capable and learn from their more advanced peers.

METHODOLOGY

The researcher stance that I adopted for this project was one of advocacy (Cameron, Fraser, Harvey, Rampton, & Richardson, 1992). I attempted to balance the needs of my learners with my own goals. I explained to them the type of research I was conducting, and I promised I would share my results with them. As far as possible, I adhered to the BAAL’s 2006 Recommendations on Good Practice. All names of participants have been altered, as have any references to circumstances which may have revealed identities.

My approach was primarily qualitative. I observed the learners before, during and after the lessons, and I maintained a research diary in order to make notes and begin to develop emerging themes. These notes were supplemented by interviews with the participants (individually and in small groups) in order that I could triangulate these findings. With the learners’ full consent, these interviews were recorded, as were classroom interactions between learners, and between learners and myself.

I accompanied the aforementioned qualitative approach with a quantitative method whereby I analysed the students’ narratives in order to chart their development.
A THREE-STAGE TEACHING CYCLE

The following lesson-cycle is anchored in neo-Vygotskian principles whereby initial teacher-guided activities gradually give way to more student-led stages, culminating in independent production by the learners. Each stage was designed to be taught during one 80-minute class.

PROLOGUE

“Trouble,” writes Bruner, “is the engine of narratives” (Bruner, 1994, p. 145). I applied this concept in the lesson prior to this first stage when I assigned students a short homework assignment. The topic: Write a short story about a time when you encountered a problem with English. How did you overcome it?

The first draft of this assignment provided me with the chance for some early formative assessment to gauge the learners’ current competence, while also allowing me to tweak my subsequent input.

LESSON 1

At the beginning of the lesson, I handed the class a short poorly written narrative. I divided the learners into pairs and asked them to identify the weaknesses of the text. After giving them time to discuss in pairs, we reconvened and I elicited the story’s failings. I used their answers as a springboard to create criteria of what a good story should involve. I made a list on the whiteboard which included “A good story uses a range of past tenses,” “A good story uses and, but, then, suddenly,” “A good story tells us the characters’ feelings.”

In this stage, I attempted to instill in the learners a sense of ownership of the criteria. Rather than handing them a ready-prepared list, I encouraged them to create a set of “community standards” with which they would later be able to judge their own narratives as well as those of their peers.

Having formulated these criteria, I asked the students to rewrite the poorly written passage in order to bring it into line with the features, which they had listed. I circulated the room and assisted. After wetting their toes with this guided rewrite, I asked them to do the same with their homework assignments. These stories would become the second draft.

LESSON 2

The second stage revolved around peer assessment. In previous lessons, I have found these learners to be reluctant to comment on the work of their classmates. I hoped that the communal creation of the Good Story criteria in lesson 1 would benefit them here.

I gathered the learners’ re-written homework assignments and re-distributed them around the classroom. In pairs, they were asked to assess the stories according to the criteria. I encouraged them to annotate the papers, comment on weaknesses and offer advice on how to improve. I was interested in observing whether the students had appropriated the conventions of a good narrative.
After the students had returned the stories to their writers, we discussed common strengths and weaknesses. This was followed by a chance for students to further edit their own narratives into a third draft to incorporate the suggestions made by their peers. These narratives would serve as the backbone of the final class of the cycle.

LESSON 3

This stage was designed to bolster the students’ sense of community. In order that the learners could have the chance to interact on a more personal level, I divided the class into groups of three, ensuring that each group contained a variety of narrative topics - such as overcoming grammar problems, learning vocabulary and writing emails.

The learners took it in turns to tell the stories that they had been working upon over the past two weeks. After they had done this, the other members of the group asked questions or added their own suggestions. Having shared their stories, I collected the papers and posted them on the wall of the classroom as a permanent resource. I hoped to give a sense of achievement to the learners while also making the stories available for students of other classes who might be able to read the experiences and gain some insight into overcoming their own problems.

FINDINGS

LEXICO-GRAMMAR AND GENRE

On the plane of lexis and grammar, the teaching cycle was designed to bring students’ stories in line with genre norms. In the first lesson, I gave them a poorly written narrative to elicit from them the criteria for an effective tale. During this stage, the learners managed to come up with all of the criteria that I had expected (see Lesson 1 above), and they even created some of their own, such as “Good stories include visual details,” and “Good stories show the listener/reader a new way of looking at their lives.”

The extent to which they went on to apply these criteria is best illustrated by a comparison of the three essays, which they wrote.

Over the course of the lessons, the learners’ stories uniformly moved closer to the norms of the genre. As expected, the largest development occurred between Drafts 1 and 2, reflecting, in my opinion, the learners’ application of the criteria that they had recently created. Further editing between Drafts 2 and 3 suggests that the learners are taking on board the comments of their peers and incorporating them into their work.

I had hoped that the act of creating the criteria for themselves would imbue the learners with a sense of ownership of the list. This appears to have been effective. The learners referred to the criteria as “Our list,” and they appeared to hold one another to their communally created standard, as in the following exchange:

Kenji: Remember we said last week [Lesson 1]
Kaoru: We need feelings.
Kenji: Emotions of speaker.
Kaoru: Tomoko said we need feel same as speaker.
[Lesson 2]

They are drawing upon their previous comments as well as those of their peers, and applying them to the task. Further evidence of the students recognizing the importance of the criteria for this group is suggested in the following excerpt, taken from the second lesson:

Mari: If we don’t use joining kotoba [words] there is no --
Daisuke: No flow.
Mari: Yes. Flow. And so the reader don’t know what is happen next.
Daisuke: Joining words are important. For classmates to understand.

The ways in which the learners appropriated the criteria and the assistance of their peers is perhaps best illustrated by examining the evolution of one learner’s story. The creator of the tale, Keiko, is a member of a flower-arranging school. Every year it holds a festival. Her story describes the problems she encountered at last year’s festival, when asked to give a short presentation in English to visiting tourists. Below is the first paragraph of Draft 1:

I was requested my [flower-arrangement] teacher to speech for Hong Kong sightseers. My teacher said “Only five minutes presentation.” Before, I cannot sleep and I felled sick.

The weaknesses of this short excerpt are typical of the story as a whole. At a macro-level, it lacks effective scene-setting. At the micro-level, there are several tense errors and poor usage of conjunctions.

After the first class, Keiko amended her text to bring it into line with the criteria that she and her peers had created. The second draft of her essay opens in this way:

Last year, my teacher of my flower-arranging club asked me to help her. “Next week,” she said, “Hong Kong visitors will come to our event. I want you to give a speech.” I want to help my teacher and introduce to foreigners to Japanese culture, so I said “OK!”

This paragraph shows evidence of the learner beginning to appropriate the criteria. She explains the when and where of the story. She is fleshing out her narrative with speech and feelings. There is tentative use of conjunctions with so in the final line.

During the second lesson, her peers further amended the text. Her classmates recommended that she include more emotional language, and perhaps add more of her history to the introduction. Keiko was very open to these comments, and she actually approached her classmates after the lesson to clarify the comments that they had written on the page.

The final draft of her introduction reveals that she has taken these comments on board and worked them into her story.
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I have been a member of a flower-arranging club for 6 years. Last year, something surprising was happened – my teacher asked me to give a speech – in English! I was shocked and very nervous. So I asked to my friends what should I do.

Here, through a combination of her own edits and peer input, Keiko has created a lively introduction, which catches the reader's attention and complies with narrative norms. Taken as a whole, the three drafts of her tale function as a process folio for the learner; they reveal, to both me and the student, her progress over the three lessons.

While the above examples suggest learners' appropriation of the genres of the criteria, they do not reveal the occasional resistance that I encountered. During the lessons, I overheard several comments such as these: “In English stories, we must say our feelings,” “Mitchell said we have to use ‘suddenly,’” “We can't use present. We must use only past.”

These statements suggested that the students regarded the criteria as something imposed upon them. I pursued these comments in my follow-up interviews. I asked the learners whether they saw the criteria as a list of suggestions or as requirements, which they had to follow. Overwhelmingly, they perceived it as a mandatory list. The coda, in particular, was problematic for them. During the elicitation stage, three of the learners had expressed doubts as to its necessity: “Why do we need to say our feeling? People can understand from our voice and story,” “We don't have to be so clear to listener – it is not a lesson. Only a story.”

Despite these comments, when the learners came to write their third drafts, all of them included codas. When I asked them whether they had changed their minds, two of them told me that they had only done it because they thought they had had to. Rather than a way to find their own voices, it seems as though they felt they had been forced to adopt the voice of another. This is a point to which I will return at the end of this paper.

IDENTITY

Finding evidence of transformations in identity can be a difficult task, especially in a short-term study such as this. However, I have sought out examples through three main ways: feedback interviews, a detailed case study of one participant and observation of the learners in subsequent lessons.

1. After the lesson cycle had finished, I arranged short interviews with the learners to follow up on some of the issues that I had witnessed emerging during classes. The creation of personal narratives, I argued in the introduction, make the tellers more positive about their self-identities, so I decided to ask my learners directly what they felt about story telling, and if they felt that they had changed.

Nine of the twelve expressed a positive change, while one quarter said they felt that they had not changed. When I asked the nine how they had changed, seven of them expressed notions of pride. One learner said, “When I read my finished story, I felt proud [of] my writing.” Another learner said that she felt happy with her tale and she had even shown it to her family at home.
Comments from four of the nine included a sense of “refreshment”. When invited to elaborate on this, they reached for their dictionaries and explained the word they wanted to use: catharsis. “I feel lighter,” said one learner. Another learner said that he would feel “a weight [lift] from my shoulders” after he had shared his story.

The third feeling relayed by the learners (including two of those who said that they had not felt changed) was one of “comfort.” They expressed a sense of empathy with their peers, which made them feel more at home in the class. One learner stated, “Not only me have problems. I am not the only one.” Another learner said, “I feel we [students] are not alone.”

2. Changes in self-identity are often accompanied (Lave and Wenger (1991) would argue are caused by) by shifts in participation. The new roles adopted by learners reflect upon simultaneous shifts in their identities. Such a paradigm is well illustrated by a more comprehensive discussion of how one learner’s involvement changed during the course of my research.

At the beginning of the first lesson, Kenji expressed some nervousness about his English ability: “Story is difficult to make.” Throughout the first lesson, he remained on the periphery of the class and did not interact much. Draft 1 revealed a similar lack of confidence in his writing ability; the text was short (four lines) and contained many tense and anaphoric referencing errors.

During the peer assessment of the second lesson, though, he stepped in to help one of his classmates who was having problems structuring a sentence. “You need past progressive here,” he advised her. The other learner praised his English. After this exchange, his self-confidence seemed to grow. In an interview discussing this point, it seems that he realized that he had knowledge to add to the discourse of the class. “I felt happy I can help my classmate. I know a little about grammar.” This increase in confidence appears to have continued into the final session where he told his story from memory (i.e., he did not read it) and he expanded on his ideas when requested by his classmates.

I asked Kenji how he’d felt about telling his tale. He said that he often shares stories when talking in Japanese, and the class showed him that he need not give up this facet of his character in a foreign language setting. For this learner, then, telling stories had enabled him to align his in-class identity closer to his identity outside the classroom.

3. The changes, which I observed in Kenji and his peers, appear not to be confined to the three-lesson cycle. In subsequent lessons, I have observed that the twelve learners continue to take roles that are more central. Three of the learners in particular have become more confident in expressing their ideas in classes and assisting their peers. They had previously preferred to remain quiet in group discussions. However, recently they have adopted more active roles, including, on some occasions, telling short stories about their daily lives to their peers. These new patterns of participation, I believe, demonstrate a transformation in identity from passive listener to English storyteller.

COMMUNITY

At the beginning of this paper, I spelled out how stories might be harnessed on the community plane in two main ways: firstly, as a means of creating solidarity and secondly, in furnishing the members with a sense of
history. During my research, I found evidence of both of these benefits.

1. Prior to these classes, the students had separated themselves along the lines of age and gender. The young sat with the young, the men with the men. The three-lesson cycle, I feel, went a long way towards desegregating the class. Students, who had previously not interacted with one another before, were brought together in the second class during the peer assessment stage. Each learner brought his or her different strengths to the table, with some students helping with grammar, others helping with vocabulary and others providing insights from their own life experiences.

It was initially difficult for me to determine how much of this was due to the lesson cycle, and how much was due to the act of story telling itself, so I asked my learners during the feedback interviews. They responded that the practice of story telling was central to their bonding. “I could know about others’ problems and feel we are the same,” said one learner. Another learner stated, “Sharing stories is nice to make team work. We can help and get help.” A third learner stated: “Telling stories makes our class more strong. We can learn and we can teach another students.”

These interactions have been maintained in subsequent classes. Learners ask one another more questions (rather than relying solely upon me), and they are more prepared to offer up ideas of their own without waiting for prompts. This newfound sense of community, I have been pleased to witness, has not been confined to the classroom, some of the students have also instigated a post-lesson coffee session among themselves.

I have observed, too, that these learners’ stories have helped newcomers to the school. New students often read the twelve narratives posted on the wall of the classroom. On occasion, they go as far as to make notes of their peers’ advice on overcoming problems. This expands the relevance of these tales, helping those on the outskirts to enter the community of practice.

2. The school in which I conducted this research is a private institution where learners are free to sign up and sign out as they see fit. This flexibility is often detrimental to the evolution of a sense of history. The three lessons in narratives, I feel, have helped to promote communal memory. In the weeks since the lessons, I have observed that the participants refer back to their peers’ stories in a number of ways. They have turned to the tales to borrow a choice phrase, or to check the criteria for an effective narrative. Many of the learners have also adopted the advice contained within their peers’ tales. They have taken up Tomoko’s suggestion to buy an English-English dictionary; they have started singing karaoke in English to improve their intonation (as recommended by Mayumi). I, too, have embraced Keiko's idea of how to overcome nerves during public speaking by imagining the audience as a field of pumpkins. The tales serve as a community resource to which we can turn when we are experiencing problems of our own.

It is not only the products of the lessons that serve as a reference for the students; it is also the experience of studying together. In subsequent lessons, I have heard learners comment, “Remember we need a list, like the story class,” “Let’s work together,” “Can you comment on my work like before?” They are building upon the tools, which the study of narratives gave them, and applying them to new contexts. In this way, they are encoding the experience into their own narrative biographies, giving them faith in themselves and one another as learners.

Jon Mitchell
CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND EXPANSIONS

Many textbooks and school curricula currently concentrate on the lexico-grammatical features of storytelling. While the benefits of narratives on this plane are undeniable, to limit them to this is to overlook the role which stories can play in shaping self-identity and creating strong community bonds. My research suggested that story telling could encourage students to become prouder in their own abilities, start to adopt more active roles in the classroom and feel empathy with their peers. Narratives also seem to strengthen the inter-relationships of learners - helping them to develop a sense of history and solidarity both inside and outside the classroom.

Although this approach to teaching seemed to have been largely beneficial, one cautionary theme emerged. The students felt straitjacketed by the genre. Rather than regarding the macro-structure as a guide, they viewed it as a mandatory pattern with which they had to comply. Future applications of this teaching cycle must try to remedy this problem. One possibility might be to expose the learners to a wider range of model texts and have them decide for themselves which ones they think are more effective. Another way might be to embark upon a cross-cultural comparison of Japanese and English language narratives. Examining how they differ, and the reasons why, may help learners to appreciate that the genre is not a rigid structure, but has developed over time to fulfill a communicative function.

When considering these conclusions, it is necessary to bear in mind the obvious limitations of this project. The research was conducted with a small group of learners over a relatively short time scale. In order to determine whether these conclusions have wider relevance, research should be expanded to encompass a larger number of learners over a longer period.

Such an extension may also reveal other ways to harness the advantages of narratives. Now, I am working with a group of nursing school students to explore how the creation of narratives revolving around patients' problems might help more specialized communities of learners. Similar lessons might benefit a range of other ESP classes.

To strengthen community bonds, I have started exploring ways to introduce an element of recycling into classes. Learners' completed stories can be employed in subsequent lessons as model texts for other groups of students. Since these model texts originate from within the same community, they might be seen as more attainable than texts which come from outside, such as those from textbooks or abroad.

A final way in which this cycle could be broadened might be to take the learners' stories online. As a permanent paper resource in the school, fellow school members can only read their tales. However, putting their tales on a dedicated website would break these boundaries, and allow all those with internet access to learn from these learners' experiences in the worldwide community.
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ABSTRACT

The growing global dominance of the English language has led to a shift in focus in the field of ELT away from a more traditional, content-based teaching to the promotion of a learner-centered, process-oriented one. Training learners in learning strategies does have an effect on their learning success and autonomy. However, research studies on the effects of strategy training are still relatively rare and the results are quite unclear (Nunan, 1997). Within the field of autonomy in language learning, a variety of approaches has been developed as a means of conducting foreign language strategy training (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Pearson & Dole; 1987, Oxford, 1990; Cohen, 1998; Grenfell & Harris, 1999). All of them, however, provide classroom-based instructional models which apply language strategy training as a part of a foreign language curriculum. This paper will show an explicit strategies-based training model that is a self-access mode of learning designed for individual students to practice self-direction in their learning. The model’s rationale, design and implementation will be presented as well.

INTRODUCTION

An autonomous language learner is one of the educational goals of research on learner strategies. Wenden and Rubin (1987) identify a set of assumptions about language learner strategies that can describe the effects of teaching such strategies to novice learners. The most controversial but undeniable one is that “some language learners are more successful than others in learning a second or foreign language” (p. 15). It is assumed that cognitive and metacognitive behaviors in which learners engage will bring about their success. Success in language learning depends on a number of factors, such as individual learning styles; however, it is also assumed that less successful learners can become more effective if they are provided with some training in the second language (L2) learning strategies of good language learners. As a result, the focus of training in learning strategies, cognitive and metacognitive strategies in particular, is very important for promoting learner autonomy.

SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES

Learning strategies are defined differently based on the different taxonomies
proposed by some experts in the field. O’Malley and Chamot (1990, as cited in Rasekh & Ranjbary, 2003) describe them as special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to comprehend, learn, or retain new information. They classify learning strategies into three main groups: cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective; each of which is further divided into sub-strategies. Oxford (1994) defines learning strategies as actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques students use, often unconsciously, to improve their progress in apprehending, internalizing, and using the L2. She categorizes learning strategies into direct and indirect. The former includes memory, cognitive, and compensation, while the latter covers metacognitive, affective, and social. O’Malley and Chamot (1990) also point out that the two learning strategies that are mostly used together are the cognitive and the metacognitive ones. They are closely related, but cognitive skills are necessary to perform a task; whereas metacognition is necessary to understand how the task is performed (Hacker, 1988). It is also assumed that developing metacognitive awareness may also strengthen cognitive skills (Anderson, 2002).

STRATEGIES IN READING

Hosenfeld (1984, cited in McDonough, 1995, pp. 43-44) conducted research on individual learners’ reading strategies using an interview and think-aloud protocols as research tools. In her research, she identified kinds of strategies the successful readers seemed to have/use:

(a) keep the meaning of the passage in mind
(b) read in broad phrases
(c) skip inessential words
(d) guess from context the meaning of unknown words
(e) have a good self-concept as a reader
(f) identify the grammatical category of words
(g) demonstrate sensitivity to a different word-order
(h) examine illustrations
(i) read the title and make inferences from it
(j) use orthographic information (e.g., capitalization)
(k) refer to side gloss
(l) use the glossary as a last resort
(m) look up words correctly
(n) continue if unsuccessful at decoding a word or phrase
(o) recognize cognates
(p) use their knowledge of the world
(q) follow through with a proposed solution to a problem
(r) evaluate their guesses

Hosenfeld (1984, cited in McDonough, 1995) assumed that good and poor readers do different things and adopt different strategies. Therefore, to become more successful in L2 reading, poor readers need to receive training in such strategies.

Cognitive Reading Strategies

Oxford (1990) classifies cognitive strategies into four sets: practicing,
receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output. These strategies are sub-divided into a number of sub-strategies. Cognitive strategies that can be applied to developing reading skills are shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Cognitive Reading Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>In reading, the strategy of repeating might mean reading a passage more than once to understand it more completely. Another technique is to read a passage several times, each time for different purposes. The learner might also take notes about a reading passage and then review them several times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing and using formulas and patterns</td>
<td>Recognizing and using routine formulas and patterns in the target language greatly enhance the learner’s comprehension and production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing naturalistically</td>
<td>As applied to reading, it means using the language in an authentic way for reading comprehension, e.g., encouraging students to read in a new language outside of class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the idea quickly</td>
<td>This strategy helps learners to focus on what they need or want to understand, and allows them to disregard the rest or use it as background information only. Examples are skimming and scanning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using resources for receiving and sending messages</td>
<td>This strategy involves using resources to find out the meaning of what is heard or read in the new language, or to produce messages in the new language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning deductively</td>
<td>This strategy refers to deriving hypotheses about the meaning of what is heard by means of general rules the learner already knows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing expressions</td>
<td>This strategy helps learners break down a new word, phrase, sentence, or even paragraph, into its component parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>This strategy allows learners to use their own language as the basis for understanding what they hear or read in the new language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking notes</td>
<td>The focus of taking notes is on understanding, not writing. These can be written in the learners’ own language at first, in the target language, or in a mixture of the target language and the learners’ own language, depending on the purpose of using the notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>This strategy means making a condensed, shorter version of the original passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting</td>
<td>This strategy emphasizes the major points in a dramatic way, through color, underlining, capital letters, initial capitals, stars, boxes, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metacognitive Reading Strategies**

According to Oxford (1990), metacognitive strategies for learning include three main groups: centering, arranging and planning, and evaluating, all of which are further divided into 10 sub-strategies. The reading-related metacognitive strategies are illustrated in Table 2.

**Table 2. Metacognitive Reading Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overviewing and linking with already known material</td>
<td>Comprehensively overviewing a key concept, principle, or set of materials in an upcoming language activity and associating it with what is already known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about language learning</td>
<td>Making efforts to find out how language learning works by reading books and talking with other people, then using this information to help improve one's own language learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Understanding and using conditions related to optimal learning of the new language; organizing one's schedule, physical environment, and language learning notebook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting goals and objectives</td>
<td>Setting aims for language learning, including long-term goals or short-term objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the purpose of a language task</td>
<td>Deciding the purpose of a particular language task, such as reading a play for enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for a language task</td>
<td>Planning for the language elements and the functions necessary for an anticipated language task or situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking practice opportunities</td>
<td>Seeking out or creating opportunities to practice the new language in naturalistic situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>Identifying errors in understanding or producing the new language, determining which ones are important, tracking the source of important errors, and trying to eliminate such errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluating</td>
<td>Evaluating one’s own progress in the new language. For instance, by checking to see whether one is reading faster and understanding more than 1 month or 6 months ago.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compensation Reading Strategies

Two strategies that are applicable to reading skills are shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using linguistic clues</td>
<td>Previously gained knowledge of the target language, the learners’ own language, or some other languages can provide linguistic clues, e.g., suffixes, prefixes, and word order, for guessing meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using other clues</td>
<td>Some clues are related to language but come from other sources, e.g., forms of address, nonverbal behavior, and text structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As there are varieties of L2 learning strategies, and it is impossible to train learners in all of them in a short period, this paper will concentrate on those related to reading skills only as these are what the case study student considered her most problematic area.

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY TRAINING

According to the results of language learning strategy-training research, training in strategies brings about positive effects on language learning performance. Also, strategy training may be beneficial to learners in three ways: (a) to become better learners; (b) to become independent and confident learners; and (c) to understand the relationship between the use of strategies and success in learning languages; consequently, their motivation may increase (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994, as cited in Rasekh & Ranjbar, 2003). In addition, Oxford (1994) suggests that strategy training should be explicit, overt, relevant, and should provide opportunities for students to practice various types of authentic tasks. It should also enable the students to transfer the strategies they have learnt to future language tasks beyond the language classroom. As individual students are different in terms of their preferences and needs, strategy training should be individualized.

Strategy training can be classified into three types: awareness training, one-time strategy training, and long-term strategy training (Oxford, 1990). Awareness training (also called “consciousness-raising” or “familiarization training”) trains participants to be aware of and familiar with the general idea of language learning strategies and how to use them to complete language tasks. Participants need not do real practice with awareness training. One-time strategy training trains participants to learn and practice one or more strategies with actual language tasks; however, participants learn very specific and targeted strategies in a short period, such as one to a few sessions. Long-term strategy training is very much like one-time strategy training, but it takes a longer time and deals with a greater number of strategies.
LEARNER AUTONOMY

Autonomy is often used interchangeably with self-direction. Autonomy refers to the ability to take charge of one’s own learning, whereas self-direction is described as a way of organizing learning (Lee, 1998). To develop learner autonomy, a self-directed program should be designed. However, “self-directed learning does not guarantee success but may pave the way for a student’s development of autonomy” (Lee, 1998, p. 287). Today, a number of classroom teachers spend a great deal of time organizing their students to conduct independent learning outside the classroom. Some integrate self-directed learning into an existing course and call it a classroom-based self-directed learning program. This type of program still has some limitations that affect students’ involvement and interest in it. Those students who are self-sufficient and show some degree of autonomy in learning seem to be more successful than those who are not.

In the applied linguistics literature, autonomy is viewed as the capacity for active, independent learning, critical reflection and decision-making (Dickinson, 1995). Littlewood (1996) explains that the independent capacity of a person to make and carry out his or her own choices depends on two main components: ability and willingness. Ability depends on possessing both knowledge of alternatives from which choices have to be made, and the necessary skills for carrying out whatever choices seem most appropriate. Willingness is concerned with having both the motivation and the confidence to take responsibility for the choices required. To become autonomous, these four components need to be present together. In practice, these components are closely linked. “The more knowledge and skills the students possess, the more confident they are likely to feel when asked to perform independently; the more confident they feel, the more they are likely to mobilize their knowledge and skills in order to perform effectively” (p. 428).

THE PROPOSED MODEL

The Explicit Strategy Training (or the EST) model proposed by the researcher of this study is a mixture of both awareness training and one-time strategy training in the same model. This model includes eight steps, as illustrated in Table 4:

Table 4. A Procedure of L2 Strategy Training

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Determining needs of the individual learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Selecting types of strategies the learners want to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Explicit L2 strategy training including awareness training and one-time strategy training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Action planning of tasks, learning goals and the strategies to address them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>General practice of the new strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Setting new goals and the strategies to be learnt.
8. Restarting the cycle.

[Adapted from Oxford (1990), Cohen (1998), Grenfell & Harris (1999), and Harris & Grenfell (2004)]

The EST model was developed by integrating Oxford’s concepts of strategy training with the three current models for language learning strategy instruction (Cohen, 1998; Grenfell & Harris, 1999; Harris & Grenfell, 2004). The Cohen (1998) model concentrates on a variety of teacher roles in facilitating students’ use of strategies appropriate to their learning styles. According to Cohen (ibid), a teacher should be a diagnostician, a language learner, a learner trainer, a coordinator, as well as a coach. The Grenfell and Harris (1999) model consists of six steps: awareness-raising, modeling, general practice, action planning, focused practice, and evaluation. The Harris and Grenfell (2004) model is a revised version of the Grenfell and Harris (1999) model, but it provides more explanations of those steps of the model which are regarded as “unconscious, implicit, and automatic” (ibid, p. 123). The model puts much emphasis on ‘practice’ and ‘scaffolded learning’ in steps 3 and 5. The need for explicit knowledge about learning how to learn, and extensive practice in the L2, can facilitate students in practicing the new strategies.

The model begins with the students’ determination of their needs, i.e., what specific language skills they want to improve. Then, with the help of the teacher, the students decide what types of language learning strategies are to be applied to the selected language skill (reading, writing, speaking, or listening). Next, the teacher conducts explicit strategy training, which includes both awareness training and one-time strategy training. The students make an action plan by choosing language tasks, setting goals and choosing strategies to attain those goals. After that, the students practice the selected strategies one-by-one. Later, the students evaluate the success of their action plan and set new goals. Finally, the cycle starts all over again.

To validate the EST model, this study was conducted using a case study to investigate to what extent training in L2 strategies influences an individual learner’s beliefs and use of L2 strategies. In addition, the question of whether the proposed strategy-training model can develop the individual learner’s autonomy in L2 learning was also addressed.

**Research Questions**

(a) What types of L2 learning strategies does Alisa, the case study student, use when performing reading tasks?
(b) To what extent does the proposed strategy-training model bring about changes in Alisa’s use of L2 learning strategies?
(c) Can the proposed strategy-training model develop Alisa’s beliefs about learner autonomy?
THE CASE STUDY

The training was done with a student named “Alisa”, a fictitious name assigned to maintain anonymity, with the use of the Explicit Strategy Training (or the EST) model proposed by the researcher of this study. As the researcher believes that the use of multiple methods to collect data increases the reliability of research, the research instruments included a learning diary, a semi-structured interview and a student portfolio. Content analysis was used to analyze the collected data.

THE SUBJECT

Alisa was a young female pre-university student who attended the “2B KMUTT” project during mid-March - early April 2008. The project is conducted annually to provide high school students interested in research and innovations in fields of study such as Science, Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Science, with the opportunity to participate in the activities of KMUTT research groups. When the project ends, all of the participating students must give an oral presentation to a committee that evaluates their performance. The students can also apply to study at the university if they wish. Each year, a number of students are admitted to KMUTT through this project.

PROCEDURE

The 4-week research project was started by choosing a subject. As there was only one student interested in this research topic, the researcher decided to do a case study with her. On the first day of training, Alisa was asked about the English language skills that she needed to practice. As the duration of the project was very short, she was asked to choose the skill that she wished to develop the most. She chose reading. After that, she was interviewed about her L2 reading behaviors using the Interviewer Guide for Reading Strategies (see Appendix 1). After learning about the different types of reading skills, Alisa decided to practice three reading skills: reading for the main idea, reading for specific purposes, and reading for details. What reading strategies related to each skill was then discussed with Alisa, and she identified a number of reading strategies she needed to practice, as shown in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Strategies</th>
<th>Reading Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading for the main idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using keywords</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using linguistic clues</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Alisa’s Selected Reading Skills and Reading Strategies
In the following days, Alisa was trained by the researcher of this study and a co-teacher in the use of cognitive strategies, compensation reading strategies, metacognitive reading strategies, and how to become a language learner. Then, she made her action plan, of achieving her goals for each learning task she had chosen, and applying the strategies needed to achieve each goal. Next, she practiced using the strategies by herself to complete the tasks. The project was supported by the Self-Access Learning Centre (SALC) in the School of Liberal Arts, KMUTT that provided different types of resources that Alisa could work on. To complete each goal, she could choose either printed materials provided in the SALC or log on to a Self-access English learning computer program called “My English” developed by the Department of Language Studies, School of Liberal Arts, KMUTT. She was also asked to reflect on her feelings and any problems she had encountered, and write down her reflections in a portfolio (see Appendix 2). She had to record in a diary what she had studied or learnt by herself to find out if what she had thought was similar to how she had actually performed. On the last day, after presenting her project entitled “How to be a good language learner” to the 2B KMUTT committee, she was interviewed about her reading behaviors to see whether there were any changes due to the training. The collected data were then analyzed using content analysis. To minimize the threats to the validity of the research, the co-teacher, who gave valuable comments on the findings, reviewed the final draft of the paper.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

**GENERAL READING BEHAVIOR OF THE CASE STUDY STUDENT**

Findings from the interviews indicate that, from among the four alternatives of a learner’s reading behavior, Alisa reported that she always chose to translate unknown words or guess their meanings from the context when performing a reading task. She had also used this compensation strategy before and after the training. Table 6 illustrates Alisa’s use of the other L2 reading strategies.

**Table 6. L2 Reading Strategies Used by the Case Study Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L2 Reading Strategies</th>
<th>Types of strategies</th>
<th>Before the training</th>
<th>After the training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes cognates.</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes chances in order to identify meaning.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps meanings in mind.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses context in preceding and succeeding sentences and paragraphs.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks up words correctly.</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continues if unsuccessful.</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses side-gloss.</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skips unnecessary words.</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows through with proposed solutions.</td>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of types of context clues.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skips unknown words (guesses contextually).</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates guesses.</td>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read titles (makes inferences).</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses knowledge of the world.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses illustrations.</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses glossaries as last resort.</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings show that overall, Alisa seemed to use all three types of learning strategies when performing reading tasks. The type of L2 learning strategies that Alisa used most was compensation strategies (including guessing contextually), followed by cognitive and metacognitive strategies. This finding supports the assumption that Asian students prefer compensation strategies rather than other types of L2 learning strategies (Lu, 2007).

**CHANGES IN ALISA’S USE OF L2 LEARNING STRATEGIES AFTER THE TRAINING**

According to Table 2, before the training, Alisa utilized eight strategies, two of which she did not use after the training. These were recognizing cognates and taking chances in order to identify meaning. This might be because she had realized that there are strategies other than the compensation strategies that she could use to complete reading tasks.

After the training, she used fourteen strategies, half of which she had just learnt in this project. Therefore, it can be concluded that Alisa’s use of L2 learning strategies changed dramatically after the training. Even though the case study student still used compensation strategies more than the cognitive
and metacognitively both before and after the training, the number of each type of strategy she used had increased. This means that the explicit strategy training did affect her use of L2 strategies.

However, findings from the student portfolios showed that she had used only two types of learning strategies, cognitive and metacognitive strategies, when performing reading tasks (see Table 7, 8). This may be because they were “new” to her.

### Table 7. Report on the Case Study Student’s Use of Cognitive Reading Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td><em>I should practice reading very often so that I can remember the words over which I’ve moved my eyes.</em>&lt;br&gt; <em>Sometimes, I came across some words I remember having seen before. But, I still didn’t remember their meanings.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing naturalistically</td>
<td><em>I can practice reading by choosing the reading text that I am interested in.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the idea quickly</td>
<td><em>I’ve learnt how to skim.</em>&lt;br&gt; <em>I’ve learnt how to scan. If I just keep moving my eyes over the reading text, I may not finish reading it in time. When scanning a text, I should try to find the key words first.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using resources for receiving and sending messages</td>
<td><em>To test how much I know about skimming, I did some exercises in the SEAR Project learning material.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking notes</td>
<td><em>I’ve learnt how to take notes.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Report on the Case Study Student’s Use of Metacognitive Reading Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding out about language learning</td>
<td><em>I can use the vocabularies I have learnt to communicate orally with foreigners.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td><em>After having succeeded in doing an easy task, I have to do other tasks which are more difficult.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting goals and objectives</td>
<td><em>To test how much I know about skimming, I did some exercises in the SEAR Project learning material. I should practice more scanning and skimming so that I can do them more effectively.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the purpose of a language task</td>
<td><em>I had fun reading the novel.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for a language task</td>
<td><em>Reading a lot will help me remember the meanings of the words I have often seen.</em>&lt;br&gt; <em>To finish the task in time, I should think about how much time I should spend on each item.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking practice opportunities</td>
<td><em>I can improve my reading ability by reading novels.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td><em>As I didn’t read the text thoroughly, I made some</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mistakes.  
I have problems about vocabulary and grammar. Sometimes, I don’t understand some instructions.

Self-evaluating  
I spent too much time on each particular reading task. I should manage my time more efficiently. I did very well on this task as the content and the questions are easy to understand.

**ALISA’S BELIEFS ABOUT L2 LEARNING STRATEGIES AND LEARNER AUTONOMY**

According to Park (1995), students’ beliefs, learning strategies, and L2 proficiency are generally related. The findings of this research confirm this assumption. Findings from the student diary illustrate the case study student’s reflection on belief and use of L2 learning strategies:

1. Alisa believed that training in L2 learning strategies could help improve her reading ability. She wrote, “I also learnt different types of reading skills. I did some reading practice in the SALT; as a result, I gained more knowledge about a variety of reading strategies.” This finding is supported by Alisa’s reflection in her portfolios where she seemed to rate herself very low on her first reading task, and higher on the following tasks (see Table 9).

**Table 9: Self-evaluated Portfolio Scores of the Case Study Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reading Skill</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Self-evaluated Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading for specific purposes</td>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>Topic in English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using keywords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using linguistic clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using imagery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading for the main ideas</td>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>SEAR Project materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using keywords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using linguistic clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Highlighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Reading deductively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading for details and reading for main ideas</td>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>SEAR Project materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using keywords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using linguistic clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Note-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Reading deductively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading for details and reading for main ideas</td>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>SEAR Project materials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using keywords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Using linguistic clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Note-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Reading for details</td>
<td>Reading deductively Summarizing</td>
<td>Skimming Taking notes Summarizing Translating Reading deductively</td>
<td>Classic Tales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reading for details</td>
<td>Reading deductively Summarizing</td>
<td>Skimming Taking notes Summarizing Translating Reading deductively</td>
<td>Classic Tales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Very poor  
2 = Poor  
3 = Fair  
4 = Good  
5 = Excellent

It can be concluded that metacognitive strategies do have positive effects on students’ reading comprehension. Similar findings have been reported in several studies (Al-Shaye, 2002; Chamot, 2005).

2. Alisa also recognized the importance of metacognitive knowledge—autonomous learning, as shown in her diary:

*I know and understand what self-access learning is. First of all, in language learning, one must set learning goals for what he/she wants to do, set purposes and expected outcomes so that he/she can know whether he/she could achieve the set goals or not.*

In addition, findings from the student portfolios revealed Alisa’s metacognitive knowledge involving task analysis and monitoring. For example, after having finished a reading text, she had recorded in her portfolio: “I learnt how to skim a reading text. [To understand what it is about], you need to find the key words first.” This shows that she knew how to analyze a reading text. Her portfolios also indicated her knowledge of monitoring a reading task. She wrote, “[the problem I encountered was] I couldn’t finish the task within the time limited. I should have managed my time better not by spending too much time on any specific items.” “I don’t know many words. I need to spend more time on practicing reading and taking notes of the words I’ve learnt.”

Such findings are congruent with those from her diary: “For the short period of the 2B KMUTT project, I found that the reading skill was the most suitable for practice as I had problems with reading, especially reading a long text within a limited time.”

With regard to the characteristics of an autonomous learner identified by Littlewood (1996) that involve (1) ability (i.e., knowledge and skills) and (2) willingness (i.e., motivation and confidence), findings from her diary and portfolios show that she had some degree of being an autonomous learner. Findings from her diary revealed that Alisa had sufficient knowledge about independent learning: “I’ve learnt the procedure of how to be an independent learner that includes six steps: analyzing, setting goals, planning the study, studying and evaluating.”

In addition, she reflected her understanding of learning how to learn:
At first, teachers aid students with their learning by modeling and giving advice. The teachers change their roles by gradually allowing the students to take charge of their own learning. Teachers allow students to set the learning goals more extensively than they did in the primary stage of learning until students can take full control of their own learning and need less support from the teachers. Eventually the students can be on their own.

Alisa also elaborated where and how she could study English by herself:

I had toured the SALC and found that there were a lot of self-access materials for practicing every English skill. Every corner is very interesting. In the reading room, there are several corners that provide materials for practicing different kinds of reading, e.g., literature, novels, journals, and magazines. There were cable TV and CDs for practicing listening, and materials in languages other than English such as Japanese, Thai, and Chinese. There are also ESP materials: English for Engineering, English for Science, and so on.

In addition, findings from Alisa’s portfolios expressed that she knew how to evaluate her own work: “I want to practice scanning and skimming, so I can do both techniques more effectively.” “I did [read] it too slowly. I need to read faster.” “I did quite well because the content and the questions of the task were easy. There is nothing to edit today.”

Willingness is the other characteristic of a good language learner. In her portfolios, Alisa commented on her motivation that after having been trained in L2 learning strategies, she hoped that she could read better and faster for an exam or even her own pleasure: “I can apply the knowledge I’ve gained in taking an exam or reading the texts that I’m interested in.” Her reflection on the task on reading for detail, she wrote: “I can read fictions; such as tales and novels, and I can use the expressions I have learnt from them to talk with foreigners.”

However, Alisa did not have enough confidence to become a fully autonomous learner. She reflected in her diary that she knew the procedure of learning how to learn quite well, but she still needed teacher support: “But, they [students] can ask for help anytime they want, so the teachers need to be around.” She also suggested that for Thai students, teacher support is necessary: “I have learnt that self-access learning is not totally teacher-free. Teachers should provide some support when we need it, since self-access learning is something new for [Thai] students.”

It is worth noting that students who are learning to become independent, autonomous learners should learn L2 learning strategies and skills that can help improve their reading ability.

CONCLUSION

Encouraging learners to develop autonomy is not just an ideal concept. Developing some degree of autonomy is essential for learners to become
effective language learners. Even though there is a strong argument that L2 autonomous learners are rare, and fostering learner autonomy is best done in the language classroom (Nunan, 1997), I would recommend that an out-of-class self-access mode of learning may be good alternative for promoting student autonomy, especially for mixed-ability classes. L2 learners, whether they are “good” or “weak” students, have equal chances to become autonomous learners if they are trained in using learning strategies. The results of this study indicate that the explicit instruction of L2 learning strategies, particularly cognitive and metacognitive ones, positively influenced the subject’s reading comprehension and belief in self-directed learning. However, due to the short duration of the study and the use of only one subject, the results of this study may not be generalized to other Thai EFL students in more or less similar contexts. More research should be done to verify the use of the Explicit Strategy Training model to develop autonomy in language learning.
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## APPENDIX 1

### Table 1. Interviewer Guide for Reading Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Reading Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely translates; Translates; guesses contextually guesses noncontextually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translates; Translates; guesses contextually rarely guesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies Comments

1. Keeps meaning in mind.  
2. Skips unknown words (guesses contextually).  
3. Uses context in preceding and succeeding sentence and paragraphs.  
4. Identifies grammatical category of words.  
5. Evaluates guesses.  
6. Reads titles (makes inferences).  
7. Continues if unsuccessful.  
8. Recognizes cognates.  
9. Uses knowledge of the world.  
10. Analyzes unknown words.  
11. Reads as though he or she expects the text to have meaning.  
12. Reads to identify meaning rather than words.  
13. Takes chances in order to identify meaning.  
15. Uses side-gloss.  
16. Uses glossary as last resort.  
17. Looks up words correctly.  
18. Skips unnecessary words.  
19. Follows through with proposed solutions.  
20. Uses a variety of types of context clues.  

APPENDIX 2

Portfolio

Name: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Topic/Unit: ______________________ Level: __________________________
Source: __________________________

Instructions: Reflect on how you feel toward your portfolio task. Answer the following questions:

1. What did you learn from the text (e.g., content, vocabulary, grammar, expression, or idiom)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. What skills did you improve in doing this task? How did you monitor your improvement? Did you develop your own techniques to practice such skills?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. Why did you choose this item/text? Specify the reason(s), including your interests, needs, and so on.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. How did you plan your portfolio task? Did you set your own learning goals and objectives before doing this task? Did you check whether you accomplished your learning goals and objectives?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. What do you want to improve in the item/text (e.g., content, idea, task type, or exercises)? If not, give reason(s).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. How did you feel about your performance? Did you work well on your task? Why or why not?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
7. Evaluate your own performance. Indicate your rating by putting a circle on the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What were the problem areas you encountered (e.g., content, vocabulary, grammar, expression, or idiom)? How did you solve your problems?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9. How did you correct your mistakes? Did you correct your own mistakes? Did you ask people to help you? If so, who are they?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. How can you apply the knowledge you have gained from this task to real-life situations?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
English as a Global Language: Global Englishes versus International Englishes

Johanathan Woodworth
York University, Toronto, Canada

Abstract

Current research into varieties of English represents a paradigm shift in how English is perceived in the global community. Proponents and opponents have closely argued the advent of the term Global English. Opponents, according to Graddol (1997), claim that English is a tool of imperialism and examine the hegemonic nature of English and its close ties with the reduced linguistic diversity in the world. This is especially critical in Asia, where more than 30% of the world’s living languages reside, and in which is one of the fastest consumers of English as a foreign and second language. However, the proponents look at English as both a tool of empowerment and an emblem of unification in the globalizing world. Butler (2002, p. 166) points out that while there are other languages with as many speakers or more, none offers the “same dual passport legitimacy at the local level as well as the international level.” More important than the debate on the usefulness of Global English is the need for a paradigm shift in language planning where English sustains rather than destroys the multilingual ethos of Asia and the rest of the world. The paradigm should not be one dominating Global English, which homogenizes and corrupts cultures, but an international language that encourages the speakers from various domains to incorporate their L1 norms and values, and to use English as International Language (EIL) for local as well as international interaction and communication.

While globalization was a key concept of the 1990s in western societies, a smaller movement - internationalization - was quickly gaining acceptance in eastern societies. Internationalization is based on the recognition of nations as distinct entities whereas globalization is about the process of producing a unified and integrated common culture (Featherstone, 1996, as cited in Hashimoto, 2002, p. 64). Although Global English, in its present form, is the most popular second language to learn, it is not a culturally neutral lingua franca. Global English is seen by opponents like Phillipson (2002, p. 7) as an “abstraction, a language in the minds of the prophets and cheer leaders of globalization, a hugely powerful myth that we need to locate, interpret and dissect.” The spread of Global English has deep roots in colonialism and inequality of distribution of power. Many claim that English is the world language, but to describe it as such ignores the fact that a majority of the world’s population do not speak English, whether as L1, L2 or as a foreign language (Phillipson, 2002). Currently, 10-20% of the population is getting obscenely richer; these “haves” also consume 80% of the available resources whereas the non-English-speaking “have-nots” are being systematically
impeoverished (Phillipson 2002). David Crystal’s (1997) celebration of the
growth of Global English as a homogenous regulated entity fits squarely into
what Phillipson (1999) terms the Diffusion of English Paradigm:

\[ \textit{an uncritical endorsement of capitalism, its science and technology, a} \]
\[ \textit{modernization ideology, monolingualism as a norm, ideological globaliza-} \]
\[ \textit{tion and internationalization, transnationalization, the Americanization} \]
\[ \textit{and homogenization of world culture, linguistic, cultural and media} \]
\[ \textit{imperialism. (p. 274)} \]

Moreover, a theory that focuses exclusively on the hegemony and the
spread of English in the developing countries only accounts for half of the
equation. “There is no doubt that English in the postcolonial era is promoted
and seen by many as a commodity” (Li, 2002, p. 54). Thus, English is being
supplied because there is a demand for this commodity as the English haves
control the world’s political and economic powers. The global language of
English can be seen to open doors, which fuels a demand for the consumption
of English, as transnational corporations look for cheaper sources of “standard”
or Global-English-speaking laborers.

Currently, these transnationals wield tremendous power to dictate English
policies in developing or periphery countries. English is found at the leading
dege of economic modernization and industrial development. In turn, the
typical pattern of economic modernization involves technology and the transfer
of skills from transnational companies via joint ventures with companies in
periphery countries. In addition, most often these joint ventures use Global
English as a medium of business and information exchange (Graddol, 1997).
However, as the periphery countries benefit from technology transfer and
‘catch up’ to these joint ventures, they often split off and employ local
companies using local language or localized Englishes. Although the beginning
stages of these joint ventures stimulate Global English, ultimately they result
in international English for localized use. The danger here is that many third
world countries need the “indispensable global medium” for survival in the
global economy even though “the medium is not culturally neutral, [so] they
run the risk of co-option, of acquiescing in the negation of their own
understanding of reality” (Thiru Kandiah Post Colonial World 21-22, as cited
in Phillipson, 2002, p. 21). To safeguard the local identity, English must be
“reconceptualized, from being an imperialist tool to being a multinational tool”

One of the implicit assumptions of a hegemonic view and analysis of the
spread of Global English is that people in the Periphery countries have been
brainwashed. For example, in Hong Kong, “English is imposed by decree in
the superstructure . . . colonial subjects would voluntarily consent, or even
choose, to be educated in English in place of their mother tongue, often
without realizing that in so doing, they have fallen victim of English linguistic
imperialism” (Li, 2002, p. 46). These consumers accept unquestioningly the
medium of instruction, textbook and teaching material, teaching methods,
preferred teacher-student interaction patterns, and all assumptions underlying
who are the best qualified to teach English on the basis of the
native/non-native distinction (Li, 2002). Thus the expression ‘native speaker’
is, in effect, synonymous with ‘white.’ Their real role is not as language teacher
but as a living example of the ‘American Way of Life.’ This binary opposition between native and non-native is troublesome because the native speaker’s English is taken as the norm, and other variance from it are defined negatively (Phillipson, 2002, p. 7). The parents’ and the students’ predisposed assumptions about the superiority of the native speaker teacher has strong roots “grounded in the continued global technological, economic, and political dominance of English” (Oladejo, 1997, as cited in Phillipson, 2002, p. 19). However, if the consumers of English think of English not as a foreign language but as the international common language, the hegemonic homogenous nature of English would be dispelled. The Japanese proposal of English as the second official language states succinctly that English is:

an essential tool for obtaining information globally, sending messages, dealing with business and being involved in activities internationally. Needless to say, our mother tongue Japanese is the base for the inheritance of Japanese culture and tradition, but people should be also encouraged to learn other languages. However, to master English as the international common language means to acquire the most basic ability to access and understand the world (Asahi Shinbun, 2000, Feb. 25, as cited in Hashimoto, 2002, p. 67).

In Japanese education and language policies, Hashimoto (2002) continues to argue that English is a device to develop abilities and qualities that will enable Japanese citizens to earn the trust of the international community. This effectively means that the Japanese can use English to create an identity through empowerment rather than succumb to the co-option of English culture. This is a shift of looking at English as a Global English to International English.

In the previous scenario, the respect for Japanese traditions and culture is portrayed as part of the development of qualities that will earn such international trust. In other words, the promotion of internationalization aims to re-educate Japanese citizens to re-assert to the outside world their collective identity as Japanese, and the teaching of English-as-a-foreign-language has been structured for that purpose (Hashimoto, 2000). Much in the same respect as Hashimoto, Hashim (2002) reiterates that English in Malaysia reflects the experiences of the people living in the country. Malaysian English is considered different from others in that it has emerged to suit the culture and identity of the people. One of the primary reasons for the lack of any kind of resistance or movement against the Englishization of Malay in Brunei can be attributed to the fact that the process is regarded as providing a means for strengthening the Malay language in order to facilitate its use as a medium for the dissemination of knowledge in all disciplines (Rosnah, Ramly, Othman and McLellan, 2002, p. 104). This is the fundamental difference between Global English and International English.

Variations of English continue even in the English L1 environment because of immigration, as well as the entry of foreign students and workers into the country. Encroachment of Spanish in the Southern United States, and variant English forms found among black youths highlight the fact that English is not a homogenous entity, as proponents of Global Englishes declare. Many schools in America enroll “limited English proficient” students who have different
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cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and many colleges and universities hire international teaching assistants who speak different varieties of English (Kubota & Ward, 2000, p. 80). In addition, in many workplaces, especially in the IT field, Brazilian, Indian, and other varieties of English coexist harmoniously. In such a diverse linguistic community of International Englishes, people have developed an awareness of different varieties of English, positive attitudes toward diversity, and, most importantly, a willingness to engage in intercultural communication.

Multicultural education is needed for national survival because of growing cultural and linguistic diversity, both domestically and internationally. Many people mistakenly “assume a commonality of understanding when both speakers use the same English words” (Gilsdorf, 2002, p. 364). However, in culturally diverse environments, English words often carry different assumptions, connotations and meanings (Gilsdorf, 2002, p. 370). This greatly worries the proponents of Global English. However, as Stevens (1992) points out, “one interesting aspect of Standard English is that in every English-using community those who habitually use only Standard English are in a minority” (p. 52, cited in Xu, 2002, p. 228). Global English is a myth.

The localization of English would be a key development to the trend of the Englishes. Even now, within the English L1 countries, there is great stratification and diversification of varieties of English. Although some researchers argue that such stratification and fragmentation of English would be detrimental to the global economy because the business world would lose an important tool for communication, others such as Graddol (1997) see this as inevitable. Localization of content, followed by the medium of communication and its localized methods of discourse, are increasing due to the need to increase market penetration. “It is well known that advertising, for example, needs to adapt to local culture, language and social values” (Graddol, 1997, p. 46). Thus, localization of English is actually helping to build or strengthen national identities.

Local varieties of International English reflect the cultural norms and value systems used by non-native speakers of English in their localities. As the trend continues, there could be a concern that an understanding of the language in itself, without knowledge of the local cultural schema, will not bring complete and comprehensive meaning to outsiders. For the outsiders to be able to understand and appreciate the discourse, they must have “the schema of local cultural attributes, norms and value systems” (Khemlani and Yong, 2002, p. 177). This may be alarming for some but already there is much dissimilarity between the English spoken by different groups within each of the English-speaking countries. In addition, these divergences continue to stratify because the language reflects the identity construction of varied sub-cultures and these identities continue to emerge and change within those countries. Thus, these non-native localized varieties are simply different varieties, neither deficient nor superior to Standard English. There is no concept of a standard and norms of English. Language is not static but dynamic and evolving. The coexistence of many varieties of English has enriched, and will continue to enrich, the language, as a multinational entity. It will increasingly become more multi-cultured, “which in turn enhances communication among speakers of English, and secures the position of EIL” (Xu, 2002, p. 228).

David Crystal, in his book Global Englishes (1997, p. 7) once stated that “a
language becomes an international language for one chief reason: the political
tower of its people - especially their military power.” Historically, this may
have been true, but it is now economic influence that decides how much
international power a country has at its disposal. China and other powers in
Asia are quickly becoming dominant forces in the world economy. As powers
shift and the Englishes become more localized, speaking English suddenly has
nothing to do with nationality or with the historical imperialistic spread
(Stevens, 1992 as cited in Xu, 2002, p. 227). English in the international scene
has dual functions: (a) it provides a vehicle for international communication
and (b) forms the basis for constructing cultural identities through localization.
Each variety of English will need to maintain a balance between localism and
internationalism (Butler, 2002, p. 165). In order to achieve this goal, learning
English should not be about gaining knowledge about the English language
itself, but rather about using the language for authentic and natural
communicative processes.
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Legitimizing the Non-Native English Speaking Teacher in English Language Teaching
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Abstract

Compared to other teaching fields, disputes and ambiguities regarding the knowledge base and competence required for an English language teacher (ELT) is striking due not only to the broad terms defining the teachers’ proficiency in teaching but also their status as a native speaker (NS) or as a non-native speaker (NNS). According to Zheng’s description (cited in Jie, 1999, para 6), the following items may be taken into consideration for the evaluation of a teacher of second language: teaching effectiveness, linguistic competency, and presentation of foreign culture, and classroom management skills.

Students of English prefer NSs because of their perceived superiority in fluent, idiomatic spoken English and pronunciation (Ellis, 2002). Given the fact that 80% of all ESL/EFL teachers worldwide are NNS of English (Liu, 1999), the diverse geographical and linguistic backgrounds of these teachers must be examined in terms of the criteria of a good teacher (Canagarajah, 1999). Although the terms NNS and NS are useful for classification, the differentiating among teachers based on their status as native or non-native speakers perpetuates the dominance of the NS in the ELT profession, contributes to discrimination in hiring practices and relegates NNSs to the second-class status.

Introduction

Compared to other teaching fields, disputes and ambiguities regarding the knowledge base and competence required for an English language teacher (ELT) is striking due not only to the broad terms defining the teachers’ proficiency in teaching but also their status as a native speaker (NS) or as a non-native speaker (NNS). There is little dispute that teachers should have a post-secondary education and possess strong knowledge of English, but beyond this, there are disagreements on what makes a good ELT. Furthermore, when teaching English, a distinction must be made between EFL (English-as-a-foreign-language) and ESL (English-as-a-second-language). EFL indicates the use of English in a non-English-speaking region while ESL is the use of English within an English-speaking region, generally by refugees, immigrants, and their children.

According to Zheng’s description (cited in Jie, 1999, para 6), the following items may be taken into consideration for the evaluation of a teacher of second language: teaching effectiveness, linguistic competency, presentation of foreign culture, and classroom management skills. In the scope of this paper, the categories of linguistic competency (English), confidence of language usage,
students’ perception of the teachers’ competency and the classroom management based on psychological elements and personality will be examined.

Students of English prefer NSs because of their perceived superiority in fluent, idiomatic spoken English and pronunciation (Ellis, 2002). Given the fact that 80% of all ESL/EFL teachers worldwide are NNS of English (Liu, 1999), the diverse geographical and linguistic backgrounds of these teachers must be examined in terms of the criteria of a good teacher (Canagarajah, 1999). Although the terms NNS and NS are useful for classification, differentiating among teachers based on their status as native or non-native speakers can perpetuate the dominance of the NS in the ELT profession, contribute to discrimination in hiring practices and relegate NNSs to second-class status.

**DEFINITION OF NS AND NNS**

What defines a non-native English-speaking teacher (NNEST) and native English speaking teacher (NEST) has been much debated. For some, NSs embody the idealized English teacher because their very act of being embodies the foreign; they look, act and think differently in the students’ minds. They are perceived as having the answers on grammatical correctness, nuances of idiom and appropriateness of expression that NNEST may not. Medgyes (1994) speaks of the difficulty in defining who a native speaker is. Studies by Coppieters (1987) suggest that a significant difference exists between native speakers and non-native speakers. According to Davies (1991, p. 128), from a sociolinguistic point of view, the distinction between native speaker and non-native speaker is “one of confidence and identity.” Medgyes (1996) describes native speakers as being potentially more accomplished users of English than NNSs. Additionally, the different varieties of English pose further problems by segregating them into different levels of prestige. If a national variety of English is unintelligible outside of that country, it is of limited value, thus discounting the legitimacy of some native speakers of English for ESL purposes.

Boyle (1997) combines the ideals presented by previous researchers by selecting five elements, which are essential to being a native-speaker that will be used in this paper:

- inheritance / birth / early start
- expertise / proficiency / fluency
- continual use as dominant language
- loyalty / allegiance / affiliation
- confidence / comfortable identification

In terms of English language ability, the advantages of being a native speaker as an English language teacher correlate with the above five criteria. For NSs, English is learned from birth or very early on and is fixed for life. English tends only to fade if neglected over many years, but the intricacies of the grammar of the language that were learned instinctively can be employed with speed and certainty. Provided there are not any mental defects or unusual
circumstances, the level of proficiency, including vocabulary and usage of idioms, can be expected to be very high. Unlike NNESTs working in their L1 countries, NESTs tend to mix with other native-speakers and therefore continue to use English as their dominant language, even in situations when another language is the host one of the broader speech community. These NSs, apart from unusual circumstances, have a strong sense of attachment to the mother tongue and a high degree of confidence in their ability to use the language, though this will vary from person to person.

**Perceived Deficiencies of NNESTs**

NNS have the following disadvantages in relations to the five criteria: a language learned later in life can be easily forgotten, unless it is constantly practiced. Cultural and linguistic differences between L1 and English could translate into deficiencies in grammar, vocabulary and idiomatic usage, creating an enormous, ongoing challenge for the NNSs. Additionally, the prestige of having core-English-speaking-countries’ accents delegates the NNESTs’ accents to second-class status, often causing those teachers to lose confidence. For these NNSs, it is difficult to keep English as the dominant language of use when the dominant speech community is not English, and especially so when the dominant language is in fact that person’s own native-language, giving the perception that these teachers are somehow less capable. Furthermore, the NNSs lack emotional ties with English; English is not the language of their emotional expression and it is not a conduit of their heritage and cultural background. They use English for work but their L1 maintains cultural and kinship ties in their personal lives that are different from the thoughts and the actions of a NS, which translates into classroom management.

Though there can exist deficiencies of the NNESTs, Phillipson (1996) uses the term “the native speaker fallacy” to refer to the unfair categorization of qualified NNESTs as being less capable than NESTs. He further describes the NNESTs to be potentially the ideal ELTs because they have gone through the second language acquisition (SLA) process. Unlike NSs, NNSs are usually proficient in both English and another language. Due to the experience of learning English, sometimes these teachers are better able to relate to their students because they are sensitized to the linguistic and cultural needs of their students. NNESTs can more easily appreciate their learners' problems of language transfer and cultural alienation. Medgyes (1996) concluded that NNESTs could be good learner models, in spite of their lower language proficiency than NESTs, having gone through the experience of learning English as a second (or third or fourth) language. They have had to adopt language-learning strategies during their own learning process, most likely making them better qualified to teach those strategies and more empathetic to their students’ linguistic challenges and needs. In the following, the NNESTs’ linguistic and cultural competency, confidence of language usage, perception of competency by the students and the teacher’s classroom management style based on the NNESTs’ culture and personality will be examined.
LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL COMPETENCY

In grammar, the NEST may know what is correct, but may be unable to explain the grammatical rules (Coppeters, 1987). Some non-native-speakers may surpass some native speakers in the vocabulary of specialist registers, such as, for example, Computer English or the English of Accounting (Thomas, 1999). In addition, some words are not dictionary translatable. As a bilingual in Korean and English, I often feel that the dictionary definitions are not correct, because they do not include the connotations and cultural artifacts associated with the terms. Grammar is another area where NNESTs proficiencies have been challenged (Coppeters, 1987). However, because NNESTs often learn grammar explicitly with comparison to their L1, they may be able to explain the intricacies of grammar to the students more precisely. Often when my students ask me a difficult grammar question, I know the answer but I have difficulties explaining why. NNS who have learned English by contrasting it to their mother tongue would have the training and the specific vocabulary to explain to the students not only the correctness of grammar but also how it is different from their L1. Similarly, in cultural aspects of English, although the NSs embody the foreign culture, they are disadvantaged because they cannot relate the two cultures effectively to be able to explain the differences to the students. In such cases, the students can study the culture but will not be able to internalize it because the NESTs do not represent the synthesis of the L1 and target language cultures.

CONFIDENCE OF LANGUAGE USAGE, ACCENTS AND WORLD ENGLISHES

Many excellent NNESTs feel a lack of confidence when compared with NSs on the grounds of peculiarities of accent, intricacies of grammar, or knowledge of vocabulary. Nevertheless, such diffidence is often misplaced. It is possible that a native-speaker with a strong Cockney, Glasgow, Australian, or Deep-Southern American accent can pose more problems as a teacher of English than many a Singaporean, Nigerian, Indian or Hong Kong Chinese teacher. Phillipson (1992) argues that one aspect of linguistic imperialism is a sense of inferiority in many NNS teachers of English when they compare themselves with native-speaker teachers.

Often these NESTs from the periphery English-speaking countries have been discriminated by employers. Lippi-Green (1997) found that teachers with supposed non-native accents (from the periphery English-speaking countries) were perceived as less qualified and less effective and were compared unfavorably with their native-English-speaking (from core English-speaking countries) colleagues. However, the global spread of English has increased opportunities for NS to interact with other speakers of World Englishes (WE), giving credence to varieties of authentic Englishes. Nevertheless, NESTs are rarely encouraged to develop the knowledge and skills necessary for intercultural communication (Kubota, 2001). The NNESTs usually speak WE and may have more positive attitudes towards varieties of Englishes.
PERCEPTION OF COMPETENCY BY THE STUDENTS

Although NNS can become native in proficiency and be able to communicate more effectively in WE in terms of communicative and linguistic competence than NSs, it is often in the place of education that students and parents discriminate against NNS (Davies, 1991). Most private English language centers still only require a bachelor’s degree and a proof of ‘Whiteness’ via a picture (Canagarajah, 1999; Braine, 1999). In a study, Thomas (1999) found that some ESL learners were critical of the teachers who did not ‘look like’ NS, meaning white. According to him, some ESL students assume that teachers who do not look native will not be good ESL/EFL teachers. Often these students are not aware of the great cultural and racial diversity that is pervasive in North America. When I am asked the question, “Are you Korean?” I usually answer, “No, I am Canadian.” The usual answer is quickly followed by, “But you look Asian.” The English learners’ lack of understanding of racial diversity contributes to their linguistic biases against non-native ESL teachers. Often, to these students, it does not occur to them teachers who are not white could have also lived in the English-speaking countries all their lives.

Even if the students recognize the value of NNESTs, the conert of the NS as the ideal English teacher is pervasive even in the nature of English curricula. Many schools have been adopting the communicative competency model, which emphasizes the use of authentic materials and natural language in the classroom as models of communicative acts. Widdowson (1994) remarks that this notion of authenticity has given the NS teachers a sense of privilege and entitlement. As a result of giving this “authenticity primacy as a pedagogic principle, you inevitably grant privileged status to native-speaker teachers, and you defer to them not only in respect to competence in the language but also in respect to competence in language teaching” (Widdowson, 1994, p. 387).

LEARNING STYLES FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

When I was teaching at a university in China, the government guidelines disapproved of teaching culture in English classes by foreign teachers because they saw this as cultural imperialism. In vastly different cultures with different communication rules, the NS teacher’s lack of cultural rules in communicating can alienate the students because they may have ideas about teaching and classroom behaviors that conflict with those of the students. For instance, in Japan, communication rules are based on the preference for group conformity to insure harmonious interaction (Kitao & Kitao, 1985). There always exists one inevitable relationship in any classroom: teacher(s) and students. In other words, both teachers and students attach their individual psychological processes in their teaching and learning (Breen, 2001). When the teachers’ and the students’ expectations of classroom management style do not match, problems can arise. For example, the NS teacher’s preference for a Western style of active participation may contribute to communication apprehension among Japanese learners. Saito and Ebsworth (2004) found that Japanese college students are more apprehensive than their Western counterparts in the
paired, small group and public communication settings that NSs prefer. Such communication apprehension can negatively affect the language acquisition process (Krashen, 1982). Lippi-Greenn (1997) claims that NNESTs’ self-identification as teachers, immigrants, and language learners profoundly affect how they construct their classrooms and their instruction. She found that NNESTs draw on the commonalities among linguistic and ethnic groups represented in the class as a means to collaborate and create a community of learners. They use instructional materials developed in countries outside the inner circle to offer a variety of perspectives and use both the teachers’ and students’ experiences as immigrants and second language learners as sources of knowledge.

CONCLUSION

In complex issues where several different and interconnected variables are involved, whose relative weights are hard to judge, it is difficult to go beyond broad generalizations. There are some excellent and some very poor NS teachers of English and equally there are some excellent and some very poor NNS teachers of English. It is impossible to say one is better than the other. However, between NS and NNS teachers, one is given credence and privilege above the other. Those who oppose the dichotomy feel that differentiating among teachers based on their status as native or non-native speakers perpetuates the dominance of the native speaker in the ELT profession and contributes to discrimination in hiring practices. Native English speakers without teaching qualifications are more likely to be hired as ESL teachers than qualified and experienced NNSs, especially outside North America (Canagarajah, 1999).

The term “L2 Users,” and “multicompetence” proposed by Cook (1999) to replace NNS is very apt in that it underscores the fact that while the teachers had learned their L2 later in life and may still be learning some aspects of it, at present they are legitimate and regular users of that language. In spite of bias from the ELT profession, students and parents, the L2 users make potentially more effective ESL/EFL teachers because they have experience acquiring English as an additional language. They have first-hand experience in learning and using a second language, and their personal experience has sensitized them to the linguistic and cultural needs of their students. Teachers who have the same first language as their students have developed a keen awareness of the differences between English and their students’ mother tongue. This sensitivity gives them the ability to anticipate their students’ linguistic problems. Despite the challenges of not fitting into the idealized version of an 'ideal English teacher,' the L2 users must see themselves and be viewed by others as equal partners in the ELT profession, both in the institutions where they teach and within the professional organizations that represent them.
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**Testing and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Burden</td>
<td>Student Evaluation in Japanese Universities. Are ELT Teachers Disadvantaged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ting-yao Cheng</td>
<td>Development of Online Multimedia English Test for EFL Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Davila</td>
<td>Assessment in the English Language Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi Emori</td>
<td>Pre &amp; Post Self-Assessment: Getting Students to Anticipate the Course Ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Fusselman</td>
<td>Making TOEFL iBT Reading Tests for Your Classroom Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Guest</td>
<td>The Criticism and Analysis of University Entrance Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahra Janbazi</td>
<td>The Relationship Between Left/Right Brain Dominance and Performance of Cloze and Multiple Choice Item Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miae Lee</td>
<td>Portfolios in the Korean Middle School Classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vocabulary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Dunbar</td>
<td>Vocabulary Learning Strategy Instruction and Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Owen</td>
<td>Vocabulary Cha-Cha: Taking Matching Activites Up a Notch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing
Mingxia Gao The Impact of Explicit Revision Instruction on L2 Student Writers
Julia Gardiner Corrective Feedback, Collaborative Revision, and L2 Writing
Lawrie Hunter Graphical Means of Reducing Cognitive Load in L2 Writing
Young Ok Jong Voices of Korean Primary and Secondary Students About Learning English Writing
John McNulty Proactive Approaches to Combating Plagiarism in University (EFL) Writing Courses
Adriane Moser Using Pedagogical and Learner Corpora to Investigate Summary Writing
David E. Shaffer Writing Research Papers: Proper Quoting, Citing, and Referencing
Isaiah WonHo Yoo Teaching the Academic Body Paragraph in Content-Based Instruction

Organizational Partner Presentations
Neil Anderson Are You an ACTIVE Reader?
Nalin Bahaguna Tune In: Listening to Learn Natural English the Easy Way
Nalin Bahaguna Well-Read and Cover to Cover - Reading for Test Success!
John Baker Choosing Textbooks for Teaching Second Language Writing
John Baker Putting Students in Charge of Their Reading With Houghton Mifflin’s Reading Keys: Reading for Results and Reading for Thinking Texts
John Baker Teaching Second Language Writing
Michael Cahill Listening Strategies for Learners of English How and Why
Michael Cahill Teaching Grammar Through Content
Michael Cahill Writing Practice for Assessment Success
Michael Cahill Three Things You Need to Know About Teaching Grammar
David Charlton Active English Grammar in the Classroom
Gilly Dempster Pumping Up the Volume!
Andrew Finch Discussion: Integrating Oral Skills Into the School Syllabus
Clyde Fowle Developing Discussions
Steven Gershon Materials and Methods: Time For a (New) Upgrade!
Patrick Haffenstein Learners’ Dictionaries Today - A One-stop Shop for Language Help
Patrick Haffenstein Let Your Students Be Who They Are!
Patrick Haffenstein Waking Up the Classroom
Clare Hambly The Complete Let’s Go
Jeremy Harmer You Want to Know How to What?
Marc Helgesen Access Leads to Success Firsthand
Chanmi Hong Guided Reading: Learn to Read, Read to learn
Chanmi Hong The Six Traits of Effective Writing
Hyunsu Ji You Light Up My English Life!
Robert Kim Ventures: A New Integrated-skills Adult Course for Practical Communication
Sara Kim We Always WELCOME You All!
Katherine MacKay Oral Communication Made Simple
Katherine MacKay On Track to Listening Success!
Emily Page Successful Reading Activities for the Classroom
Heejung Park Listening That Works!
Sherry Preiss Assess for Success: Practical Strategies to Improve Learning
Sherry Preiss The Power of Technology - Maximizing Learning Opportunities
Jason Renshaw Planning and Managing Lessons for Skills-based English With Pre-teen Korean Learners
Liana Robinson A Communicative Approach to Writing in the Classroom
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Rilla Roessel  Active Reading Creative Responses
Marcos Benivedes  Widgets: A task-based Approach to Fluency Building
Chris Valvona  Widgets: A Task-based Approach to Fluency Building
Eric Verspecht  Mega Flash Plus: Stimulating Grammar Learning in the Primary Classroom
Eric Verspecht  Reading in English: A Fascinating Journey With “All of Us”
Eric Verspecht  Grammar in View: Ensure Students’ Success in Learning Grammar
Linda Warfel  Magic School Bus Chapter Books: Driving Science Vocabulary and Content
Linda Warfel  English Libraries: Practical Solutions to Improve Vocabulary and Reading Achievement
Rob Waring  Discover Our World with Footprint Reading Library
Rob Waring  Managing and Running a Low-level Extensive Reading Program
Jason Wilburn  Can Phonics Be Fun for Young Learners?
Jason Wilburn  Is Grammar Right for Young Learners?
2008 Conference Overview
Presentations of
The 16th Korea TESOL International Conference

Responding to a changing world
October 25–26, 2008, Seoul, Korea

The 2008 Korea TESOL Conference Committee gratefully recognizes the following people for presenting research papers, conducting workshops, and leading discussions at the 16th Korea TESOL International Conference. Listings are in alphabetical order by surname (academic preceding commercial presentations), followed by the title of the session; co-presenters are listed separately.

**Academic Presentations**

### 21st Century Learning Preferences/Styles

Nathan Jones  
Personality Type and the Persistence of Error Correction Preferences

Chada Kongchan  
Teachers’ Personality Styles, Objectives and Material Design

Caroline Linse  
Where Should I Get My Advanced Degree in TESOL?

Tatsuhiko J. Paul  
Changing World: Utilizing Hollywood Movies for Cultural Awareness

Nagasaka  
Why Don’t My Students Want To Learn?

Kevin Parent  
Energizing Learning: Engaging All Learners in the Classroom of the 21st Century

David E. Shaffer  
Korean attitudes Towards Varieties of Spoken English

Wareesiri Singhasiri  
Teachers’ Personality Styles, Objectives and Material Design

Shun Wang  
Personality Type and the Persistence of Error Correction Preferences

Johanathan  
Legitimizing the Non-Native English Speaking Teacher (NNEST) in English Language Teaching (ELT)

Woodworth

### Content-Based Instruction

Brian Keith  
Worship, the Bible, and Teaching English

Heldenbrand

James H. Life  
Instructing Listening Comprehension With Internet Video-Clips

Tory Thorkelson  
Building a Successful Content Based (CBI) University Course

### English for Special Purposes

Terry Fellner  
Writing Fluency: What is It Really?

### Extensive Reading Colloquium

Kazuko Ikeda  
The Effective of Extensive Reading on TOEFL Scores and GPA Results

Hyonjung Kim  
An Introduction To Extensive Reading

Mike Misner  
The Usefulness of In-Text Glossing

Rocky Nelson  
Implementing a Pure Extensive Reading Course in a University

Sean Smith  
A Teacher’s Reflections on Implementing Extensive Reading

Paul Suh  
The Effects on Reading Comprehension of Combining Extensive and Intensive Reading

Atsuko Takase  
Implementing Extensive Reading at the High School Level

Rob Waring  
An Introduction To Extensive Reading

David Williams  
Extensive Reading as a Means To Raise TOEFL Scores in a
Facilitating Learning

Atushi Asai  
Upidating Basic Vocabulary in EFL

Sasan Balezghizadeh  
The Dilemma of Assessing Paragraph Structure Awareness

Allison Bill  
Creative Reading and Writing for Children

Allison Bill  
the Next Step - Professional Development

Peter Carter  
EFL Textbooks: What Do Low-Proficiency Learners Want?

Tsan-Jui Cheng  
Fosterling Learners' Self-Directedness - A Study on English Teachers' Role

Kristin Dalby  
Using Targeted Surveys To Inform and Improve Our Teaching

Tim Dalby  
Testing Times for Teachers

Tim Dalby  
Using Targeted Surveys To Inform and Improve Our Teaching

Kelly Drake  
Monsters 101: A Project for the Creative Classroom

Yuko Goto Butler  
Assessment and Instruction: Can they Have a Happy Marriage?

Soonam Han  
The Influences of Teachers' Support in Young Learners' Narrative Task

Andrea Henderson  
"Let the Students Write" - (Practical Ideas To Assist Students With their Writing)

Richard Johnstone  
Teaching Young Learners an Additional Language: Moving forward in the Light of Experience

Sarah Jones  
Encouraging Participation in Compulsory Freshmen University Conversation Classes

Curtis Kelly  
The Evolving Science of Learning

Chris Kennedy  
Investigating the Language Landscape of Our Learners

David Kluge  
Students Helping Students: How To Do Peer Reading

Chada Kongchan  
Teachers' anxiety About Using L2 in EFL Classrooms

Kyosung Koo  
the Effects of Reference Tools on Accuracy of foreign Language Writing

David Leaper  
Group Discussion Tests for In-Class Assessment

Jung-Hwa Lee  
Teacher's Written Error Feedback on College Students' Writings

Danielle Little  
Maximizing Learning By Developing Students' Brain Potential Through Brain Education

Stafford Lumsden  
Teaching Listening: Instructional Interventions for Improved Listening

Don Makarchuk  
Effects of Reciprocity Conditions in Interviews and Paired Testing

Nancy Jo Marcet  
Helping Your Students Become Organized Essay Writers

Jessica Matchett  
Using Mind Mapping as a Tool for a Four-Skills Class

Julia-Louise Missie  
Using Mind Mapping as a Tool for a Four-Skills Class

Jon Mitchell  
Finding Our Voice: Learner Narratives in the TESOL Classroom

Sutida Ngonkum  
Collaborative Listening: Maximizing Students’ Aural Comprehension

Kyungnan Park  
Using DVDs To Improve Communicative Competence for Korean Young Learners

Sherry Preiss  
Energizing Learning: Engaging All Learners in the Classroom of the 21st Century

Rafael Sabio  
Online Videos: Authentic Materials Used in English Language Learning

Sherry Seymour  
Encouraging Participation in Compulsory Freshmen University Conversation Classes

Wareesiri Singhasiri  
Teachers' anxiety About Using L2 in EFL Classrooms

Raymond Smith  
Beyond Listening: How To Enhance the Listening Experience

Christopher Stillwell  
Bringing Change To the Classroom Through Collaboration

Osamu Takeuchi  
Language Learning Strategies in an Asian EFL Context
Danny Tan
Perfect Pronunciation? Say What?

Makiko Tanaka
Is “English Only” Instruction More Favorable in Elementary Schools? an analysis of Teacher-Students Discourse and Interaction

Matthew Taylor
Students Helping Students: How To Do Peer Reading

Tory Thorkelson
Bringing Drama Into Your Classroom: How To Activate Your Students

John Wendel
Encouraging Participation in Compulsory Freshmen University Conversation Classes

John Wiltshier
Peer-Shadowing - What, Why and How It Helps Students To Speak

Tomoko Yabukoshi
Language Learning Strategies in an Asian EFL Context

Nicholas Yates
Professional Development: Empowering Teachers for the Future

John Campbell-Larsen
Promoting Fluency Through Discourse Awareness

Chungeol Park
Who's Doing All the Talking?

Korey Rice
Meeting Students' Changing Needs Through Program Reform

Heather Sellens
Who's Doing All the Talking?

Rose Senior
Towards Teaching in Class-Centered Ways

Rose Marie Whitley
Teacher's Written Error Feedback on College Students’ Writings

Genre Studies
Siamak Mazloomi
On the Relationship Between EFL Learners’ Genre-Awareness and their Proficiency Level

Global Engishes
Barry Kavanagh
The Native Speaker’s Relevance To the ELT Classroom and Profession

Kazushige Takahashi
A Breakfast Effect on Japanese University Students’ ESL Proficiency

Li-Yi Wang
From Standard English Advocates To World Englishes Educators

Johanathan
English as a Global Language: Global Englishes Versus International

Woodworth
Englishes

Global Issues
Marti Anderson
Pedagogies of Peace

Merton Bland
Ten Commandments for Teaching English in a Changing World: Methodology for the 21st Century

John Cashman
Foreseeing a Changing World

David Graddol
The Future of English and Teaching

Jeremy Kritt
English Through English: A Critical Engagement of New English Language Educational Policy in South Korea

Jeremy Kritt
An Introduction To Task-Based Language Teaching

Joo-Kyung Park
Glocalization Should Be It!

Intercultural Communication
Kristin Helland
World Englishes: Seeking a New Framework for Teaching Culture

John Honisz-Greens
Using Tandem Learning To Explore National Identity and Stereotypes

Maggie Lieb
Should We Care How Our Students Perceive Us?

Dr John Linton
Life in Korea, A Century of Family Perspectives

Other Relevant issues of ESL/EFL
Johnathan Aleles
Using Differentiated Instruction in a Multilevel English Conversation Course
Christopher Bozek  Weekend Review
Peter Burden  Benefit Or Bane?: Student Evaluation of Teaching in Japanese Universities
Parisa Daftarifard  Perceptual Learning-Style Preference and Achievement Across Age and Proficiency Level
Terry Fellner  Taking It Outdoors: Language Learning Beyond the Classroom
John Halliwell  Grammar Practice: From Memorizing To Grammaring
John Honisz-Greens  Incorporating DREAM Management Into the ELT Workplace
Jennifer Jordan  an Investigation of Short-Term Length of Residence on the English Pronunciation of Native Speakers of Korean
Hyonjung Kim  Building Reading Speed With Extensive Reading
Jihyun Kim  Reading and Writing: English Newspapers in Education
Richard Johnstone  Teaching Young Learners an Additional Language: Moving forward in the Light of Experience.
Hsing-Chin Lee  The Use of Two Small Corpora: English Literary Works Vs. Classroom Textbooks
Chiiyo Myojin  Teaching English Methodology
Ubon  Project-Based Teaching and Learning in a Thai University
Sanpatchayapong  Context: A Paradigm Shift of Teacher’s Role
Rose Senior  Communicative Language Teaching in Australia: the Inside Story
Justin Shewell  Empirical Evidence of Common Speech-Perception Problems for Koreans
Toyoko Shimamura  What is an Appropriate Style for Academic Presentations?
Osamu Takeuchi  What is an Appropriate Style for Academic Presentations?
Jessica Vaudreuil-Kim  Teaching English Through Storytelling: How To Teach Various Levels
Jeffrey Walter  Teaching Conversation Strategy and Structure
Grace H. Wang  Teaching Discourse Intonation: the Why and How
Grace H. Wang  The ABCs of Task-Based Teaching
Rob Waring  Building Reading Speed With Extensive Reading
Stuart D. Warrington  The Lexical Modification of Teachers’ Instructions: Perceptions Vs. Reality
Michael T. Welles  The Lexical Modification of Teachers’ Instructions: Perceptions Vs. Reality
Pamararat Wiriyakarun  Strategy Training for Promoting Learner Autonomy: A Case Study

Special Interest Groups
David D.I. Kim  Doing Research 3: Collecting and analyzing Research Data
Jake Kimball  Doing Research 1: Selecting a Research Topic
Kevin Parent  Doing Research 2: Designing a Research Project
David E. Shaffer  Doing Research 4: Reporting Research Results
Wendy Arnold  Synthetic, analytical Phonics & Whole Word Approach
Wendy Arnold  Story as a Vehicle
Caroline Linse  Creative Correspondence Activities for the YL Classroom
Caroline Linse  Selecting Books for Young EFL Beginners YL
Hans Mol  Why Sing? Using Songs With Young Learners.
Hans Mol  Grammar Can Be Fun!
Adrian Tennant  Exploring Reading
Adrian Tennant  Audiobooks

Technology Enhanced Instruction
Charles Anderson  Mobilizing Affective and Effective Homework
Sarah Louisa Birchley  ESL Podcasts - Don't forget the Content!
Michael Bowles  The Role of Online Tutors in Supporting Teacher Education
Through Asynchronous Computer-Mediated Communication

Ian Brown
CALL for Change With Lower-Level University Students

David Deubelbeiss
TEXT To SPEECH — Liberating the Learner and the Teacher!

Justin Shewell
Free, Easy, Adaptable Online and Paper-Based Vocabulary Activities

Jeong-Weon Song
The Use of Voice Bulletin Board in a Classroom English Course

Rex Stewart
Creative and Motivating Writing Activities Using Sound and Video

Jennifer Vahanian
Creative and Motivating Writing Activities Using Sound and Video

Joe Walther
The Use of Voice Bulletin Board in a Classroom English Course

Etsuko Fukahori
Effective Strategies To Integrate Video Production Into EFL Classes

Sergio Mazzarelli
Effective Strategies To Integrate Video Production Into EFL Classes

Thomas Webster
Grounding Technology: Considering the Educational Situation

Organizational Partner Presentations

Cleo Ahn
Developing 4 Skills With Interchange

Martí Anderson
Humanism in Language Teaching: A Concept Worth Revisiting

Nalin Bahuguna
Interacting With Academic Texts and Learning Academic Vocabulary Through Inside Reading

Nalin Bahuguna
Oxford Learner’s Thesaurus – A Dictionary of Synonyms

Oliver Bayley
Become Communicatively Competent Speakers With American English File

Oliver Bayley
Get Your Students To Join In!

Michael Cahill
Differentiated Instruction Strategies for Writing

Michael Cahill
Essential Listening Strategies for Korean Learners: Interactivity in Listening

Michael Cahill
Globalization & Its Impact on Teaching & Materials

Michael Cahill
Helping Language Learners Reach Milestones To School Success

Rebecca Fletcher
Have You Got the Word Skills?

Rebecca Fletcher
Learn English the Happy Way

Clyde Fowle
Writing Natural English: How Research Can Inform Practice

Clyde Fowle
Writing: Back To Basics

Alastair Graham-Marr
Teaching the Strategies of Speaking

Patrick Hafenstein
Developing Fluency, Accuracy and Complexity in Oral Exams

Patrick Hafenstein
Effective Speeches and Presentations for College Students

Patrick Hafenstein
Using Pictures and Video for Large Classes

John Halliwell
Making Informed Choices: Teacher Education at Saint Michael’s

Linda Hanners Warfel
Bookflix: Building the Love of Early Reading & Learning With Videos & Ebooks

Linda Hanners Warfel
Read-To-Go Libraries: Practical Solutions To Reading Achievement

Chanmi Hong
Getting the Most Out of Reading: Leveled Readers!

Hyunsu Ji
Bring a Piece of Fact Into Your Child’s Imagination

Aaron Jolly
Going Extensive: Creating Independent L2 Readers With Graded Readers

Gemma Kang
Storytown: Teaching Integrated Skills With Practical Activities

Curtis Kelly
Active Skills for Communication

Curtis Kelly
Writing From Within

Chris Kennedy
The University of Birmingham Distance MA in TEF/SL /Applied Linguistics

Casey Kim
Is Grammar Right for Young Learners?

Sarah Kim
Three Ways To Language Immersion
Cheri Lee  English Grammar
Sam Lee  Enhancing Learning for All Students Through Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching
Tony Maguire  Reading Boat Course-Books, By E-Future
Tony Maguire  Read Together Graded Readers By E-Future
Scott Miles  Turning Students into Avid Readers: Essential Reading
John Morse  A First Look at Merriam-Webster’s Advanced Learner’s English Dictionary
Heejeong Park  Linking Early Literacy To Technology
Sherry Preiss  My Topnotch Lab: Pathways To Practice, Perform and Perfect
Sherry Preiss  The NEW Northstar Third Edition: Insights and Inspiration
Jason Renshaw  Boosting Preparation for IBT Speaking With Young Teenage Learners
Renald Rilce  Achieving Success in the TOEIC Test for Both Teachers and Students
Scott Thornbury  The New School MATESOL: Learning at the Speed of Life
Ivan Sorrentino  Beyond the Plateau - Reaching Advanced Levels of English
Ivan Sorrentino  Public Speaking the Easy Way
Ivan Sorrentino  What is Real English?
Eric Verspecht  Spark Your Students’ Enthusiasm for Grammar
Eric Verspecht  Developing Language and Life Skills for the Workplaces
Eric Verspecht  Successful Learning at Intermediate Level
Bruce Wade  Business for Special Purposes: Presentations and Tourism
Bruce Wade  Get the Business: Business One:One, Business Venture, and Business Result!