Korea TESOL Journal

Fall/Winter 2002
Volume 5, Number 1

Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Korea TESOL Journal Volume 6
Call for Papers

Korea TESOL Journal, a refereed journal, welcomes previously unpublished practical and theoretical articles on topics of significance to individuals concerned with the teaching of English as a foreign language. Areas of interest include:

1. classroom-centered research
2. second language acquisition
3. teacher training

4. cross-cultural studies
5. teaching and curriculum methods
6. testing and evaluation

Because the Journal is committed to publishing manuscripts that contribute to bridging theory and practice in our profession, it particularly welcomes submissions drawing on relevant research and addressing implications and applications of this research to issues in our profession.

Action Research-based papers, that is, those that arise from genuine issues in the English language teaching classroom, are welcomed. Such pedagogically-oriented investigations and case studies/reports, that display findings with applicability beyond the site of study, rightfully belong in a journal for teaching professionals.

Korea TESOL Journal was recently awarded a 'B' rating by the *Korea Research Foundation*.

Korea TESOL Journal prefers that all submissions be written so that their content is accessible to a broad readership, including those individuals who may not have familiarity with the subject matter addressed. The Journal is an international journal, welcoming submissions from English language learning contexts around the world, particularly those focusing upon learners from northeast Asia.

GENERAL INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS
Submission Categories
The KOTESOL Journal invites submissions in three categories:

I. Full-length articles. Contributors are strongly encouraged to submit manuscripts of no more than 20-25 double-spaced pages or 8,500 words (including references, notes, and tables).

II. Brief Reports and Summaries. The KOTESOL Journal also invites short reports (less than 1,200 words), manuscripts that either present preliminary findings or focus on some aspect of a larger study. Papers written in pursuit of advanced studies are appropriate for summarization.

III. Reviews. The KOTESOL Journal invites succinct, evaluative reviews of scholarly or professional books, or instructional-support resources (such as computer software, video- or audiotaped material, and tests). Reviews should provide a descriptive and evaluative summary and a brief discussion of the significance of the work in the context of current theory and practice. Submissions should generally be no longer than 1,200 words.

To facilitate the blind review process, do not use running heads. Submit via email attachment or on diskette in MSWord or RTF file. Figures and tables should each be in separate files, bitmap files (.bmp) are preferred. Hardcopy versions may be requested at a later time.

Inquiries/Manuscripts to: Sangho Han (Editor-in-chief) at *KOTESOL@chollian.net*

The Korea TESOL Journal accepts submissions on a continuous basis.
Find the Korea TESOL Journal in ERIC and more info at www.kotesol.org

The Korea TESOL Journal

Volume 5, Fall/Winter 2001

KOTESOL

www.kotesol.org

Table of Contents

KOTESOL

About KOTESOL

Korea TESOL: Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (KOTESOL) is a professional organization of teachers of English whose main goal is to assist its members in their self-development and to contribute to the improvement of ELT in Korea. KOTESOL also serves as a network for teachers to connect with others in the ELT community and as a source of information for ELT resource materials and events in Korea and abroad.

Korea TESOL is proud to be an affiliate of TESOL Inc., an international education association of almost 14,000 members with headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia, USA.

Korea TESOL was established in October 1992, when the Association of English Teachers in Korea (AETK) joined with the Korea Association of Teachers of English (KATE). As stated in The Constitution and Bylaws of Korea TESOL, "The purpose of Korea TESOL is a not-for-profit organization established to promote scholarship, disseminate information, and facilitate cross-cultural understanding among persons associated with the teaching and learning of English in Korea. In pursuing these goals KOTESOL shall cooperate in appropriate ways with other groups having similar concerns."

KOTESOL is an independent national affiliate of a growing international movement of teachers, closely associated with not only TESOL Inc., but also the Japan Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (JALT), Thailand TESOL (ThaiTESOL), ETA-ROC (English Teachers Assn of the Republic of China/Taiwan), International Association of English Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL), TESL Canada, and most recently with the Far East English Language Teachers Association (Russia).

The membership of KOTESOL includes elementary, middle and high school and university level English teachers as well as teachers-in-training, administrators, researchers, materials writers, curriculum developers and other interested persons. Approximately 40% of the members are Korean.

KOTESOL has Seoul, Gyeonggi-Suwon, Cheongju, Daejeon, Daegu-Gyeongbuk, Busan, Jeolla, Gangwon, and International chapters. Members of KOTESOL hail from all points of Korea and the globe, thus providing KOTESOL members the benefits of a multi-cultural membership.

Annual membership in KOTESOL costs 40,000 Won. Interested in joining KOTESOL? Visit www.kotesol.org for membership information.

Editor's Note

KOTESOL

The Korea TESOL Journal, awarded a 'nation-wide' scholarly journal rating by the Korea Research Foundation, continues moving towards its goal of becoming recognized as an international journal that welcomes submissions from English language learning contexts around the world but with a particular focus upon learners from northeast Asia. It is our belief that this volume meets and surpasses this goal.

We have detected three overlapping threads stitching together the articles selected for this volume. A majority of the articles, to some degree, examine the ways in which culture influences understanding and, hence, understanding of language. KOTESOL's mandate reads: "To promote scholarship, disseminate information, and facilitate cross-cultural understanding among persons concerned with the teaching and learning of English in Korea." The Korea TESOL Journal lives up to our mandate. A second noticeable thread is that a majority of articles focus on adult learners in pursuit of tertiary degrees. As the number of Korean students studying abroad steadily increases, addressing their needs and assessing their abilities is one of our responsibilities as English language teachers in Korea. A third thread is the focus on EFL writing.

- Jin Sook Lee examines whether Korean non-native speakers of English interpret conversational implicatures in the same manner as native speakers of English. She determines that learners' knowledge of the culture, personal biases, stereotypes and transfer of knowledge from the native culture are involved in the process of interpretation.

- Jean Kim analyzes articles on the teaching of culture in EFL and ESL contexts and makes recommendations for the language classroom. She offers up some teaching materials as examples of ways to incorporate culture into a lesson plan.

- Linda Fitzgibbon presents an investigation of one class at an international school in Macau analyzing its literacy cultures and those of the students'' families. She argues for culturally sensitive EFL teaching that recognizes diverse literacy practices and language habits.

- Tying together the three threads, Yueh-miao Chen attempts to identify the characteristics and problems of university EFL writing in Taiwan attempts. She

concludes that lack of cultural knowledge was one of the causes of learners' difficulties and that extensive reading of a variety of authentic material might alleviate these problems.

- Michael Roberts used focus groups and structured interviews to determine the attitudes of 14 Korean language learners preparing for the TOEFL in Toronto finding that cultures of learning, individual motivations, and experiences have an effect on how learners prepare for the TOEFL.

- Don Makarchuk describes the process of conducting needs analysis to aid in the selection of appropriate content for a class of Korean professors going overseas for research or study. Both the results of his study and the process used to determine the content will be of interest to instructors whose students need English for specific purposes.

- Bill Templer's look at how universities and university language centers could better address the needs of faculty and graduate students is the last full-length article in this volume. The paper, a call to action, evaluates strategies to empower non-native speakers as communicators within English dominated communities of discourse and practice.

New to the Korea TESOL Journal is inclusion of a short report on ongoing research. Michael K. Leung describes and discusses the benefits of an e-mail based discussion course for EFL teachers in Japan. Short Reports and Summaries are brief descriptions of investigations of interest to classroom teachers that, due to their abbreviated form, are excused from the normal peer-review process. We invite submissions of short reports in future volumes. See the Call for Papers in this volume.

The threads described above were neither announced nor preplanned but emerged as the character of this volume due to our good fortune in receiving a number of high quality submissions that seemed, when sewn together, to be no longer a collection of patches but a quilt.

We would like to thank all of those who submitted to the Korea TESOL Journal and all of those who contributed their time and energy in other ways. There are too many people to name in this short space so, in brief, we would like to thank our Board of Editors, our proofreaders, our reviewers, Robert J. Dickey without whom the Korea TESOL Journal would have floundered and fizzled out long ago, David Shaffer for editing the reviews, the Korea Research Foundation, all of the authors who submitted work whether it was accepted for this volume or not, and the membership of KOTESOL for making the journal possible. I am particularly thankful to Trevor Gulliver wearing several hats on this volume and have invited him to co-sign this Editor's Note.

Park Joo-Kyung, Editor-in-Chief
Trevor H. Gulliver, Managing Editor

Interpreting Conversational Implicatures: A study of Korean learners of English

Jin Sook Lee
Rutgers University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent Korean non-native speakers of English are able to interpret conversational implicatures in the manner native speakers of English do and how the strategies that are employed in the interpretation differ for the two groups. Data show that native and non-native speakers differ significantly in their ability to interpret particularized conversational implicatures in English, but do not vary in their ability to interpret generalized implicatures. The two groups also demonstrated different preferences for strategies to interpret implicatures. The learners' knowledge of the culture, including personal biases, stereotypes, and transfer of knowledge from the native culture, seem to govern the way in which they interpreted certain conversational implicatures.

Introduction

Successful communication can be achieved when interlocutors adhere to similar pragmatic rules that govern how language is used and interpreted. For second language speakers, this process is complicated by the fact that these speakers often rely on a different set of pragmatic rules based on the sociocultural conventions of their native language. The discrepancy in the expectations of language use created by the different pragmatic systems is often the source of miscommunication between native and non-native speakers of a language. Thus, language learners must not only acquire the correct forms and sounds of the target language, but also the knowledge of how language is pragmatically used in the culture. As native speakers of a language, we constantly employ pragmatic strategies that allow us to play with words to achieve various communicative effects. For example, as a way of expressing sarcasm, we use expressions that really mean something other than what is literally said as in the case of "Boy, she *really* knows how to sing," said about a horrible singer. In order for second language learners to have the same access to these pragmatic strategies, they need to figure out how their native sociocultural

conventions of language use differs from those of the target language. In an attempt to better understand how language learners acquire pragmatic conventions that allow for meaningful communication, this paper examines the ways in which Korean ESL learners differ from native speakers of English in their interpretation of conversational implicatures commonly found in the English language.

Research suggests that the rules for discourse units or speech acts can vary significantly from culture to culture (Keenan, 1976; Nash, 1983; Olshtain & Cohen, 1989; Wierzbicka, 1991; Lee, 2000). However, some theorists claim that there are certain rules that underlie all conversational interaction in any language (Grice, 1975; Fraser, 1980; Brown & Levinson, 1987). Grice (1975) first presented the idea that certain inferences that we make from utterances arise from our expectations of conversational behavior. He provided a framework for explaining how it is possible to mean more that what is actually said by proposing the Theory of Implicatures, which suggests that interlocutors derive inferences based on a certain code of conversational behavior that interlocutors are expected to follow in the culture of the language.

According to Grice, interlocutors are expected to conform to certain conversational maxims. For example, they are expected to cooperate by recognizing a common purpose in communicating, which he defines as the Cooperative Principle. Related to this general principle are four types of individual maxims that direct the particulars of discourse. The Maxim of Quantity, Quality, Relation (= Relevance), and Manner specify the rules of what should and should not be included in the conversation and how they should be said. The Maxim of Quantity specifies that one should give as much information as is called for, but no more information than is required; the Maxim of Quality states that one should tell the truth, and not say anything that one lacks information for; the Maxim of Relation or Relevance claims that one should ask questions and provide information that is relevant to the course of conversation; and finally, the Maxim of Manner refers to the rules of being orderly, brief, and avoiding ambiguity and obscurity when speaking.

Grice further explained that the expectations for fulfilling these maxims can be violated by speakers in the following ways: (1) a speaker may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim, which usually results in a misunderstanding; (2) a speaker may opt out from the operation of maxim or the Cooperative Principle indicating an unwillingness to cooperate; (3) a speaker may find that two maxims clash and chooses one over the other; or (4) a speaker may choose to flout a maxim by obviously failing to fulfill the demands of the rules.

The failure to live up to these codes of conversation can in itself convey some type of meaning. This study examines the intentional failure to fulfill a maxim to achieve a communicative effect known as conversational implicatures. That is, the listener is required to make inferences based on shared cultural knowledge and

presuppositions and arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's message assuming that both parties are adhering to the Cooperative Principle. For example,

> [phone rings]
> *John: Can you get that, Susan?*
> *Susan: I'm in the shower.*

In this case Susan is not following the Maxim of Relevance; that is, she is not giving a direct response such as "No" to John's question. However, John assumes that Susan is being cooperative and makes the connection between Susan being in the shower and therefore, not being able to answer the phone.

According to Clark and Clark (1977), in coming to an interpretation, listeners must first input the message, form a hypothesis about what routine is being enacted, and then rely on social background knowledge and expectations to evaluate what is intended and conveyed. Gumperz (1982) stated that "what distinguishes successful from unsuccessful interpretation is not absolute or context-free criteria of truth value or appropriateness, but rather what happens in the utterance exchange itself" (p. 167). We make those inferences that are likely to help us to understand a text. Usually, the need to make an inference only becomes apparent when the current sentence cannot be integrated satisfactorily with what has gone on before.

Although Grice claimed that these codes of conversation are universal in application, it is an empirical question as to whether in all societies and in all situations, these codes of conversational conduct are followed and the interlocutors are able to arrive at the same interpretations. Research has shown that these maxims of conversation exist to certain degrees in all language and cultures (Keenan, 1976; Fraser, 1980; Blum-Kulka, 1991). However, the boundaries of these domains vary situationally and cross-culturally. The extent to which these domains vary and the specificity of how they differ need to be determined. Thus, in cross-cultural communication and in situations where second language learners have not yet attained native-like proficiency, the process of making inferences and creating meaning through the use of implicatures has great risk of going astray.

Previous Research

Keenan (1976) investigated the validity of the universality of Grice's maxims of conversation by examining the use of the Maxim of Quantity -"be informative" in a Malagasian society. She found that the maxims do not function in the same way in all cultures, but differ in the domains to which they are expected to hold and to the degree the members of society are expected to conform to them. In contrast to the American society where the primary objective of a conversation is to exchange necessary information, the Malagasians are expected to "provide less information

than is required by their conversational partner, even though they have access to the necessary information" (Keenan, 1976, p. 70). Keenan offers several reasons why the withholding of information is a plausible code of conversation in Malagasy. For example, there are cultural reasons such as " the stigma of guilt attached to those who provide incorrect or damaging information and the reactive rarity of new information in society" (Keenan, 1976, p. 70) as well as situational constraints such as the familiarity of the interlocutors and the gender of the speaker. Thus, the blatant flouting of a maxim by withholding information, which would result in an implicature in the American English speaking society, would not result in an implicature in the Malagasy society because the expectation that the participant will fulfill the informational requirements of what the question asks is not a basic norm. Due to the differences in the expectations of the behaviors in different cultures, Keenan argues that speakers from different cultures can interpret the same utterance in the same context differently.

In a further test to investigate whether the maxims of conversation are universal, Devine (1982) examined how second language learners and native speakers of the target language interpreted implicatures arising from the violation of these conversational maxims. If they were indeed universal, speakers of different languages would not have any difficulty interpreting them. Devine found that the extent to which the native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs) recognized and interpreted the implicatures depended on which of the Grice's maxims was violated and what the basis of the violation was. She concluded that speakers do not uniformly respond to the manipulation of Grice's maxims as a Gricean analysis predicts they will. She also claimed that her research supports that of Keenan (1976) and that the conversational expectations of interlocutors "may vary because of cultural or situational constraints on these maxims" (Devine, 1982, p. 203).

Bouton (1988) conducted a similar study on the ability of foreign students, who are non-native speakers of English, to derive the same meaning from conversational implicatures as native English speakers do. He conducted a cross-cultural study by comparing the abilities of speakers from six foreign cultures including Spanish, German, Chinese, and Japanese who had similar levels of English proficiency as American English speakers. In general, his findings support the results of Devine's study in that the ability of NNSs to interpret implicatures in English varied with the individual NNS and with the specific type of implicature involved. Furthermore, the comparison of the groups of NNSs from linguistically and culturally different backgrounds showed that there were statistically significant differences between the ability of informants from different cultures to interpret implicatures [$F(6,323=23.83), p<.0001$]. Thus, this comparison of groups emphasizes the importance of cultural background as a factor underlying a person's ability to interpret implicature.

In order to find out whether NNSs can learn to use implicatures with little or no direct instruction and how long it takes for learners to reach a point where their

interpretations are not significantly different from those of American NSs, Bouton (1994) conducted a longitudinal study of newly arrived NNSs over a 17-month period in the U.S. and also retested the NNS informants who had participated in his 1988 study to see how much their implicature interpreting skills had developed. The informants were categorized into two groups, the 17-month group and the 4.5-year group. The results showed that for the 17-month group, there was no improvement over the 17-month period in their ability to interpret implicatures, whereas the 4.5-year group showed evidence of near-native like competence in their interpretation of implicatures. Thus, according to Bouton, NNSs are likely to become quite proficient in their ability to interpret implicatures when they have had ample time to experience and observe the culture that influences the language. However, this process is a long and frustrating one for many second language learners and with explicit and systematic instruction, it is predicted that NNSs can become effective communicators in English more efficiently.

In light of previous research, this study goes a step further by trying to understand in what ways NNSs and NSs differ in their ability to interpret conversational implicatures. Because of the culture-sensitive component of the topic at hand, I chose to conduct an in-depth study on the ability of Korean non-native speakers of English to derive interpretations of implicatures in comparison to American native speakers of English. It examined the types of strategies Korean learners used when interpreting implicatures and also tested whether certain types of implicatures were more difficult for these learners than others. The findings will provide insights into the level of cultural understanding that second language learners possess as well as inform ESL pedagogical techniques intended to help learners develop their pragmatic competence.

Methods

Informants

A total of 30 graduate students from a U.S. university volunteered to participate in the study. Fifteen monolingual native speakers of English and 15 Korean ESL learners were recruited to form the groups for comparison**.** In the native speaker group, there were seven males and eight females and in the non-native speaker group, there were nine males and six females. Twelve of the native speakers were either humanities or social sciences majors and three were science majors, whereas for non-native speakers ten were science majors and five were humanities or social sciences majors. The foreign students' length of stay in the U.S. ranged from five months to two years and their average TOEFL score was 619 on the paper and pencil test. Most of the ESL learners in the study were not required to take any additional ESL courses during their program of study.

Instrument

The Implicature Test used in this study was an abbreviated version of an instrument originally designed by Bouton in 1988 and revised in 1994 (See Appendix A). Each item on the test was composed of a situation, a dialogue and a question concerning the meaning of the implicature within the dialogue. Fourteen questions representing six different types of implicatures were selected from Bouton's pool of 25 questions. The items on the test covered implicatures based on the violation of the four Maxims that resulted in understated negative criticisms, irony, sarcasm, indirectness, etc. (For a complete breakdown of the items, see Table 1).

For each item, there were four multiple-choice answers and a blank to fill in an alternative interpretation if the informant did not agree with any of the given choices. In addition, for every question, there were two 5-point rating scales asking the informants to rate their perception of the degree of accuracy of their answers and the difficulty of the question.

Procedure and Data Analysis

Each informant was given approximately 30 minutes to complete the test. Informants were also asked to think aloud and explain their reasoning behind the interpretation of the implicatures as they solved the problems. The reasons that they gave as to why and how they chose the answers were tape-recorded and transcribed for analysis. The Korean informants chose to perform the think-aloud procedure in Korean.

The most common response given to each of the items by the 15 native speakers in this study was selected as the "correct answer" for the question. Each informant was given a score of 1, if their response matched the response chosen by the majority of the native speakers and 0 if the informants chose a different response. The total scores ranged from 0-14 on the implicature test. Using T-tests and ANOVAs, the performances of English native speakers and Korean ESL speakers on the implicature test were compared for significant patterns.

Due to the limited sample size, the findings must be carefully interpreted. The purpose of this study is not to make generalizations across language groups and proficiency levels, but rather the goal is to attempt to gain a clearer picture of how learners from a particular culture handle the interpretation of conversational implicatures, which has not received much attention in the field. Based on the findings of this exploratory study, further studies that can factor in differences due to the learners' cultural backgrounds and proficiency levels will be needed to understand the development of the ability to interpret and use conversational implicatures.

Results and Discussion

The mean score on the implicature test for native speakers was 12.0 and for non-native speakers 10.2, indicating only a slight difference in the performance of the two groups. The reason for this slight difference may be attributed to the nature of the types of implicatures or to the fact that the ESL informants had very high proficiency levels. What is interesting was that Bouton claimed that it took his informants nearly 3-5 years of exposure to the target culture to achieve near-native like competence in interpreting conversational implicatures, however, from this study which examined ESL learners with less than 2 years of experience in the target culture, they were still able to perform at a very high level. Thus, regardless of the length of exposure to the target culture, learners with high linguistic proficiency seem likely to have the linguistic and pragmatic strategies that will allow them to derive the same meaning as native speakers.

Furthermore, despite the fact that in many instances the group of native and non-native informants were able to come to a correct interpretation of the implicatures, the native speakers rated their responses to be more accurate than the non-native speakers for every question. Even learners with advanced proficiency in English perceived their responses to be less accurate than the native speakers. It is interesting to see how the status of being a native speaker endows a certain level of confidence and authority in their language use as opposed to non-native speakers who may possess a very high level of competence in the language, but still lack the sense of authority in the language. This pattern was also reflected in the way the NNSs rated most of the items to be more difficult than the NSs. A closer examination of the responses and the strategies that the informants used is warranted to investigate the factors that contributed to the difference in responses and the reasons for why the performance gap was not greater.

Tabulations of the responses given by each of the informants in the two groups were done to identify the patterns in the responses. Table 1 summarizes the percentage of correct responses given by native and non-native informants grouped according to the six types of implicatures the test items targeted.

The responses from the "think aloud" procedure offered valuable insights that explained some of the patterns found in the quantitative analysis as seen in Table 1. Based on the initial descriptive analysis, one unanticipated finding was that for item Q#11, more non-native speakers arrived at the correct answer than native speakers. To recap, the correct answer for each item was determined by the answer selected by the majority of native speakers. In this case, although the majority of native speakers found this implicature to be an understated criticism and, hence, it was selected as the correct answer, there were also some that felt that the expression should be interpreted literally. According to the think aloud responses, the reason why more NNSs than NSs were able to select the correct answer was because the

Table 1

Tabulations of responses for NS and NNS arranged according to the grouping of similar type of implicatures

Q#	Type of implicature	Context of implicatures	Correct response	% of NS (15) with correct answer
1	Quantity- understated negative criticism	I thought it [paper] was well typed.	He did not like it.	87%
3	Quantity- understated negative criticism	Recommendation- no content.	Not a strong recommendation - no mention of quality of work.	87%
11	Quantity- understated negative criticism	I don't think I'm a good judge of chili.	She does not like it very much.	40%
2	Quality - irony/sarcasm	Bill knows how to be a really good friend.	Bill is not acting the way a good friend should be.	93%
10	Quality - irony/sarcasm	I'm not sure, but Sue was playing a song named "We are the World".	Mary sang badly.	73%
4	Quality- set conventional expressions	Is the Pope Catholic?	Susan has a lot of relatives.	100%
9	Quality- set conventional expressions	Does the sun come up in the east these days?	Yes, he'll give the test.	87%
5	Relevance	I went jogging today.	I hurt it jogging.	87%
8	Relevance	There's a yellow Honda.	Rudy may be over at Sarah's house.	100%
13	Relevance	Men are beginning to count their change.	Instead of looking at her men are paying attention to their money.	80%
14	Relevance	Have you seen any good movies lately?	She does not want to talk about how much money she makes.	100%
6	Quantity- be sufficiently informative	Are you two 21?	Ted and Sharon are at least 21.	80%
12	Quantity- be sufficiently informative	Do you have 50 cows?	He has at least 50 cows, maybe more.	87%
7	Manner- be orderly	Steal car & go to Philly	Maria got the story right.	93%

* t-test significant at $p < 0.01$

NNSs understood "I don't think I am a very good judge of chili" to be a humbling gesture in the face of a negative criticism. The NNS informants said that this type of expression is commonly found in Korean. However, in Korean, the more typical way of expression would be in the line of "*My taste buds are not sophisticated enough to judge the taste of chili"* to avoid a potential situation where the harmony between the participants in the interaction might be disrupted.

Cultures like Korean that value collectivism place high emphasis on maintaining harmony among the members of their in-group and are likely to avoid face-threatening situations that might cause conflict or disagreement (Park, 1979; Ting-Toomey, 1988; Gudykunst and Nishida, 1994). Native speakers, on the other hand, did not make this connection. Although the majority of the NSs understood the implicature to be a very subtle negative criticism, several felt that it would have to be interpreted at the literal level; that is, the speaker probably has not had chili before and does not know what it is suppose to taste like and that there are no other intended implications to it. Thus, even in NS-NS interaction individual differences in perception and interpretations can result in miscommunication. What was clearly evident from this example was that even advanced ESL learners appeared to be applying their schemata of experiences from their native culture as the basis for their interpretation. The NNSs' ability to arrive at the same interpretation as NSs despite some individual variance in the interpretations attests to the fact that there are similar pragmatic strategies in both cultures to express negative criticism indirectly.

Toward this end, Q#8 is another test item that provides evidence that similar pragmatic strategies exist in the two cultures. Q#8 resulted in a ceiling effect in that there was no variance in the responses between the two groups; all informants arrived at the same interpretation. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that both the native and non-native groups offered the same strategies and reasons in interpreting Q#8. The informants recognized that they had to assume that the yellow Honda belonged to Rudy because of circumstantial evidence. Implicatures that are derived based on logical reasoning appear to be universal in its use. This item was omitted from all subsequent analysis because of its ceiling effect.Because the initial data analysis revealed some differences between the NSs and the NNSs, it is important to first examine whether the variance between the NS and the NNS group is statistically significant and to identify any patterns in the types of conversational implicatures the NNSs may have difficulty acquiring in the second language. T-tests were conducted to compare the response patterns of the native speakers and non-native speakers on each of the individual items. The results showed that there were only two items (Q#1 & Q#2) that were statistically different ($p<.01$) between the native and non-native speaker groups. A scan of the performance data shown in Table 1 shows that there is no systematic pattern in the responses based on the types of implicatures that were defined. That is, the way the category of implicatures was defined was not a reliable construct in predicting whether non-native speakers were

able to respond in the way native speakers do. In order to find a more reliable way of identifying a pattern in the types of implicatures that may cause difficulty for learners, correlations were done to identify the items that had high inter-item consistency with the other items in the test. Based on the correlations as well as on some qualitative data from the "think aloud" process, two new categories were identified.

According to Grice (1975), these newly identified constructs can be labeled as Particularized and Generalized Conversational Implicatures (See Table 2). Particularized Implicatures refer to those implicatures that are very sensitive to the non-linguistic and contextual cues that the implicature is embedded in. For example, depending on how one says "Bill is a *really* good friend" and the context of the situation, this statement could be an implicature through which a sarcastic inference might be made or it could be taken at face value. Generalized Implicatures, on the other hand, refer to those types of implicatures where the implicature is not as sensitive to the contextual cues or non-linguistic cues. For example, statements like "Is the Pope Catholic?" will bring about the same interpretation in most instances regardless of the contextual or non-linguistic cues. The results showed that the items within the Particularized and Generalized category had moderately high inter-item correlations and had very low or negative correlations with items in the other category. Cronbach's alpha for these two constructs was .59 for Particularized Conversational Implicatures and .54 for Generalized Conversational Implicatures.

A repeated measures analysis of variance conducted on the response patterns of native and non-native speakers for Particularized Conversational Implicatures $[F(1,26)=4.175, p<.05]$ showed a statistically significant difference; however, there was no difference between native and non-native speakers in their interpretations of Generalized Implicatures $[F(1, 26)= 1.536, p=0.226]$ (See Table 3).

Table 2
Pearson Correlations of Individual Items within the Constructs of Particularized Conversational Implicatures and Generalized Conversational Implicatures

	Generalized Implicatures				Particularized Implicatures		
Q #	Type	Name	R	Q #	Type	Name	r
1	neg. criticism	TERM	0.38	5	relevance	JOG	0.39
3	" "	RECOM	0.21	13	" "	BEAUTY	0.26
11	" "	CHILI	0.24	14	" "	RAISE	0.54
4	set expression	POPE	0.38	2	sarcasm	FRIEND	0.34
7	be orderly	STEAL	0.25	6	be sufficiently informative	BAR	0.32
10	sarcasm	SING	0.40	9	set expression	SUN	0.30
12	be sufficiently informative	COWS	0.25				

Table 3

Analysis of Variance on the Dependent Variables of Performance on Particularized and Generalized Implicatures against the Independent Variables of NS/NNS and Gender

Dependent Variable	Generalized Implicatures			Particularized Implicatures		
Source	DF	Mean-Square	F-Ratio	DF	Mean-Square	F-Ratio
NS/NNS	1	0.07	1.5	1	0.22	**4.2***
Gender	1	0.05	1.0	1	0.00	1.0
NS/NNS * Gender	1	0.00	0.1	1	0.05	0.4
ERROR	26	0.04		26	0.05	

* p<0.05

Thus, it appears that ESL learners have more difficulty interpreting conversational implicatures that are sensitive to cultural context and suprasegmental features such as intonation and tone, which is not surprising. Even native speakers recognized the difficulty of the former type of implicatures; some said, "This is very hard for me, vocal intonation would be very important in trying to understand whether this is sarcasm or he is being genuine" (RS), "This is a tough one. This could mean a lot of things" (TS), and " Since I am not hearing the conversation, there is no way for me to know. It's hard to assess" (JK). Despite the fact that the context of these expressions are given in detail, NS informants felt that the meaning of the expression would still depend on the intonation and the tone of how the expression is said. What was interesting was that the NNSs did not comment at all on how the intonation or tone would have changed the meaning of the expression. They seemed to be less sensitive to the suprasegmental features of language use and more focused on the semantics of the lexical items used. This speaks to a lack of training and emphasis on the ways in which suprasegmental features are used to carry meaning in addition to the lexicon. Vocabulary and expressions need to be taught in full context with the appropriate gestures, facial expressions, intonation and tone.

Non-native informants commented that the generalized implicatures dealing with set expressions such as "Is the Pope Catholic?" or "Does the sun come up in the east?" were easy to interpret. They recognized that it was a type of idiom and gave similar examples that existed in Korean. For example, one informant said, "In Korean we have expressions like*, "are you sure you are Korean?"* [said to another Korean to mean "you have to know this"] or "*you say them as if they were words?"* [meaning "it is so obvious that it would be a waste of time to explain"].

However, in interpreting Particularized Implicatures, non-native speakers tended to interpret the situations in light of their native cultural norms. In many cases differences in cultural values and experiences prevented them from arriving at the

correct interpretation. For example, in Q#2, many NNSs did not catch the sarcasm intended in the expression, because they were interpreting the situation in light of the societal responsibility of fulfilling the role of a friend by attending to a friend's wife. In the Korean male culture, the quality of a man's character is determined in relation to how he fares with others; that is, his loyalty to and consideration for others rather than solely by his individual characteristics. Thus, in this situation it was perceived by the Korean learners that the friend was dancing with his friend's wife out of responsibility to make sure that the wife is doing well, while the husband is away rather than with the intention of flirting with her. In other words, if such a situation were to happen, the Korean informants commented that if Bill were a good friend of Peter's the benefit of the doubt would be given to him. The NNSs, on the other hand, perceived the "so-called" friend to have an ulterior egoistic motive in that he was using this situation to make advances at Peter's wife. Because particularized implicatures are based on the specific codes related to the subtleties of contextual cues and non-linguistic cues that are particular to the American culture, they require sophisticated knowledge and skill in order to arrive at the "correct" interpretation, which was probably the main cause of the difficulty that the NNSs had with these items.

Regardless of whether the item was a particularized implicature or a generalized implicature, the strategy that the learners used were the same. They arrived at interpretations of implicatures based on their translations of what it meant in Korean and on their native cultural norms. In the case of generalized implicatures, learners were able to derive similar interpretations as native speakers; however, in the case of particularized implicatures this was not the case. The translation strategy that NNSs used led them to the wrong interpretation, because they were so focused on only the lexical meaning of the expression without the consideration of other possible non-linguistic cues. Although it has been more than a decade since the communicative approach to language teaching has taken precedence, it is clearly evident that it has not changed the way learners approach language learning. Learners seem to rely heavily on translation strategies as has been documented in learning and communication strategies research (Oxford & Anderson, 1995; Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). The critical point is that learners need to be aware of the inherent nature of the two types of implicatures and how to differentiate them, so that they know when to apply and not apply their translation strategy. Furthermore, learners need to be aware of how meaning is constructed through various uses of intonation and tone and how the target culture interfaces with the language. One pedagogical strategy that can be used to teach learners how to differentiate the different types of implicatures is to raise students' level of critical awareness by explicitly demonstrating what properties to look for in identifying implicatures. By directing the students' attention to the contextual and linguistic cues that govern implicatures, students can refine their skills in their ability to observe how language is used in the community.

The qualitative data from the "think-aloud" procedure revealed patterns in the reasoning that the NSs and NNSs employed. Even in cases where the informants in the two groups were arriving at the same answer, the reasons and strategies differed between the native speakers and the non-native speakers. Table 4 summarizes the most commonly cited reasons for why the interpretations were made for both the native and non-native speaker groups.

The most commonly cited reason for the use of these implicatures by native speakers was for the effect of sarcasm. Most NSs recognized the sarcasm in the implicatures, but NNSs interpreted the sarcasm as humor without the negative implication that undergirds sarcasm. For example, NNSs misunderstood the implicatures found in such items as Q#10, which was intended to be a sarcastic remark, to be humorous. It is interesting to see how sarcasm is viewed between the two groups. Native speakers reported that sarcasm was used to highlight the witty nature of the speaker through a negative evaluation at the expense of the person or thing being criticized. However, Korean NNSs reported that the communicative goal of the speaker in using the implicature was to create a humorous ambiance that can liven up the conversation. The comment was considered a light joke that could be said in the presence of the person being evaluated without threat to the person losing face.

According to Gudykunst and Nishida (1994), one fundamental difference between western cultures such as the American culture and eastern cultures such as Korean and Japanese lies in how the self is perceived. In individualistic cultures such as the North American cultures, each person is viewed as having a unique set of talents and experiences and the emphasis is placed on the individual's goals and self-realization. On the other hand, in collectivistic cultures such as the Korean culture, each person is viewed in relation to others within a particular group (e.g., family, friends, school, religious groups, occupation, etc.) and emphasis is placed on following the social norms and maintaining cooperation with the in-group.

This difference in the cultures was reflected in the strategies that the two groups selected. NSs' interpretations were based mainly on their personal biases and personal experiences. In contrast, NNSs were mostly concerned with the social hierarchical status of the people involved in the conversation in their interpretations. Their interpretations were derived under the assumption that the interlocutors were being polite and trying to save each other's face through the use of the implicatures. For example, one of the most common reasons given for the interpretation of Q#11 ("I am not a very good judge of chili") by the NNSs was that by directly stating that you don't like chili, you run the risk of threatening the face of the speaker who was looking for an evaluation of the taste of the chili. Another example where the NNS informants viewed the implicature as an act of saving face was in Q#2. NNS informants commented that by saying "Bill knows how to be a really good friend" the speaker

is conveying that Peter has asked Bill as a favor to see that his wife enjoys herself at the party while he is away and thus saving both Peter's and Bill's faces by acknowledging that Peter is aware of Bill's actions.

Furthermore, many NNS informants also commented that you would never use phrases like "Is the Pope Catholic?" to someone in a higher societal position than

Table 4

Examples of the Most Commonly Stated Reasons in Interpreting Implicatures in Rank Order

<u>Native Speakers</u>

1. Sarcasm

ts (Q1) "He is being sarcastic. If he were being polite, he would talk about the content and say well this part was OK but his other parts missed the target or something like that. He would say something about the content."

ba(Q2) "It's a sarcastic expression. Sarcasm in this case is used very negatively about a supposedly good friend that a good friend does not take other people's wife out dancing while they are on trips."

2. Social relation/familiarity with interlocutor

ss (Q5) "By saying I went jogging the inference is there that the injury occurred as a consequence of jogging and I think that if you were to make a statement like this with people you totally don't know will be totally out of context and people would not have a clue as to what you are saying. Since this is a husband and wife situation, I don't know I'm making assumptions."

ss(Q1) "I inferred from here that since they were two teachers that they understood each other. I think if the scenario had been between the parent and the teacher if the student and the teacher , probably this type of sarcasm would not be used."

3. Indirectness for emphasis

rs(Q10) "I mean um you can say she had sung badly but you weren't really asked that . You were asked what did she sing so you can really twist the knife in Mary by having been asked to. You get to really knock her down and not appear vicious about it because you were really just answering the question asked."

hc(Q4) "Susan's last question means 'It's an obvious and well-known fact.' She let Joan know that everyone knows that Susan has a lot of relatives. Implies that Joan is a bit stupid and uninformed."

4. Personal relevance

rs(Q6) "That... and that I am going to choose that the bartender doesn't know anything because um as a native speaker the question seems to be to what degree is there personal honesty as well. In bars, well I'm not sure , one can never be sure that people are telling you the truth. It may be that it is just part of the culture um.. In this country even if we are assured that Ted was telling the truth, there is no way for the bartender to know, It's such a natural instinct to me. Be skeptical that um the next phrase is can I see some ID so the bartender will not stop there ask to see some ID."

ss(Q2) "I guess for me and its totally personal, when my husband goes out on a business trip its for like two weeks at a time and um.. this just suggest it for me I think it's applicable for the norm within our friends."

Table 4 continued
Examples of the Most Commonly Stated Reasons in Interpreting Implicatures in Rank Order

Non-Native Speakers (English translations)

1. Humor

yy(Q10) "Well, in Korean there are similar expressions. For example, If someone were to sing awfully you would say, is that really a song? Was there a song like that? I think Sue probably did a good job playing the piano but Mary sang very badly I think he said it in this way to be funny."

jw(Q10) "I think it is because Mary is such a bad singer that he couldn't even recognize the song. I think he said it in this way to be funny. Don't Americans value humor a lot?"

2. Social (hierarchical) status of interlocutors

kw(Q4) "Susan used this type of expression only because it was her friend she was talking to. It would be very inappropriate to use this type of expression to a professor, because it would be rude."

jw(Q14) "I think it is more polite of her to just switch to a different subject then to confront this person and ask her how she could have asked such a question. I mean if she were at a higher level, it would be okay to say how could you ask such a thing and nobody in their right mind would ever ask a person higher than them such a personal question, but if someone in a higher position asks you it would be very improper to avoid the answer like this, you would have to answer."

3. Indirectness for politeness/humility

cjs(Q11) "But if Rosie says directly that I do not like the chili the it is very rude/ no manners."

js(Q14) "Since she said that before her work load gets heavier, she would like to watch some movies, it could only mean that she is saying that she did receive a raise in an indirect manner, so that you don't look like you are bragging about the raise."

4. Face saving acts

yy(Q2) "Bill probably said this to cover for his friend in front of his others friends who did not trust Peter's actions."

si(2) "He is saying that Bill is a good friend. It is not sarcastic , but more of a techniques to save his face by saying that he knew about it and appreciates what Bill is doing of him and his wife."

themselves such as to their professors or boss, because it would be extremely rude and disrespectful; this type of talk is reserved for equal ranks or to those of lower ranks than the speaker. Thus, for NNSs, their use of implicatures seem to be determined by the socially inherent hierarchical structure that Koreans abide by, whereas for NSs, their personal judgments of the closeness of or the social distance between the interlocutors seem to have a determining role in use or non-use of implicatures and the degree of the communicative intent of the implicature.

Finally, both groups mentioned that implicatures could be used as a means of expressing indirectness. However, the NSs and the NNSs differed on their reasons for why indirectness is used. NSs claimed that being indirect through the use of implicatures could at times be used to emphasize a point. For example, one NS

informant commented that instead of saying directly that Mary had sung badly in Q#10, by using the implicature the speaker is highlighting how bad she sang without being overtly nasty. However, the Korean ESL learners stated that indirectness through the use of implicatures conveyed politeness or humility. For example, in Q#14, one informant commented that it was a situation where the speaker indirectly hints that she did receive a raise by switching the topic, so that she is not caught in a situation where she could potentially be misunderstood as having bragged about her raise. For NSs this was clearly a case of "it is none of your business," because in the American culture, the cost of things and salaries are considered inappropriate topics to be inquired about, whereas in the Korean culture, people seem to have more open attitudes about such topics. This is a great example of how cultural values interplay with conversational strategies.

It is evident that the cognitive processes by which the native and non-native speakers arrive at an interpretation are grounded in their native cultural backgrounds. For second-language learners it is commonly the transfer of interpretation cues that causes breakdown of communication. Such evidence of transfer shows us that learners employ familiar schemata when encountered with communicative situations that require interpretation. In other words, these learners search for understandings based on their native or host culture to make contextual sense of the words. What causes confusion is that both Korean and English share some types of common conversational implicatures that allow learners to successfully transfer their understanding to arrive at the same interpretation and yet in other cases the transfer of their understanding will set them up for failure. Therefore, it becomes a pedagogical question as to whether we can teach learners how to interpret conversational implicatures or whether learners must go through trial and error to accumulate a separate set of cultural understandings that will allow them to interpret these implicatures successfully.

Pedagogical Implications

Needless to say, students will greatly benefit from systematic and strategic instruction that will help them acquire the necessary strategies to manage communicative situations that require the use of conversational implicatures. Rather than attempting to introduce students to random situations in which conversational implicatures can arise, it may be more productive to equip foreign students with the skills to identify linguistic and contextual cues that may lead them to make an appropriate interpretation of an implicature. Through explicit instruction, teachers can teach students about what implicatures are and what communicative purpose they serve as well as what factors to look for in the context, how to analyze the situation, and how and when implicatures can be used to convey the intended conversational effect (see Lee & McChesney 2000 for description of pedagogical

activity). Students need to raise their awareness of how conversational implicatures are used in the target language and also make connections between what they already know about language use in their native language with the expectations of language use in the target language.

This requires repeated practice of critically analyzing conversational situations involving implicatures. Because the context of language use is so important, teachers can first use media clips from television shows or movies to demonstrate how situations involving conversational implicatures can be analyzed and interpreted. Then, teachers and students can co-construct situations that may have relevant application to the students and provide avenues for practice. Instead of just informing students of how conversational implicatures are used and what they mean, learner autonomy needs to be promoted in that students are expected to take responsibility for their learning and understanding. Thus, by encouraging students to become researchers of their own language use and that of the speech community in which they participate, they will become more active learners.

The Author

Jin Sook Lee is an assistant professor of Language Education in the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University. Her research interests focus on the development of pragmatic competence in second/foreign language learners and on teacher preparation for language educators. Based on her many years of experience as an EFL/ESL instructor in Asia and the United States, her research centers around helping teachers develop effective practices that are grounded in sound theories of language development. Please direct comments and questions to jinslee@rci.rutgers.edu.

References

Bouton, L. (1988). A cross-cultural study of ability to interpret implicatures in English. *World Englishes*, *7*,183-196.

Bouton, L. (1994). Conversational implicature in a second language: Learned slowly when not deliberately taught. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *22*,157-167.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 1-47.

Clark, H., & Clark, E. (1977). *Psychology and language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Cohen, A., & Olshtain, E. (1989). Speech act behavior across languages. In H. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Transfer in language production* (pp. 53-67). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Devine, J. (1982). A question of universality: Conversational principles and implications. In M.A. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL* (pp. 191-209). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Fraser, B. (1980). Conversational mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *4*, 341-350.

Grice, H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 9, pp. 411-458). New York: Academic Press.

Gudykunst, W., & Nishida, T. (1994). *Bridging Japanese/North American differences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G., & Kellerman, E. (Eds.). (1997). *Communication strategies*. Essex, England: Addison Wesley Longman.

Keenan, E. (1976). The universality of conversational postulates. *Language and Society*, *5*, 67-79.

Lee, J.S. (2000). Analysis of pragmatic competence among Korean learners of English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Lee, J.S., & McChesney, B. (2000). Discourse rating tasks: A teaching tool for developing sociocultural competence. *ELT Journal*, *54*(2), 161-168.

Nash, T. (1983). American and Chinese politeness strategies: It sort of disturbs my sleep or health is important. *University of Hawaii Working Papers*, *2*(2), 23-39.

Oxford, R., & Anderson, N. (1995). A crosscultural view of learning styles. *Language Teaching*, *28*, 201-215.

Park, M. (1979). *Communication styles in two different cultures*. Seoul: Hanshin.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face negotiation theory. In Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication*, (pp. 213-238). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Appendix

Instructions: Each item consists of a description of the setting and a dialogue that should be imagined to be taking place in the United States. After each dialogue there will be a question about what an utterance (sometimes in boldface letters) means. Each question will be followed by four multiple-choice answers. Please choose the answer that seems to best answer the question. If you disagree with all of the multiple choice answers, please write out what you think the answer should be in the blank labeled "Other". In addition, please rate the degree of difficulty you experienced in interpreting the English expressions on a scale from 1 (not difficult at all) to 5 (very difficult) as well as how accurate you think your answer is. There will be 14 questions. Again, simply imagine that you are present when the dialogue occurs and choose the answer that comes the closest to what you think the utterance means.

1. Two teachers are talking about a student's term paper

Mr. Ranger: Have you finished with Mark's term paper yet?
Mr. Smith: Yes, I have. I read it last night.
Mr. Ranger: What did you think of it?
Mr. Smith: **Well, I thought it was well typed**.

How did Mr. Smith like Mark's term paper?
a. He liked it. He thought it was good.
b. He thought it was important that the paper was well typed.
c. He really did not read it well enough to know.
d. He did not like it.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5

2. Bill and Peter work together in the same office. They are good friends. They often have lunch together and Peter has even invited Bill to have dinner with him and his wife at their home several times. Now Peter's friends have told him that they saw Bill out dancing with Peter's wife recently while Peter was out of town on a business trip.

Peter: **"Bill knows how to be a really good friend, doesn't he?"**

Which of the following is the closest to what Peter meant by his remark?
a. Bill is not acting the way a good friend should.
b. Peter's wife and Bill are becoming really good friends.
c. Peter and Bill are good friends, so Peter can trust him.
d. Nothing should be allowed to interfere with the friendship.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5

3. Professor Williams is a professor of electrical engineering at the University of Illinois. He has been asked by a local company to write to them about a student of his who has applied for a job as an electronics research technician with that company. He agrees to do it and sends the following note:

Dear Mr. Royal,

Michael Ronson has been in two of my courses and has been my advisee for two years. He was present in class almost everyday and seemed to pay attention. He turned in his assignments on time, was always quite pleasant, and got along with the other students quite well. I hope this brief description will help you in your consideration of Mr. Ronson's application for the position with you.

If you were Mr. Royal, would you consider this a strong recommendation for Ronson?

a. Yes, because Professor Williams says he attends classes regularly, does his assignments and is pleasant.
b. No, because Professor Williams did not mention the quality of Ronson's work.
c. Yes, because if Professor Williams did not want to help Ronson get the job, he would not have written a letter at all.
d. No, because Ronson apparently missed class once in a while.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5

4. Two roommates are talking about their plans for the summer.

Susan: My mother wants me to stay home for a while, so I can be there when our relatives come to visit us at the beach.
Joan: Do you have a lot of relatives?
Susan: Is the Pope Catholic?

How can we best interpret Susan's question?

a. Susan feels her relatives are too religious.
b. Susan has a lot of relatives.
c. Susan was suddenly remembered a question on her final exam in Religion 101
and wanted to make sure she had answered it correctly.
d. Susan is trying to change the subject; she doesn't want to talk about her relatives
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
 not at all..   very difficult
    1   2   3   4   5

5. When Jack got home, he found that his wife was limping.

    Jack: What happened to your leg?
    Wife: **I went jogging today**.

Another way the wife could have said the same thing is...

a. Today, I finally got some exercise jogging.
b. I hurt it jogging.
c. It's nothing serious. Don't worry about it.
d. I want to change the subject because it is embarrassing.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5

6. Ted and Sharon went to a bar to have a beer and the following conversation took place.

    Ted: Can we have a couple of Lite beers, please?
    Sharon: Make mine a Bud Light, will you?
    Bartender: I don't know. Are you two 21?
    Ted: Yeah, we are. Now can we have our beers?

Assuming that Ted was telling the truth, what does the bartender know about how old Ted and Sharon are?

a. Ted and Sharon are both 21- no more, no less.
b. Ted and Sharon are both at least 21.
c. Ted and Sharon are the same age.
d. There is no way for the bartender to know which of these Ted means based on what he said.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.

not at all .... very accurate

    1   2   3   4   5

How difficult was it to answer this question?

 not at all.. very difficult

    1   2   3   4   5

7. Two friends, Maria and Tony, are talking about what had happened the night before. Last night, they had had dinner with Andy, a friend of theirs, in a little town just outside Philadelphia. Then, after dinner, Andy had left and got in trouble. Now, this morning, Maria and Tony are trying to figure out what Andy did after he left them.

Maria: Hey, I hear Andy went to Philadelphia and stole a car after he left us last night.

Tony: Not exactly. He stole a car and went to Philadelphia.

Maria: Are you sure? That's not the way I heard it.

What actually happened is that Andy stole the car in Philadelphia. In that case, which of the two friends has the right story- Maria or Tony?

a. Maria

b. Tony

c. Both are right. Since both are saying essentially the same thing, they really have nothing to argue about.

d. Neither of them has the story right.

e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.

not at all .... very accurate

    1   2   3   4   5

How difficult was it to answer this question?

not at all .... very accurate

    1   2   3   4   5

8. Frank: Where is Rudy, Helen? Have you seen him this morning?

Helen: **There's a yellow Honda parked over by Sarah's house.**

What Helen is saying is that...

a. she just noticed that Sarah has bought a new yellow Honda.

b. she doesn't know where Rudy is.

c. she thinks Rudy may be over at Sarah's house.

d. she likes yellow Honda and wants Frank to see one.

e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.

not at all .... very accurate

    1   2   3   4   5

How difficult was it to answer this question?

not at all .... very accurate

    1   2   3   4   5

9. A group of students are talking over their coming vacation. They would like to leave a day or two early, but one of their professors has said that they will have a test on the day before vacation begins. "No one will be excused," he said. Everyone has to take it. After class, some of the students get together to talk about the situation , and their conversation goes as follows:

Kate: I wish we didn't have that test next Friday. I wanted to leave for Florida before that.
Jake: Oh, I don't think we'll really have that test. Do you?
Mark: Professor Schimt said he wasn't going anywhere this vacation.
Jake: What do you think Kate? Will he really give us that test? Do you think we have to stay around until Friday?
Kate: **Does the sun come up in the east these days**?

What does Kate mean by her last question?
a. I don't know. Ask me a question I can answer.
b. Let's change the subject before we get really angry about it.
c. Yes, he'll give us the test. You can count on it.
d. Almost everyone else will be leaving early. It always happens. We might as well do it, too.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
 not at all...   very difficult
    1   2   3   4   5

10. At a recent party, there was a lot of singing and piano playing. At one point Sue played the piano while Mary sang. When someone who had not been at the party asked Bob what song Mary had sung, Bob said,

Bob: **I'm not sure, but Sue was playing a song named "We are the World".**

Which of the following is the closest to what Bob meant by this remark?
a. He was only interested in Sue and did not listen to Mary.
b. Mary and Sue were not doing the same song.
c. The song that Mary sang was "We are the World".
d. Mary sang very badly.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
    1   2   3   4   5

11. Two friends are talking about different places to eat.
Robin: Have you tried the chili at Pedro's?
Rosie: Yeah. Just the other day.
Robin: How did you like it?
Rosie: I don't know. **I don't think I'm a very good judge of chili.**

How does Rosie like Pedro's chili?
a. We don't know. She doesn't say whether she liked it or not.
b. She can't really remember
c. Really hot and spicy.
d. Not very much.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
   1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
   1   2   3   4   5

12. Mr. Brown is a dairy farmer and needs to borrow money to build a new barn. When he goes to the bank to apply for the loan, the banker tells him that he must have at least 50 cows on his farm in order to borrow enough money to build a barn. The following conversation then occurs.

Banker: Do you have 50 cows, Mr. Brown?
Mr. Brown: **Yes, I do**.

Which of the following says exactly what Mr. Brown means?
a. He has exactly 50 cows- no more, no less.
b. He has at least 50 cows- maybe more.
c. He has no more than 50 cows- maybe less.
d. He could mean any of these three things.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
   1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
   1   2   3   4   5

13. The cashier in a restaurant is talking to her boss.

Cashier: I need a good long rest. I'm afraid my beauty is beginning to fade.
Owner: What makes you think that?
Cashier: **The men are beginning to count their change.**

What does the cashier mean by her last comment?
a. Recently the cashier has given some customers the wrong change, so now the men count what she gives them.
b. Instead of looking at her, the men have begun to pay attention to their money.
c. If her beauty fades, the customers will not come to the restaurant to meet her.
d. She is getting older.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
     1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
     1   2   3   4   5

14. Sarah and Joan are colleagues at work. Joan turns to Sarah and says:

Joan: By the way, how much are you getting this year? I heard you got a really nice raise.
Sarah: **Have you seen any good movies lately, Joan**? I'd really like to see one or two before the workload gets heavier.

Why does Sarah bring up the movies?
a. She wants to go to some before she gets too busy this fall.
b. She did get a nice raise and is inviting Joan to be her guest at the movies.
c. She does not want to talk about how much money she makes.
d. She hasn't seen any good movies in a long time.
e. other_____

Please rate how accurate you think your answer is.
not at all .... very accurate
     1   2   3   4   5
How difficult was it to answer this question?
not at all .... very accurate
     1   2   3   4   5

Teaching Culture in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom

Jean Kim
The Catholic University of Korea

Abstract

It is a generally accepted principle that language and culture are inseparable. Yet, traditionally, when one thinks of second language teaching, there is a tendency to think of only the four skills to be taught: listening, speaking, writing and reading. Thus with this emphasis on the so-called 'skills,' the teaching of culture is often a neglected, if not forgotten, component. However, as technological advances bring the world closer together as a 'global village,' the emphasis on the teaching of English for intercultural understanding and communication is becoming a vital part of education in countries all over the world. This paper analyzes various published articles that investigate the teaching of culture in the English as a Second Language (ESL)/English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context as well as in SL/FL contexts in general. Based on the findings, recommendations for the language classroom will be made with some newly designed 'culture teaching' materials offered as examples of ways for teachers to incorporate culture into their actual lesson plans.

Introduction

As the world joins closer together in a 'global village,' the role of English in this ever-shrinking global community is becoming increasingly important. English is the language of international business, prevails in the transportation and media sectors, and is developing as the world's truly first international language (Ashworth, 1991). Hence, needless to say, the emphasis on teaching English is becoming a vital part of education in countries the world over. However, in order for English to play a role as the lingua franca, it is insufficient to promote the use of English as a mere linguistic tool. Rather, its function as a means for intercultural understanding and communication should be further expanded. Therefore, the teaching of English as a

second or foreign language should not be limited to teaching English as a linguistic skill, and thus the scope of language learning should be broadened into one that incorporates intercultural awareness and understanding as well. Accordingly, this paper will examine and analyze various published articles that investigate the teaching of culture in the English as a Second Language (ESL)/English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context as well as in Second Language (SL)/Foreign Language (FL) contexts in general. Based on the findings, implications will be sought that can be applied to the language classroom with some newly designed 'culture teaching' materials offered as examples of ways for teachers to incorporate culture into their actual lesson plans.

Literature Survey

The History of Culture Teaching

Although there is evidence of an interest in the interrelationship between language and culture interspersed throughout the ages, prior to the 1960's, the vast majority of studies did not associate culture with communication, but rather with literature. Therefore, the primary goal of language study was to develop sufficient linguistic skills to enable the interpretation of great literary works (Flewelling, 1994). However, from the 1960s on, a deeper interest arose towards the aspect of communication, which necessitated a better understanding of the *people* whom one was trying to communicate with. Beginning in the 1980's, educational systems started placing emphasis on cultural literacy for sociopolitical and socioeconomic advantages within the international market (Moore, 1995). Thus, the teaching of language was accordingly modified from a heavy focus on linguistic skills to a gradual increase in the incorporation of cultural literacy instruction.

Over the years, there have been changes and modifications in terms of the criteria employed in deciding what was meant by culture. Because educators traditionally tended to define culture in terms of 'Big C' (i.e. culture as aesthetics-the fine arts, the great books, opera, and architecture) or 'Little C' (i.e. culture as anthropological-customs, values, manners), language teachers were also inclined to choose between these two approaches (Moore, 1995). However, with the increasing emphasis on the inclusion of 'authentic' materials in classroom instruction, the definition of culture was broadened from these dichotomous notions to include "everything related to the world views of people and individuals" (p. 597).

Theoretical Approaches to Culture Teaching

As with any aspect of teaching, the inclusion of a theoretical model for teaching culture is important to teachers because theory can provide teachers with a basis on which they can judge the adequacy of the particular approach that they employ.

According to Arries (1994), there are essentially two different theoretical approaches to teaching culture that have been advocated by researchers — the 'activity' and the 'anthropology-process' approaches. The former group suggests that teachers include activities such as culture assimilators, mini-dramas, field trips, and visits by native speakers, and utilize authentic materials. On the other hand, those who advocate the latter approach claim that an exclusive focus on materials and activities reflects a misconception about the nature of culture. Within the 'anthropology process' approach, cultural behaviors are viewed as constantly changing, and thus materials can easily be outdated and/or applied in artificial and inauthentic ways. In other words, this approach conceives of culture learning as a process rather than a "mere conglomeration of facts that trivialize the concept of culture" (p. 523).

Issues in Culture Teaching

Regardless of existing theories to fall back on, teaching foreign language culture still remains a difficult task for teachers due to a variety of factors. The significance placed on communication and interaction that characterizes ESL/EFL instruction today demands that ESL/EFL teachers possess not only a high level of language proficiency, but also cultural proficiency as well (Schimidt-Rinehart, 1997). Naturally, there is now a greater recognition on the part of the foreign language teacher of the importance of integrating culture into their curriculum. However, mere recognition does not necessarily lead to automatic application of culture teaching in the language classroom. In fact, language teachers face obstacles due to their lack of preparation on culture teaching as well as the lack of available insights, sources of information and the conceptual tools to effectively integrate culture into their actual lessons (Hadley, 1993). Moreover, according to Alptekin (1993), foreign language teachers are often times forced to teach the culture of which they have scarcely any experience. Such teaching based on inaccurate knowledge may lead to dangerous misconceptions towards the target language culture. Consequently, it is imperative for language teachers to consider several issues related to the teaching of culture prior to any classroom instruction.

Defining Teachers' Own Beliefs on Culture

The word culture is perhaps one of the most complex terms to define in the English language. Thus although language studies specialists are constantly searching for what culture means in language teaching, the complicated nature of the term makes it difficult to create a clear-cut definition of it. Likewise, it has become apparent that language teachers also have different definitions, concepts, and underlying assumptions about culture. As Pajares (1992) suggests, individual teachers' beliefs strongly influence their teaching behavior. This claim can also be applied to the teaching of culture, and as Ryan (1996) asserts, discrepancies among

teachers' cultural beliefs may become problematic since how the teacher perceives culture relates directly to their instructional behavior in the classroom. Ryan's two-year qualitative study of university English teachers in Mexico exemplifies the diverse range of definitions teachers had of culture, and how each teacher's definition was influenced by their personal experiences, especially deeply rooted in the Mexican setting. For example, some teachers admitted that their attitudes towards the English culture have been somewhat negatively influenced by their own parents' negative attitudes toward acquiring any foreign culture, not just that of English speaking countries. Therefore, although teachers involved in the study cannot be generalized to all ESL/EFL teachers, it is nevertheless worth noting the potential dangers of teachers conveying their own personal prejudice to their students. This would be particularly hazardous if the teacher denigrates some aspects of target culture, which may result in negative consequences for the students. Hence, Ryan suggests that in order to prevent such possibly dangerous effects, teachers need to become ethnographers investigating their own beliefs of culture, not only that of their target language but also that of their native language, thereby developing 'healthy' and beneficial sociolinguistic goals for their language classrooms.

Target Culture Only vs. the Incorporation of Native Culture

Researchers continue to encourage culture learning that is more 'authentic.' Here, important issues that need to be addressed are some theoretical claims about the necessity of teaching target language only in relation to target language culture. Some researchers, for example, Stewart (1982, cited in Alpetekin, 1993), go so far as to assert that teaching formal aspects of a foreign language while referring to the native culture of the learner is virtually useless. Others, like Valdes (1986), reiterate this view by arguing that the use of native culture in foreign language teaching is devoid of benefit.

On the other hand, Kramsch (1993) claims that learning culture can only be pursued when there is a development in the understanding of one's own culture. Thus although practical advantages do exist in teaching and presenting the target language solely in relation to the target culture, culture teaching must begin with comprehension of one's native cultural behavior, its prejudices and ethnocentric outlook, which can be used as a basis for cross cultural application and analysis.

Applying culture teaching through the use of native culture knowledge that teachers are actually more familiar with may be more effective rather than placing overemphasis solely on target language culture. In fact, Prodromou's 1992 study surveying 300 Greek EFL students' preferences on English lessons revealed that students prefer to discuss about various cultures in general, followed by discussions of their native culture, then followed by the culture of their target language. Moreover, intermediate and advanced students believed that it was more important for their

teacher to be familiar with their local culture rather than that of their FL. Prodromou interprets these results as the students' desire to prioritize their cultural identity before acquiring any new cultural knowledge.

Ownership of Language

Another concern regarding the teaching of target language culture involves the potential misconception of "equating language with the combined uses and usages of its native speakers, thus making them not only its arbiters of appropriacy, but more importantly, its sole owners" (Alptekin, 1993, p. 141). However, considering the lingua franca status of the English language, it is virtually impossible to think of English as the sole possession of native speakers. "English already represents many cultures and it can be used by anyone as a means to express any cultural heritage and any value system" (p. 140). Hence, Alptekin argues that rather than indulging in an over-simplification such as the inseparability of language and culture, it would be a more realistic approach to address a certain language that may not necessarily be inextricably tied to one particular culture, as is the case with English.

There are ESL/EFL textbooks which also contribute to creating misleading or inappropriate teaching of culture. This is more the case when the textbook writers are native speakers who consciously or unconsciously transmit their views, values and beliefs of their own society, such as the US or UK (Philipson, 1992). In such cases, these texts may once again confine the English language culture to one of its native settings, in a manner devoid of comparative insight and critical perspectives.

Analysis

Theory vs. Reality

Although teachers and researchers alike agree on the importance of culture teaching, it is difficult to produce the ultimate 'successful' language teaching curriculum. Researchers encourage the use of native speaker informants and the use of more authentic materials to promote cultural understanding (Moore, 1995). However, such suggestions do not reflect what could actually be used in the classroom setting, for not only are qualified and well trained native speaker informants difficult to locate, such additional activities become burdensome and time consuming for the already over-worked teachers. Thus on the one hand there are theorists who criticize the ineffectiveness of culture teaching methods employed by teachers in that they lack cross- cultural understanding, comparison, and analysis. Yet on the other hand, there are teachers in the real classroom who, for many reasons beyond their control, cannot but reduce culture teaching to mainly imparting factual knowledge, and "if time permits, extend that teaching to some 'cultural activities'" (Moore, 1995, p. 599).

Assessing Cultural Knowledge

Assessing student progress is an important part of teachers' responsibility, thus if culture is to be integrated as part of the language class, testing culture is also an issue that needs to be addressed. Because of the traditional quantitative view of the importance of a reliable and valid test, culture tests have also been dominated by objective and easily scored items that measure students' geographical knowledge, historical facts and figures. Some researchers (e.g. Lafayette, 1988, cited in Moore, 1995), have criticized such culture tests as limiting students' learning to fragmented, incomplete and sometimes inaccurate pieces of information. Although some modifications have been made in response to such criticism, such as the creation of multiple choice or true/false items, such tests were again questioned for their validity in that they measured students' reading skills more than cultural understanding.

The use of portfolios has been a newly emerging method in assessing students' cultural knowledge as part of adopting more 'authentic' and performance-based assessment. Those who use and advocate portfolios (e.g. Moore, 1995) attest to their ability to capture the depth and breadth of the students' learning, and to provide evidence of growth that cannot be measured by standardized tests.

The Need for More 'Tangible' Suggestions

One of the main concerns of culture teaching is not whether teachers dispute the importance of culture teaching in the language classroom, but rather their lack of knowledge or confidence in how to attempt to do so. Among some empirical studies that may offer more tangible suggestions to teachers are examinations on the effectiveness of videos to teach about FL culture. In her 1998 study, Martinez-Gibson reported the findings of an exploratory study to assess FL students' ability to observe cultural differences between target and native culture as presented in television commercials. Her results indicated that the addition of pre- and post-viewing culture-based discussion activities seemed to have positively affected students to recognize cultural features in a FL commercial. She claims that the visual aspect of television commercial messages, which is often more important than verbal messages, helps students become aware of the actions of the people, which in turn aids comprehension and enhances cultural awareness.

Herron et al's 1999 study also investigated the effect of video based language learning on students' acquisition of target language culture. A pre-test, administered prior to exposure to the videos, and a post-test given at the end of the semester after exposure to the videos, assessed long-term gains in cultural knowledge. A questionnaire administered also revealed that students themselves thought they gained cultural knowledge through such video viewing.

Seelye (1994) warned, however, that the use of visual aids should be carefully planned so as not to present false images about the people and places being studied. This is especially the case with outdated visual materials, where teachers must take steps to ensure that students understand what they are seeing is truly representative of the past, not as they are now. Otherwise, the original intent to encourage intercultural understanding will only backfire, for there may be a risk of students ridiculing the people portrayed.

Other suggestions to utilize in classrooms include the use of literature, popular music, magazines, brochures and pamphlets, commonly perceived as 'authentic' by language teachers (Moore, 1995; Shanahan, 1997).

Application

Based on the various aforementioned studies on culture teaching, I will now provide a lesson plan and some materials related to culture teaching that can be incorporated into the actual EFL classroom (refer to Appendices A and B for detailed lesson plan and materials). [1]

One Week Lesson Plan

The lesson plan can be applied to an intermediate-advanced EFL class that meets twice a week (for 75-90 minutes) or 3-4 times per week (for 50 minutes). The focus of the lesson is to introduce students to the notion of culture shock and compare, analyze, and discuss various cultural behaviors of different cultures and countries. Here, the teacher is encouraged to involve students' own experiences as much as possible by promoting discussions that compare students' own culture with that of their target language culture. By doing so, students are able to analyze cultural differences that may possibly lead to cross cultural misunderstanding and undue prejudice towards certain cultures/people.

Materials

Various handouts illustrating common areas of intercultural misunderstanding will be provided (refer to Appendix B). Again, it is important for the teacher to encourage students to explore reasons behind such misunderstandings instead of merely 'telling' them the answers to comprehension check-up questions. Since students will most likely emphasize their need for linguistic skills as well as cultural knowledge, the teacher can inform students of various expressions that can be used to resolve cross-cultural misunderstandings or shock (refer to Appendix B, Handout 4).

Video viewing will also be integrated into this lesson plan. As Martinez-Gibson (1998) claims, the visual aspects of video viewing will help enhance student understanding of cultural behaviors. Students will watch a short clip of a video (here, I have specifically chosen the movie 'Mr. Baseball'[2]), discuss the content of and difficult languages used in the scene, and compare the various cultural behaviors shown in the video with that of their own culture. Then, with the language skills (Handout 4) learned in the previous class(es), students will be asked to create a detailed script that describes the scene from the video they have watched (in groups) then present their scenario to the rest of the class as a role play; by doing so, students will not only be discussing/learning culture, but also practicing their language skills at the same time.

Assignment

Students will be asked to write journals that describe their experiences of culture shock and/or miscommunication.

Concluding Remarks

Based on the various articles examined above, there are several recommendations that can be made for the teaching of culture in not only the ESL/EFL context, but in any SL/FL classroom context. One important implication is that although it is a generally accepted principle that language and culture are inseparable (Flewelling, 1994), before any actual teaching is conducted, it is vital for teachers and the curriculum designers to devise clear goals for culture instruction based on a mutual understanding of what is meant by culture. Furthermore, prior to any hasty integration of authentic materials into the classroom, it is necessary to first address the issue of incorporating native culture vs. sole focus on target culture and consider the various advantages/disadvantages involved with both approaches. The decision to choose between either approaches is again heavily influenced by the teachers' own beliefs toward culture, thus it is crucial for the teacher to have a clear yet critical understanding of his/her own perceptions towards culture so as to provide students with opportunities for unbiased and 'healthy' culture instruction. In addition, whether or not cultural knowledge can/should be assessed with standardized tests or other alternative methods, or whether cultural knowledge can/should be assessed at all is another area that needs to be examined by the language teacher. Teachers need to be catalysts in analytical cultural thinking (Hyde, 1994). These vital issues related to culture education need to be examined in order to create the most beneficial culture teaching curriculum for the second/foreign language student.

The Author

Jean Kim received her MA in English as a Second Language from the University of Hawaii at Manoa, where she has also taught for two years. She is currently a visiting professor at the Catholic University of Korea. Her research interests include the relationship between language and identity, culture and language learning, bilingualism, and second language acquisition, with focus on the critical period hypothesis. Email: treasurejean@hanmail.net

Endnotes

1   This particular lesson plan has been utilized by the author while she taught international ESL students at the Hawaii English Language Program and Korean EFL students at the Catholic University of Korea. Upon completion of the lessons, the author requested feedback from her students regarding their views on the content, activities, and materials involved in the lessons. The majority of students provided positive feedback in that it was interesting, relevant to and reflective of their real life activities and needs.

2   The specific scene used from 'Mr. Baseball' is a short clip (approximately 7-10 minutes long) about an American baseball player who is invited to lunch at a traditional Japanese family's home. During the meal, there are several incidents that provoke confusion , annoyance and shock on the part of the various characters. Most of the scene is filled with non-verbal actions, which nevertheless sufficiently explain the situation.

3   Some of these expressions were taken from Chan, D. & Sandstrom, D. (1995). *Journeys to cultural understanding*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

References

Alptekin, C. (1993). Target language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal*, *47*(2), 136-143.

Arries, J. (1994). Constructing culture study units: A blueprint and practical tools. *Foreign Language Annals, 27*(4), 523-534.

Ashworth, M. (1991). Internationalism and our "strenuous family." *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(2), 231-243.

Atkinson, D. (1999). TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 625-654.

Flewelling, J. (1994). The teaching of culture: Guidelines from the national core French study of Canada. *Foreign Language Annals*, *27*(2), 133-142.

Hadley, A.O. (1993). *Teaching language in context* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Herron, C., Cole, S., Corrie, C., & Dubreil, S. (1999). The effectiveness of a video-based curriculum in teaching culture. *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(4), 518-533.

Hyde, M. (1994). The teaching of English in Morocco: The place of culture. *ELT Journal*, *48*(4), 295-305.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context in culture and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martinez-Gibson, E. (1998). A study on cultural awareness through commercials and writings. *Foreign Language Annals*, *31*, 115-139.

Moore, Z. (1995). Teaching and testing culture: Old questions, new dimensions. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *23*(7), 595-605.

Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, *62*(3), 307-332.

Philipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Prodromou, L. (1992). What culture? Which culture?: Cross-cultural factors in language learning. *ELT Journal*, *46*(1), 39-50.

Ryan, P. (1996). Sociolinguistic goals for foreign language teaching and teachers' metaphorical images of culture. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(4), 571-586.

Schimidt-Rinehart, B. (1997). Authentic materials and Mexican immersion: A professional development program combining pedagogy, language, and culture. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*(2), 201-210.

Seelye, H. (1994). *Teaching culture: Strategies for intercultural communication*. Chicago, IL: National Textbook Company.

Shanahan, D. (1997). Articulating the relationship between language, literature, and culture: Toward a new agenda for foreign language teaching and research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(2), 164-174.

Valdes, J. (1986). *Culture Bound*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A: Lesson Plan (For 50-minute classes)

Focus: Understanding Cultural Differences

Day 1:
1) Discuss culture shock (refer to appendix B, handouts 1 & 2)
- discuss the incidents described in the handouts & discuss whether such behavior is acceptable in students' own culture (in small groups then as a whole class).
2) Assignment: read handout 3 (appendix B), and prepare to discuss in next class.

Day 2:
1) Go over and discuss content of handout 3. Compare the behavior portrayed in handout 3 to that of students' own culture (in small groups then as a whole class).
2) Discuss ways to describe and resolve cross-cultural miscommunication (refer to appendix B, handout 4).

Day 3:
1) View video clip ("Mr. Baseball").
- pre-viewing discussion
(present students with brief background information of the scene that will be watched)
- view video and discuss content of video as a class
- review video, go over difficult language
- discuss in small groups whether the behavior seen is culturally appropriate in the students' own countries

Day 4:
1) Based on the video watched on day 3, and using the expressions learned from handout 4, create a script that best describes the scene from the video. Work in groups, then perform as role play in front of class.
2) Assignment: Journal- "describe a time when you experienced culture shock or cross-cultural miscommunication."

Appendix B- Handouts

Handout 1: Greetings in different cultures

All cultures have different styles of greetings. Here are some examples of greetings in some countries. Think about greetings in your country. Are they similar to any of the examples?

- American/Canadian: "Hi, how are you?"
- Egyptian: "Good morning of roses."
- Chinese/Korean: "Have you eaten yet?"
- Thai: "Where are you going?"
- Certain African groups: "Are you alive?"

Handout 2

<u>Cultural Differences</u>

Read the situation described below. Do you agree with the discussion that is going on between the three people? What do you think of the English teacher's behavior?

A: "Look! There's our English teacher, Mrs. Smith."
B: "Who is that man she is hugging?"
A: "That's not her husband. I've seen her husband before. That's a different man!"
C: "Oh, that is Tom. He's one of her students who recently received a scholarship."
A: "A student? How can she hug a man in public? And he is not even her husband."
B: "I can't understand American people!"

Handout 3

Michael, Kelly and Soojin work together in a company in the U. S. Michael and Kelly are American and Soojin is Korean. Michael and Kelly invite Soojin to dinner one day, and Soojin recommends a nice Korean restaurant. At the end of the meal, Soojin tries to pay for everyone. Here is a conversation of the three people.

Michael: "Here, take this please (offering Soojin $20)."
Soojin: "No, that's OK. "
Kelly: "Soojin, you can't pay for all of us. Besides, we asked you to join us."
Soojin: "Please don't worry about it. It was a pleasure for me to introduce you to

this restaurant."
Kelly: "Yes, but we asked you to join us, not the other way around."
Michael: "Please let us pay for ourselves."
Soojin: "No, no. Today, you are my guests."
Michael: "Well, OK. But next time, it's on us."
Soojin: "No, you don't have to do that."

Handout 4

Learning from miscommunications
Here are some expressions you can use to talk about and possibly
solve some cross-cultural miscommunications.[3]

1. You can directly talk to the person right away:
- " I'm sorry. Did I say (or do) something to upset you?"
- " I'm sorry. I didn't mean to upset you."
- "I think we misunderstood each other."
- "In my culture it's a little different."
- "I think there's been a misunderstanding. Can you tell me if I said (or did) something to upset you?"
- "I think I upset you, but I'm not sure why."

2. You can talk to the person after some time has passed:
- "Do you have some time to talk about what happened the other day?"
- "Can I talk to you about something? I've been wondering about what happened the other day."
- "I don't quite understand why there was a misunderstanding. Can we talk about it?"

3. You can explain the situation to another person and ask for advice:
- "Something happened to me a few days ago that I don't understand. Maybe you can help me understand and tell me what you think about it."
- "Can I ask you about something that happened with an American (or other nationalities)? I don't know the culture well enough to understand."
- "Why do you think he/she said (did) that?"
- "What would you do in that situation?"
- "What would most Americans (or other nationalities) do in that situation?"

Looking at Discontinuity in an Asian Context

Linda Fitzgibbon
Hanguk University of Foreign Studies

Abstract

In international settings educators cannot hold English language practices and embedded values and skills as the norm. The aim of this project was to undertake an investigation of one class at an international school in Macau, to characterize its literacy practices and those of the families and analyze them in the light of the concept of discontinuity. Specifically, this study focused on the concept of 'discontinuity' in the teaching of reading.

The case study approach was employed with data being collected from a wide range of sources: classroom observations, interviews, questionnaires and school documents.

The study found discontinuity at the data collection site. One kind of discontinuity centered on the methods and materials used; another was found between the homes and EFL best practice. A similar discontinuity was found between the curriculum and EFL best practice and a degree of difference around EFL best practice between staff and administration.

Introduction

The examination of literacy practices among different groups has led to the realization that children experience greater school success when home literacy practices closely match those of their schools (Gray, 1990; Heath, 1983; Watson-Gegeo 1992). That all cultures have specified ways of imparting knowledge of the world and ways of asking children what they know has also been shown (Heath & Mangiola, 1991).

The aim of this Project was to undertake a case study of one classroom at an international school, to characterize its literacy practices and compare them with culturally specific practices of the families at the school. Specifically, the notion of

discontinuity was examined to identify whether the teaching of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) was constrained by lack of awareness regarding the importance of providing continuity between the home and school literacy cultures.

Malcolm describes discontinuity as "incompletely shared acceptance or awareness of the norms of interaction by participants" (cited in Cazden, 1988, p.74). Heath and Mangiola (1991) theorize that all cultures have specified ways of imparting knowledge of the world and ways of asking children what they know about it. They suggest that when the school way hinders education, teachers need help in bridging the cultural gulfs. Such help would include community building and opportunities for cultural exchange between the protagonists.

The outcome of this research was to document and consider what is going on in terms of literacy at an international school and in the families of a Year 1 class. The results, while not generaliseable to other schools in this context, will highlight the importance of providing continuity between what goes on in school and at home as "failure occurs when participation (in school) violates principles of discourse learned at home" (Wittrock, 1986, p.20).

At the outset, I would like to make it clear that this study was not about making judgments: rather it was about answering a research question and providing a rationale regarding the importance of addressing continuity between home and school literacy cultures.

Research Question

Is discontinuity evident in the teaching of reading at the School of Nations? And if so, how?

Literature Review

Presentation of literacy issues is warranted in order to construct a framework, which identifies certain pedagogical orientations for cross cultural teaching and learning.

Freire informs us that literacy is socially learned, and not a mechanical decoding process (Freire & Macedo, 1987). Functional, cultural and critical literacy are three terms of central import to a discussion about what literacy is, who owns it, and how it is learned and used. To Freire and Macedo, functional literacy is technical mastery of the discrete skills necessary in the decoding process. Cultural literacy involves the gaining of skills that enable one to be aware of the way language operates. Critical literacy involves awareness of the variations of discourse. Friere maintains that literacy is constructed in the world via experience and knowledge. In an international setting, acceptance of this notion helps to change the pedagogy from one that places the teacher and the school at the center to one that places the students at the center. These concepts are critical in the treatment of EFL pedagogy.

The concept that literacy is a social reality is highlighted by many researchers who challenge dominant conceptions of the functions and uses of literacy as they do not "correspond to the social meanings of reading and writing across either time periods, cultures or contexts of use" (Heath cited in de Castell, 1986, p.16).

Beare and Slaughter (1993), in presenting the dimensions of change in education, challenge educators to review their world view, that set of assumptions on which systems and practices are based. Cummins (cited in Minami & Kennedy, 1991) gives a detailed framework that assists teachers and administrator in examining the types of "personal and institutional redefinitions" (p. 373) that are needed in order to reassess the attitudes and assumptions that currently underlie teacher and student interaction. In common with Friere, Cummins believes that Standard English is dominating minority students' linguistic skill and cultural knowledge.

The inappropriateness of transferring pedagogy across cultural contexts has been theorized from a number of perspectives (Harris, 1990). Similarly, there has been much research that shows how various cultural groups use language differently (Kale & Luke in Furniss & Green, 1991). Ultimately, these findings enable teachers to examine their understandings of literacy, as these influence teacher practices in EFL. Cultural and linguistic differences are manifested by unique ways of using words. For example, in some communities adults ask children display questions, where their knowledge will be on show. Display questions are not real questions in that the child's interlocutor does not need the information. Display questions often take the guise of language games, the ritual naming of body parts, for example. In contrast, other communities abhor overt displays of knowledge and to do to so may result in ridicule from others (Heath & Mangiola, 1991, p.14).

Home and school discontinuity is discussed by Campbell and Yong (1993). They point out that "ignoring the cultural context guarantees failure of general teaching strategies." The authors report that general teaching strategies only work in a cultural-specific context when attention is given to students needs, teacher qualifications and traditional cultural-specific relationships between the teacher and the students.

School desegregation in the U.S. caused many to focus on the language differences of children. Heath (1983), working at the request of American parents, showed that different communities had contrasting patterns of language use. The analysis of her ethnography reveals language socialization differences that make progression beyond functional literacy problematic. Clear discontinuity practices between home, community and school were identified. In an African American community different language structures were expected from boys and girls. Boys received encouragement to perform "public challenges" while girls were encouraged to adopt "fussing" language behavior. Children do not expect adults to ask them questions, as they are not seen as information givers. Adults do not give children

the opportunity to show knowledge of the world. Therefore the behaviors of Anglo Saxon teachers would be a clear violation of home cultural norms.

At present, the claim that schools in Australia are giving the indigenous population access to academic success has to be challenged. Aboriginal ways of knowing and doing conflict with white Australian ways of knowing and doing. Aboriginal people, when expressing the frustration they collectively feel, have pleaded to learn what they call "secret English" that they believe is being kept from them. For Aborigines to progress beyond the middle years of primary, they have to adopt Western styles of thinking and knowing. Gray (1990) adds further perspectives to the work of Freire (1987), recognizing that literacy education for Aboriginal children has to develop within a pedagogy that will give them more than marginal access to English. Presently, Aboriginal children are educated in a system that is structured on a model for non-Aboriginal children. An example of this discontinutity can be seen in how writing is taught. Process writing is an ethnocentric pedagogy, which assumes lengthy immersion in Standard Australian English (SAE). The failure of schools to recognize the Aboriginal oral tradition essentially means that the resulting learning context — the "ways with words" (Heath, p.42) — will not be accessible to Aboriginal children. Thus, we can be critical of the use of the implicit pedagogical model, as in the process writing approach used with Aboriginal children, as their experience with the social construction of SAE is not considered.

In the Solomon Islands, Watson-Gegeo conducted a ten-year research project studying school failure. The belief underlying this research was that "differences in language use and cultural understandings between home and school are the cause of low school success rates among children from ethnic minority backgrounds" (1992, n.p.). In the Solomon's, the language of instruction at school is English. The research findings detail an interesting discontinuity pattern. The children receive language socialization at home that is "direct, [and includes] verbally mediated teaching of intellectual and cultural skills" (Watson- Gegeo, n.p). Recognizing the distance between home and school, failure is attributed to the thin discourse that takes place in the classroom. Teachers are often inadequately trained, not native speakers of English, and materials are outdated and culturally irrelevant. The discontinuity lies therefore in the classroom environment providing diminished interaction when compared to the rich literacy practices at home.

Kale and Luke (in Furniss & Green, 1991) undertook a case study of Elsey, a child from the Torres Strait Islands (Australia). It was found that Elsey used a set of speech and literacy acts, which were different from those of her Anglo teacher and her peers. Elsey's language socialization was specific to her community. The language acts used habitually at school were observed to provide advantages for those children whose previous language experience matched that of the school. Therein lies the discontinuity. The researchers predicted that Elsey would not be successful in school. This prediction is a consequence of the authors' assumption that literacy is a social practice, which manifests itself differently in different contexts.

Differing expectations about schooling are detailed by Toner (1995), when describing 2 families from the Pacific. She describes the discontinuity between what the school provides for emergent reading with the familial expectations. The expectations of these families are clearly grounded in experiences in their home community. The premise of the research was that "the more the expectations of home and school run parallel, the greater the likelihood of success for the student" (p.7). Toner warns that learners' cultural and language experiences need to be considered when considering teaching and learning materials as "If teachers expect students to talk about stories as a preliminary to [reading], then we have to present them with the sorts of material, people, settings and referents which they recognize" (p.8).

Case Study

The research design chosen to answer the research questions was the case study, which is an in-depth examination of one environment. Individual environments have unique interpersonal interactions and patterns of influence; the researcher's task is the revelation of these patterns. The researcher determines an issue, question or event and then observes, questions and analyzes the environment subsequently, systematically and critically. The construction of an explicit theoretical framework prevents personal bias and assumptions that may distort both the data collection and analysis. Despite the heuristic nature of this study, it does not aim to be generalisable. Other studies conducted in other locations have contributed to the literature; this research seeks to add to the collective body of objective literature. In common with Bassey's views, this research aims at "...the improvement of education..." (cited in Bell, 1993, p.9).

The validity of this research is supported by the collection of data at the School of Nations from predetermined perspectives. The research question was answered by following an appropriate research framework which focused on reading, from both the school's position and the home's position. Reliability involves the utilization of known operational procedures demonstrating that further case studies can be undertaken. Again, as the research questions and framework are explicit, it is highly possible that the study may be replicated. The reliability of this project was enhanced as the data coding of all documents were scored by two additional independent individuals (executive teacher and a Ph.D. student). In 80% of the cases, codes were classified identically. This system helped ensure that the research instruments and results were reliable, credible and consistent. Another critical technique employed was triangulation. The same type of information was collected from various sources. For example, information about the reading program was elicited from administrators, the class teacher and researcher observation. Data about reading practices was gained from interviews with parents, parental questionnaires, classroom observation, examination of documents and interviews with administrators.

Data Collection Site

School of Nations (SoN) was established in 1987 with 5 students to provide an educational opportunity to the children and youth of Macau. Its opening was prompted by a desire to show the students the world and its inhabitants from a new perspective. The current enrolment is some 450 students ranging from Pre-primary to Secondary. The students represent 35 nations with a significant 75% being from Macau itself. Approximately 80% of the student population speaks a language other than English as a first language.

In the early years of schooling, 70% of instruction is undertaken in English and the remaining 30% in Mandarin. In secondary school the ratio changes to 80:20. The expectation is that by the end of secondary school, the students will have become fluent in both languages. The SoN argues that it develops in each student the fundamental knowledge, qualities, skills, attitudes and capacities necessary for them to become conscious directors of their own growth and active, responsible participants in the building of an emerging global society. The SoN believes that the use of English enables the students to access an increasing amount of information at the international level, concomitant to attaining a degree of language that will facilitate tertiary education in an English speaking country. Mandarin was chosen as a language of instruction in order to prepare the student for the time when Macau would return to Chinese rule and with this event a possible role in China's development. With mastery of Mandarin comes the possibility of tertiary education at a Chinese language university.

Macau has no standard curriculum and as such the school recognizes the potential to develop approaches to curriculum that reflect not only the diverse student and staff bodies, but also 21st century pedagogy. At the SoN, the Administration is keen to aid in the evolution of a pedagogy inspired by spiritual and moral principles.

In the pre-primary area not all teachers are trained. The remaining members of the faculty are tertiary graduates, some with Masters Degrees. At the time of the research the faculty came from Iran, Sweden, Columbia, Canada, Australia, USA, China, Taiwan, India, Malaysia and Singapore.

Academically the educational program is directed towards the Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education. The traditional subjects are studied; Math, English Literature, World History, Geography, Science and Art.

Case Selection

A Native English-speaking teacher working in a lower primary class was invited to participate in the case study. The class consisted of 25 children, 12 girls and 13 boys. The Lower Primary was chosen, as the data collection site as it is at this stage that reading behavior is "emergent" and the likelihood of parents being involved is greatest.

Data Collection and Instruments

Specifically, the case study was undertaken by formulating research questions, reading the curriculum documents, discussions with the classroom teacher and administrators, analysis of questionnaires to parents, and where possible parental interviews. The discussions with the classroom teacher and administrators were vital because a range of diverse and sometimes contradictory views on the nature of language and its acquisition can be displayed within any given faculty. A three-week period was spent operating as participant observer.

In all, seven data collection instruments were designed for this project: an observation schedule for use in the classroom, an interview schedule for the teacher, a set of open ended questions for use with the whole school staff, a checklist for inspection of teaching programs and curriculum, a questionnaire for the parents in English and Mandarin, an interview schedule for administrators and a set of open ended questions for use with parents.

Data Analysis

The qualitative analysis of this data was conducted by the "cut and sort" approach. Thirty code categories were selected, and the data sorted into one or more of the categories. Some of the themes identified were perspectives held by the subjects, some were strategy codes and some were the subjects' ways of thinking about their environment. The scaled responses of the parental questionnaires were collated on a frequency distribution graph.

This project found discontinuity at the data collection site. It was found that differences in the way the homes and SoN undertook literacy existed. One kind of discontinuity centered around literacy practices at home and at school. Another kind of discontinuity was assumptions about schooling at home and at School. Discontinuity was also evident between the School's stated philosophy and actual practices. Finally, the *Reading 360 Series* is a source of further issues.

A Description of the Reading Materials

This set of books for emergent readers, published by Pearson Education, is known as the *Ginn Reading Steps Program* in Canada and the U.S. In England, Macau and Australia it is known as the *Reading 360 Series*. The series has been reprinted several times since the 1970's. The whole series is a K-6 product. The *Reading 360 Series* follows the philosophy of supporting emergent readers by providing them with texts using high frequency words. The current publisher describes it as a bottom up approach to reading. That is to say, the inherent

methodology is one in which emergent readers acquire reading by reading books with vocabulary being progressively presented. The publisher notes that each teacher's guide includes a list of high frequency words as well as a word count (Ontario Curriculum Centre).

Discussion of the Discontinuity of Literacy Practices at Home and at School

Table 1 shows the types of activities provided by home and school environments to support literacy. It shows that the homes provided a more diverse range of activities. Both qualitative and quantitative evidence of discontinuity was found, in that the home provided numerically more activities and these occurred more frequently than did the activities at school.

Table 2 details the materials provided by the participant parents and the school. When contrasted, a difference between both groups is evident. The school does not provide materials on a comparable level to those provided in the children's homes.

When asked to describe the materials that she had in the classroom to support literacy, the teacher responded "almost none." For all the diversity of culture,

Table 1
Activities undertaken at home and at school to facilitate learning to read

Home	School
Story books, Chinese and English.	Limited
Read carefully.	Unknown
Listen contents read daily in class.	None
Parents read to children, let them read interesting books and let them listen to the radio.	In part, dependent on materials.
Help child learn English by same method as Chinese.	None
Read in English and then translate to Chinese and ask children to read in English.	None
Bought a lot of books and encourage reading.	In part
Provide books.	Limited
Let the children read.	Yes, limited materials
Ask child to read aloud, and then have child talk about the book to check comprehension.	Children do not read aloud, but the teacher does comprehension checks.

language and experiences at SoN, there was a distinct lack of diversity in the reading material available. The teacher also described how high humidity prevented the use of environmental print, such as posters and displaying the children's work on the walls of the classrooms.

Parents held different beliefs about "best practice" in teaching reading. The following comments summarize the responses. Four parents agreed "slightly" and four parents agreed "a great deal" with the view that a good reading lesson "teaches mainly spelling, punctuation and grammar." Six parents agreed "slightly" and four a "great deal" with the statement "that the best method for a reading lesson is one where children work by themselves." To the statement referring to the children's enjoyment of reading, nine parents indicated that children do not need to enjoy reading to be good readers.

Discontinuity in Assumptions About Schooling at Home and at School

The way reading is understood, taught and supported differed between home and school. Parental expectations of SoN covered a wide range of positions: from expectations for more supervision and use of interesting methodologies to the provision of a good learning environment. Of the ten respondents, four mentioned

Table 2
Reading materials at home and at school

Home	School
Magazines and Newspapers	None
Story Books	Limited
Reading library materials and books on tape	None
Story books, picture books, novels and magazines.	No magazines
Chinese and English books	Limited
Children's Weekly Magazines	None
Animal story books	Limited
Picture Books	Limited
'Read it yourself 'books	None
Nothing	Not applicable

character/moral development. With particular reference to expectation of the reading program, one parent during the interview responded, "it was not important for my child to read in English." This parent commented that she wanted her child to learn English conversation only. Another parent reported that her expectations had been reached and the child was "now able to communicate with the maid in English." This deserves consideration as in this environment the maid (usually Filipino) is often the primary caregiver.

The parents differed in their understandings of how reading is "done" at SoN. The question went unanswered by three respondents. Two didn't know how reading was taught. Of the remainder, none was able to describe the teaching/learning process as it occurs at the school. Three believed that reading was taught in the same way in English and Mandarin. During an interview one of the parents said that the children "learn by pronouncing the words." Analysis of these responses indicates that parents do not understand current trends regarding the teaching of reading in EFL.

Parents also differed in their understanding of how reading was taught in Mandarin. Two did not respond, two said it was learned at school, three said it was learned from school and home, one from the family, one from the parents daily life, one by heart, one by hearing and speaking often, one by reading, watching TV and listening to the radio.

Several respondents related that their child liked to read "after homework." The homework was seen as an essential element of school life. Indeed, teachers were assessed as "good or bad, by the amount of pen and paper work given." A salient feature of this environment is that parents provide tutors for the children, even at this young age. The tutor is tasked with homework responsibilities in addition to activities that will support not only literacy but also learning in general, be it in English or Mandarin. It was reported to me that the children are "tutored to death." Despite the extreme nature of this statement, it remains that almost universally children receive daily individual lessons from tutors. The parents do not believe that the school can provide sustained individual attention.

From the point of view of the school, parent involvement is not a critical concern. It was reported that in this region "teachers give knowledge [and that] parents want results and don't understand about the process."

During interview, the Director reported that the school had not addressed the issue of differences in school and familial reading practices. While he stated that the school was aware of language differences, his comments suggest that most of the understandings centered on dialect differences. Understandings around the issues of differences in language use and structure were not evident. Indeed, questions regarding these concepts were apparently misunderstood. When asked to comment on the idea of "not holding western languages practices as the norm" a member of

the administration said "we can't hold it as the norm, but as this is an English language school, we have to (...) for us to teach it." When asked how culturally specific language and concepts were treated in the classroom the teacher responded that "they are avoided as much as possible." The Director responded to these questions with reactions about an appropriate age to commence reading instruction and about teachers who "used flowery language that others can't follow."

One of the challenges of such a scenario is to determine an appropriate strategy for building bridges among the parties involved. It is suggested here, that doing the same things with a different awareness, seems to make a bigger difference than doing different things with the same awareness. The quantum shift facilitating more effective learning is in the level of attitudes, awareness and attention to process.

Parents, as children's first educators, teach numerous matters of significance and in ways that are extremely child centered. That said, if teachers could emulate the learning environment of the children's homes, it is probable that they would continue to learn effortlessly, as they do in their early years. In terms of producing proficient readers, much research is available that supports the concept that what occurs at home has almost equal importance with what goes on at school (Nicoll & Wilkie, 1991). In this respect, Cambourne (cited in Butler & Turbil, 1984) nominates several conditions fundamental to language learning that are transferable to any classroom situation.

In such a context, culturally relevant materials are of paramount importance. To Toner (1995, p.12), this means providing materials that reflect the children's cultures and experiences, including illustrations that include referents that the children will recognize. She summarizes: "This is not simply having people with brown skin behaving in exactly the same way as white, middle class people behave."

Discontinuity between the School's Stated Philosophy and Actual Practices

The findings indicate the nature of discontinuity is in the way the curriculum approaches reading. It prescribes that English be taught in a bottom-up approach, where phoneme drills, minimal pairs and structure drills occur. The School's Administration has a clearly articulated English Language Arts syllabus for Year 1; central is the use of a reading scheme, the *Reading 360 Series*. An administrator sees reading as the gaining of discrete skills, "...phonics is a big area that we want to develop....". When describing the school entry test, the same administrator says, "Basically the test has three parts, initial reading skills, phonics, word recognition and a math test." The left hand side of Table 3 is based on a description of current reading pedagogy. It was used as a framework to assess classroom observations and serves to characterize reading practices.

Table 3
Classroom observations.

Current Reading Pedagogy	Observations
Concepts of Print	
Is time given to read, listen to and enjoy books?	Yes, within the limits of lack of literature and 70% English time.
Is occasion given to associate pictures to text and meaning?	Yes, see above.
Is reading undertaken for a range of purposes?	As wide a range as limited resources allow.
Reading Behaviors	
Is a range of print material available in English?	Limited
In what way are children oriented to a book?	Author, illustrator, cover, questions to check comprehension purposes.
How often do children read?	Daily
Teaching Strategies	
Is the approach Whole Language or Phonics?	Phonics
Is the classroom an environment structured for mastery of content?	Mastery of content
Is the classroom a flexible environment where the process is important?	Teacher wants understanding. Due to curriculum and time constraints process is largely ignored.
Is co-operative group work encouraged?	Not in group work but co-operation, respect and justice are highly valued.
Is creativity and originality encouraged?	Reading curriculum requires students to give the right answers.
Classroom Organization	
Is the focus in the classroom on individual, small groups or the whole class?	Whole class
Is the classroom teacher or student centered?	Class is centered on getting through the program.
Classroom Resources	
Books, Fiction, Non-Fiction, Student produced.	Limited Fiction and Non-Fiction. No student produced stories or reading material.
Reading schemes	Reading 360.
Reading corner	No reading corner or listening post
Environmental print	Class has 4 posters displayed.
The Library	
How much time is spent in the library?	Half an hour a week.
What do the children do in the library?	Choose 1 book from a particular selection deemed suitable for the year level.

A salient feature of this data is that the emphasis in the classroom is on the whole class approach, focusing primarily on the use of the *Reading 360 Series*. Another feature of the classroom is that its practices were being constrained by limited resources. The space available to the class prevents the use of active learning centers and forces the teacher to teach the class as a whole.

Another level of discontinuity shown in the data is between the class teacher and the administration. The teacher stated on several occasions that she prefers to practice a less lock step methodology, focusing on meaning and communication; however, the SoN's documented preference is for one that focuses on the content, form and discrete language elements. Table 3 shows the results of classroom observations and discussions with the teacher and characterizes the reading practices that occur in the classroom.

During an interview, an administrator experienced difficulty expressing the exact language needs of the Year 1 class. In addition, the class teacher is required to complete a Yearly Overview before school commences, before undertaking any assessment, and without knowledge of the children and their experiences and needs.

Despite the class teacher's considerable teaching experience, the school prescribed both the methodology and materials that she would use to teach reading. The School mandated that the *Reading 360 Series* be used, despite sufficient copies of the Core and Companion Readers being available. Also, there was evidence that the prescriptive bottom-up approach was not working, that is, the students were not fluent readers, speakers nor writers of English. The class teacher reported, "They [the children] are not learning to my expectations." Furthermore, the stated purposes of the *Reading 360 Series* and SoN differ. School documents state that students are expected to become fluent in the oral and written forms of both English and Mandarin, while the preamble to the *Reading 360 Series* states that "fluent reading is the goal" (Teachers Manual, 1973, pp. 4 -5). The *Reading 360 Series* was not designed to develop oral language skills**.**

A further implication of the findings relates to the overall philosophy of the school. The School states that the curriculum is "constantly analyzed and improved, and careful attention is given to maintaining a harmonious atmosphere." Can the discontinuity between the Administration and the class teacher be conducive to a harmonious atmosphere? Is the discontinuity congruent with the emphasis on moral education? A member of the Administration explained the need to establish "an understanding of spirituality in terms of visible behavior." Perhaps the tension between the two levels of staff shows difficulties in practice as opposed to principle.

The Reading 360 Series: The Source of More Problems

The homogenous nature of the English language syllabus potentially precludes children whose families do not share the same language [and use] and assumptions about language. Culturally determined schemata embedded in the *Reading 360 Series* from England are largely unfamiliar to the children of Macau. The SoN's prospectus states: "using English ... the SoN will open to the youth the doors of the world." The children need learning to read materials that will make accessing this world possible by giving them opportunities to explore other worlds, concepts, values and ways of knowing from a wide range of literary experiences. The *Reading 360 Series* describes itself as "innovative" (Teacher's Manual, 1973, p.6) and then teaches words in a sequential fashion, focusing on form, in books devoid of intrinsic motivation or relevance to the children.

In its Guiding Philosophy, the School, in describing the principles around which the School is built, states the necessity of recognizing, "...the consciousness of the oneness of humanity....". As the class was a diverse group and the children's individual needs and cultural differences seemed to be unconsidered, this principle is not being acknowledged. The School is desirous of "...enhancing and harmonizing the interaction among the members of the school community." This principle begs the question of how it is possible to attain such nobility with a curriculum that limits children to "...a controlled and limited vocabulary" (Teachers Manual, 1973, p.5). Another feature of this series is that being written in the 1970s, it was not done so from a bias free perspective, be it gender or culture. This is not congruent with notions of education "as a means of realizing individual potential and as a powerful force in the transformation of a just society" (SoN, Guiding Philosophy).

The class teacher reported that in order to get through the required number of books in the *Reading 360 Series* 'everything else is being pushed aside [and that] their writing is not so good."

While the School's philosophy states that up-to-date methods will be used, the use of the *Reading 360 Series* indicates that the SoN is not in fact carrying out this goal. A significant feature of current methodology is that of exposing children to reading material that rhymes, is repetitious and is predictable (Gibbons, 1991, p.11). This framework is not a feature of the *Reading 360 Series*. Current practice in the teaching of reading is based on evidence of what successful readers do by focusing on meaning, predicting and then checking comprehension. Furthermore, at the SoN little attempt has been made to immerse the children in a print environment. Language displays, big books, genre based materials, readers, children's literature, listening posts and library research materials were unavailable. While limited copies of readers are available, literacy cannot be adequately supported by the use of photocopied

readers from the series. Children's literature is also a central feature of a literate environment as it, in addition to being wonderful to read, typifies what children will encounter later in life.

In short, the school would serve its community by adopting a language program that focuses on meaning and purpose, where children are immersed in a rich and varied language environment. The children should be exposed to communicative language, which is both comprehensible and relevant to their lives, while participating in a wide range of language experiences across various genres and registers.

Conclusion and Further Issues

Where international schools teach English as a foreign language, with a largely imported teaching staff, the administrators and teachers need to be cognizant of the notion of discontinuity. This knowledge involves the realization that students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds bring to the classroom different "kinds of knowledge, language habits, and strategies for learning at school" (Heath & Mangiola, 1991, p.14). Awareness of these principles would no doubt enable more effective EFL teaching and learning and decrease the possibility of cultural denigration.

Responding to any discontinuity involves decisions about focus. Should the focus be on enabling the parents to understand and value the literacy practices of the school or vice versa? To Cairney (1995) a combination of both is the most effective. Involving the families in the life of the school provides opportunities for cultural exchange. It is not enough to show parents the "way of the school" but to determine a systematic approach to building understanding between the school and the homes, which informs and supports parents, and affirms their cultural resources.

It is my desire to add to the effectiveness of international English language schools by providing them with a secure knowledge base in EFL pedagogy, by which to frame teaching and learning and to become culturally sensitive. Reading is not simply a matter of the transmission of information, it relates to ways of learning and ways of thinking, which are inextricably linked with culturally specific processes of socialization. In agreement with Campbell and Yong (1993), when they comment that "ignoring the cultural context guarantees failure of general teaching strategies", these schools need to have the highest regard for the cultural and linguistic contexts of the client group. Campbell and Yong continue with the concept that general teaching principles only work in a cultural-specific context when attention is given to students' needs, teachers' qualifications and traditional culture-specific relationships between student and teacher. As schooling is a cultural practice, it is essential that those schools teaching EFL remove their overtly Western views and assumptions and become culture-specific.

The Author

Linda Fitzgibbon is an experienced teacher in a variety of contexts. She was a primary school teacher in Australia, after completing a Graduate Diploma in Applied Linguistics LOTE (Languages other than English) she taught Indonesian and Spanish. After doing an MA TESOL, Linda taught ESL to international students. Desiring adventure, she came to Korea. Linda currently is an Assistant Professor at Hanguk University of Foreign Studies. She teaches in 2 graduate schools at Hanguk University of Foreign Studies and is keen to help students shift their teaching paradigm towards a communicative, interactive and meaningful approach.

References

Bell, J. (1993). *Doing your own research project*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Butler, A., & Turbill, F. (1984). *Towards a reading-writing classroom*. Sydney: PETA.

Cairney, T. (1995). *Developing partnerships: The home, school and community interface* (vol. 2). Sydney: University of Western Sydney.

Campbell, K., & Yong, Z. (1993). The dilemma of English language instruction in the People's Republic of China. *TESOL Matters*, *2*(4), 4-6.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom Discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

De Castell, S., Luke, A., & Egan, K. (1986). *Literacy, society and schooling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Furniss, E., & Green, P. (Eds.). (1991). *The literacy agenda*. South Yarra, VIC, Australia: Eleanor Curtain.

Gibbons, P. (1991). *Learning to learn in a second language*. Sydney: PETA.

Gray, B. (1990). Natural language learning in Aboriginal classrooms: Reflections on teaching and learning style for empowerment in English. In C. Walton & W. Eggington (Eds.), *Language: Maintenance, power and education in Australian Aboriginal contexts* (pp. 105-139). Darwin, NT, Australia: NTU Press.

Harris, S. (1990). *Two-way Aboriginal schooling*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S.B., & Mangiola, L. (1991). *Children of promise: Literate activity in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms*. Washington, DC: NEA School Restructuring Series.

Minami, M., & Kennedy, B. (1991). *Language issues in literacy and bilingual/ multicultural education*. Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.

Nicoll, V., & Wilkie, L. (1991). *Literacy at home and school*. Sydney: PETA.

Ontario Curriculum Centre (n.d.). *Ginn reading steps kindergarten* [Review]. Retrieved from http://www.curriculum.org/occ/resources/k3ginnreadingk.shtml

Toner, G. (1995). *You have to read it by yourself.* Australian Capital Territory Child Literacy and ESL Research Node. Canberra: NLLIA.

Reading 360 Series. (1973). London: Ginn.

Reading 360 Series Teacher's Manual. (1973). London: Ginn.

Watson-Gegeo, K.A. (1992). Thick explanation in the ethnographic study of child socialisation: Longitudinal study of the problem of the schooling for the Kwara'ae (Solomon Islands) children. *New Directions in Child Development*, *58*, 51-66.

Wittrock, M. (1986). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: Macmillan.

The Problems of University EFL Writing in Taiwan

Yueh-miao Chen
National Chung Cheng University

Abstract

This study attempts to identify the characteristics and problems of university EFL writing in Taiwan. Twenty-eight sophomore and freshman students, mostly foreign languages and literature majors, were asked to write a self-reflective report on the topic: " y problems when writing in English." The problems of EFL writing stated by students were categorized by identifying key ideas and by counting the frequency with which they occur in the students' reports. The main ideas of problems students have when writing were matched with real statements from the students. Based on these results, I conducted an error analysis of the students' self-reflective reports to find evidence of the students' stated writing problems. It is expected that a thorough understanding of the characteristics and problems in EFL writing might offer insight to university EFL writing instruction.

Introduction

Writing is not only a communicative tool, but also a means of learning, organizing knowledge and thinking. However, few people write effortlessly. Writing has been a difficult skill for students, especially EFL students, to learn and develop. In their composition classes, we often observe students struggling to transform their thoughts into words and put them on paper. Students are confused with word usage, sentence structure, and are constrained by a shortage of vocabulary, alternative expressions and cultural knowledge. They are limited at almost every level, from lexical to syntactic, from pragmatic to social-cultural levels. 'How can we help them?' This question weighs heavily on the minds of EFL writing teachers. The purpose of this study is to identify the characteristics and problems of university EFL writing in Taiwan.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at *Second Regional Conference on College English Teaching: Crosslinks in English Language Teaching 2001*, Hong Kong, June, 2001.

Twenty-eight sophomore and freshman students, mostly foreign language and literature majors, were asked to write a self-reflective report on the topic: "My problems when writing in English." Through analyzing students' reports thematically, the EFL writing problems, which students stated they had, were categorized by identifying key ideas and by counting their frequency of occurrence in the students' reports. The main problem areas were illustrated with real statements from the students. Based on these results, I conducted an error analysis of the students' self-reflective reports to find evidence of the students' stated problems within their reports. It is expected that a thorough understanding of the characteristics and problems in EFL writing might offer insight into university EFL writing instruction.

Related Literature

Writing Development

Children learn to speak through frequent exposure to the utterances of their mother tongue, and through interaction in speech with their peers and with adults. However, they often learn to write through formal instruction, normally in a school setting. How can they become good readers and writers? Edelsky, Altwerger, and Flores (1991) in their *Whole language: What's the difference* state that children become good readers and writers when literacy learning is presented to them through whole, meaningful texts with authentic social purposes made clear to the learner. In this respect, they emphasize the social nature of language and literacy learning Edelsky et al. (1991) write:

> People learn to write by attending to what they have to say in contexts where writing has particular meanings and where the writer has particular social relations with others. What is learned is thus a huge bundle – how to write plus what writing means plus what social relations accompany writing.   (p. 71)

As Rose (1984) argues, there is a need to create a rich model of written language development and production that considers not only the cognitive dimension but also the emotional and situational dimensions of language. The model will help writers to understand what is observed as well as what can only be inferred. In other words, observations of the cognitive dimensions of writing and of the contextual nature of tasks need to be associated with the larger cultural dimensions in which students learn to read and write. Writers come to understand writing and develop their writing abilities not in a vacuum, but within social contexts, including home, the world at large, the school and the classroom (Hudelson, 1989).

In his "Translating Context into Action," Ackerman (1990) states:

> Writing is a social activity. And as teachers and researchers, we knew that our students' responses to a reading-to-write assignment were as

much a function of larger social, economic, and cultural influences as of the immediate social context of a writing task in a university classroom. We knew that the reading and writing behavior we saw was strongly influenced by these students' twelve years of public schooling and eighteen years (or so) of living in a literature culture. (p.176)

Ackerman (1990) then tries to discover how the "cultural matrix" (p.176) influences the reading and writing practices of a group of students in freshman composition. He intends to interpret how these students translate context into an intellectual act from the perspective of the writer inside a linguistic community. He makes it clear that the writer's history in school acts as a "legacy of literate behavior" (p. 176) in which the habits and assumptions from schooling appear as procedures for reading and writing for students to translate writing task into a draft. Then, this legacy transforms into a "legacy within the composition of a draft." (p. 176) From this view, he describes how a freshman writer confronts the unique problem of acting upon a college-level writing assignment. This suggests, in part, that students, coming to university writing, may be struggling with the transition between high school and college assignments.

McCormick (1990) also notes that there is a need to place student writing in broader cultural contexts, involving academic and nonacademic influences, to recognize assumptions underlying students' writing. By examining the positions of students and educators on the nature of reading and writing, she discovers the ideological assumptions that command reading and writing acts. Through looking at students' work within larger institutional contexts, she argues that their reading and writing acts can be seen as much more culturally motivated, directed, and constrained; that students have to become conscious of the cultural and cognitive forces that direct the strategic awareness needed for academic success. She finally proposes to supplement the reading and writing instruction with cultural studies.

Flower (1990), in her article, "Negotiating academic discourse," describes the act of entering university-level academic writing as a cognitive and social transitional event in which students need to learn textual conventions, the expectations, the habits of mind, the methods of thought to operate in an academic community. However, the transition is not a linear developmental path, because students bring prior knowledge, past practices, and tacit assumptions about school writing. To help them move along the path, she holds that the necessary strategic knowledge is made up of three elements, goal, strategies, and awareness, which can gear actions within a specific context. Learning to write in the academic context involves negotiating a transition from one discourse to another discourse. In order to assist the individual student to act as a goal-directed thinker functioning in a complex social and educational environment, it is important to integrate cognition and context theories and guide them in dealing more directly with the strategic knowledge – the goal, strategies, and awareness. The knowledge supports students to develop their writing ability, and as a consequence, their academic advancement.

This section reviewed some studies on writing development and on writing and contexts. Although ESL/EFL writing is treated as a distinct area of study and teaching and the ESL/EFL writer is viewed as a traveler through discourse communities (Johnson & Roen, 1989), in general research on the composing process of writers in English as a second language (ESL) has suggested that the writing process of nonnative writers is similar to that of native writers (Raimes, 1985, 1987; Spack, 1984; Zamel, 1982, 1983, 1987). Meanwhile, it is assumed that the first language writers and EFL writers face similar situations in transiting from high school to university in their academic advancement.

Contrastive Analysis

Robert Kaplan (1966) studied L2 student essays and coined the term contrastive analysis with the teaching implications for ESL writing instruction (Enkvist, 1987; Leki, 1991). According to Kaplan (1966, 1987), the rhetorical structure of languages differs. Written texts, and the way in which they are perceived, vary according to the cultural group to which an individual belongs. Two aspects of language show cultural differences: the content or what is written, and the forms or structures used to encode that content. The two aspects constitute the surface manifestations of cultural differences. Students, under the influence of the norms within their own culture, may deviate from the norms of the foreign culture in what kinds of materials are to be written in which variety of written language, what style is appropriate, and how the discourse is to be organized (Enkvist, 1987). This indicates that what L2 students write is not necessarily wrong, but it is different. Under the circumstances, differences in cultural expectations create an obstacle for those who are learning to write in a foreign language.

Reid (1990) indicates that ESL writers bring various cultural and educational experiences with them to their second language writing experiences: "Second language writers who are successful writers in their first languages often know what is socially and culturally appropriate in terms of the writer roles, audience expectations, rhetorical and stylistic conventions, and situational or contextual features of written text in their native languages" (p. 201). However, as Kaplan (1988) states: "there is no reason to assume that the nonnative English speaker will be aware of this set of conventions in English, or that the learner will be able to acquire these conventions for him- or herself" (p. 294). Kaplan (1987), in his "Cultural thought patterns revisited," further states that the non-native speaker does not possess as complete an inventory of possible alternatives, does not recognize what sorts of constraints exist on those alternatives, and does not recognize what sorts of constraints a choice imposes on the text which follows. These concerns imply that there is a need to recognize the L1 influence on L2 development and, in the meantime, there is a need for non-native writers to learn about the inventory of alternatives and constraints of the target language.

Li (1999) states that there is a need to revalue EFL student writers from the perspective of literacy development by understanding the nature of writing and from the perspective of current contrastive rhetoric. His case studies concluded that there is an influence from L1 literacy development on EFL writers' self-esteem; however, he did not discuss the nature of first language development for students in Taiwan. This study, then, intends to study the problems and characteristics of EFL writing development and hopefully to find out how EFL writing instruction can be facilitated from the understanding of EFL writing problems and characteristics.

Error Analysis

According to Corder (1983), a learner's errors provide evidence of the system of the language he is using (i.e., has learned) at a particular point in the course. The errors can be significant in three ways (Corder, 1967, 1983). First, they tell the teacher, if he undertakes a systematic analysis, how far towards the goal the learner has progressed and what s/he must learn. Second, they provide to the researcher evidence of how language is learned or acquired, specifically, what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in his/her discovery of the language. Third, they are indispensable to the learner, for the making of errors is a device the learner uses to learn. In the article, "Describing the Language Learner's Language" (1972), Corder distinguishes remedial error analysis from developmental error analysis. The former type of EA facilitates teacher evaluation and correction; the latter describes the successive transitional dialects of a language learner (Schachter, Celce-Murcia, 1983).

Richards (1983) claims:

An analysis of the major types of intralingual and developmental errors — overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete applica-tion of rules, and the building of false systems or concepts — may lead us to examine our teaching materials for evidence of the language learn-ing assumptions that underlie them.   (p. 206)

He (1983) concludes that teaching techniques and procedures should take account of the structural and developmental conflicts that can come about in language learning.

Hendrickson (1987) also states: "Errors are signals that actual learning is taking place, they can indicate students' progress and success in language learning" (357). According to Brown (1994) and Littlewood (1998), language learner's errors come from systematic and non-systematic sources. Systematic sources contain interlingual errors of interference from the native language and intralingual errors within the target language. Non-systematic sources contain the sociolinguistic context of communication, psycholinguistic cognitive strategies and countless affective variables.

The intention in conducting an error analysis in this study is to identify the students' errors and their frequency of occurrence and rank the frequent errors in order to offer evidence *from* their writing to what they had stated *in* their writing about their problems *of* writing in English as a foreign language.

Methods

This study seeks to discover underlying problems that create writing obstacles for university EFL writing in Taiwan. There are many factors affecting students' English writing processes and products, such as cultural, linguistic, and affective constraints. In order to gain first-hand, empirical information from students' perspectives to understand the underlying constraints impeding their English writing, I conducted this study, designed to fit within a qualitative as well as a quantitative research framework of collecting materials, analyzing data and reporting the results. The following presents information about the participants and the methods of data collection and analysis.

The Participants

Twenty-eight students were the participants in this study. They were asked to write self-reflective reports in English on the topic: "My problems when writing in English" to gain first-hand information about the problems they encounter when writing in English. Among twenty-eight students, twenty-four of them were foreign languages and literature majors. They were taught English composition formally in the department and submitted English writing assignments regularly for their English writing courses for one or two years. The other four participants were not foreign language majors; however, they were interested in English language learning and at that time were taking English language skills courses with foreign language and literature majors. However, whether they were majors or non-majors, all twenty-eight students started their formal English education in the first year of junior high school.

Data Collection and Analysis

Twenty-eight self-reflective reports written in English were collected, forming the database of this study. The twenty-eight articles were numbered and used anonymously. Two methods were employed to analyze the data in order to achieve a cross-section check effect (Yin, 1989). First, a thematic and content analysis was utilized to identify the major problems and key ideas reported by the participants. A narrative account along with dense descriptive data excerpted directly from the participants would present the findings of this analysis. This account, based on the researcher's interpretation of original data, constitutes a descriptive report with its coherence and internal consistency. Second, in order to have more evidence to

achieve a data density (Smith, 1987) of the findings, an error analysis was conducted to determine the real errors occurring in the twenty-eight students' reports. There were three steps undertaken for this analysis: (1) The researcher and a research assistant reviewed all students' writing to determine the errors in their writing; (2) they then categorized those errors by type; (3) the frequency of error occurrence by category was then determined. The results from the error analysis offered more support to the students' statements about their writing problems.

Limitation of This Study

Since there were only twenty-eight participants included in this study, their perspectives and experiences cannot completely represent the whole population. One would expect there to be a wide variety of differences existing even among the participants. As a consequence, the results just reveal "a slice of life" (Yin, 1989), which might only be generalized to putting forth some tentative theoretical propositions.

A second limitation of this study comes from the methodology. According to Smith (1987), a researcher in a qualitative approach is the instrument of data collection and analysis. He/she describes the situation through his/her eyes, a subjective perspective. In order to gain objectivity in the findings, two graders reviewed the students' writings and conducted the error analysis, specifically, the researcher and a research assistant. Ideally, if time had not been limited, a third grader could have reviewed the writing to increase the degree of objectivity.

Findings and Discussion

This section covers two major parts: First, the results from the thematic and content analysis are presented in a descriptive and narrative account with real statements from the participants; second, the results from the error analysis are presented and summarized in a table followed by interpretation.

Problems of Writing English

After analyzing twenty-eight self-reflective reports written by the participants in a content and thematic analysis, it was found that the six most frequently perceived problems were: (I) Word usage/choice, (II) Vocabulary, (III) Grammar, (IV) Organization, (V) Chinese/English translation, and (VI) Content/thinking. The less frequently perceived problems were learning attitude/habits, spelling, phrase/slang, expressive skills, and sentence structure. In the following sections, the most frequently reported problems are presented with elicited, simplified examples from the participants.

Problem I: Students are unable to use words properly or precisely.

Eighteen students reported that they couldn't use words to express meaning precisely or properly. They said that they tended to put words in the wrong places or they did not know what words to use to express their ideas. They were uncertain about the usage of words; sometimes they were confused by words of similar meanings and did not know which ones to choose in order to be exact. Because of confusion about word choice, they tended to use words repeatedly and from time to time they used a lot of repetition in their writing. They thought that whether the words used in their articles were really appropriate or not was vital in constructing the whole composition; each word was a brick and the article was the house to be built. Therefore, every single word was un-negligible because each word constituted an element of the article. As a result, the correct choice of words was very important to them. The following were statements reported from the participants:

Student 3's report

[U]sing a word precisely is also difficult. For example, 'beautiful' and 'pretty' are both adjectives used to describe a woman. But it is better that you use "beautiful" than "pretty" when you give a compliment to a lady. 'Beautiful' describes a woman who has beauty and gives pleasure to the senses or the mind. But when you describe a woman who is "pretty" instead of "beautiful", it means that you are satirizing her with physical charms but no inner beauty. I often make mistakes like the above when writing English. Such mistakes make my writing reads strange.

Student 5's report

Knowing lots of English words is the most basic fundamental to express oneself properly. My problems in English writing are that I often misspell a word and I cannot find the proper word to describe what is in my mind. For example, there are several words to use when a person speaking in anger, like 'roar', 'bellow', 'shout', 'yell', 'cry', and so on. I think I should consult the English dictionary more often to learn more about the specific meanings to each word.

Student 11's report

Sometimes I use a word, they will say that that word is not suitable in this occasion. Then, they will tell me a better word. In my opinion, I think the two words are very similar, but they don't think so. For example, in senior high school, I always couldn't distinguish "problem" from "question" very well. I often wrote a sentence like "My leg was hurt, it was a big question." I didn't know the problem of that sentence until my

teacher told me. Now I know the way of using "problem" and "question" very well, but I believe that there are still many other similar problems that I don't know at all in my English writing. I have to find them out and correct them. So, this is my second problem of writing English.

Problem II: Students are short of vocabulary.

Seventeen students reported that they were short of vocabulary. Constrained by limited vocabulary, they usually used simple, easy, and the most common words, which made their writing repetitive and boring. Since entering university, they had not actively attempted to memorize new words. A lot of words they had learned in high schools have been forgotten. Anytime they wanted to write an article, they spent a lot of time looking for the English translations of words in their Chinese-English dictionaries. Students lacked in vocabulary, i.e., their word bank was very limited. As a result, they found no words to use and spent much time in looking up words in the dictionary. This problem is different from problem I, saying that they could not use words precisely or correctly. The following are examples elicited from the participants' reports:

Student 13's report

One of my problems is vocabularies tend to leak out of my brain. I began to forget the use of vocabularies and phrases. When I meet new words I was too lazy to remember them. Perhaps I know many vocabularies, but just lost the skill of using them so that the essay would come out as a very good article. ... On the whole, I get two problems in writing English: losing of old vocabularies and lack of new vocabularies; difficult in expressing feelings in English.

Student 16's report

The first problem I had is the problem about vocabulary. To me it's pretty difficult to find a suitable word in the writing, and my vocabulary is poor. I've tried to learn some more words in books, but strangely, it seems that I couldn't put them into use so that the English writing I make are always lack of beautiful words and phrases.

Student 19's report

I do not have enough vocabulary. When I write English, I usually use the same words for several times. I think it is my serious problem. If one word appears in my writing for many times, this will make the writing boring. No reader likes to read the same word again and again.

Student 23's report

> Second, insufficient vocabulary. I find it's hard for me to put my thought into words. Sometimes I tend to be too wordy and talk a lot of nonsense, sometimes I can't find the right word to express my ideas properly.

Problem III: Grammatical errors are very serious.

Fourteen students reported that one of their serious problems was in grammar. They made a lot of grammatical errors in tense, singular/plural, punctuation, etc. Tense was particularly troublesome, they claimed. They were confused with which tense was the correct one. Making grammatical errors seemed unavoidable for most of the participants because they were not familiar with the form of English writing. Some even viewed grammatical errors as vital enemies in their English writing and they thought that without correct grammar, a composition wouldn't become a complete one. The following are examples elicited from the participants:

Student 5's report

> I also have some problems of use the correct English grammar. If I write a sentence in the wrong grammar, there is no way for readers to understand what I'm trying to say. Unlike Chinese, there are usage of future and past tense, and the singular and plural forms. They cause much confusion when I write a sentence in English. The prepositions are also very confusing.

Student 20's report

> Third, the most mistakes I often made are grammar mistakes. For example, I usually write in wrong time pattern, but I think it is easier for me to correct. After finished an article, all I need to do is to check carefully.

Student 23's report

> First, grammatical errors. ... I tend to make lots of grammatical errors because I don't concentrate on the grammar and learn the rules by heart. Even more, I regard grammar as a obstacle to my free writing and it will kill my thought at the same time. ... Although we usually don't emphasize grammar so much in our daily conversation, grammar is the key to coherent a whole paragraph.

Student 26's report

> First, grammatical problems, I am still confused with the usage of articles, prepositions, and tense. For example, the article "the", I am not very sure when I should use it. As for tense, I am still not very certain of

my usage. As for prepositions, because there were lots of prepositions and they are applied to different cases, sometimes I might wonder which one is correct.

Problem IV: English organization is very different from that of Chinese

Thirteen students reported that because English organization was so different from that of Chinese, they had trouble in getting used to the English discourse pattern. Each culture has its own discourse style and the uniqueness of each discourse style reflects the ways people both talk and write. Not familiar with English writing organization, some reported that they didn't know how to combine sentences together in a paragraph. Sometimes they lacked topic sentences, unity or coherence, then they lost the connection with the topic of the paragraph(s). Some reported that they did not have a clear idea about how to organize writing well. They often followed a Chinese way of composing an English composition; for example, to develop thinking following the four-step pattern: beginning, developing, turning, and integration (i.e., in Chinese, chi, cheng, zhan, he). Though it was not the best way to write an English article, they still thought it was the easiest and fastest way to write up a composition. Obviously, organization and presentation of ideas and opinions caused a lot of confusion for the participants. The students' examples of statements are as follows:

Student 3's report

The ways we write Chinese composition are quite different from English. We take examples or make descriptions in advance and point out the subject at the last sentence. However, when we read English articles, we see the point clearly at the very beginning of every paragraph. This makes me confused because I am used to write English composition in Chinese way.

Student 6's report

First, when you write English compositions, you have to write the topic sentences in the beginning and then you describe something to support your thoughts. When I was young, however, I was taught in another way. My teachers always reminded me that when you write compositions, you have to take some examples and you can write down your conclusion.

Student 17's report

The second one is the problem of organization. Once, a teacher told me that I should organize my thought before I write down it. The teacher told me that my opinion was presented, but my readers wouldn't under-

stand the exact thought of mine. It is because my thoughts are disorder. ... My thoughts are mixed up.

Student 22's report

As we all know, the way we write in Chinese is very different from that in English. When writing English, we're taught we ought to start with a topic sentence to show our main idea clearly, then the explanation of our opinion, and finally the conclusion. ... The problem is that I always stick to the principle. I'm too accustomed to describing things directly. Little by little, I find my writings are lacking in variety.

Problem V: Students tend to think in Chinese first, and write in Chinese English.

Thirteen students reported that they tended to think in Chinese first when writing English, then translated what they thought into English; therefore, what they wrote was Chinese English. That is to say, they wrote English in a Chinese style. Because English is not their mother tongue, they found it very difficult to express in an English way. They reported that they usually could generate beautiful sentences in Chinese; however, it was quite hard to express the same ideas in English. The way they expressed their ideas was not native-like; they tended to write strange English sentences and sometimes they even translated word by word from Chinese to English.

Student 8's report

Third, I usually write English in Chinese English. I do not know exactly what is so called Chinese English. However, when my classmates review my articles, they mentioned that.

Student 13's report

Sometimes, I used to think of the sentence in Chinese first, and then translate it into English. But I find that this method is not a correct way to writing English, to say it precisely, it is hard to express the words in English.

Student 17's report

To us, English is a second language. We are unable to use it as well as our mother language. Therefore, we will construct the statement that we want to present in our first language first, then translate in English. However, during the translation, there would be some linguistic misemploy that we wouldn't discover.

Student 26's report

Second, sometimes the grammar seems correct, but the way I write English doesn't seem to conform to American syntax. It reads like Chinese English.

Problem VI: Students have trouble in generating ideas.

Ten students reported that they didn't know what to write or could not decide what to write. They said that sometimes they did not have any experience with the topic, or had few feelings to share with others. As a result, they possibly wrote around few points repeatedly, and this made the article boring. They were constrained by limited life experiences or lack of independent thinking, which made their writing short of content. It seemed that facing an empty paper, they were also struggling with an empty mind, too.

Student 10's report

The last problem is that I am not a born-writer, so I always find that I do not know what to write. I have to spend a long time thinking what I can write, and after a long time I still do not know what to write.

Student 14's report

In addition, every time I write, facing that empty white paper, I feel afraid that should I have enough ideas to fill it with words, sentences, or paragraphs. Sometimes, when I see a subject of a composition, I would begin to write down a list of associations with the subject. However, although I would make some surprising and interesting associations between the ideas, I always agonize over what to write next so that I always could not write it smoothly.

Student 17's report

The first one, the most serious one is that I would never know how should handle the content. That is to say that I never know what should I write. I don't know what kind of opinion that I should state.

Student 26's report

Fourth, the content of writing English. This is also a problem in writing English. It takes me to think more and deeply of one problem and to have a clear understanding of it.

Besides the above six frequently mentioned problems, there are still some other minor problems stated by the participants. For example, five of them reported that they had problems in learning attitude. One said: "However, I think all the problems caused by myself. Because I don't have constructive learning attitude and good studying ways and plans, I couldn't improve my English ability." Another said: "I'm too lazy to study English hard. I spend less time on studying rather than fooling around all day long." In short, we can categorize these statements as negative learning attitudes and bad habits. Meanwhile, four participants reported that they are short of phrases or slang. This problem is related to the participants' lack of cultural knowledge as most phrases and slang reflect cultural content. Also, three participants stated that they couldn't express feelings or points clearly. The most infrequent problem area was that of two participants who indicated that their problems were that they were inclined to write very long and complicated sentences, which made their writing difficult to understand. To summarize, less frequently reported problems had to do with learning attitudes, limited phrases/slang, poor expressive skills. Table 1 summarizes the whole section:

Table 1
Self-reported EFL Writing Problems

Writing Problems	Frequency
Word usage	18
Shortage in vocabulary	17
Grammatical errors	14
Organization	13
Chinese English	13
Limited ideas about topics	10
No constructive learning attitude	5
Spelling	4
Lack in phrases and slang	4
Poor expressive skills	3
Writing long and complicated sentences	2

Results of Error Analysis

After finishing the content analysis, the students' original writings were reviewed to find the errors they actually made. Two graders conducted the analyses: the researcher and one research assistant. There were three steps in the reviewing process: (1) identification of the students' mistakes and errors, (2) categorization of those errors by type, (3) calculation of the frequency of each type of errors. Table 2 summarizes the results from the error analysis.

Table 2
The Findings of Error Analysis

Student	Usage	Tense	Def. Article	Preposition	Verb	Sing./plural	Rel. clause	Redundant	Adv./Adj.	Misspelling	Conjunction	Quotation	Comparative	Total
1	2			3	2	3	1		1	2				14
2	2									1			1	4
3	3	1	1	1		1	1		1					9
4	2	2							1			7	1	13
5	3	1	4	2	1	2		1	1	1				16
6	1	9	4			1				1	1			17
7	7	1	8	5	2	1	2		1		1		1	29
8	3		2	3		1		3			1			13
9	7		1		2	1	1	3	1					16
10						2		1						3
11	1	2	1			1	1							6
12	3	1					1							5
13	4	15		2		2								23
14	5	6		1	2		2				1	1		18
15	2	1	2	1								2		8
16	6	1			1	1				1			1	11
17	11	2	3	2	4		4	4						30
18	2	2	6	3	3			2	1					19
19	5	3	1	2	3			1	1		1			17
20	8	1	3	1		3			1	1				18
21	8	1	2	3	3	1	1							19
22	3	2	5	1	2	2	1		1	1				18
23	5	1	3	1	4	1	1			2				18
24	7	1	1	4	1	2		1	2	2			1	22
25	5	3	2	2	1			1				1		15
26	5		3	1			1							10
27	4	2	2				1							9
28	4			1	1					1				7
Total	118	58	54	39	32	25	18	17	13	13	8	7	5	407
%	29	14	13	10	8	6	5	4	3	3	2	2	1	

The table above shows that the most frequent errors the participants made were: (1) errors in word usage, (2) errors in tense, (3) errors in definite article usage, i.e., "the", (4) errors in prepositions, (5) errors in verbs, (6) errors in number, singular or plural, (7) errors in relative clauses, (8) redundant usage. Table 3 shows these error types tabulated and ranked.

Table 3
The Most Frequent Errors the Participants Made in Order

Errors in order	Frequency
1. Word usage	118
2. Tense	58
3. Definite article	54
4. Prepositions	39
5. Verbs	32
6. Number, sing./pl.	25
7. Relative clauses	18
8. Redundancy	17

Conclusion and Implications

From the two analyses, we find similar results, that is, word usage and English expressions were both the most perceived and the most real problematic aspect of English composition for the participants. Lacking in cultural knowledge, they were confused with the subtle differences among similar words. They were also confined by limited vocabulary, often using similar simple words repeatedly.

Grammatical errors bothered them deeply, too. This is supported by evidence from the error analysis, which included several types of grammatical errors: tense, definite articles, verb form, number and relative clauses.

Organization appeared to be the next most frequent problem. Different ways of presenting and organizing ideas brought difficulties for the participants too. They were not familiar with English discourse and rhetorical patterns and, furthermore, they were still deeply influenced by Chinese ways of organization. This may be the reason that they lack topic sentences in paragraphs and also produced English writing with Chinese characteristics. The error analyses also provided evidence of this, i.e., the participants made a lot of errors in prepositions, which frequently appeared in English idioms or slang. Naturally students' writing was short of idiomatic accuracy and, as a result, they have shown very limited cultural proficiency in English writing.

We can conclude that the major problems of EFL writing are in word usage and English expressions, vocabulary, grammar/tense, organization/rhetoric patterns, idioms and slang, first language influence, and independent thinking. The problems that students faced were widely spread from lexical, syntactic levels to rhetorical and

cultural levels. We might say that EFL writing is characterized by various constraints from linguistic representations to rhetorical and socio-cultural representations. EFL writing is constrained at almost every level of the language, plus suffers from linguistic and cultural transfers (Soter, 1988) from the first language. As Kaplan (1987) remarked: "The non-native speaker does not possess as complete an inventory of possible alternatives, does not recognize the sociolinguistic constraints on those alternatives" (p.11).

With the thorough understanding of EFL writing characteristics and problems, then what can EFL teachers do to help students cope with those obstacles? First, extensive reading of authentic materials and various rhetorical patterns might provide input of every type, lexical, syntactic, rhetorical, and cultural, to EFL writers. By using meaningful texts with various rhetorical patterns as the teaching materials and using integrated activities of reading and writing in the language learning classroom, we might expect to both increase students' lexical inventory and knowledge of syntactical variations, and to demonstrate discourse patterns while, at the same time, informing them about social issues and cultural differences. We might then be able to attain our objective to, as Kaplan (1987) stated: "increase the size of the inventory, to stipulate the sociolinguistic constraints, and to illustrate the ways in which a choice limits the potentially following text" (p.11).

Second, since there is linguistic and cultural transfer in EFL writing, especially in discourse patterns, the field of contrastive rhetoric is seemingly able to contribute greatly to our understanding of the impact of the first language discourse pattern on writers learning second or foreign language writing (Soter, 1988). Therefore, the study of the field is worthy of our attention. Finally, we need to recognize the value of error analysis in diagnosing students' individual errors, then helping them identify their weaknesses and cope with those problems.

The Author

Yueh-miao Chen, Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan teaches courses such as the History of the English Language, Language Acquisition: Reading and Writing, Approaches to Foreign Language Teaching, and EFL skills courses. Her research interest is in language acquisition, ESL/EFL writing and learning. E-mail: folymc@ccunix.ccu.edu.tw.

References

Ackerman, J. (1990). Translating context into action. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick, & W.C. Peck (Eds.), *Reading-to-write: Exploring a cognitive and social process* (pp.173-189). New York: Oxford University Press.

Arnold, R. (1991). *Writing development*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Butler, A., & Turbill, J. (1988). *Towards a reading-writing classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chen, D.W. (1995). Process-directed English writing instruction – Illustration and demonstration. *Proceedings of ROC English Composition Teaching Conference, 1995* (pp.197-208).

Chen, Y. (1995). English instruction and writing development: EFL university students in Taiwan. *Selected Papers of the 12th Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the ROC, 1995* (pp.326-351). Taipei: Crane.

Chen, Y. (2001). The writing development of the first language and the problems of university EFL writing. *Proceedings of the 89th NSC Conference on Language Teaching* (pp.121-144).

Chen, Y. (2001). The characteristics of university EFL writing in Taiwan. Paper presented at *Second Regional Conference on College English Teaching: Crosslinks in English Language Teaching, 2001, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, SAR.*

Chen, Y. (1999). A portfolio approach to EFL university writing instruction. *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the ROC* (pp. 313-333). Taipei: Crane.

Chen, Y. (2000). Learning writing as writers: A portfolio writing curriculum for EFL university first-year students. *Proceedings of the 17th Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the ROC* (pp.294-309). Taipei: Crane.

Corder, S.P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *IRAL*, *5*(4), 161-170.

Corder, S.P. (1972). Describing the language learner's language. In *CILT Reports and Papers*, *6*, 57-64.

Corder, S.P. (1983). The significance of learners' errors. In W. Robinett & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, related aspects* (pp.163-172). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Edelsky, C., Altwerger, B., & Flores, B. (1991). *Whole language: What's the difference?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Enkvist, N.E. (1986). Text linguistics for the applier: An orientation. In U. Connor & R.B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp.23-43). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Feng, H.P. (1995). A close look at writing strategies through a questionnaire and group interviews. *Proceedings of ROC English Composition Teaching Conference*, *1995* (pp. 281-307).

Flower, L. (1990). Negotiating academic discourse. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick, & W.C. Peck (Eds.), *Reading-to-write: Exploring a cognitive and social process* (pp. 221-252). New York: Oxford University Press.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981). A cognitive process of theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*, 365-387.

Hendrickson, J.M. (1987). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. In M.H. Long & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Hsieh, L.T. (1995). Alternative approaches to EFL assessment: Peer conference and journal writing. *Proceedings of ROC English Composition Teaching Conference, 1995* (pp. 41-54).

Hsin, A. (1995). A communicative writing class for advanced EFL students. *Proceedings of ROC English Composition Teaching Conference, 1995* (pp.433-449).

Huang, S.Y. (1995). EFL university students' perceptions of their performance in peer response sessions. *Proceedings of ROC English Composition Teaching Conference, 1995* (pp. 55-84).

Hudelson, S. (1989). *Write on: Children writing in ESL.* Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Johnson, D.M., & Roen, D.H. (Eds.). (1989). *Richness in writing*. New York: Longman.

Kaplan, R.B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, *16*(1), 1-20.

Kaplan, R.B. (1987). Cultural thought patterns revisited. In U. Connor & R.B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 9-22). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kaplan, R.B. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning: Notes toward a theory of contrastive rhetoric. In A. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 275-304). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Leki, I. (1991). Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric: Text analysis and writing pedagogies. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(1), 123-143.

Li, L.T. (1999). Revaluing EFL student writers from the perspective of literacy development. *The Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on English Teaching.* English Teachers' Association, ROC, Taipei, 1999 (pp. 441-452). Taipei: Crane.

Lin, T.L. (1995). A process-oriented curriculum for the development of interrelated language skills with emphasis on functional writing. *Proceedings of ROC English Composition Teaching Conference, 1995* (pp. 127-160).

Lin, S.O. (1995). Incorporating peer response into journal writing. *Proceedings of ROC English Composition Teaching Conference, 1995* (pp. 85-108).

Lindemann, E. (1982). *A rhetoric for writing teachers.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W.T. (1998). *Foreign and second language learning.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCormick, K. (1990). The cultural imperatives underlying cognitive acts. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick, & W.C. Peck (Eds.), *Reading-to-write: Exploring a cognitive and social process* (pp. 194-218). New York: Oxford University Press.

Merriam. B.S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossy-Bass.

Murray, D.M. (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In C.R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Research of composing: Point of departure* (pp.85-103). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 229-258.

Raimes, A. (1987). ESL composition: The expectations of the academic audience. *TESOL Newsletter*, *21*(2), 34.

Reid, J. (1990). Responding to different topic types: A quantitative analysis from a contrastive rhetoric perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp.191-210). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (1983). A noncontrastive approach to error analysis. In W. Robinett & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, related aspects*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Rose, M. (1984a). Complexity, rigor, evolving method and the puzzles of writer's block: Thoughts on composing-process research. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing-process problems* (pp. 260-277). New York: Guilford.

Rose, M. (1984b). *Writer's block: The cognitive dimension.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Schachter, J., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1983). Some reservations concerning error analysis. In W. Robinett & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, related aspects* (pp. 272-284). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Smith, M.L. (1987). Publishing qualitative research. *American Educational Research Journal, 24*(2), 173-183.

Smith, F. (1994). *Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read* (5th ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Soter, A.O. (1988). The second language learner and cultural transfer in narration. In A. Purves (Eds.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 177-205). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Spack, R. (1984). Invention strategies and the ESL college composition student. *TESOL Quarterly*, *18*(4), 649-670.

Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. *Language Arts*, *60*, 627-642.

Whiteman, M.F., & Hall, W.S. (1981). Introduction. In M.F. Whiteman (Ed.), *Writing: The nature, development, and teaching of written communication* (vol. 1, pp. 1-10). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yin, R.K. (1990). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The processes of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *16*, 195-209,

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, *16*(2), 165-187.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*(4), 697-716.

TOEFL Preparation: What are our Korean students doing and why?

Michael Roberts
Catholic University of Korea

Abstract

The way students prepare for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) has implications for the test's validity. A review of the literature on the washback effect from TOEFL reveals that studies have focused on classroom activities but few have considered students' attitudes towards TOEFL preparation and the extent to which these stem from their educational background. I surveyed through focus groups and structured interviews the attitudes of 14 Korean language learners preparing for the TOEFL in Toronto to discover their attitudes and beliefs towards TOEFL preparation. The findings suggest the following: (a) participants' culture of learning seemed to have an effect on the way they prepare for the TOEFL, yet their preparation is also influenced by individual motivations and experiences; (b) TOEFL preparation manuals influenced the way they prepared for the TOEFL; (c) participants engaged in preparation practices that seemed to weaken the utility of the TOEFL; and (d) participants' language education was affected by the TOEFL.

Introduction and Review of Relevant Literature

The purpose of this study was to make a contribution to how sociocultural backgrounds influence the way second language learners conceive of and prepare for standardised examinations. Specifically, the study looks at how Korean learners prepare for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). This study looked at how Korean students studying in Toronto prepared for the TOEFL, and what their overall attitudes were towards TOEFL preparation.

Validity and Multidimensionality of Washback

In order for a proficiency test to be an adequate instrument, students' scores must be a reflection of the desired proficiency goal of the people using the test.

Creating and evaluating how well tests achieve a desired goal is the complex task of test validation. This study looks at an aspect of test validity known as "systemic validity" or washback – an idea that states that tests can have significant influence on classroom behavior. Messick (1996) points out that for some educators this is the most important aspect of test validity, "holding that a test's validity should be gauged by the degree to which it has a positive influence on teaching" (p. 241). The problem with this concept is that washback is often only associated with the actual test; however, Messick argues that the actual test is only one of many influences on classroom behaviors.

> Such forms of evidence are only circumstantial with respect to test va-
> lidity in that a poor test may be associated with positive effects and a
> good test with negative effects because of other things that are done or
> not done in the educational system. (Messick, 1996, p. 242)

In a study of the impact of the introduction of a new language test in Sri Lankan high schools, Wall (1996) revealed thirteen reasons, from lack of teacher training to political unrest, why positive effects were not realized in the classroom after the introduction of the new test.

Watanabe (1996) studied washback on classes preparing for the English section of the exam for Japanese university entrance. He found that two teachers, teaching in an identical setting, with comparable students, were not affected by the format of the exams to the same extent.

Brown (1995) explains the process that his team went through in preparing Chinese science students for the TOEFL. They radically changed the method of TOEFL preparation by taking "the position that, if we taught the students English for science and technology (EST) (based on a communicative approach), their TOEFL scores would naturally rise" (Brown, 1995, p. 241). What these examples imply, and what I noticed in the finding of this study, is that the washback is more dynamic than just a test's influence on classroom behavior.

Overview of the TOEFL

The TOEFL is the most widely used and most internationally recognized test of English language proficiency. While many groups, such as corporations and governments, also use it, the TOEFL's primary purpose is to judge the English proficiency of adults who have not been educated in an English dominant country wishing to enter an academic program at an institution of higher education in English-speaking North America (ETS, 1999a).

For many international students, achieving a degree or graduate degree from a North American university can be a crucial step for success at home. For these students, the TOEFL is a high-stakes exam because many universities stringently

require a minimum score (Hamp-Lyons, 1998). Taylor, Irwin, Eignor, and Jamieson (1999) reported that only 38% of students achieved a score greater than 550 on the TOEFL in the 1995/96 testing year. For comparison, the University of Toronto requires a score of 580 to 600 to enter its undergraduate programs.

Alderson and Wall (1993) argue that a test of significance to the learner will affect classroom behavior. Given its importance for the futures of the test takers, the TOEFL can be expected to have a significant impact on the way students approach language learning.

TOEFL History and Stakeholders

The major stakeholders of TOEFL include ETS, the College Board, the TOEFL Policy Committee and its Committee of Examiners, individual universities that use the TOEFL, TOEFL preparation materials developers, teachers of TOEFL, and TOEFL examinees.

TOEFL Administrators

The College Entrance Examination Board (The College Board) developed the TOEFL in 1961 as a way to standardize English proficiency exams in order to "meet the needs of all US colleges and universities who were considering the admission of foreign students" (Spolsky, 1995, p. 217). ETS joined the TOEFL project in 1965 and then in 1975 took over the whole TOEFL project.

Within the TOEFL program there is a Policy Committee, which is responsible for advising ETS and the College Board on issues pertaining to TOEFL. Within the Policy Committee is the Committee of Examiners, whose role "is to establish overall guidelines for the test content, thus assuring that the TOEFL test is a valid measure of English language proficiency reflecting current trends and methodologies in the field" (ETS, 1999a, p. 5). Under their initiative, the TOEFL 2000 Committee was established in 1993 to create a new battery of tests that improve the validity of the TOEFL. The new test is being developed in three stages (ETS, 1999a).

Revision to the TOEFL

In 1995 the TOEFL was revised. The paper-based test (1995) consisted of three sections of equal weight – listening, structure, and reading. The emphasis placed on structure and the single dimensional nature of the format caused many to question the test's validity: "Some teachers of ESL and EFL are concerned that discrete-point test items, and exclusive use of multiple-choice items to assess receptive skills, have a negative impact on instruction" (ETS, 1999b, p. 2).

Michael Roberts 83

The computer-based TOEFL, now in use in most countries, incorporates four significant improvements over the old paper-based TOEFL, namely, the following: the incorporation of the Test of Written English (TWE) into every TOEFL test; the introduction of an adaptive listening and structure section; the reduction of weight given to structure and written expression questions; the creation of question types that more realistically resemble the academic tasks expected of university students; and more careful consideration to ensure that the reading passages "are similar in topic and style to academic texts" (ETS, 1999b, p.12).

Within the next few years ETS promises a new test that will aim to measure the English proficiency for academic purposes of university candidates with even greater accuracy. It is hoped by many that this new test will also have an impact on the classroom, helping to facilitate positive washback. However, this will depend on whether the other stakeholders are able to adjust their attitudes and beliefs towards the TOEFL and the preparation for it. This is why it is helpful to understand how students' sociocultural backgrounds influence test preparation practices.

Registrars

It is the registrars' decision as to whether and how to use the TOEFL for their institute. According to ETS "TOEFL is used by more than 3000 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada" (ETS, 1998, p.1). ETS recognizes that institutions have varying needs and suggests that each school should carefully consider the validity of the TOEFL for their situation. Registrars should be sensitive to characteristics of the applicants such as "instructional language at undergraduate institution, … length of time in the United States, Canada, or other English-speaking country, native language, [and] length of instruction in English" (ETS, 1998, p.5).

TOEFL Teachers and Materials Developers

Teachers who prepare students for the TOEFL, the materials developers who design the test preparation books, and the test-takers make up the dynamic relationship of TOEFL preparation.

Traditionally, TOEFL preparation classes "generally consist of test-taking strategies and mastery of language structures, lexis, and discourse semantics that have been observed on previous TOEFLs" (Hamp-Lyons, 1998, p.332). In TOEFL classes that follow the format of the commercially developed TOEFL preparation materials, skills (reading, listening, and structure) are practiced by continuous review of simulated test questions. The vast majority of TOEFL preparation classes use commercially developed materials that are marketed towards students' preparation for the TOEFL. In a telephone survey I conducted of 8 language institutes in Toronto, all of the schools that taught TOEFL (7 out of 8) stated that they used TOEFL preparation books (Roberts, 1999, p. 18).

The problem is that these preparation books tended to reinforce a non-communicative approach to language education (Hamp-Lyons, 1998).

TOEFL Preparation Manuals

To give an understanding of the format of traditional TOEFL preparation curricula, I will review *The Cambridge preparation for the TOEFL test* (Gear, & Gear, 1998) (hereafter referred to as the manual). It is, in my opinion, one of the better TOEFL manuals.

The book is divided into four parts, one for each of the four sections on the TOEFL. The goal of the manual is to provide students with every possible question type that they could be asked and to show them how to practice those question types.

The first part is the listening section. Over the years TOEFL materials developers have discovered that there are recurring themes in the particular skills that are needed for the TOEFL. The manual uses TOEFL type questions to give students practice in these skills and themes. Section two is Structure and Written Expression, the longest section in the book. This is somewhat imbalanced, considering this section is worth much less than the other sections on the computer-based TOEFL. The format of this section is similar to the listening section. The third part of the manual is the Reading Comprehension Section. Once again, the manual provides a series of TOEFL-type readings and practice questions and gives some advice on how to answer typical questions. There is some focus on developing vocabulary in this section but only by getting students to identify synonyms.

The final section is the TOEFL Essay. The manual only provides a twenty-five-page introduction to writing, which makes up less than one-tenth of the book. It provides some general lessons on brainstorming, outlining, and writing paragraphs. I think that it is questionable to believe that this simplistic treatment of the writing section can lead to any real benefit in students' development of writing skills.

Essentially, what the TOEFL preparation manual does is provide students with an opportunity to practice questions similar to those that will appear on the TOEFL. This manual allows students to become more comfortable with the test and provides them with many test-taking tricks. However, the manual provides students with little authentic language input, merely systemic and contrived listening and reading passages, and no opportunity for authentic output.

Test Takers

Since achieving a satisfactory TOEFL score is often a necessary requirement for them to pursue their academic studies or professional careers, the test takers are the stakeholders with the most personal and profound stake in the TOEFL.

According to Taylor et al. (1999), 740,279 examines took the TOEFL in the 1995/96 testing year, making it the "most widely used test of its kind" (ETS, 1998, p. 1). While the test is taken by examinees throughout the world, the largest concentration of students is in Asia. Japan, China, Korea, and Thailand alone represent 56% of all examinees (Taylor et al., 1999).

Culture

Reflecting on culture itself is a useful way of discovering how it affects the ways in which students approach language education and language testing. People are educated within a cultural context. As each culture, and thus each education system, is constrained within a "socially and historically situated discourse community" (Kramsch, 1998, p. 10) our understanding of what it means to be educated is also constrained within this historical framework. This historical framework is always understood through a language or languages.

> Culture both liberates and constrains. It liberates by investing the randomness of nature with meaning, order, and rationality and by providing safeguards against chaos; it constrains by imposing a structure on nature and by limiting the range of possible meanings created by the individual.   (Kramsch, 1998, p. 10)

Cortazzi and Jin (1996) offer the term "cultures of learning" as a way of understanding that education happens within a culture that is historically based. Through this historicity the conception of what it means to be educated is shaped: "Any particular culture of learning will have its roots in the educational, and, more broadly, cultural traditions of the community or society in which it is located"(Cortazzi & Jin, 1998, p.169).

What constitutes successful learning and acceptable learning practice is acquired though this educational historical context. Declaring a learning practice, such as rote memory, as educationally indefensible is a culturally defined opinion. Many cultures value such learning as it shows respect for the words of the teacher. Whereas the ability to apply knowledge is often seen as a goal of education in the west, this may not be taken for granted in an Asian culture. Cortazzi and Jin point out that foreign teachers of English in China, who often stereotype Chinese students as being poor language learners, also do so from a cultural perspective:

> [Foreign teachers' attitudes do] not take into account Chinese culture of learning, or students' achievements and expectations. For example, it is not unusual for students to memorize extensive lists of English words: we met a dozen or more students who could recite the whole of a good-sized dictionary by heart.   (Cortazzi & Jin, 1998, p. 185)

Cole (1996) adds to the understanding of culture by presenting the idea that culture, while being historically rooted, is also "that which surrounds." For Cole, every person is part of an embedded context which shapes who we are and how we think: "Context is defined as 'the whole situation, background, or environment relevant to a particular event," and "environment" is "something that surrounds" (Cole 1996, p.132). In Cortazzi and Jin's example above, the Chinese students and their Western teachers come from different educational environments and thus each judge the other in terms of that which has traditionally surrounded them.

What constitutes good TOEFL preparation is also situated within a belief system of what is educationally acceptable. Opinions, such as Hamp-Lyons' (1998) critical judgment of TOEFL preparation manuals as educationally indefensible, are formed from within a western tradition of education and may be quite foreign to others who have been socialized in other traditions.

I am not creating a defense for non-communicative language learning; my point here is just that we must be sensitive to the historicity of language learners. The argument that a form of education is acceptable because it is culturally rooted would imply that culture is a static and unchanging "institution." Both Cole (1996) and Kramsch (1998) argue that culture is in fact not static, but rather it is always changing and developing. It is not that what constitutes good language learning in one culture of learning is antithetical to good language learning in another culture of learning, it is just that how we consider such questions is rooted in our historical context. It is for this reason that the test users and developers must be sensitive to the historical, sociocultural backgrounds of the test takers preparing for the TOEFL.

Gardner (1985) develops a socio-educational model of language learning. In this model he argues that cultural influences have both a macro and micro effect on language learning. How much value is placed by the community on learning the language will affect not only how much time and energy are put into language learning but also will shape the way the language is learned. A group that values the learning of a foreign language, for example, for use in the tourism industry may have significantly different goals for and approaches to language learning than a group that values language learning for academic applications (Gardner, 1985, p.146). Gardner argues that individual motivation and anxiety are factors that contribute to both how well learners learn a language and the approaches that they take to language learning. These factors are greatly influenced by the cultural beliefs of the community. Wadden and Hilke (1999) provide a good example of the importance of understanding the sociocultural backgrounds of students when considering why test takers act the way they do when preparing for important examinations. They illustrate that students' attitudes and beliefs about a particular test are shaped by their culture of learning:

> Japan, for instance, like several other East Asian countries, possesses a
> veritable culture of testing with roots stretched back to the imperial

Michael Roberts   **87**

examinations of 12th century China. Even today in Japan, results on a wide array of tests largely determine the course of one's life – success on tests smoothes the way for everything from entrance to the right kindergarten to lifetime employment in a prestigious corporation. (Wadden & Hilke, 1999, p.269)

This example shows that different cultures place varying degrees of importance on examinations.

Design and Methods

The data collected for this study consist of attitudes and opinions of adult learners. The data were collected through participation in focus groups and structured interviews. The focus group sessions lasted one hour, and the structured interviews lasted thirty minutes. My research questions were: How do a sample of Korean English language learners, studying in Toronto, prepare for the TOEFL? And, what are the overall attitudes towards TOEFL preparation of a sample of Korean language learners studying in Toronto?

Phase One

Phase one consisted of focus groups. Participants in groups of three to five were asked to comment on a series of questions that dealt with how they prepared for the TOEFL and what their attitudes were towards TOEFL preparation in general. The purpose of this phase was to generate an overview of the attitudes and beliefs towards TOEFL preparation of a sample of Korean students in Toronto. Verification was achieved by conducting four sets of focus groups over a period of two months with participants who had no connection with the previous group of participants. See Appendix A for the focus group questions.

The focus group sessions were audiotaped and then transcribed. A total of fourteen participants were involved in this phase of the research. From each group, I asked one or two participants to be involved in phase two, as described below in the section, Elicitation of Data.

Phase Two

Phase two consisted of structured interviews. The structured interview consisted of each participant answering a series of questions about how they prepare for the TOEFL and their attitudes towards the TOEFL. These lasted for about thirty minutes each. The questions in the structured interview were considerably less open-ended than the questions from the focus group. The purpose of the structured

interview was to draw out more detailed information about the attitudes and belief towards TOEFL preparation from the participant to help support and enrich the data that was gathered in the focus groups. See Appendix B for the structured interview questions.

Participants

The 14 participants were adult Korean learners of English, who were preparing for the TOEFL at private language institutes in Toronto. They were all enrolled in either an intermediate or advanced TOEFL preparation class. Participants were asked to choose a pseudonym for themselves that preserved only their ethnicity and gender. Table 1 summarizes the participant's background information.

Table 1
Summary of participants' backgrounds

Background Factor	%	Background Factor	%
Sex		*Time spent in English speaking country*	
Male	57%	Less than 2 months	0%
Female	43%	2 to 5 months	21%
		6 to 11 months	58%
Age		1 to 2 years	21%
18 to 20	7%	more than 2 years	0%
21 to 25	36%		
26 to 30	50%	*Reason for preparing for the TOEFL*	
over 31	7%	To enter a university or college	
		in Canada or the United States	35%
Total ESL/EFL		To improve English proficiency	36%
Over 6 years	100%	To enter a Korean university	28%
		To enter a company in Korea	21%
Full-time ESL/EFL		To teach English in Korea	7%
2 to 5 months	14%		
6 to 11 months	58%	*Future plans for English*	
1 to 2 years	21%	Business with native speakers	65%
more than 2 years	7%	Business with speakers	
		of other languages than English	50%
Full-time employment		Studying at an English speaking university	28%
None	29%	Travel	28%
Less than one year	43%	Teaching English	14%
1 to 2 years	0%	Live as a Canadian Immigrant	7%
3 to 4 years	14%		
5 to 6 years	7%		
more than 6 years	7%		

Elicitation of Data

I began each focus group by giving a brief overview of my study and why I believed it to be important for research and development in the area of TOEFL preparation. I then gave the participants a few minutes to ask me general questions about my study and my academic, teaching, and personal background. In general, I found the participants to be articulate and competent enough to express their beliefs and opinions in English. I encouraged them to speak freely and not to worry about errors in grammar.

Five participants were selected for the structured interview so that a reasonable representation of the larger group was interviewed. Even if a dominant group were to have existed, I would not have chosen a larger number of students from that group. The reason for doing this was to ensure that the study was as inclusive as it could be of the general population. I paid special attention to participants' background information sheet to ensure that people with various backgrounds and future goals were selected, using criteria such as gender, age, level of English, years having studied English, work experience, time spent in a foreign country, reason for taking the TOEFL, and reason for studying English.

Research Instruments

The purpose of the research instruments was to elicit the participants' ideas, attitudes, and beliefs about the TOEFL and TOEFL preparation in order to answer the two main research questions guiding the thesis research.

Preparation Practices – First Research Question

The first research question asks, "How do a sample of Korean English language learners, studying in Toronto, prepare for the TOEFL?" I addressed this research question by asking about: a) participants' general preparation practices; b) participants' beliefs about which language skills are important for TOEFL; c) preparation time that the participants allotted to individual TOEFL sections; d) participants' attitudes towards TOEFL preparation manuals; e) participants' openness to alternative forms of TOEFL preparation; and f) participants' preferences for native versus non-native TOEFL preparation teachers.

Attitudes Towards TOEFL Preparation – Second Research Question

The second research question asks, "What are the overall attitudes towards TOEFL preparation of a sample of Korean language learners studying in Toronto?" I explored this question by asking about: a) importance of the TOEFL for the participants; b) participants' perceptions of which TOEFL sections were most

difficult; c) TOEFL preparation and general language ability; d) participants' attitudes towards TOEFL as a test of language proficiency; and e) participants' overall satisfaction with their TOEFL preparation methods.

Analysis

The data from each focus group and structured interview data were transcribed into Microsoft Word. In the transcribed data, I made some grammatical and stylistic changes to the participants' comments in order to better communicate their opinions in the written form. The data were then grouped into sections related to each of the two main research questions. Where applicable, I have provided statistics in the form of percentages.

A significant portion of the data from this study is qualitative in the sense that it is derived from participants' comments and responses to structured questions. The focus group participants were often asked direct questions and then asked to defend or explain their answers or choices. For example the participants were asked, 'Do you think a TOEFL preparation teacher should be a native speaker of English? Why?' In the case of the above, five possible answers were identified: a) Yes, b) Yes but with qualification, c) No, d) No but with qualification, e) It doesn't matter. This method of grouping participants' answers was necessary because the participants tended to give very straightforward answers, though it required some interpretation on my part. Verification was achieved by having an independent researcher repeat the process of grouping the responses on 30% of the questions. Inter-rater reliability was 95%.

Findings

TOEFL Preparation Practices

The first research question focused on the actual preparation practices of the participants.

General Preparation Practices

When asked to give general comments on how they prepared for the TOEFL, the participants gave the following comments: a) most participants reported that they prepared for the TOEFL at private institutes and on their own; b) they used a combination of English and Korean preparation manuals; c) some participants said they used authentic English materials for TOEFL preparation; and d) they seem to be aware of the issues facing them in preparing for TOEFL. For instance, Chang-ho's comments are fairly typical in comparison with the other participants.

> I prepare for the TOEFL two ways. One is that I am at the language institute taking the TOEFL program. Then, I study individually using the TOEFL references books that I have bought in Canada. I had bought some TOEFL books in Korea that use the Korean language. (Chang-ho)

Beliefs about Which Language Skills are Important for TOEFL and Preparation Time Allotted to Individual TOEFL Sections

The participants were asked which language skills they believed most important for TOEFL preparation and how much time they spent studying for each TOEFL section. They tended to believe that listening is a very important skill for TOEFL and spent the most amount of time studying for the listening section. None of the participants believed that writing is an important skill for success on the TOEFL, and so they did not spend much time studying for the TOEFL Essay.

As shown in Table 2, the participants in the focus groups indicated that they believed listening was the most important skill for TOEFL, followed by grammar. The structured interview participants, as summarized in Table 3, also indicated that they believed listening skills were most important for TOEFL preparation. Table 4 shows that the listening section is the section most studied for, with only 7% of participants studying less than one hour a day. In contrast, the writing section is the least studied, with 79% of participants studying less than 1 hour or never studying for the TOEFL Essay.

The participants indicated that listening is an important skill for TOEFL preparation. Many believed that it is the only skill that cannot be mastered simply through preparation manuals. For example,

> Listening is the most important for me because in grammar part or reading part my score gradually increased by studying myself but [not listening]. (Sung Chul)

Listening is the section that the participants spent the most amount of time studying. For example, the following is a typical comment about this topic:

> I spend the most amount of time studying for the listening section … I spend at least 2 hours a day on the listening section. (Chang-ho)

The structure section was the second most studied for. Some participants feel that grammar is easy, so they attempt to gain a perfect score in the structure section of the test.

> I think grammar is most important for TOEFL. I think that you can improve your grammar score more easily than your listening and reading score … If we study grammar hard, we can get a perfect score in the grammar section. (Suk-gu)

Table 2
Opinions of which language skill is most important for the TOEFL

Most important skill for TOEFL	%
Listening	50%
Grammar	29%
Vocabulary	7%
Reading	7%
Equal	7%
Writing	0%

Table 3
Structured interview participants' mean ranking of language skills important for the TOEFL.

Importance(Ranked by Mean)	Language Skills	M	SD
Most Important	Listening	1.6	0.55
Second	Reading	3.0	1.41
Third	Grammar	3.2	1.92
Fourth	Vocabulary	3.8	1.48
Fifth	Writing	4.6	0.89
Least Important	Speaking	5.2	1.09

Table 4
Time spent studying for each TOEFL section: focus group participants.

Time spent per day	Listening	Structure	Reading	TOEFL Essay
2 to 3 hrs.	28%	22%	14%	14%
1 to 2 hrs.	64%	50%	43%	7%
> 1 hr.	7%	28%	43%	72%
Never	0%	0%	0%	7%

The participants perceived writing as an unimportant skill for the TOEFL and did not spend much time preparing for the TOEFL Essay. The participants seemed not to realize the importance of writing for the computer-based TOEFL. For instance,

> Before I came here, I didn't know that I would have to write on the real TOEFL test … I never practiced writing exercise for the TOEFL test, so it is also very difficult for me to write an essay. (Dong-wook)

Dong-wook's comments indicate that there is some confusion surrounding the change from the paper-based TOEFL to the computer-based TOEFL even though the computer-based TOEFL had already been implemented in Korea at the time of this research.

Attitudes Towards TOEFL Preparation Manuals

All (100%) of the participants believed that TOEFL preparation manuals are a good way of preparing for the TOEFL. They believe that manuals help them learn the language skills and test-taking strategies necessary for the TOEFL, and help them gauge their level or readiness for the TOEFL. For these participants, manuals are seen as an indispensable part of TOEFL preparation. For example,

> If there were no TOEFL preparation manuals then maybe we could not study for the TOEFL. We could study but we could not prepare properly. (Suk-hyun)

The participants indicated that the manuals offer practice with relevant grammar, reading, and listening skills and are a good way of mastering the TOEFL test-taking skills and strategies.

> I think TOEFL preparation manuals are good because I can concentrate on what I need for the TOEFL: grammar, reading, listening. (Jin)

> They have a lot of strategies for taking the test … I learned how to eliminate the impossible answers and then choose from the possible answers. (Mi-na)

The participants said they used the simulated tests in the manuals in order to gauge their test readiness. Many participants reported that they take the simulation tests on a regular bases. For example:

> I used the TOEFL manuals to test myself … every two days I took a sample test for myself with the TOEFL materials.(Dong-wook)

Openness to Alternative Forms of TOEFL Preparation

The participants were asked if they used authentic materials to help them prepare for the TOEFL: 64% reported they did and 36% did not. Those who used authentic materials did so to improve their reading speed, vocabulary, and listening skills. The participants who did not use authentic materials view authentic materials as an inefficient way of improving their TOEFL score.

Some participants argued that authentic materials help them improve their reading speed:

> [S]o I think that if we read magazines and articles we can increase our reading speed and learn a lot of the vocabulary in the TOEFL reading section. (Mi-na)

Some indicated that using authentic materials are a good way of developing skills for dealing with new and difficult vocabulary:

> If you get used to reading articles you develop a skill for guessing the meaning even if there is a word that you do not know.   (Hee-seung)

Others use authentic materials, such as TV and radio, to improve listening skills. For example:

> To improve my listening comprehension, I watch television … I didn't understand all of them, but some parts of the shows I can understand.
> (Dong-wook)

A typical reason given for not using authentic materials is that TOEFL preparation manuals are a more efficient way of increasing a TOEFL score quickly. For instance:

> I never read magazines or newspaper … I want to get my TOEFL mark soon. So I think that the fastest way is to just use the TOEFL books.
> (Sung-jin)

In sum, there was division in attitudes towards using authentic materials for TOEFL preparation.

Preference for Native Versus Non-Native TOEFL Preparation Teachers

The participants were asked if, for TOEFL preparation, they preferred a native English-speaking teacher or a Korean teacher who was not fluently bilingual. Table 5 shows that 58% believe that it would be better to have a Korean TOEFL preparation teacher; 21% believe for the most part they prefer a Korean teacher; and 14% believe for the most part native English-speaking teachers are better.

Table 5

Beliefs about native speaking versus non-native speaking TOEFL preparation teachers.

Preferred KT	Preferred KT- with exceptions	Preferred NT - with exceptions	It doesn't matter	Preferred NT
58%	21%	14%	7%	0%

Note: Korea Teacher (KT)/Native English Speaking Teacher (NT).

One reason for preferring a Korean teacher is that participants said that they find it easier to understand vocabulary and grammar rules when they are explained in Korean. For instance,

> I think that the TOEFL teacher should not be a native speaker … sometimes I didn't understand my teacher's (native speaker) explanations … Even though I heard her explanation, I sometimes I did not understand perfectly.   (Dong-wook)

Many participants also believe Koreans know how to prepare for standardized language tests much better than native English speakers.

> When we go to a private school to take a TOEFL class we want to improve our score, so the teachers, especially the Korean teachers, give us special skills to help us improve our TOEFL score – like how to solve problems.
> (Mi-na)

For the most part, the participants who preferred a Korean teacher, but with some exceptions, argued that native speaking teachers are beneficial when studying for the listening section:

> I think to prepare for the listening part the teacher should be a native speaker. For the other parts I think that a Korean teacher is better because sometimes I can't understand what the native speaking teacher says.   (Sung-jin)

Some participants indicated that, for the most part, they preferred an English native speaking TOEFL teacher. They argued that there are serious limitations to learning vocabulary through a crosslingual approach and non-native teachers do not have the necessary cultural familiarity to explain the meaning of vocabulary items or the context of situations in the listening section:

> [My Korean] teachers could not explain exactly some of the vocabulary, but here the teachers always knows the vocabulary and can explain it well.
> (Jin)

> I think that language is from the culture and so Korean teachers do not really understand some expressions and ideas that are in the TOEFL.
> (Chang-ho)

Attitudes Towards TOEFL Preparation

The second research question examines participants' attitudes towards TOEFL preparation.

Importance of the TOEFL

Participants were asked how important the TOEFL was for their futures and why they were taking it. Table 6 shows that 72% believed that a high TOEFL is very important, 14% believed that it is somewhat important, and 14% believed that it is not very important.

Table 6
Importance of a high TOEFL score

Importance of the TOEFL	%
Very important	72%
Somewhat important	14%
Not very important	14%

Table 7
Reasons for taking the TOEFL.

Reason for taking TOEFL	%
Enter university in North America	36%
Enter university in Korea	21%
Get a job in Korea	29%
Improve general language ability	21%

As indicated in Table 7, 36% of the participants said they were taking the TOEFL to enter a university in North America, 21% to enter a university in Korea, 29% to get a job in Korea, and 14% to improve their general English language ability.

All of the participants who indicated that they wanted to go to a North American university, and most of the participants who said they were planning to attend a university in Korea, said a high TOEFL score was very important for them. For example,

> The reason I am taking the TOEFL is to get into a university in Canada. So for me it is very important to get a high mark so that I can go to university.   (Suk-gu)

> It is really important because I want to go to graduate school in Korea … the school that I want to go to needs a really high TOEFL score.
>   (Young-hee)

Most of the participants that would be using their TOEFL scores to get a job in Korea also said that a high TOEFL score was very important for their careers. For example,

> In my case getting a high mark on the TOEFL test is absolutely important. If I get a low mark I can't survive in Korea because I can't get a good job.   (Sung-jin)

The participants that indicated that a high TOEFL score was somewhat important were those who could benefit from a high TOEFL score but did not absolutely need it. For instance,

> I want to be an English teacher in Korea [so] I need to pass the special exam. If I have a 600 score in the TOEFL then I can get extra points on that exam.   (Mi-na)

Perception of Difficulty

The participants were given a list of the four TOEFL sections, and asked to rank order them from most difficult to least difficult. Figure 1 indicates that the listening section was ranked the overall most difficult section. 50% of the participants ranked listening the most difficult, and 22% ranked it second most difficult. Thus, a total of 72% ranked listening as at least above average difficulty. The TOEFL Essay was ranked the second most difficult section. 28% ranked it most difficult, and 22% ranked it second most difficult. Thus, a total of 72% ranked the TOEFL essay as at least above average difficulty. The structure section was ranked the easiest section of the TOEFL. 64% of the participants ranked the structure section as the easiest section, with a total of 86% of the participants ranking the structure section as below average difficulty.

Many participants indicated that the listening section was the most difficult because they felt that their oral comprehension skills are the skills most neglected in the Korean education system:

> I think listening is most difficult. Before I came here I couldn't understand anything that I heard.   (Chul-soo)

Those who rated the TOEFL Essay as difficult indicated they did so because of a lack of writing experience in their educational backgrounds.

> When I study in Korea I never had to write anything. I just had to pick the answer from the questions. So I had no experience in writing English ever.   (Suk-gu)

The participants rated the structure section the easiest section of the TOEFL. The main reason cited was extensive exposure to English grammar in their education. For example,

> The structure section is the easiest. From middle school, high school, and university I studied grammar. So it is very easy for me. (Chang-ho)

TOEFL Preparation and General Language Ability

The participants were asked if they felt that their general language ability was improving by preparing for the TOEFL: 36% answered yes and 64% indicated they were improving only in specific language skills (see Table 9). Of the 64% who gave a qualified yes, 44% said they were improving reading skills, 22% said they were improving listening skills, 22% believed they were increasing vocabulary, and 22% believed that their writing skills were improving (see Table 10).

The participants who felt that they were improving overall general language ability tended to have been in Canada for a relatively longer period of time. In general, they tended to believe that the TOEFL gives them a goal or a reason for studying English:

> My general language ability is being improved a lot. I think that we study so much for the TOEFL, so our ability is being improved in listen-ing and reading and even speaking. It helps us to study English harder I think. We have a goal.   (Jin)

Table 8
Ranking of the four TOEFL sections by difficulty.

	Listening	TOEFL Essay	Reading	Structure
Most difficult	50%	28%	14%	7%
2nd	22%	44%	28%	7%
3rd	14%	28%	36%	22%
Easiest	14%	0%	22%	64%

Table 9
Opinions about improving their general language ability by preparing for the TOEFL.

Is your language improving?	Yes	Qualified Yes	Not Improving
%	36%	64%	0%

Table 10
Language skills they were improving by taking a TOEFL preparation class.

Qualified Yes. Which skills?	%
Reading	44%
Listening	22%
Vocabulary	22%
Writing	22%

Note: From the participants that indicated a qualified yes only.

Many participants felt that they had made improvements in general reading ability. For example:

> I used to hate reading the newspaper because it was too hard but now I can read the paper much better because I have learned a lot of new vocabulary. (Chang-ho)

These next three quotations exemplify how participants indicated that TOEFL preparation is only helping them improve specific language skills:

> I write an essay every other day and that is helpful for me. But just that one. I think that the other parts don't really help my language ability. (Young-hee)

> I think that it helps my structure but I don't think it is helping me with anything else. (Sun-hee)

> In my case, the writing and listening are being improved by taking the TOEFL test but the other things, well I don't know. (Chul-soo)

TOEFL as a Test of Language Proficiency

The participants were asked if they believed that TOEFL is a good measure of English language proficiency. Table 11 shows that 57% percent of the participants believed that the TOEFL is a good test of English for academic proficiency, and 7% believed it is a good judge of language proficiency in general. Only 36% said they believed it is not a good test of language proficiency.

The majority of the participants believed that the TOEFL is a good test of academic readiness but a rather poor judge of English proficiency for the other purposes that it is used for:

> [I]n order to understand what the professor are saying and to get a good score at university we have to study TOEFL … but besides studying in a university it is not useful. I know that both in Korea and Canada people have to take a TOEFL test sometimes to get a job … so I think they should add more speaking, rather than writing or grammar.(Min-sue)

Participants, who believed that the TOEFL is not a good test of academic language proficiency, offered two main reasons. First, it was pointed out that many Korean students achieve a high TOEFL score with out being able to speak or write in English:

> In Korea many students who get a good score but they can't speak English at all and they can't really write very well. (Chul-soo)

The other reason is that some participants felt that the TOEFL is unfairly difficult. For example:

> The TOEFL test is not very good. I think that the vocabulary is too difficult, even for university students. (Sung-jin)

Overall Satisfaction with TOEFL Preparation Classes

The participants were clearly divided as to their satisfaction with their TOEFL preparation methods, with 50% unsatisfied, 43% satisfied and 7% undecided (Table 12). Motivation was the primary distinguishing factor between those who were happy and those who were not.

Some participants who were unhappy with the way they prepare for the TOEFL argued that they would prefer a method that helped them improve their overall language ability.

> No, I am not happy. I think that the problem for me is that I need to improve my real ability of English. I think that in my TOEFL class we try to get a higher score just through practice … Sometimes my teacher says, don't listen to the whole sentence; just try to pick the main words. (Sung-chul)

On the other hand, the participants that were happy with their current method of TOEFL preparation felt that they were using the most expedient method for achieving a high score.

Table 11
Beliefs about the TOEFL as a measure of language proficiency.

Belief	%
The TOEFL is a good test of academic proficiency	57%
The TOEFL is a good test	7%
The TOEFL is not a good test	36%

Table 12
Overall satisfaction with TOEFL preparation methods.

Satisfied	Not Satisfied	Not sure
43%	50%	7%

> For me, I am satisfied with my approach because I've just studied TOEFL for three months but my TOEFL score is getting better.   (Dong-wook)

In sum, participants' satisfaction with their method of TOEFL preparation seems to depend greatly on their expectations of a TOEFL preparation class.

Discussion

The findings from this section lead to eight conclusions. First, at least for these participants, the TOEFL is a high-stakes exam. Second, the participants' culture of learning seem to have an effect on the way they prepare for the TOEFL, but individual motivation and experiences also affect these processes. Third, TOEFL preparation manuals influence the way the participants said they prepared for the TOEFL. Fourth, many participants are open to exploring alternative ways of preparing for the TOEFL. Fifth, the participants were engaging in certain TOEFL preparation practices that seem to subvert the utility of the TOEFL. Sixth, participants' preparation practices were significantly affected by the test methods of TOEFL; i.e., there is a washback effect in such areas as grammar, reading, and listening. Seventh, the introduction of the computer-based TOEFL has had limited washback effect for these participants. Eighth, participants' satisfaction with their method of TOEFL preparation seemed to depend on their motivation.

The findings reaffirm that the TOEFL is considered very important for the participants' future academic and work careers. This is important since it is generally assumed in the literature that on standardized tests washback effects occur in tests that are perceived as important, or high-stakes, by candidates.

In general, participants shared very similar TOEFL preparation practices, which do seem to be in keeping with their culture of learning. The participants tended to prefer Korean TOEFL preparation teachers because they believe that the "Korean" system of test preparation is an effective way of increasing one's score on the TOEFL. They indicated that they spent a great deal of time studying listening because their educational background lacked oral communication. They indicated that they felt they were able to do very well on the structure section of the test because of the emphasis placed on grammar by the Korean public education system. Also, they tend to shy away from writing and consider the TOEFL essay very difficult.

The fact that all participants reported using TOEFL preparation manuals is an important finding for this study. While the patterns and trends in the way that the participants prepared for the TOEFL tend to fit the their culture of learning, they also fit the format of TOEFL preparation manuals. This finding demonstrates, at least for these participants, the importance that preparation manuals play in the design and structure of TOEFL preparation instruction.

Findings about participants' openness to alternative forms of TOEFL preparation reveal that participants' individual choices, preferences, and experiences affect the way they prepare for the TOEFL. Before conducting this study, I had assumed that most of the participants would not be open to using alternative methods for TOEFL preparation. My assumption was based on the perception that participants would be more comfortable, given their educational backgrounds, using traditional approaches to TOEFL preparation such as commercially produced TOEFL preparation manuals. The majority believed that using authentic materials in addition to TOEFL preparation manuals was a good way of improving their TOEFL score.

The findings from this study indicate that, at least for these participants, the TOEFL may often be used, or perhaps misused, for purposes other than its primary intention. Nearly two-thirds of the participants indicated that they were taking the TOEFL for reasons other than to enter a university in North America, which raises the question of the appropriateness of the TOEFL for some of the purposes the participants are being required to take it for (e.g., employment, study at universities in Korea).

My findings concerning the amount of time participants spent on each section of the TOEFL show that most participants were preparing for the TOEFL full time. However, they also admit that they were deriving limited benefit from their time spent studying in terms of improving their general English language proficiency. I believe that this demonstrates that the language learning activities of these participants are significantly affected by the nature of the TOEFL, and clearly there is a washback effect for them.

In contrast to the above findings, there seems to be a lack of washback from the addition of the TOEFL Essay to the TOEFL. The lack of importance placed on developing skills for the TOEFL Essay is a rather disturbing trend. I pointed out earlier that one of the reasons ETS (1999b) gave for developing the computer-based TOEFL was to affect improvement on TOEFL instruction. However, the participants' comments suggest that this change has made virtually no impact on their TOEFL preparation practices at this point in time. The participants rated writing skills as relatively unimportant and tend to dedicate less study time to the TOEFL Essay in comparison to the other TOEFL sections.

The participants' attitudes towards their TOEFL preparation methods depended on their motivation in studying for the TOEFL. Those who saw TOEFL preparation as a means of achieving a high score on the TOEFL seemed to be more satisfied than those who wished to gain a language education from the efforts they place into TOEFL preparation.

Implications

The issues raised in this study present some implications for the TOEFL stakeholders. For ETS and its test developers, I believe that the lack of washback from the introduction of the TOEFL Essay on participants' attitudes and practices in terms of developing writing skills is an indication that consideration needs to be given to publicity and orientation when making improvements to the format of the TOEFL. Dissemination of information about the structure of the test seems necessary if positive washback on test preparation is a goal of the next generation of TOEFL.

Registrars at universities should be aware that students might be engaging in activities that allow them to increase their TOEFL scores without having the English language proficiency necessary to perform at an academic level. Moreover, registrars should be aware that stringent reliance on the use of TOEFL scores as an indication of language proficiency might be negatively effecting the way students approach language learning.

The writers and publishers of commercially produced TOEFL preparation manuals should be aware that they are considered an authority, at least by the participants in my study, on how to successfully prepare for the TOEFL. The participants relied heavily on these manuals for not only the content of their language studies but also for information on the structure of the test.

Teachers of TOEFL preparation to Korean learners should be aware that the participants indicated that listening was a skill for which they felt they needed more practice, whereas writing is a skill that the participants found difficult yet unimportant for success on the TOEFL.

Researchers concerned with the TOEFL should consider that on the whole, the participants tended to indicate that a significant portion of the time that they spent studying for the TOEFL was outside the context of a formal classroom. This is an important finding because in previous studies of TOEFL preparation (specifically Alderson & Hamp-Lyons, 1996; Brown, 1995; Hamp-Lyons, 1998) the focus of the research has been on classroom activities. It seems then that a study with participants such as these, which examines the washback effects on TOEFL preparation, should bear in mind students' extracurricular studies.

The Author

Michael Roberts is from Canada. He has a Masters of Arts in English as a second language education from Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. He has also earned a Cambridge Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA/RSA). Michael has taught English as a second language

for seven years, both here in Korea and in Canada. His professional interests include computer assisted language learning, language test preparation, and second language writing. Currently he teaches at Catholic University of Korea. His current courses include Computer Assisted Language Leaning in the TESOL program, and advanced writing in the undergraduate program. Email: mroberts@catholic.ac.kr.

References

Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied Linguistics, 14*, 115-128.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, J. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the Language Classroom* (pp.169-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Educational Testing Service. (1998). *Guidelines for TOEFL Institutional Validity Studies*, [World Wide Web]. Educational Testing Services [Accessed 1999, October].

Educational Testing Service. (1999a). *About the TOEFL Program*, [World Wide Web]. Educational Testing Service [Accessed 1999, September].

Educational Testing Service. (1999b). *TOEFL Developments*, [World Wide Web]. Educational Testing Service [Accessed 1999, March].

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gear, J., & Gear, R. (1998). *Cambridge preparation for the TOEFL test*. (Second ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (1998). Ethical test preparation practice: The case of TOEFL. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 329-337.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. Language Testing, *13*, 241 - 256.

Roberts, M (1999). *The multidimensional nature of TOEFL preparation*. Course paper (OISE/UT CTL 3000). Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto.

Spolsky, B. (1995). *Measured words: The development of objective language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, C., Kirsch, I., Eignor, D., & Jamieson, J. (1999). Examining the relationship between computer familiarity and performance on computer-based language tasks. *Language Learning, 49*, 219 - 274.

Wadden, P., & Hilke, R. (1999). Ethical test preparation practice: The case of the TOEFL. Polemic gone astray: A corrective to recent criticism of TOEFL preparation. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 263-270.

Wall, D. (1996). Introducing new tests into traditional systems: Insight from general education and from innovation theory. *TESOL Quarterly, 13*, 334 - 354.

Watanabe, Y. (1996). Does grammar translation come from the entrance examination? Preliminary findings from classroom-based research. *TESOL Quarterly, 13(3)*, 318 - 333.

Needs Analysis and ESP Course Content Selection for Korean Professors Going Overseas

Don Makarchuk
Kyonggi University

Abstract

This article focuses on the use of needs analysis to choose course content for an English for Specific Purposes course. It highlights a need analysis model and a way in which it can be implemented to determine course content appropriate to a particular group of learners including the selection of appropriate communicative events and the analysis of these events for teaching/learning purposes.

Introduction

This paper reports on a study that attempted to determine the course content of an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) course for Korean professors who were preparing to live in the USA for a period of one to two years in order to pursue scholarly activities. It originated from the need to design a course to meet the needs of these learners in conjunction with the discovery that little was available in the literature to provide for their particular needs. This paper will demonstrate how a particular needs analysis procedure can be used to determine course content in the hope that it may be useful to teachers and other course designers working with learners with specific language needs. It will also detail the communicative events that were deemed relevant to teaching the learners who inspired this course in order to guide teachers who find themselves faced with learners with similar language needs.

Background

While research has been done on the needs of learners whose first language is not English who are preparing to study or are studying at the tertiary level in countries

where the L1 is English (Biber, Conrad, Reppin, Byrd, and Helt, 2002; Jordan, 1997; Underhill, 1991), much of this is English for Academic Purposes (EAP) work, and most of it seems to focus on learners at the undergraduate or post-graduate level. This is, of course, because that is where most of the demand for this information is concentrated. I, however, was asked to prepare and teach a course for a small group (5 learners) of Korean university professors who were planning to spend a year or two in the U.S. either doing research or teaching or both. As these learners were all roughly middle-aged individuals with doctorates, extensive teaching experience, and who would not be attending conventional academic programs, the EAP regimen of academic writing practice, note-taking skills and such seemed of questionable value. In order to determine just what might be useful for these learners to focus on, it was decided that the place to start was with a needs analysis.

Needs analysis is the foundation of ESP course syllabuses (Johns and Price-Machado 2001) and is used to lay the groundwork for other syllabuses. Nunan (2001, p.63), for example, describes an integrated syllabus that is developed in the following way:

1. Identify the general contexts and situations in which the learners will communicate.
2. Specify the communicative events that the learners will engage in.
3. Make a list of the functional goals that the learners will need in order to take part in the communicative events.
4. List the key linguistic elements that learners will need in order to achieve the functional goals.
5. Sequence and integrate the various skill elements identified in Steps 3 and 4.

The study described here used a sequence of steps similar to Nunan's (though Step 5 is not the subject of this paper) with the addition of procedures to collect information about the learners themselves.

Needs Analysis Model

The needs analysis model used in this study is adapted from one described in Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) which in turn draws heavily on work by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) and Brindley (1989). The essential elements of the model are as follows:

1. **Learning Situation Analysis**
   What do the learners want to learn? How can they best be helped to learn? How do they like to learn? How have they learned traditionally? (Might there be a conflict with the course's way of teaching the course content?)

2. **Target Situation Analysis**
   What communicative events will the learners need to negotiate in order to achieve their objectives in the target situation they are going to be living, studying and working in? What are those objectives?

3. **Present Situation Analysis**
   What are the learners' present target language communicative abilities with respect to the events described in the Target Situation Analysis?

4. **Lacks (2-3)**
   What is the gap between the communicative ability that the learners will need and their present level?

5. **Communicative Features Analysis**
   What are the types of language that the learners need to learn at the linguistic, discourse and genre levels? What other communicative features do they need to be competent in? (e.g., paralinguistic, pragmatic, cultural)

6. **Means Analysis**
   What are the features of the learning and teaching environment that might affect the progress of the learners?

Conducting the Needs Analysis

A sensible place to begin a needs analysis would seem to be with a Target Situation Analysis (TSA) as this would reveal the communicative requirements of the situation in which the learners would have to function. Then one would conduct a Present Situation Analysis (PSA) to discover what the learners already know, and then subtract what is known from what is required to leave the language and other communicative features that the learners need to learn. While this is a seemingly sensible approach it unfortunately fails to take account of the learners' preferences. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) highlight the importance of distinguishing between *overall needs* and *course needs* with the former referring to all of the needs relevant to the target situation (TS) and the latter determined by *what the learners want to get from the course*. This is a useful distinction because if the learners are not interested in studying the course content, no matter how useful the instructor may think it to be, it is questionable whether much will be learned and almost certain that the learners will leave the course dissatisfied. Hence, it was decided to begin with an analysis of what the learners hoped to gain from the course.

Learning Situation Analysis

Doing the Learning Situation Analysis (LSA) first was advantageous as the writer had been planning, based on what he knew of the learners' plans from an informal discussion, to include reading and writing skills work in the course. It was assumed that as the learners intended to do this sort of work in the U.S. that it would be of benefit to them to engage in this sort of practice. However, a structured interview was held with each of the learners (Appendix A) and it revealed that they were not at all interested in improving their reading and writing skills, but rather their conversational English ability. Further questioning showed that as the learners had considerable experience in reading and writing English, they believed, unequivocally, further work on these skills to be unwarranted.

In addition to information about the learners' reasons for taking the course, the LSA supplied guidance regarding the learners' preferred modes of learning English, their perceived weak areas, and their preferences for error correction (Appendix B). Of particular value was the knowledge that these learners believed the following to be effective in learning English:

1. practicing English with other students;
2. studying from a textbook;
3. playing language games.

The LSA also revealed that the learners were not especially fond of pair work, but enjoyed small group activities. This knowledge suggested that it would be beneficial to base the course on a textbook that contained ample amounts of small group activities and language learning games.

Target Situation Analysis

Having thus limited the course needs to those related to conversation in the TS, the next step was to try to decide which communicative conversational events to focus the course on. It was decided to seek the advice of those who might reasonably be expected to know something about the TS needs; that is, individuals similar to the learners taking the course who had relatively recent experience of the TS. The justification for this approach was that if individuals could be found who were similar to the learners in background and language ability, and who had recently had the experience of trying to achieve similar communicative goals in the TS, their input ought to be a good indication of what the learners needed to know. To access this information a rating form was prepared (Appendix C) which listed a number of possible communicative events that might be of importance in the TS and which asked the respondent to rate them in importance according to a 5-part scale. The rating form

also asked respondents to add other communicative events not listed on the form that they had found to be important to successfully functioning in the TS. The rating form was then sent to 8 individuals with backgrounds similar to those of the course learners who had spent time in the U.S. for scholarly purposes. (A larger sample would have been preferred, but it represents the greatest number of qualified respondents that could be found in the limited time available for the TSA before the beginning of the course.) The results of the rating form revealed the importance of the following communicative events (which are ranked by importance). They are divided into events initially included in the rating form (see Appendix D for mean ranking scores) and events which the respondents added to those listed in the form.

Communicative Events Included in the Rating Form

Rank of Importance

(1-7 = important, 8-11 = somewhat important, 12-13 = not very important)
(Events beginning with the same number (e.g., 2.1, 2.2) have the same importance rank.)

1.   Talking to bank employees
2.   Talking to people about accommodations (e.g., landlords), possibly university-related, including problems
2.1   Having casual conversations with colleagues
3.   Talking to insurance company employees
3.1   Talking to government officials about immigration matters
3.2   Meeting new people for business or academic reasons
4.   At the airport (e.g., customs, immigration, claiming baggage, etc.)
5.   Talking to school officials and teachers about one's children's education
5.1   Getting a driver's license
6.   Talking to the police
6.1   Having casual conversations with friends other than colleagues
6.2   Meeting new people for social reasons (e.g., neighbors, parties — including etiquette)
7.   Eating out at restaurants, etc. (including etiquette)
8.   Talking to doctors (e.g., terminology for describing symptoms)
8.1   Talking to dentists
8.2   Using taxis, buses, the subway and other forms of transportation
9.   Preparing for and taking trips
9.1   Talking to lawyers
10.   Shopping at supermarkets, small local markets and convenience stores

11. Shopping at department stores
12. Going to other entertainment facilities (e.g., zoo, etc.)
13. Going to movies

Other Communicative Events Reported by the Respondents

Ranked by Number of Times Reported

(1a = 2 times, 2a = 1 time)
(Events beginning with the same number (e.g., 2.1a, 2.2a) have the same importance
    rank.)

1.a   Talking to service people (e.g., mechanics, getting telephone and/or TV
       cable service)
1.1a   Using the telephone (e.g., making reservations for hotel rooms and tickets
       over the phone, using a phone card, reporting emergencies using "911")
1.2a   Buying a used car
2.a   Talking in semi-formal/formal situations (e.g., PTA meeting, discussion after
       an academic presentation)
2.1a   Getting a social security number

      With this information the course developer has a rationale for choosing the events to include in the course. It seems likely that the events deemed most important would form part of the course. A question arises, though, as to how to value the additional events that were reported. On the one hand, the fact that a respondent took the trouble to include them indicates that they were of considerable importance to that respondent, but on the other hand, it's impossible to know whether the other respondents would also similarly value them unless, of course, the events were reported by more than one person. If every respondent added the same event, it would mark it as being of considerable importance, however, if only one or two respondents added the same event (as in this study) it would leave open the question of the importance of the event to the other respondents. As a result, while frequency of reporting was used as a means of measuring the importance of the events, it was done so with a lesser degree of confidence than with the events that were initially included in the rating form.

      Another way to address this issue would be to create a follow-up rating form containing the additional events and ask the respondents to rate them. Yet another course of action might be to consider whether the most frequently mentioned events could be taught as a part of one of the events that the developer is more confident of the need to teach. For example, Event 1.a might be combined with Event 2.1 to cover getting housing and services (telephone, cable, an Internet service provider), and

dealing with housing problems. In this way, the additional events could be included, but the lower level of confidence of the need to teach the events might lead the course developer to spend less time on them than would be the case if the confidence level were higher.

Present Situation Analysis

Learner Data

> Number: 5
> Gender: male
> Age: 35-54
> Academic background: physics (1), Korean history (1), Japanese literature (2), tourism management (1)

The next part of the needs analysis consisted of the Present Situation Analysis (PSA) in which the learners' present level of conversational English was ascertained. In this particular group, each learner was interviewed by the instructor individually as the group was small (5 learners). In larger groups a less time-consuming assessment instrument would most likely have to be employed (perhaps pair or small group role plays which featured the communicative events above). The interview was conducted in English about one month before the start of the course, and lasted for about 30 minutes. It began with small talk to attempt to put the interviewee at ease, and then covered a number of the communicative events drawn from the TSA.

One challenge identified by the PSA was the difference in conversational English levels of the learners with 3 of them at the mid-elementary level and the remaining two at the low-intermediate level. As a result, the level of the course was set at the high-elementary level on the grounds that it would be accessible to the lower-level students while not being so low as to be useless to the higher-level learners. Also, the more advanced learners could be given additional activities or have the goals of the regular course activities set higher than those of the less proficient students.

As well as determining the learners' general level of proficiency, it was also necessary to check whether they had additional expertise in areas related to the above communicative events. If, for example, the learners were found to have, because of their academic background, knowledge of medical or legal terms beyond the level normally associated with learners of their proficiency, it would make it unnecessary to include these in the course. Interviewing the learners during the PSA revealed no particular areas of strength related to the target communicative events.

Lacks

Having specified certain valuable communicative events of the TS, and having determined somewhat the learners' present language ability, one can to some extent identify the learners' lacks by detailing the differences between what they need (and want) to know and what they currently know. It should be said that this process is far from being an exact science. It is very difficult to truly determine just what learners do and do not know (especially if one only has a short time). What the course designer can do is make educated guesses based on the TSA and PSA as to what to include in the course. For example, in the course being described here, it was decided that the learners would benefit from work on all of the communicative events that were described as either important or somewhat important (Events 1-11, see Appendix E). That is, given their current proficiency levels, the learners were judged to be less than communicatively competent in all of the events.

Part of this judgment procedure is attempting to determine to what extent and in what way(s) the learners are *not* communicatively competent. The course designer must try to distinguish the features of the communicative events that the learners are likely to be familiar with versus those that are unknown or in need of development. For example, in this course it was shown that learners would likely benefit from being able to talk to landlords about housing problems. To do this they would need to know vocabulary related to housing, discourse patterns used to make complaints and socio-cultural information concerned with this event at the very least. Using the information from the PSA that the optimum proficiency level for the course should be high elementary, the designer would try to decide what vocabulary to include. 'house' would likely be deemed to have been learned already while 'blocked kitchen sink' might be considered more appropriate for learning. With regard to discourse patterns, it would be helpful to know whether the series of moves involved in complaining in the learners' L1 are similar or different from that in the L2. If similar, less attention would need to be paid to teaching it. Similarly, if the socio-cultural dynamics of the L1 and L2 are alike, less emphasis would be needed in this area. However, if in the L1 culture complaining were only done at the end of the day so as not to ruin the "harmony" of the person's day, but not so in the L2, this might create difficulties. Imagine a situation where the learner feels s/he ought to wait until late in the day to complain, but the landlord is never available at that time.

Having made some informed decisions about which of the communicative events revealed by the TSA the learners need to learn, and the extent and nature of their lack of communicative competence, the next step is to analyze the events in detail to discover precisely what needs to be included in the course.

Communicative Features Analysis

This part of the needs analysis seeks to provide the course developer with a more specific description of what ought to be learned in order for the learners to succeed at the communicative events chosen for the course. In this study, the analysis was divided into two parts, elements related to language (Language Analysis) and those not specifically linguistic, but nevertheless vital to overall communication (Other Communicative Features).

Language Analysis

Language analysis seeks to describe the language to be learned in a way which makes it easier to learn. There are many ways to analyze language, and it is up to the course designer to decide which type best suits the needs of his/her learners. This choice will depend a lot on the proficiency of the learners (Lower-level speakers might benefit more from an analysis that focused on various types of formulaic utterances than advanced speakers) and the learners' particular language needs (an analysis of the features of formal speeches would be of more use to learners preparing for public speaking than learners interested in informal conversation).

In order to describe the communicative events relevant to this course, it is important to consider the vocabulary and grammar of the events. In addition, at a more holistic level, discourse and genre patterns can be added to the description as well as more general categories like those described in Brown and Yule (1995).

Brown and Yule, with regard to spoken language, distinguish between two types: *interactional* and *transactional*. Interactional language is used primarily to make and maintain social relationships while transactional language is used to give or get specific information. An example of interactional language would be the light banter of conversation at a party, whereas transactional language would be that of an exchange in a store between a customer seeking information about clothing and a salesperson answering. With these two categories in mind, the above target situation communicative events would be divided up as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Transactional and Interactional Communicative Events

Transactional	Interactional
1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 9.1, 9.2, 10.1, 11.1, 12.1, 13.1, 1.1a, 1.2a, 1.3a, 2.1a, 2.2a	2.2, 6.2, 6.3

Further distinctions can be made between (1) a formal and informal style or register, and (2) talking to a stranger or to someone one is on friendly terms with.

Table 2
Four Determinants of Conversational Style:
Known or Unknown Person/Formal or Informal Context

	Formal	Informal
Stranger	A	C
Friend, Acquaintance	B	D

For example, Conversation A, in Table 2, might be a conversation between a student and a university president who had not been met previously. B might be a conversation between colleagues sitting around a table waiting for a university departmental meeting to begin, C between strangers at a party for college students, and D between good friends over dinner.

Another level of language analysis might involve the specification of genres. Genres are frequently occurring language formats. These formats consist of a commonly occurring pattern of moves or steps (in a conversation, for example), and are governed by a communicative purpose. Swales (1997) distinguishes between genres with a clear communicative purpose like a letter of condolence and a pre-genre (e.g., any letter).

While the communicative purpose is not as clearly defined for interactional conversations as for transactional ones, the following genre-like pattern (or pre-genre) is relevant to interactional and some transactional conversations (see Richards (1998) for reference to parts 1, 2 and 4 of this pattern [3 is implied]):

1. Greeting,
2. Opening remark,
3. Body (topic introduction & development),
4. Closing remark.

This genre-like pattern usefully allows us to distinguish between conversations of the A and D types above. Conversation A, for example, would have a more formal Greeting (e.g., Good afternoon.), Opening remark (e.g., It's nice to meet you.), and Closing remark (e.g., It was nice to meet you.). Conversation D would be more casual using language like 'Hey.', 'How's it going?' and 'See you later.'

In addition, this description of genre-like patterns (in terms Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) called *speech acts* (e.g., Greeting, Parting) allows us the added pedagogical benefit of introducing relevant adjacency pairs to our learners. For instance, Speaker A says, 'Nice to meet you.' and Speaker B replies, 'Nice to meet you, too.'

As well as the formality/informality-stranger/non-stranger dimensions relevance to language, they are also useful for clarifying appropriate topics for the Body. That is, while discussions of sensitive topics like religion and financial concerns would be suitable for conversations of the D-type but not the A-type, less sensitive topics like the news or weather would be appropriate for A-type conversations but less so for those of the D-type.

At the last level of this language analysis scheme, vocabulary and grammar, the specification of appropriate topics for different types of conversations would allow the teacher to introduce vocabulary relevant to a given topic (e.g., sports-related vocabulary), appropriate functions and grammar. Lexical chunks might be taught for introducing a topic when having a conversation with a stranger (e.g., Could you tell me what you think about ____?), and grammar could be introduced to support the accurate construction of the entire sentence (e.g., Could you tell me what you think about + noun phrase).

As was mentioned above, one important difference between interactional conversations and transactional ones is that the latter tend to have more strictly defined communicative purposes which lead to more rigidly structured patterns of discourse. That is, a conversation in which the purpose is to report an emergency by calling 911 is more likely to exhibit regularities than a verbal social interaction intended to further interpersonal relations. While it may not be possible to completely identify the structure of a given transactional conversation, there often are certain regularities that would constitute part of a genre that can be profitably included in a syllabus. As an example of the process of determining these regularities, let us take a communicative event that was revealed to be quite important by the needs analysis: talking to landlords about housing problems.

Genre (partial)

1. Complaint
2. Apology
3. Justification

This series of speech acts for complaining, which was described by Coulthard (1996), provides the course designer with a useful pattern to draw learners' attention to when teaching the above communicative event.

At the level of the individual speech act, certain commonly occurring lexis, vocabulary and grammatical structures can be highlighted. For example, when making a complaint about a housing problem, the learner would need vocabulary related to the house (e.g., light, furnace, water heater and so on), lexical chunks to perform the complaining function (e.g., I'm having some trouble with _____., My _____ isn't/aren't working.) and grammatical support (e.g., My + noun phrase + isn't/aren't working.)

Other Communicative Features

Thus far our investigation of the TS communicative events has focused on language that the learners require to meet their needs. However, it is also essential to consider the other aspects of the communicative events that have been identified for their effect on successful communication. Of especial importance are *paralinguistic behavior* and the *process* of carrying out relevant communicative events. Paralinguistic concerns include proxemics (e.g., distance between interlocutors), body language (e.g., head movement to indicate agreement or interest) and physical communication customs like eye contact and handshaking.

As well as these language-related concerns, it is helpful to familiarize learners with the procedure(s) that certain communicative events entail. For example, one respondent to the needs analysis reported that the difficulties she had in getting telephone service in the U.S. stemmed not from language problems per se, but rather from difficulties understanding the concepts related to getting the service. That is, she understood the words and sentences which were spoken but she couldn't relate them to the concepts involved in getting the telephone service as her L1 country's process of acquiring phone service was quite different from that of the target country. Another respondent wrote of the need for cultural information related to expected and unacceptable behavior when attending parties and eating at restaurants.

Shank and Abelson (1977) use the word "script" to describe the series of steps that inform a well-known activity in a given culture, and Cook (2001, p. 91) writes that when there are differences between the L2 learners' L1-based scripts and those of the L2 TS "the L2 learners will be at a loss." Cook (ibid) goes on to note the importance of the background information supplied by scripts with regard to conversation.

> There is an expected framework of information necessary to the task of booking a ticket. The customer has to supply bits of information to fit this framework. Both participants are combining background knowledge of what goes on in a travel agent's with the specific goal of booking a ticket.

It is important, then, to consider not only the linguistic needs of one's learners, but also the paralinguistic and the cultural.

Means Analysis

The final part of the needs analysis to be considered here is the Means Analysis. This analysis considers the environment in which the course will be held. It is concerned with practical matters like the availability of technology, classroom conditions, class times and duration in relation to learners' needs, the availability and quality of the teaching staff, textbook costs (if there is one) in relation to the learners' income level, and so forth. For example, in this course the cost of a textbook would not be a concern as the learners were reasonably well-off; for other students the situation might be quite different.

Conclusion

The needs analysis process delineated in this paper set out to provide information about what to teach a particular type of ESP learner that is not prominent in the literature. While the results described in this paper are directly applicable only to learners with wants, needs and backgrounds similar to those of the learners described in this paper, it is hoped that the content selection process described in the study will be of help to other teachers who find themselves confronted with the task of choosing appropriate course content for other similarly little-researched groups of learners.

The Author

Don Makarchuk teaches in the Division of Western Languages and Literature at Kyonggi University. He holds a BA in English from the University of Western Ontario, Canada and an MA in TEFL/TESL from the University of Birmingham, U.K. He is currently engaged in doctoral studies in applied linguistics at Macquarie University, Australia. His research interests include second language acquisition, methodology and testing. Email: dmak@kyonggi.ac.kr

References

Austen, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Biber, D., Conrad, S., Reppin, R., Byrd, P., & Helt, M. (2002). Speaking and writing in the university: A multidimensional comparison. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(1), 9-48.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1995). *Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brindley, G. P. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Arnold.

Coulthard, M. (1996). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1999). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

John, A., & Price-Machado, D. (2001). English for specific purposes (ESP): Tailoring courses to students needs – and to the outside world. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1994). *The learner-centred curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2001). Syllabus design. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Richards, J. (1998). *Springboard 1*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schank, R., & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swales, J. (1997). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Underhill, N. (1991). *Focus on studying in Britain*. Hemel Hempstead: Phoenix ELT.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

1. Why are you taking the course?

_____

_____

_____

2. What situations do you think you will use English in?

_____

_____

_____

3. Who are you going to talk to?

_____

_____

_____

4. What do you think will be the most difficult situations with respect to using English?

_____

_____

_____

5. What do you want to be able to do in English when this course is finished?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

*Please Tell Me a Little About Yourself**

Please rank the following answers in order of importance. For example,
most important = 1, second most important = 2, third most important = 3, and so on.

Why do you want to learn English?	**From 1 to 8**
To talk in formal situations (e.g., to a doctor, employer, government official)	_____
To understand the radio or television	_____
To talk informally with native speakers (e.g., a friend, future neighbor, etc.)	_____
To read newspapers	_____
To understand foreign cultures (e.g., American, Canadian, British, etc.)	_____
To do further study in a foreign country	_____
To travel more easily in foreign countries	_____
To write letters and essays	_____

What learning activities do you like best?	**From 1 to 8**
Memorizing grammar rules	_____
Practicing English with other students	_____
Practicing pronunciation by repeating what the teacher says	_____
Learning new words by looking them up in a dictionary	_____
Studying a textbook	_____
Playing language games	_____
Doing role plays	_____
Listening to the teacher lecture and writing the information in your notebook	_____

I have a problem with English because...	**From 1 to 4**
I can't understand native speakers.	_____
I can't say what I want to say.	_____
I can't read very well.	_____
I can't write very well.	_____

When you make a speaking error, how do you want to be corrected?	**From 1 to 4**
Immediately, in front of the whole class.	_____
Later, at the end of the speaking activity, in front of everyone.	_____
Later, in private.	_____
I don't want to be corrected.	_____

In class, how do you like to learn?	**From 1 to 4**
Individually.	_____
In pairs.	_____
In small groups.	_____
In one large group (the whole class together)	_____

*adapted from Nunan, D. (1994)

Appendix C

Living and Communicating in the US

Please rate the following communicative activities according to their level of importance. Use the following scale: 1=very important, 2=important, 3=somewhat important, 4=not very important, 5=not important. Thank you!

Put an X in the appropriate box

	1	2	3	4	5
At the airport (customs, immigration, getting your baggage, etc.)					
Using taxis, buses, the subway and other forms of transportation					
Eating out (restaurants, cafeterias, street vendors, etc.)					
Shopping at supermarkets and small local markets					
Shopping at department stores					
Shopping at convenience stores					
Talking to doctors					
Talking to dentists					
Talking to lawyers					
Talking to other professionals (Which ones? _____)					
Meeting new people for business or academic reasons					
Meeting new people for social reasons (neighbors, parties)					
Having casual conversations with friends					
Having casual conversations with colleagues or business associates					
Talking to government officials (police)					
Talking to government officials (immigration)					
Talking to government officials (getting a driver's license)					
Talking to people about your accommodations (e.g., phone, cable service)					
Talking to bank employees					
Talking to insurance company employees					
Talking to school officials or teachers (e.g., at your children's school)					
Preparing for and taking trips					
Going to movies					
Going to other entertainment facilities (zoo, other _____)					

PLEASE ADD OTHER RELEVANT COMMUNICATIVE ACTIVITIES ON THE BACK

Appendix D

Living and Communicating in the U.S.

Mean Scores of Respondents to the Communicative Events Initially Included in the Rating Form

Please rate the following communicative activities according to their level of importance. Use the following scale: 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = not very important, 5 = not important. Thank you!

	Mean Scores	Rank
At the airport (customs, immigration, claiming your baggage, etc.)	2.0	4
Using taxis, buses, the subway and other forms of transportation	2.5	8
Eating out (restaurants, cafeterias, street vendors, etc.)	2.4	7
Shopping at supermarkets and small local markets	3.1	10
Shopping at department stores	3.4	11
Shopping at convenience stores	3.1	10
Talking to doctors	2.5	8
Talking to dentists	2.5	8
Talking to lawyers	2.6	9
Talking to other professionals (Which ones? _____)	Not scored	
Meeting new people for business or academic reasons	1.8	3
Meeting new people for social reasons (neighbors, parties)	2.3	6
Having casual conversations with friends	1.6	2
Having casual conversations with colleagues or business associates	2.3	6
Talking to government officials (police)	2.3	6
Talking to government officials (immigration)	1.8	3
Talking to government officials (getting a driver's license)	2.1	5
Talking to people about your accommodations (e.g., phone, cable service)	1.6	2
Talking to bank employees	1.5	1
Talking to insurance company employees	1.8	3
Talking to school officials or teachers (e.g., at your children's school)	2.1	5
Preparing for and taking trips	2.6	9
Going to movies	3.9	13
Going to other entertainment facilities (zoo, other _____)	3.6	12

Appendix E

Course Outline Developed from the Needs Analysis

Unit 1 Arriving in the States

Class 1 - Topic 1   Introduction of the course, teacher and students
Class 2 - Topic 2   Arriving at the airport (customs, immigration, baggage concerns)
Class 3 - Topic 3   Using taxis, buses, subway, etc./Eating out
Class 4 - Review 1

Unit 2 Getting Set Up

Class 5 - Topic 1   Meeting new people at the university for academic-related purposes
Class 6 - Topic 2   Having semi-formal conversations related to accommodations (phone, cable service)
Class 7 - Topic 3   Talking to bank employees about accounts and insurance company personnel
Class 8 - Topic 4   Talking to school officials about one's children's education
Class 9 - Review 2

Unit 3 Settling In

Class 10 - Topic 1 Meeting new people for social reasons (neighbors, etc.)
Class 11 - Topic 2 Having casual conversations with one's colleagues- Part 1
Class 12 - Topic 3 Having casual conversations with one's colleagues- Part 2
Class 13 - Topic 4 Talking to government officials (immigration, social security number, driver's license)
Class 14 - Topic 5 Buying a used car and getting insurance
Class 15 - Review 3

Unit 4 Dealing with Problems

Class 16 - Topic 1 Talking to people about your problems-Part 1(housing)
Class 17 - Topic 2 Talking to people about your problems-Part 2 (police, lawyers)
Class 18 - Topic 3 Talking to doctors, dentists
Class 19 - Topic 4 Reporting emergencies using 911
Class 20 - Review 4

Unit 5 Enjoying American Life

Class 21 - Topic 1 Going shopping
Class 22 - Topic 2 Making reservations on the phone
Class 23 - Topic 3 Preparing for and taking trips
Class 24 - Review 5

Institutionalizing Innovation: Better Addressing the ESL Needs of Graduate Students and University Staff

Bill Templer
Lao-American College

Abstract

L2 graduate students and teaching staff need more efficient strategies to empower them as proficient communicators within their discipline's English-dominated "global communities of discourse and practice. " Yet at most universities here in the region, EAP/ESP remains something of a graduate school Cinderella. The paper explores three areas in particular: (1) evolving international paradigms in language revision services on a structured, institutional basis, providing advanced students and university personnel with low-cost access to high-quality editing and vetting of their own academic English writing; (2) exemplary developments in writing centers and online writing labs, coupled with programs for Writing in the Disciplines as an innovatory focus; (3) the imperatives of a better calibrated innovatory battery of learning modalities for ESP geared to the specific needs of university staff and their post-graduate students across a diverse range of spoken and written genres. Some thoughts on the temporal economy of postgraduate EFL and suggestions for applied textographic research on EAP in postgraduate and postdoctoral contexts are also explored.

Introduction

In an age of globalizing science, the Web and the headlong rise of English to near total hegemony as a kind of linguistic "Tyrannosaurus Rex" (Swales, 1997) in most fields, NNSE (non-native speaker of English) graduate students and teaching staff in universities across the planet need more efficient strategies to empower them as proficient communicators within their disciplines' English-dominated "global communities of discourse and practice" (Swales, 1998, pp. 197-201). This is vital to the internationalization of universities, their staff, curricula and research and the building of world-class and regional Centers of Excellence.[1]

Pragmatism, in Korea and elsewhere, would seem to suggest more and more English for Academic Purposes and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) at ever higher levels of instruction and inquiry, including more "content courses," especially at the graduate level, taught in English and new attention to developments in content-based ESL instruction (Kasper, 2000a).

A Graduate School Cinderella

Yet at most universities here in the region, and at many elsewhere in international academe, EAP/ESP remains something of a graduate school Cinderella.[2] Throughout NNSE academe, graduate students and staff members may have not attended formal language classes for many years. Aside from certain notable exceptions, faculty in the disciplines and their postgraduate students often lack advanced ESL training tailored to their changing oral and written research needs, while in-house vetting services for upgrading professional written English texts remain a rarity. Korea is no exception: among the 47 respondents to Gulliver's survey of EFL teachers, only two were employed in Korean graduate schools (2000, p. 62). This paper points to some fruitful paradigms for possible appropriation in East Asian academe and elsewhere.

The New Imperatives of BK 21

In the context of globalization as an emerging priority in Korean higher education and the aims of the ambitious "Brain Korea 21" (*Du-Nwae Han-guk 21*) program launched by the Ministry of Education in 1999, Gulliver (2000, 2001) has stressed the pressing need for a new array of culturally appropriate English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses in Korean universities. Based on an empirical survey of EAP in higher education, he notes a striking shortage of relevant courses at most Korean universities (Gulliver, 2000, pp. 50-55). Among the BK 21 objectives, universities seeking financing through the program are expected inter alia to encourage publication of articles in international academic journals (primarily in English), publication of PhD theses, lectures conducted in a foreign language, increased international collaboration, graduate school students' long term overseas training, participation of professors from abroad in thesis examination, credit exchange programs with foreign universities, and globalization of academic journals in a given field (Gulliver, 2000, p. 15). Indeed, Seoul National University, Korea's most prestigious public university, even aspires to a level where "eventually, all courses will be taught in English," in part to attract foreign students (ibid., p. 16) and reduce Korean students' desires to study abroad. How can such aims be better furthered? What innovations can be adapted and encouraged to spur similar developments in higher education elsewhere in the region?

Blueprinting an Innovation Agenda

In generating an "innovation agenda,"[3] three areas in particular deserve more intensive focus and development: first, language revision services (LRS) should be set up on a structured, institutional basis, providing advanced students and NNSE university personnel with low-cost access to high-quality editing/rewriting mini-centers, preferably staffed by native speakers, either face-to-face or online. Second, TESOL should import new ideas and structures from two evolving initiatives in hands-on academic rhetoric: writing centers & online writing labs (OWLs), coupled with facilitative centers or programs for WAC/WID (Writing across the Curriculum, Writing in the Disciplines). Third, existing ELT centers and English departments should build a better calibrated battery of courses, tutorials and other learning modalities creatively geared to the specific present and projected needs of university staff and their postgraduate students across a diverse range of spoken and written genres, encompassing both formal and informal registers.[4] More secondarily, we need to better assess the temporal economy of postgraduate EFL, responding to its specific pressures and constraints. Finally, it is imperative to expand the base of research focused on the empirical ecology of EAP/ESP among L2 users with specific focus on graduate and post-doctoral contexts and communities of practice.

The Imperatives of Revision and Vetting: Evolving Paradigms

In a highly competitive research world of refereed publications, commonly in English, students and researchers need an in-house university vetting facility staffed by qualified editors with native-language competence. At most institutions, that is still handled on an informal, catch-as-catch-can basis.[5]

Among evolving paradigms in Western Europe, the oldest and best-established FL vetting unit in European academe is the Language Revision Service (since 1983) within the Language Center at the University of Helsinki. The LRS offers university employees, departments and administrative units in-depth revision of texts written in a foreign language at subsidized rates (currently at 5 Euros per page; prior to 2001, such services were offered cost-free to most university employees) to staff and advanced degree candidates; a tandem Language Services Unit provides revision at market rates to outside clientele. The Language Revision Service assesses work across a broad written spectrum, including dissertations, theses, scientific and popular articles, abstracts, oral presentations, conference programs, examination questions, teaching materials, cover letters and letters of recommendation, résumés, departmental www pages, brochures, etc. Revisers, most engaged on a part-time basis, are native speakers of the language concerned, and all of them have their own fields of specialty. As Fullenwider (1993, p. 17) noted nearly a decade ago, "the Revision Service of the

Language Centre will play an increasingly important role among the research support services of the University of Helsinki." Experience at UH has borne this out. Svensson (1998, p. 5) observes that "there is a growing demand for this service, and ideas for expansion have been put forward." The University of Munich has only recently inaugurated a Fremdsprachenservice (accessible online) offering similar academic editing and translation services to university staff at reasonable fees.

Here in Asia, the unit for Language and Educational Development (LED)[6] at the Asian Institute of Technology in Bangkok, Thailand's premier English-medium graduate technical university,[7] has pioneered a multifaceted Writing Services unit. Part of its function is to address the specific vetting needs of graduate students and NNSE staff, offering basic writing analysis, hard-copy and computer editing of manuscripts, final proofreading and even composition services for shorter documents. It also provides writing assessments of dissertations in progress, with detailed recommendations on what is needed to finalize the manuscript. A distinctive feature of LED services is one-to-one consultation as a follow-up to analysis. Revision services are financed in part by fees from certain categories of users, though it no longer provides editing services for Master's theses.[8] Among the diverse EAP writing services offered by the Language Teaching Center at the Central European University (URL: www.ceu.hu/ltc/ltc) in Budapest are cost-free individual consultations for students, faculty and administrative staff.[9] Such vetting services need to network, exchanging ideas, even sharing staff online, both regionally and globally.

Financing Editing Services: New Sources of University Income

In terms of practical financing of such ventures, university personnel and advanced students can be charged reduced rates for vetting & revision, as at the University of Helsinki. Similar income-generating "bespoke" services can also be provided at reasonable commercial rates to individuals, firms and institutions off-campus.[10] Commercial editing services are proliferating on the Internet. Revision mini-centers can appropriate various ideas from an online firm like Agradeabove.com or the state-of-the-art "language globalization" firm, SDL International, specializing in technical translation and "global multilingual content management," though these companies charge high fees for quality work. Academic mini-centers can offer such services in their communities at costs significantly undercutting those of upscale online commercial ventures. In building cyber outreach, the potential market is huge. With publicizing, such an LRS unit based in Europe or Asia could provide virtual services to academic staff and graduate students anywhere in cyberspace, at attractive competitive rates, as well as to interested firms and institutions a mouse click away. There is no reason why an LRS in Korea could not furnish services to interested staff, students and others in Japan, China or elsewhere.

A Thesis Vetting Requirement?

One option in graduate education for science & technology and other "internationalized" disciplines is to introduce an obligatory EL vetting and editing requirement for student theses written in English: all M.A. and PhD theses can be required to pass through an editing advice and review process by a competent EFL professional, perhaps covered by a flat nominal fee. In Korea, this would clearly be in line with the desiderata of BK 21. That charge could in turn help finance such an on-campus ESP editing unit. A system of waivers for deserving students or stipends to finance such editing costs can be devised. This would help ensure "quality control" of the final research write-up. At the Asian Institute of Technology, doctoral dissertation writing assessment is a top priority, its goal to "ensure that external examiners' high standards for doctoral writing are met."[11]

New Angles in Staffing

Problems in staffing can be resolved in part online: as e-learning and e-editing spread, one major plus is that a team of vetters and writing tutors (at many universities in the states, advanced students) can be contracted in part online, and even given e-training specific to editing (Gillespie and Lerner, 2000). On-campus EAP teachers can also be employed part-time in a campus revision service, and qualified writing center directors constitute a new career profile within ESP (Healy, 1995).

Innovating New Writing Centers

To bolster its long-term effectiveness, a Language Revision Services unit can be operated in tandem with a *writing lab* for staff and graduate student needs, online and on-campus. One influential stateside paradigm is the Online Writing Lab (OWL) at Purdue University, a lode of experience and ideas that can be tapped in creating OWLs for EFL abroad, say an adjunct experimental unit attached to an innovative undertaking like the Foreign Language Education Center at Kyongju University or the Language Center at Korea Advanced Institute for Science and Technology. Most work at Purdue's OWL is individualized, writers meet one-to-one with an assigned tutor (see their URL). Such one-on-one tutoring, and the careful mentoring of tutors, is a distinctive feature of writing labs (Harris, 1988).

The International Writing Centers Association maintains the primary website for writing labs (most now both "bricks and mortar" & "wired"), highlighting new departures in rhetoric and offering advice on configuring electronic writing environments (see http://iwca.syr.edu). There are now well over a thousand such centers in North American higher education. The site features a "Writing Center Startup Kit," a "Virtual Writing Center Tour," "Tutor Stories," "E-Mail Discussion

Groups," links to many North American online writing labs & writing-across-the-curriculum centers and to the *Writing Center Journal*, *Writing Lab Newsletter*, *Kairos*, the *Journal of Advanced Composition* and other relevant periodicals. The European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing (EATAW)[12] brings together some 200 writing specialists across European academe, including staff at writing centers for academic German in Bochum, Erfurt and Bielefeld and the EFL Writing Center at the American College of Thessaloniki. In West Asia, the innovative *Bilwrite* unit at Bilkent University in Ankara, Turkey's flagship English-medium university, has pioneered fresh directions in writing for undergrads. The Writing Centre at Sabanci University near Istanbul, a new English-medium institution, offers extensive writing services for both undergrads and graduate students, with workshops, mini-courses and tutorials. It also provides editing consultation for theses.

Tapping Stateside Experience in L2 Writing Programs

North American writing programs and WAC centers are increasingly more involved in teaching L2 writers. In a significant move, the CCCC Committee on Second Language Writing in the United States has recently urged "writing teachers and writing program administrators to recognize the regular presence of second-language writers in writing classes" in American higher education and to "develop instructional and administrative practices … sensitive to their linguistic and cultural needs," pressing the profession to "encourage … researchers of writing to include second-language perspectives in developing theories, designing studies, analyzing data, and discussing implications" (CCCC 2001). This broadened perspective among rhetoric teachers stateside is also reflected in the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, launched in New York in 1992.[13] The insights of stateside L2 teachers can open new vistas for the international field, as reflected in Smoke (1998), Silva & Matsuda (2001) and Kasper (2000a).

WAC and WID Centers

A conjunct initiative in L1/L2 academic rhetoric are specific centers for Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID).[14] Bilwrite has recently launched a separate sub-unit for writing across the curriculum. It is possible that in tandem with Bilwrite, the WAC Center will move toward targeting the needs of graduate students and staff. The Writing Across the Curriculum Center at the University of Wisconsin/Madison provides staff with online tips for "Integrating Writing Into Your Course" and also organizes courses for teachers in the disciplines on developing improved writing strategies in their own classes.[15] Babbitt and Mlynarczyk (2000) detail administrative perspectives on connecting with other departments, including regular "curriculum development workshops" for associated non-ESL faculty. Some such centers offer summer writing seminars for university

faculty as well. EAP bridging with graduate work in students' major fields must be better structured, a priority focus at AIT in Bangkok (now run directly out of the university's separate faculties) and the Central European University over the past decade.

More concerted work in "pairing" between ESL and discipline courses, including "interdisciplinary collaborations" (Kasper 1998) would help to creatively meet some of the evolving needs in Korea. An "EL Teaching Committee" could be established for each faculty or graduate school to monitor EFL/EAP teaching and editing within the graduate program, upgrading and expanding existing facilities and course offerings. In Thailand, the ongoing self-assessment integral to programs at AIT is a good working example, as reflected in the document on "self-assessment" at the AIT website.

Support for Thesis Writing – a Key Imperative

A tried and original model that could be creatively appropriated in East Asian graduate school contexts is the Introduction to Academic Writing at the Language Teaching Centre of the Central European University, a classroom course followed up by regular thesis consultations (see their URL). The LED unit at Asian Institute of Technology conducts an analogous regular classroom course Writing Up Research, accessible online (URL: http://www.ait.ac.th/EL21.htm). The course has some emphasis on "Problem-Based Learning (PBL)," involving learners in an "active, collaborative, student-centered learning process that develops problem-solving and self-educational abilities." The LED website offers fresh angles on integrating writing in English as a Second Language in content courses, such as "Language Across the AIT Curriculum: a Manifesto" (URL: http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/langcom.htm#manifesto). The inventive English Centre at the University of Hong Kong, with one of the region's richest arrays of discipline-specific ESP courses and virtual adjuncts for undergrads, offers a 24-hour course Postgraduate Thesis Writing, now obligatory for all MPhil and PhD students, and an elective follow-up course Writing for Publication (J. Lewkowicz, personal communication, July 23, 2002; see also Allison, Cooley, Lewkowicz, & Nunan, 1999 and Cooley & Lewkowicz, 1997a, 1997b; Nunan, Lewkowicz, & Cooley, 1998).

Cyperspace in Academic Rhetoric

The LED at AIT features an excellent detailed guide on writing "Argumentative Essays," as does the virtual site of the English Centre at University of Hong Kong: the "Writing Machine" for step-by-step online guidance in EAP essay production. The Writing Center at Haverford College, though geared to undergraduate needs, offers links potentially useful to L2 writers in Asia, including the Harvard University "Writing Tools." The Language Teaching Centre at Central European University

maintains a multifaceted Self-Access Page for graduate students and staff, including template models for various text genres, tips on effective oral presentations and three concordancers.[16] And of course, a university webpage is a convenient site for posting EAP course outlines, even sample units.[17] The operative maxim: share what you're doing. Language educators in Korea and the region can readily integrate these cybersites into their own EAP programs, encouraging students to go down more self-directed, individualized paths. Kasper (2000c) explores the possibilities of incorporating the Internet into content-based ESL instruction at all levels.

In-House Materials Exchange: The Need for Networking

Both Hamp-Lyons (2001) and Dudley-Evans (2001) stress that EAP and ESP materials development is dominated by the creation of in-house materials: "most materials ... are prepared by individual teachers for particular situations, and there is not a huge amount of published ESP material" (Dudley-Evans, 2001, p. 135). That is all the more the case in advanced EAP materials for graduate school and use with practicing scientists. Exchange networks should be developed in Korea and East Asia to encourage hard-copy and online sharing of locally developed materials. Eastern Europe has pioneered a resourceful related paradigm: an international European networking scheme for ESP teachers sponsored by the British Council has held several "anti-conferences" focused on info-exchange and intensive teacher contact. There is much useful state-of-the-art discussion at their conference websites, and a handy list of locally produced ESP materials in Eastern Europe and Austria for subjects as diverse as English for Law and English for Electrical Engineering. The 1999 anti-conference in Slovenia published an online list of "Burning Issues" in ESP, as well as an original "ESP Cookery Book" providing concrete guidelines for a range of questions in ESP materials preparation & use and ESP testing.[18]

Graduate EAP Outreach and Consultancy: Two Paradigms

The Asian Institute of Technology has also pioneered "Talkbase," an intensive course on English for Science and Technology that has been exported and adapted as a component of the Swiss-AIT Management Development Program in Vietnam. This is integral to regional outreach at AIT, an initiative worth appropriating elsewhere. Since 1999, the Language Teaching Centre Outreach program at Central European University has been conducting local seminars for academic writing in Russia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, predicated on the thesis that the low academic English level among researchers in many corners of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union "if not combatted, will prevent the countries in the Region from interacting fully in the world academic community, the lingua franca of which is English."[19] Outreach could also be pioneered by new EAP initiatives in Korean higher education, possibly within the armature of the Asian Pacific Education

Exchange Promotion Plan, intended to improve educational co-operation between Korea, China and Japan. Its major goals include internationalizing higher education, enhancing universities' global competitiveness, and increasing the number of lectures conducted in English (Bak 2000, p. 38, cited in Gulliver, 2000, p. 11).

Moving Beyond Writing

Speaking Science: Presentation Skills and Other Competencies

Myers (2000) discusses in depth how to develop field-specific materials for EAP learning that address students' listening and speaking needs. The new English-medium Asian University of Science and Technology in Chonburi, Thailand is developing "tailored" courses stressing such skills as spoken presentations and negotiating within their "Communication Skills for Business and Industry." Presentation skills for advanced students and scholars are an adjunct focus addressed in a practical, user-friendly format by the online course in presentation skills at the University of Hong Kong English Centre.[20] In Korea, the Center for Foreign Language Studies at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies has considerable experience in delivering Language for Specific Purposes geared to the special L2 communicative needs of government officials and other groups.[21] As Svensson (1998, p. 4) observes in Helsinki: "demand is growing for courses such as Professional Writing or Conference English," along with "French for Rectors, English for Directors." Hlavsová (1998) describes an experimental short-course for researchers at the Czech Academy of Sciences stressing enhanced learner autonomy and argumentation skills, utilizing buzz groups and capped by a simulated "mini-conference" that prioritizes oral competence.

Curricular and Extracurricular Innovation

Centers can develop what Hamel (2000: 297-306) calls an "innovation portfolio," experimenting with a mix of modalities, including more elaborated individualized, learner-centered and collaborative approaches, and new applications of interactive dialogue-journal writing in EAP work with postgraduates and staff.[22] Potentially exciting for EAP work at undergrad and graduate levels are some facets of the Fluency First holistic approaches developed at City University of New York, where student journals also play a key role (Mlynarczyk, 1998b), along with heavy doses of extensive reading (Day and Bramford, 1998). We need new ideas in EAP on how massive reading (of literary and other genres) can be spliced into syllabi and graduate students' study habits ("10 pages a day, 7 days a week," Mlynarczyk 1998b, p. 132). Maley (2001) also calls for more extensive reading, plus holistic approaches and hands-on projects[23] at lower levels of EFL under "difficult circumstances" in Asia and Africa; suggestions that can also be productive right on up the instructional ladder.

In proactive extracurricular space, EFL Writing Centers can spark joint bridging projects, such as a monthly departmental graduate student/staff Journal Club for presenting research in progress, or an annual departmental research symposium in English. Advanced students and staff could also be involved in producing a Departmental Newsletter, possibly online, containing book reviews and brief research reports. Student writing contests can be encouraged (as among undergrads at Sabanci University). The English Language Centre at City University of Hong Kong coordinates a battery of English-focused "clubs and informal activities." Intensive week-end and two-week EAP refresher courses (see Hlavsová 1998) for graduate students and interested scientific staff are another option that language centers in the region can explore.

Resource/Self-Access Facilities

As learning individualizes, self-access mini-centers for Foreign Languages for Academic Purposes (FLAP) are springing up across the globe. Prototypes abound. In Korea, the Audio-Visual Education Center at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies is a bellwether uniquely equipped prototype. AIT maintains a Languages Resource Center for postgraduates, the University of Helsinki Language Centre is experimenting with tutored self-study in "Autonomous Learning Modules." The Language Teaching Centre at Central European University is developing a Multimedia Library. In Europe, two of the best resource centers are the Mediathèque at Fribourg University and the highly inventive Selbstlernzentrum at the Leipzig University of Applied Sciences. In Southeast Asia, the self-access Language Resources Center at AIT, the Multimedia Learning Centre at Hong Kong Baptist University and the Self-Access Center attached to the English Language Centre at City University of Hong Kong are topnotch facilities, as is the state-of-the-art Language Resources Center at the University of Hong Kong. New centers in the region can network and synergize, inter alia through the Asia-Pacific Distance and Multimedia Education Network of the Association of Universities of Asia and the Pacific (AUAP) (Srisa-An, 1998).

Discipline-Specific Services and Mini-Centers

The Graduate Faculty of Science at Prince of Songkla University in Hatyai, Thailand has proposed an ESP teaching & editing mini-center to offer tailored courses and vetting for both its staff and advanced students. Kindred LSP mini-centers directly attached to a specific postgraduate or professional school (as at law or medical schools)[24] or a related cluster of departments (such as the Fachsprachenzentrum at the University of Munich) will likely multiply. A large graduate school could develop several such mini teaching and vetting units, discipline-specific, but working in close federation. In the realm of North American writing centers, the University of Washington operates discipline-specific English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP) writing mini-centers for anthropology & geography, business,

engineering, sociology, art history, philosophy and several other fields. The University of Toronto has developed separate writing mini-centers for the health sciences, philosophy and engineering, and a number of its associated colleges. This may herald an expanding trend: writing centers attached to individual departments or divisions. In Germany, a number of universities have Fachsprachenzentren (LSP Centers) that teach courses specifically geared to various departmental specialties: for example, The Technical Language Center at the Univ. of Leipzig offers seven categories of ESAP (English for Specific Academic Purposes) courses, with four subcategories in the humanities (including English for Journalists, English for Theologians) and nine subcategories in English for natural sciences. Korean universities should move toward more ESAP offerings, especially as an adjunct for graduate students**.** Kwangoon University has pioneered courses geared to EAP for students in the social and natural sciences and engineering, Sogang University has developed a course in English for Presenting Research and Seoul National University teaches Legal English (Gulliver, 2000, p. 51) – this is a laudable beginning.

Appropriating the Portfolio in Asian Graduate Education

In new departures for vocational-oriented language learning (VOLL), centers in Korea can tap the experience and new findings of the ongoing Vocational Foreign Language Portfolio project, targeting needs in banking and finance, local administration and tourism, a spin-off of the Council of Europe's European Language Portfolio (ELP).[25] Indeed, the time has come to consider embarking on experimental appropriation of the ELP (now available in many prototypes) and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001; Templer, 2002) in pilot projects for graduate students and staff at universities in Korea, Japan and the region. Given their professional motivation, this group of L2 learners/users represent a focal target group for introducing an appropriate Portfolio in Asia.

The Temporal Economy of Postgraduate EFL

We have to be pragmatic about the added time burden NNSE grad students must struggle with to upgrade their English. Graduate schools at the receiving end of "internationalization" should recognize this added burden formally, instituting master's programs where a full extra semester and summer (maybe more) are devoted exclusively to intensive writing (or other skills) for the students who need it, a kind of graduate preparatory school, as in Pre-Masters term at AIT, entailing work with the "Talkbase" and "Bridging" programs. This is the temporal cost of "globalized" education and science.

A similar double time burden is also shouldered by NNSE teaching staff, especially when they are asked to prepare lectures in English or are writing up research

to advance professionally. Acknowledge this formally as well. Universities can introduce an incentive system where personnel not only take FL courses or consult with writing centers free of charge, but are given paid "time off" to upgrade language skills as part of their contractual hourly load: education ministries in Asia should devise new imaginative systems that credit staff hours spent in ESP short courses, tutorials, self-instructional arrangements and special EFL leaves to improve language skills. They can also be given inducements for time and effort spent in "bridging" between their disciplines and the FLAP program, and can be encouraged to participate in collaborative empirical action research on writing in the disciplines, one of the foci of the June 2003 European Association for Teaching Academic Writing conference.

Research Foci and Desiderata

There has been groundbreaking research on the communicative strategies of L2 writers of scientific articles (Sionis, 1995) and graduate theses (Bunton, 1999; Dong, 1998). In two key papers, Paltridge (1997, 2002) examines L2 strategies in thesis writing, while Cadman (1997) raises important questions about contrasting epistemologies and differing self-concepts among international research students in Australia and how these impact on their approaches to writing a thesis. Belcher & Braine (1995) provide a wide-ranging collection on the research and pedgogy of academic writing in a second language, while Flowerdew's volume (1994) explores the central skill of academic listening. Hamp-Lyons (2001) notes a new interest in research on the EFL skills of NNSE academics, especially in countries such as Hong Kong and Singapore, "and this group's needs are beginning to be addressed (Sengupta, Forey, and Hamp-Lyons, 1999). We can expect this more all-encompassing view of EAP to develop much further before it is exhausted" (p. 130). In a related vein, Flowerdew (1999) provides an empirical survey of Hong Kong academics and their ESL writing practices. Lewkowicz & Cooley (1998) examine the oral needs of graduate students at the Univ. of Hong Kong, stressing that grad students often lack presentation skills, not "micro-skills" (pp. 111-112), also looked at by Lewkowicz (1998). Again in Southeast Asia, McClure (2001) evaluates experience in teaching EAP and research skills to international postgraduates at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. Swales' work has recurrently focused on problems of graduate level EAP, as reflected in Swales and Feak (1994) and Swales, Barks, Ostermann, and Simpson (2001). In a focus on the specific problems of graduate L2 academic writers, Powers and Nelson (1995) present a survey of ESL conferencing services provided by writing centers at 75 graduate schools in the U.S. If Dudley-Evans (2001) is accurate in suggesting that "ESP teachers and researchers can have an increased role as 'genre doctors', advising disciplines and professions on the effectiveness of their communication" (p. 135), then seminal work along the lines explored by Swales (1990), Johns (1997, 2000) and Dudley-Evans (1994; Dudley-Evans & Henderson, 1990; Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998) should spawn more

extended genre-focused investigation in years to come. Moreover, there has been little empirical research of any kind to date on the vetting needs of NNSE academics and their graduate students across a range of discourse communities and ecologies of practice.

Applied Textography: an Action Research Spin-off

One longer-term focus for an EAP/ESP writing lab cum revision center is locally-based inquiry in textography. Combining elements of discourse analysis and ethnography, such textual "ethnography" probes patterns of "text life" and "textways" in specific disciplines in the institutional setting of the university, as pioneered by Swales (1998) in his study of a place discourse community (PDC) at the University of Michigan. An "applied EFL textography" can examine how NNSE staff and students interact with EFL texts, the "genres that orchestrate verbal life" (p. 20) within everyday work and research contexts. Students can be engaged in collaborative "soft" inquiry into their own NL and FL text practices (and interview staff members on theirs), especially in the "networked" environment. Dialogue journals can be specifically utilized by participants in such real research to record and describe their own text behavior, taking cues from the methodology used in ESL classes by Norton (1998). At AIT, for example, postgraduates drafted interview questions to probe "how faculty members collect the information they need for their work and how they communicate with colleagues, with particular attention to their use of information technologies and the role of print versus electronic resources" (Baker & Clayton, 1999).

Over time, applied textography can feed into finer-grained profiling of actual situations of use and user competence, "textual biographies of others in other situations" (Swales 1998, p. 196) — a kind of comparative empirical "ecology" of English as an International Language in given global and local research communities of practice and their workplaces. This was an adjunct focus explored at the June 2002 University of Hong Kong international conference "Knowledge & Discourse: Speculating on Disciplinary Futures."[26] While amplifying more traditional LSP needs analysis,[27] such hard data on communicative practices in science and the professions could also facilitate more accurate country-wide ESP profiling, vital for foreign language language policy and planning. Action research in applied textography should be placed on the regional TESOL agenda for the coming decade. It is doable.

Conclusion

Though the dynamic ecology of academic and general English in much of East Asian society and higher education differs markedly from the situation at many of the paradigms mentioned, especially at English-medium universities, inventive appropriate experimentation in innovating for EAP/ESP in graduate education in the

region will likely become a growing wave of the future under the impress of Anglicization of communication among its scientific and other elites. Prudent innovation to integrate creatively a flexible geometry of advanced EAP/ESAP options should evolve into a top priority in Korean graduate schools over the coming decade, as they tap developments in content-based ESL instruction across the globe. To seek new directions is not to denigrate what exists, but to build on it.

The Author

Bill Templer is a Chicago-born linguist with research interests in EAP, critical applied linguistics, American fiction and post-colonial studies. A widely published translator from German and Hebrew, he is chief English language editor at the Institute for Jewish History, University of Leipzig. He has taught at universities in the U.S., Ireland, Germany, Iran, Nepal, Israel and Bulgaria, and has recently joined the senior humanities staff at Lao-American College in Vientiane. Email: bill_templer@yahoo.com

References

Allison, D., Cooley, L.M., Lewkowicz, J.A., & Nunan, D.C. (1998). Dissertation writing in action: The development of a dissertation writing support program for ESL graduate research students. *English for Specific Purposes*, *19*(2), 199-217.

Babbitt, M. & Mlynarczyk, R.W. (2000). Keys to successful content-based programs: Administrative perspectives. In L.F. Kasper (Ed.), *Content-based college ESL instruction* (pp. 26-47). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bak, G.J. (2000). The plan and strategy of international education cooperation. In Korean Educational Development Institute (S.-P. Bae, Trans.), *New paradigms of international cooperation in education for educational development in the 21st century: A seminar for international affairs officials* (pp. 27-65). Seoul: Ministry of Education.

Baker, T., & Clayton, Ò (1999). *The "research problem": Notes from the information management course in Bangkok*. Retrieved July 16, 2002, from http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/working_papers/Baker-clayton.html

Belcher, D., & Braine, G. (Eds.). (1995). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bickerton, D., & Gotti, Ì. (Eds.). (1998). The innovative role of language centres. *Papers from the 5th CercleS Conference*. Plymouth: CercleS.

Bunton, D. (1999). The use of higher-level metatext in PhD theses. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(supplementary issue), S41-S56.

Cadman, K. (1997). Thesis writing for international students: A question of identity? *English for Specific Purposes*, *16*(1), 3-14.

CCCC Committee on Second Language Writing. (2001). CCCC Statement on second-language writing and writers. *College Composition and Communication*, *52*(4), 669-674.

Cooley, L.M., & Lewkowicz, J.A. (1997a). Developing awareness of the rhetorical and linguistic conventions of writing a thesis in English. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 113-130). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cooley, L.M., & Lewkowicz, J.A. (1997b). Establishing thesis writing workshops for postgraduate research students. In D. Kember, B. Lam, L. Yan, J. Yum & S. Liu (eds.), *Case studies of improving teaching and learning from the Action Learning Project* (pp. 243-250). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Comfort, J. (1995). *Effective presentations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Council of Europe. (2001). Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, R., & Bamford, J. (1998). Extensive reading in the second language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dokova, A. (1998). Learner-centredness and the culture of the medical English classroom. In S. Trendafilova, A. Dokova, I. Merdjanov, E. Georgieva, & I. Ikonomova (Eds.), *Foreign languages for specific purposes* (vol. 1), pp. 66-70.

Dong, Y.-R. (1998). Non-native graduate students thesis/dissertation writing in science: Self reports by students and their advisers from two institutions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *17*(4), 369-390.

Dudley-Evans, T. (1994). Variations in the discourse patterns favoured by different disciplines and their pedagogical implications. In J. Flowerdew, *Academic listening: Research perspectives* (pp. 146-158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dudley-Evans, T. (2001). English for specific purposes. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 131-136). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dudley-Evans, T., & Henderson, W. (1990). The language of economics: The analysis of economics discourse. *ELT Documents 134*. London: Modern English Publications / Macmillan / The British Council.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J.S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flowerdew, J. (1994). *Academic listening: Research perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(2), 123-146.

Fullenwider, H.F. (1993). From the language labyrinth to the heart: From the desk of a language checker. *Universitas Helsingiensis*, *1*, 16-17.

Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2000). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to peer tutoring*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gulliver, T. (2000). *English for academic purposes in Korea: University reform and changing needs*. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Leicester.

Gulliver, T. (2001). EAP in Korea. Working together to meet changing needs. *Korea TESOL Journal*, *4*, 93-118.

Hamel, G. (2000). *Leading the revolution.* Boston: Harvard Business School.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2001). English for academic purposes. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 126-130). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, M. (1982). *Teaching writing: A sourcebook for writing labs*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Harris, M. (1986). *Teaching one-to-one: The writing center conference*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Harris, M. (1988). SLATE (Support for the Learning and Teaching of English) statement: The concept of a writing center. *Proceedings of ICTE 1988*. Retrieved June 15, 2002, from http://iwca.syr.edu

Healy, D. (1995). Writing center directors: An emerging portrait of the profession. *Writing Program Administration*, *18*(3), 26-43.

Hlavsová, J. (1998). The why, what and how of courses for (future) professionals. In S. Trendafilova, A. Dokova, I. Merdjanov, E. Georgieva, & I. Ikonomova (Eds.), *Foreign languages for specific purposes* (vol. 1), pp. 93-97.

Hung, T.T.N. (2002). Corpus linguistics and the language teacher. *ThaiTESOL Bulletin*, *15*(1), 24-33.

Inman, J.A., & Sewell, D.M. (2000). *Taking flight with OWLs: Examining electronic writing center work*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johns, A. (1997). *Text, role and context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johns, A. (Ed.). (2000). *Genre in the classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kasper, L.F. (1998). Meeting ESL students' academic needs through discipline-based instructional programs. In T. Smoke (Ed.), *Adult ESL: Politics, pedagogy and participation in classroom and community programs* (pp. 147-157). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kasper, L.F. (Ed.). (2000a). *Content-based college ESL instruction.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kasper, L.F. (2000b). Content-based college ESL instruction: Theoretical foundations and pedagogical applications. In L.F. Kasper (Ed.), *Content-based college ESL instruction* (pp. 3-25). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kasper, L.F. (2000c). The Internet and content-based college ESL instruction: Reading, writing, and research. In L.F. Kasper (Ed.), *Content-based college ESL instruction* (pp. 183-201). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Khoo, R. (1994). *The practice of LSP*. Singapore: RELC.

Lewkowicz, J.A. (1998). Assessing and teaching advanced oral skills at the graduate level. Paper presented at *American Association of Applied Linguistics Annual Convention*, *Seattle*, *Washington*, *USA*, *March, 1998.*

Lewkowicz, J.A., & Cooley, L.M. (1998). Oral needs and difficulties of graduate students in Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *3*(2), 103-115.

Maley, A. (2001). The teaching of English in difficult circumstances: Who needs a health farm when they're starving? *Humanising Language Teaching*, *3*(6). Retrieved July 17, 2002, from http://www.hltmag.co.uk

McClure, J. (2001). Developing language skills and learner autonomy in international postgraduates. *ELT Journal*, *55*(2), 142-148.

Mlynarczyk, R.W. (1998a). *Conversations of the mind: The uses of journal writing for second-language learners.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mlynarczyk, R.W. (1998b). Fluency first in the ESL classroom: An integrated approach. In T. Smoke (Ed.), *Adult ESL: Politics, pedagogy and participation in classroom and community programs* (pp. 127-146). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mullin, J.A., & Wallace, R. (1994). (Eds.). *Intersections: Theory-practice in the writing center*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Murphy, C., & Law, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Landmark essays on writing centers*. Davis, CA: Hermagoras.

Myers, S.A. (2000). Speaking science: Developing ESL materials for university students in academic disciplines. In L.F. Kasper (Ed.), *Content-based college ESL instruction* (pp. 135-147). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Norton, B. (1998). Using journals in second language research and teaching. In T. Smoke (Ed.), *Adult ESL: Politics, pedagogy and participation in classroom and community programs* (pp. 55-71). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Nunan, D.C., Lewkowicz, J.A., & Cooley, L.M. (1998). Evaluating graduate students' writing. In E. Li & G. James (Eds.), *Testing and evaluation in second language education* (pp. 115-123). Hong Kong: University of Science and Technology Press.

Paltridge, B. (1997). Thesis and dissertation writing: Preparing ESL students for research. *English for Specific Purposes*, *16*(1), 61-70.

Paltridge. B. (2002). Thesis and dissertation writing: An examination of published advice and actual practice. *English for Specific Purposes*, *21*(2), 125-143.

Powell, M. (1996). *Presenting in English*. Hove: LTP.

Powers, J.K., & Nelson, J.V. (1995). Writers and the writing center: A national survey of writing center conferencing at graduate institutions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *4*(2), 113-138.

Raforth, B. (2000). *A tutor's guide: Helping writers one to one*. New York: Heinemann.

Reeves, N., & Wright, C. (1996). *Linguistic auditing: A guide to identifying foreign language communication needs in corporations*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Schmidt, W. (1999). Editing EFL manuscripts with excellence. *KOTESOL Proceedings PAC2, Second Pan-Asian Conference*. Retrieved July 16, 2002 from http://www.kotesol.org

Sengupta, S., Forey, G., & Hamp-Lyons, E. (1999). Supporting effective English communication within the context of teaching and research in a tertiary institute: Developing a genre-model for consciousness-raising. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(supplementary issue), S7-S22.

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P.K. (2001). *On second language writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sionis, C. (1995). Communication strategies in the writing of scientific research articles by non-native users of English. *English for Specific Purposes*, *14*(2), 99-114.

Smoke, T. (Ed.). (1998). *Adult ESL: Politics, pedagogy and participation in classroom and community programs*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Srisa-An, W. (1998). Language teaching: A look into the future. *ThaiTESOL Bulletin*, *11*(2). Retreived from http://www.thaitesol.org/bulletin/1102/110201.html

Svensson, P.F. (1998). Language centre profiles: University of Helsinki Language Centre. *CercleS Bulletin*, *8*, 3-5.

Svensson, P.F. (2001). Going for gold: University of Helsinki Language Centre and the commercial challenge. *CercleS Bulletin*, *13*.

Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J.M. (1997). English as *Tyrannosaurus rex*. *World-wide Englishes*, *16*, 373-382.

Swales, J.M. (1998). *Other voices, other floors: A textography of a small university building*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swales, J.M. (2000). Language for specific purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *20*, 59-76.

Swales, J.M., Barks, D., Ostermann, A.C., & Simpson, R.C. (2001). Between critique and accommodation: Reflections on an EAP course for masters of architecture students. *English for Specific Purposes*, *20*, 439-458.

Swales, J.M.. & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tan, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Corpus studies in language education*. Bangkok: IELE Press.

Templer, B. (2002). The International Language Portfolio: Appropriating a tool for learner empowerment from the Council of Europe. *The English Teacher: An International Journal*, *5*(3), 295-306.

Trendafilova, S., Dokova, A., Merdjanov, I, Georgieva, E., & Ikonomova, I. (Eds.). (1998). *Languages for specific purposes* (2 vols.). Varna: University of Medicine.

Endnotes

1   As envisioned in Japan for example in the programmatic document "Chiba University in the 21st Century," see Chiba Uni. webpage <http://www.chiba-u.ac.jp>.

2   For a recent overview of research on ESP, see Swales (2000) and Dudley-Evans (2001); Hamp-Lyons (2001) provides a concise survey of issues in research on

EAP. For Eastern Europe, especially Bulgaria, a diverse empirical collection is Trendafilova et al. (1998), centering primarily on undergraduate language for specific purposes (LSP); in an Asia-Pacific context, see Khoo (1994). The leading EFL journal in this burgeoning subfield is English for Specific Purposes (1980-), published by Elsevier.

3   Stimulating for such an agenda in EAP/ESP are economist Gary Hamel's "design rules for innovation" (Hamel 2000, pp. 244-275).

4   For more information on Foreign Language for Academic Purposes (FLAP) centers across Europe, see the European Federation of Language Centres in Higher Education (CercleS, <http://www.cercles.org>). . It brings together some 250 language centers across Western and Central Europe, and is committed to an agenda of innovation, cf. Bickerton & Gotti 1998. The Federation publishes biannual conference papers and a regular Bulletin.

5   Schmidt (1999) provides advice for vetters in a Korean academic context, a topic seldom broached in conference presentations or in the professional literature.

6   LED (since 2001) incorporates the former Center for Language and Educational Technology (CLET).

7   Of course, at an English-medium graduate university in an EFL country such as Thailand, the ecology of institutional EAP differs substantially, but innovation there can spur initiatives elsewhere.

8   URL: <http://www.languages.ait.ac.th>.

9   Like AIT, the CEU is also a selective English-medium graduate university, though focusing on the humanities and social sciences and oriented esp. to students from the former Eastern European socialist states.

10   On paid services provided by the Language Services Unit in the UHLC, see Svennson (1998; 2001), and their URL.

11   See URL: <http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/new_services.htm>.

12   URL: <http://www.ku.dk/formidling/eataw>. The EATAW will hold an international conference at CEU in Budapest in June 2003 focusing on tutors and the teaching of academic writing. The program of their June 2001 conference in Groningen, "Teaching Academic Writing Across Europe" is available online.

13   The website features a Second Language Writing Research Forum and abstracts of all JSLW articles.

14   Kasper (2000b, pp. 15-17) provides an instructive overview and analytical distinction between WAC and WID centers. Useful basic studies on Writing Centers are Gillespie & Lerner (2000), Harris (1982; 1986), Mullin & Wallace (1994), Murphy & Law (1995), Raforth (2000); for general guidelines, see esp. Harris (1988); on evolving OWLs, see Inman & Sewell (2000). Of the many recent books on ESL writing, see Ferris & Hedgcock (1998).

15   Also imaginative are the WAC Center at Richmond University, the Campus Writing Program at Indiana University, the University of Missouri Writery (all online), but there are many first-rate initiatives, even at decidedly "unprestigious" campuses across North America.

16   On concordancers and corpus linguistics in language teaching in an East Asian context, see Hung (2002) and Tan (2002).

17   In a Taiwan context, see the innovative webpage of the Dept. of Foreign Languages at Chung Hua University, Hsinchu, the English Centre at the University of Hong Kong or the highly original course outlines for "content-centered" First-Year English Composition in the School of English (BUSOL) at Bilkent University.

18   The 6th conference (Bled, 1999) URL is <http://www.britishcouncil.org/english/eltecs/esp99.htm>. The 7th (Lodz, Sept. 2000) can be accessed at <http://www.anticonference.pdi.net> and 8th conference (St. Petersburg, Oct. 2001) is accessible at <http://spelta.spb.ru/anti-conference>. These anti-confereences are included in the BC ELTECS (English Language Teachers Contact Scheme).

19   See LTC webpage, Outreach Program.

20   On presentation skills, see Comfort (1995) and Powell (1996).

21   As a proto-global trailblazer in Korean academe, HUFS has been a pioneer over several decades in training "creative and independent global citizens" (website HUFS), especially for service in government and business, offering an extraordinary array of Occidental and Oriental languages. Their expertise in English for Occupational Purposes for professionals in Korea is unique.

22   On journal writing in ESL more generally see Mlynarczyk (1998a). LED puts special emphasis on energizing "collaborative self-directed learning."

23   Describing his experience in teacher training in Ghana in the 1960s, Maley notes: "We were able to focus on the students as the main content area: their lives outside school, their interests, their problems … Economic deprivation does not mean that the environment has nothing in it, or that the students are empty shells. Once we began projects, a whole world of interest opened up." Why not new initiatives in collaborative project-based advanced EAP instruction for graduate students?

24   Dokova (1998) reports on a TEMPUS JEP "Languages for Specific Purposes in Medical Universities."

25   URL: <http://www.vflp.net >.

26   See conference program at the EC/HKU website.

27   Fresh angles in needs analysis, centered on corporate ESP but applicable to EAP, are elaborated in Reeves & Wright (1996), where five "audit stages" are described. The questionnaire in Appendix 3 is suggestive for such textographic inquiry. The ELP program at AIT in Bangkok has built up considerable expertise in a "needs-driven" approach, see their "Language across the AIT curriculum: a manifesto," loc. cit.

Short Reports and Summaries

A Profile of an Email-Based Discussion Course and Implications for EFL Teachers

Michael K. Leung
Kanda University of International Studies

Abstract

This paper describes an email based discussion course focusing on topics of professional interest to EFL teachers in Japan. The benefits of email discussion, such as a less inhibited, indirect discussion environment, greater time allowances for the development of ideas and arguments, and improved fluency and organization, are discussed in the description of this course.

Introduction

The purpose of the present paper is to document a topic-based email discussion course conducted at Teachers' College, Columbia University, in Tokyo. The core purpose of this discussion course is to develop analytical and critical thinking skills as applied to current research in classroom-based English foreign and second language teaching. The term "discussion" is used in this particular context to represent an exchange of ideas and opinions through email. The participants in this course read and discussed research papers published in various areas of ESL/EFL as related to their professional interests. Ideas and opinions were exchanged with the ultimate purpose of improvement in classroom teaching and approaches.

Review of Literature

There have been a number of documented uses of email in ESL and EFL learning. Bowman, Boyle, Greenstone, Herndon, and Valente (2000) were involved in a peer

Short Reports & Summaries are excused from the peer-review process.

mentoring email group where, as practicing ESOL teachers, they could discuss controversial or unacknowledged ESOL topics, stimulating critical, constructive discussion. The topics in the current discussion course covered a wide variety of ESOL topics chosen by the participants, from the use of music in EFL to reading comprehension strategies. Some of these topics were directly related to EFL teaching, which the participants could immediately apply to their classrooms, whereas other topics were more theoretically based, but which may have still been interesting and beneficial to consider.

The exchange of personal email between students at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and Taiwan's National Kaohsiung Normal University (Davis and Chang, 1994/1995) resulted in improved writing fluency and organization. Because of the asynchronous response characteristic of email, written responses and arguments can be carefully organized and reviewed before being sent.

Kroonenberg (1994/95) has written about the use of email to write email dialogue journals that are shared between members of a class in a Hong Kong-based international school. The benefits cited include: improved debating skills through email writing, freedom to express ideas that may be more difficult to express vocally, and increased confidence due to the fact that entries can be erased or corrected before submission. For the participants in the current discussion course, criticism is emphasized and email discussion may allow them to be more vocal, as well as allow them the chance to edit their criticisms before they are sent.

Gonglewski, Meloni, and Brant (2001) cite a number of benefits of using email communication. Firstly, email extends learning time and place: there is the freedom to write email in locations other than the classroom, including their home, an Internet café, or a public library. In the course being described here, the discussion session takes place over a two-week period, which is considerably longer than most in-class discussions. Secondly, interactive email discussion can simulate real-world discussion because of its "informal and interactive nature…" but "unlike face-to-face communication, email is in written form and this can serve the language learner well." Thirdly, students can choose the topic and change the direction of the discussion. In the current discussion course, all topics are chosen by the students, discussions are led by the students, and the direction of each discussion is not fixed; this promotes student-centred language learning. Finally, examples of other studies are cited where computer-mediated communication increased total class participation to 100% and that students who are "reticent to speak in face-to-face contexts are more willing to participate in the electronic context" (Beauvois, 1995; González-Bueno, 1998; Warschauer, 1995; all cited in Gonglewski, Meloni, and Brant, 2001).

Description of the Discussion Course

Participants

The discussion group described here consisted of eight full-time, professionally-qualified EFL teachers working in junior high and high schools, universities, and conversation schools in Japan; simultaneously, they were part-time graduate students studying at Teachers' College Columbia University in Tokyo, who had chosen this course as an option towards an M.A. degree in TESOL. The focus of this course is on "reading and critically discussing on-line many of the issues raised by the assigned and/or chosen readings" (Teachers' College Columbia University Tokyo, 2000). In the current cohort, all but one of the participants were native Japanese speakers.

The instructor of the course acted as a guide for the participants. He monitored the discussions, offering feedback and other comments as necessary. However, this was kept to a minimum in order to encourage the participants to develop autonomy in the leading of and participation in the discussions.

The Discussion

This course was originally conducted on a face-to-face basis, with a period of online written discussion through email, but has evolved to the present state of being conducted almost entirely through email. The full duration of the course was approximately 16 weeks.

At the beginning and end of the course, the instructor and participants met face-to-face for personal introductions and choosing topics, and concluding the course, respectively. All other discussions and interaction throughout the course were conducted through email. Each participant in this course chose one referenced research article from peer-reviewed journals in the areas of EFL and ESL, chosen according to their professional interests. These articles acted as the basis for discussion throughout the course. Each "virtual" discussion session spanned two weeks, led by the participant who had chosen the article.

To begin the session, each participant was required to read the article and subsequently respond to one or two discussion questions posed by the leader of the discussion through email. Participants were expected to critically discuss an article with the purpose of evaluating the usefulness of a given method of teaching. The email based discussion continued until the end of the first week, at which time each participant would submit to the instructor and to all other participants a 500-word summary/critique, summarizing the article and some of the main issues raised during the discussion, and critically analyzing the article. This summary/critique

could be included in the body of an email message, or as an attachment. For the second week, after everyone had read each other's summary/critiques, the discussion continued.

At the end of the two-week period, the discussion leader provided a summary and closing email. The next day, the next discussion session began with a new article, a new topic, and a new discussion leader. This cycle repeated itself for the duration of the course, covering a different topic and article every two weeks.

Topics Discussed

A total of eight research articles from education journals were discussed in turn over the 16-week span of the current cohort, each occupying a two-week period, chosen by the participants, reflecting their professional interest areas. The topics covered a variety of areas: (1) pop music and EFL classrooms; (2) learning styles of Japanese participants; (3) communicative reading and writing; (4) distance team teaching and computers; (5) whole language in TESOL; (6) reading comprehension strategies of Japanese ESL participants; (7) graphic representation and literature; and (8) letter-writing.

Participant Opinions on the Course and Conclusion

At the end of the 16-week course, when all eight articles had been discussed in turn, the participants met with the instructor in a final face-to-face summary and course feedback session. A review of the EFL/ESL articles discussed and any changes in classroom teaching practices that had resulted indirectly from these discussions was talked about (all participants had continued to teach at their regular jobs throughout this course). Some participants, for example, had taken ideas from the article on the use of music and had tried it in their classrooms to some success. As another example, after having discussed the article on whole language, some teachers had begun to think of how to teach the junior high school English curriculum using the whole language approach.

Opinions on the use of email in topic-based discussion were also expressed. Some found it more difficult at times to participate in written "discussion" than in verbal discussion, to which they were more accustomed, because verbal discussion was more interactive and turn-taking is more clearly defined in face-to-face interaction. One of the inherent disadvantages to email is the characteristic of asynchronicity: the timing between an opinion being expressed and subsequently being responded to unavoidably involves a time delay, which varies according to how often a given

discussion participant responds to email. To this point, perhaps real-time Internet messaging ("chatting") or video-conferencing would be more appropriate.

Some participants stated that email-based discussion afforded them the time and psychological space to critically examine one another's arguments on a given topic because of the absence of face-to-face, real-time interaction and the inherent pressure to provide more immediate, spontaneous responses. Less-inhibited expression, debating skills, and critical thinking skills through email writing was also reported by Kroonenberg (1994/95). As in the case of Bowman et al. (2000), the participants in the current discussion course were practicing ESOL teachers, engaged in topics they had chosen and had a vested interest in, thus stimulating critical, constructive discussion.

Most participants expressed satisfaction in the course because they were able to discuss a variety of topics over a period of time, which allowed them to think about a topic, carefully construct their opinions, gain new insights on that topic from others, reflect on their own ideas relating to that topic, and perhaps alter their opinions about that topic. Typical classroom-based discussions may be limited to the duration of a given lesson and the time allotted, for example, 30 minutes, whereas the discussion sessions in this course took place over a period two weeks. This permitted the participants the time to think carefully about questions posed or opinions expressed before responding. In addition to this, they had opportunities to repeatedly refer back to the article being discussed to review the ideas presented in the article, including the terminology and/or methodology of a given teaching method. On the topic of learning styles of Japanese participants, for example, over the two-week discussion period, it would be feasible for a participant to find related references and background reading to help her/him to understand and/or review various learning styles, and henceforth to be able to more deeply discuss the topic using the proper terminology; this was similar to the improvement in fluency and organization that Davis and Chang (1994/95) reported.

Although email based discussion lacks face-to-face interaction, lacks clearly-defined turn-taking, and has response time delays, the benefits include allowing the discussion participants to take part in written, critical discussion with their peers regardless of time and place — it allowed them adequate time to clearly form and express their opinions in a less-inhibited environment on various self-chosen topics in EFL teaching in Japan.

For any EFL or ESL teacher, it is beneficial to continuously evaluate their teaching ideas and methods, as well as constantly explore new ones. Critically discussing these ideas and methods with fellow practitioners in an uninhibited environment such as email-based discussion that is accessible regardless of time and place would be feasible, practical, and beneficial for many classroom teachers.

The course discussed in this paper used email as a medium. An increasingly popular medium for opinion exchange is Internet message boards, where messages related to a given topic are accumulated and displayed in chronological discussion order; this allows participants to view a discussion in its entirety. This medium can also support a number of discussion topics simultaneously. Future research can be conducted in this area to determine whether there are benefits beyond those found in email-based discussion.

The Author

Michael Leung has taught English at various junior and senior high schools in eastern Japan. He is currently a Lecturer in the English Department at Kanda University of International Studies in Chiba, Japan.

References

Bowman, I., Boyle, B.A., Greenstone, K.A., Herndon, L.D., & Valente, A. (2000). Connecting teachers across continents through on-line reflection and sharing. *TESOL Journal*, *9*, 15-18.

Davis, B.H., & Chang, Y. (1994/95). Long-distance collaboration with on-line conferencing. *TESOL Journal*, *4*(2), 28-31.

Gonglewski, M., Meloni, C., & Brant, J. (2001). Using e-mail in foreign language teaching: Rationale and suggestions. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *7*(3). Retrieved March, 2001, from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Meloni-Email.html

Kroonenberg, N. (1994/95). Developing communicative and thinking skills via electronic mail. *TESOL Journal*, *4*(2), 24-27.

Teachers' College Columbia University, Tokyo. (2000). *Course Descriptions*, Spring 2000.

Reviews

Books

Reviews

Software

The Korea TESOL Journal welcomes evaluative reviews of publications relevant to the field of TESOL. In addition to professional books, classroom texts, and reference materials, these include non-print materials such as computer software and audio, video, and testing materials.

Edited by DAVID E. SHAFFER
Chosun University

Teaching English as an International Language

Sandra Lee McKay.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
Pp. 150. (ISBN 0 19 437 364 9)

Reviewed by Michael Duffy

With the number of users projected to grow from 235 million to 462 million worldwide over the next 50 years, English is no longer the sole property of those people for whom it is a native language. More and more, it is used between members of different language communities and cultures both within and across national boundaries. This is the author's understanding of "English as an International Language" (EIL).

Kachru (1989) used the term "Inner Circle" for the countries that have English as their first language (e.g., the UK, the US, Australia). This group, he proposed, is surrounded by two more concentric circles: the "Outer Circle," the 70-plus countries, which use English as a second language or *lingua franca* (e.g., India, the Philippines, Singapore), and the "Expanding Circle," countries where it is widely studied as a foreign language (e.g., Germany, China, Korea) and often used as a default language among speakers of different first languages.

The wide diffusion of English in conjunction with its de-linking from any particular culture hold important implications, the author believes, for the way English is used and taught. The main target of this book is what she terms "the native speaker fallacy" (p. 44), the twin notions that all users should aspire to a common "native speaker" standard and that learners should aim at native speaker (NS) competence. With 80% of the English teachers in the world being (non-native speaker) NNS bilinguals, such attitudes are inappropriate and counterproductive, she argues.

The abandonment of NS norms in lexis, grammar, and phonology carries obvious risks, and teachers may look for guidance as to what constitutes a serious enough departure from Standard English to warrant correction in class. Chapter 5, "Standards for English as an international language," addresses this question, but without coming down firmly on one side or the other. Indeed, at one point, the author seems to this reviewer to come down on both sides at once:

 . . . those who support the promotion of Standard English argue that if consistent standards are not upheld, there will be a loss of intelligibility

among speakers of English. Others argue that this possibility is unlikely due to the fact that many . . . acquire the language in a formal educational context where standards of use are promoted. (p. 78)

Since English is not these days part and parcel of any particular culture in the way that Korean is, for example, the question arises as to what kind of cultural content, if any, should be included in English education. Should materials contain information about the local culture, or should they serve to introduce a "target" culture? The author argues for "establishing a sphere of interculturality" (Kramsch, 1993), that is, understanding one's own culture in relation to that of an Inner Circle country. It is questionable whether some of the conclusions arrived at add much to what an aware teacher would know intuitively:

" . . . a difficult question is to define the parameters of global as opposed to local lexical knowledge . . . the more locally used the lexical item, and the lower its frequency, the less likely it will be needed for EIL." (p. 86)

Of most potential interest to English teachers will be Chapter 5, which deals with teaching methods for EIL. In Outer and Expanding Circle countries, English will be taught both by native speaker and local bilingual teachers. The author argues that, just as bilingual users of English do not need to follow an Inner Circle (NS) model of English, local teachers do not have to follow Inner Circle models of pedagogy, since each country has its own "culture of learning." More specifically, the "BANA" (Britain-Australia-North America) communicative language teaching (CLT) model, even though it has recently been adopted by the Japanese and Korean governments, need not be universally followed.

There are both theoretical and practical objections to the use of CLT in countries where it is incongruent with the local "culture of learning" (Cortazzi and Jin, 1996). Chinese university teachers and Korean secondary teachers generally felt it would be an inappropriate model to follow for their students. In Korea, difficulties would arise from the low proficiency of students and teachers' lack of confidence as well as from the educational system (Li, 1998). However, it would have been interesting for the book to address the position of the NS teacher in Expanding Circle countries like Korea. Whatever teaching methods are used, they have to be informed by the teacher's "sense of plausibility," or intuition about what teaching should be (Prabhu, 1990), something which will inevitably be shaped by the teacher's own culture of learning. Should NS teachers try to conform to the local culture of learning, or on the contrary, should they import and impose their own culture? At least one experienced teacher in Korea (Voorhees, 1991) has argued very forcibly in favor of the latter position. McKay reports two interesting case studies, one from Vietnam, where college students preferred to turn a textbook pair-work exercise into a whole class activity, and another from Pakistan, where a teacher found her attempts to introduce communicative methods flatly rejected by her students. One may speculate that the

students in these cases may have a different sense of what is plausible for a local and a foreign teacher, and that the outcomes may have been different had the teachers been native speakers.

Both NS and NNS teachers should find something in the book to appeal to them. The former will find a useful reminder that CLT, as Maley (2000) put it, is a "one-size theory that does not fit all," and the latter may find reassurance in the author's view that locally developed approaches to teaching have their own value. One may have wished for some proposals as to how local and imported approaches may be reconciled and merged. And with the establishment of a center in Hanoi by the Hyderabad-based Central Institute for English and Foreign Languages (Rai, 2001), McKay's thesis that English has passed away from the ownership of the Inner Circle would seem to be an idea whose time has come, at least in Asia.

The Reviewer

Michael Duffy has taught English in the UK and Hong Kong, and has been in Korea since 1988. He has held a number of positions in Korea TESOL, including four years as president of its Busan Chapter. He is currently a professor at Dong-A University, Busan. Email: duffy@mail.donga.ac.kr

References

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B.B. (1989). Teaching world Englishes. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(1), 85-95.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context in culture and language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(4), 677-703.

Maley, A. (2000, September 21-27). One-size theory that doesn't fit all. *Learning English Supplement to The Guardian Weekly*, p. 1.

Prabhu, N.S. (1990). There is no best method – Why? *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*(2), 161-76.

Rai, U. (2001, October 25). Indian English ready for export. Education supplement to *The Guardian*. Retrieved June 10, 2002, from http://education.guardian.co.uk/Print/0,3858,4284174,00.html

Voorhees, D. (1991). A defense of cultural imperialism as a pedagogic tool. Paper presented at the AETK National Conference, Pusan National University, Busan, Korea.

Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (3rd ed.)

Marianne Celce-Murcia (Ed.).
Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 2001.
Pp. viii + 584. (ISBN: 0-8384-1992-5 Paperback)

Reviewed by Kirsten B. Reitan

Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language, edited by Marianne Celce-Murcia, recently came out in its third edition. I was quite pleased to review this book, as I am in the rather unique position to have used the first *and* second editions as textbooks in TESL methods classes. The first edition of this book came out in 1979 and addressed many EFL/ESL issues of the time. The second edition, which appeared in 1991, was a complete overhaul of the previous edition, with entirely new topics, new chapters, and new contributing authors. The third edition, likewise, is substantially changed from the second edition. Though many of the authors remain the same, the material has been updated, and it reflects the issues and methods in use in the 21st century.

The third edition has been expanded to include 36 articles and 40 contributors. The five major focus areas/units in the book are Teaching Methodology, Language Skills, Integrated Approaches, Focus on the Learner, and Skills for Teachers. As this book is clearly designed to be used as a textbook in a class with pre-service and new teachers, the review is made with this in mind.

The Teaching Methodology unit includes five articles, specifically geared to new teachers. Each article gives a brief overview or summary. Leading off is an article by Marianne Celce-Murcia giving an overview of nine teaching approaches in the 20th century. The four following articles each have a specific focus area: communicative language teaching (Savignon), syllabus design (Nunan), ESP (Johns and Price-Machado), and guidelines for classroom instruction (Crookes and Chaudron). In particular, I like Nunan's article for its excellent overview of the different types of syllabi. All in all, I feel this section is a decent primer on some important methodological issues. Further reading will be required for the new teacher who wants a thorough understanding of teaching approaches and ESP (English for Specific Purposes).

Unit 2, Language Skills, which is by far the longest unit in the book, has fourteen articles focusing on six major skills areas: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Grammar, and Vocabulary. The two articles on Listening (Morley, Peterson)

are a nice, comprehensive balance of theory and practice. These two articles alone would provide new teachers with a solid base for teaching a listening class or incorporating listening into a four-skills class. The Speaking section actually covers three different aspects of teaching speaking: teaching oral skills (Lazaraton), teaching pronunciation (Goodwin), and teaching children speaking and listening (Peck). Both Peck's and Lazaraton's articles cover a wide variety of activities a teacher can use in the classroom. However, it is Goodwin's article that I found particularly useful to the practicing teacher. Not only does it cover all the areas of pronunciation (segmentals, stress, intonation, etc.) a teacher should consider teaching, it also addresses how to teach it in a communicative context. The articles in the reading section (Ediger, Weinstein, Grabe and Stoller) and in the writing section (Olshtain, Kroll, Frodesen) are good foundation pieces, but would need to be supplemented with additional readings. Finally, the last section in this unit looks at grammar and vocabulary together. All three articles in this section reflect recent research and a shift away from a more traditional view of grammar and vocabulary teaching. The two articles on teaching grammar, by Diane Larsen-Freeman and Sandra Fotos, advocate more meaningful, inductive, and cognitive-based approaches to grammar teaching. Finally, the vocabulary article by Jeanette S. Decarrico looks at current issues, various learning strategies, and the implications of corpus studies. Overall, Unit 2 gives the new teacher some necessary tools for practice and food for thought in developing a teaching philosophy.

Unit 3, though perhaps not essential to the new teacher, examines Integrated Approaches to teaching. Articles introduce content-based and immersion models (Snow), literature as content (McKay), experiential and negotiated language learning (Eyring), and bilingual approaches (McGroarty). I particularly found "Literature as Content in ESL/EFL" and "Bilingual Approaches to Language Learning" informative. Unit 4, Focus on the Learner, is perhaps far more essential to the new teacher. Though there are articles for both teachers of children (Hawkins) and adults (Hilles and Sutton) in this section, they are definitely more geared towards ESL contexts than EFL contexts. The only article in this section that has applicability to both contexts is Rebecca Oxford's article on "Language Learning Styles and Strategies." Oxford manages to whet the appetite, but to satisfy your knowledge on learning strategies you will need to read her learning strategies book (Oxford, 1990).

The final unit, which is also perhaps the most practical, is called Skills for Teachers. It covers a wide range of practical subjects from lesson planning (Jensen) and textbook evaluation (Byrd) to the use of media (Brinton) and computers (Sokolik) in the classroom. And, of course, what methods and materials book would be complete without an article on assessment (Cohen). However, the strong points in this unit are its articles on teacher development and on intercultural considerations. Teacher development articles focus on reflective teaching (Murphy), action research (Bailey), and keeping up to date (Crandall). Crandall's "Keeping Up to Date as an ESL or EFL Professional" includes a list of publications, professional organizations, and websites.

Bailey's "Action Research, Teacher Research, and Classroom Research in Language Teaching" explains what they are and how research can benefit the teacher. Though for a full understanding of how to conduct action research, the reader would need to also read Allwright and Bailey (1991) or one of the many other books now available on the subject. Finally, this section includes two articles that focus on intercultural considerations. Eli Hinkel's "Building Awareness and Practical Skills to Facilitate Cross-Cultural Communication" gives the reader plenty of food for thought on why the teacher needs to develop cultural competence in themselves and their students. It is nice to see a methods book that includes an article on this very important issue. The other article considers issues involved with being a non-native teacher (Medgyes). Since most of the ELT teachers in this world are non-native speakers, it is refreshing to see the inclusion of this topic. I particularly appreciate Medgyes's positive view of non-native teachers and the six strengths that non-native speaking teachers have to offer their students.

At 584 pages, this book is too long to use in a single methods course. It also cannot provide the depth needed by a new teacher in many of the areas covered. However, it provides a great overview of many issues in TESL/TEFL and is a very effective introductory text. Also, its articles are in-line with current research and practices in ELT. I would definitely recommend *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* as a primary text in a methods course or as a handbook/reference book for the practicing teacher.

The Reviewer

Kirsten Reitan teaches English at Kyung Hee University in Suwon, Gyeonggi Province. She holds M.Ed. degrees in English Education and TESOL, both from SUNY-Buffalo. Over the last five years, she has served Korea TESOL in various chapter and national offices. Currently, she is International Affairs Committee Chair. Email: kotesolkirsten@yahoo.com

References

Allwright, R.L., & Bailey, K.M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd ed.)

Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Pp. ix + 270. (ISBN 0-521-00843-3)

Reviewed by Trevor H. Gulliver

Introduction to the Second Edition

The first edition of Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 1986) is annoyingly thin. I do not mean that it is particularly insufficient or lacking. It is just that it continually gets lost in that growing stretch of blue on my bookshelf that is made up of books from the Cambridge Language Teaching Library – a bad habit for such an essential book.

Upon first inspection of the second edition of "one of the most widely referred to books on teaching methods" (p. vii), I was happy to see that Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (AMLT) has attained some mass. Over half of the material in this extensive revision of the first edition is new. The thousands of students of TESOL who use this book as an introduction to or a refresher on the more significant language teaching methods and approaches that have sprouted in the last 60 years will be able to find the book when it is needed.

When they find it, they will find that it: (1) has been reorganized; (2) contains several new chapters on language teaching methods which have grown in importance since the first edition was written; (3) has had some chapters cut short, as the authors believe that some methods, no longer being used, do not require the same amount of coverage; (4) has updated lists of references for most chapters; and (5) speaks in the same objective, dry tone as the first edition. The second edition is not just an expanded version of the first; it is a reorganized and reprioritized update of the first edition.

What's New in the Second Edition?

If you already have the first edition on your bookshelf, do you really want to spend more for the second edition? For any reader who wants to stay up to date on methods and made good use of the first edition, the answer to this question will be yes.

How the Text Is Organized

The first edition of AMLT began with a brief history of language teaching, followed by a chapter that worked to define the terms used in the book, and then covered the major approaches or methods from this century in what amounted to an overlapping but chronological order. The less well-known approaches followed.

The second edition is divided into three parts. The first part, "Major Language Trends in Twentieth Century Language Teaching," remains relatively untouched and includes the same brief history of language teaching, the definition of terms, and chapters on "The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching" (chapter 3) and "The Audiolingual Method" (chapter 4). Readers seeking a more historical perspective on language teaching methodology could look at Howatt (1984) for an excellent presentation.

Part II is titled "Alternative Approaches and Methods." The approaches and methods described in this section have enjoyed some support but have never been used widely enough to be considered mainstream. They have however been provocative enough to be commonly referred to in courses on methods and approaches. These methods include most of those that appeared in the last half of the first edition including "Total Physical Response" (chapter 5), "The Silent Way" (chapter 6), "Community Language Learning" (chapter 7), and "Suggestopedia" (chapter 8). In this edition, these chapters have been given "a shorter treatment" than was given in the first edition. Several new chapters on more recently proposed methods also appear in this section (see below).

Part III is titled "Current Communicative Approaches" and includes two barely touched chapters from the first edition. The chapters on "Communicative Language Teaching" (chapter 14) and "The Natural Approach" (chapter 15) have had their references updated and a few minor changes. There are four new chapters in this section as well (see below).

New Chapters

New to this edition are chapters on several "alternative methods" – methods that have not met with a great deal of support or acceptance (and perhaps never will) – including "Whole Language" (chapter 10), "Neurolinguistic Programming" (chapter 11), "The Lexical Approach" (chapter 12), and "Competency-Based Language Teaching" (Chapter 13). As was the case with the chapters on alternative methods in the first edition, I find myself inspired by reading about these methods but do not, for the most part, come away with a clear idea of how they would look in the field. I might recognize a teacher of Suggestopedia if she bit me, but I certainly

may be missing the more subtle ways Suggestopedia has influenced mainstream language teaching, if it has influenced it at all.

New chapters that many readers of the first edition have been anticipating appear in Part III. These include chapters on "Cooperative Language Learning" (chapter 16), "Content-Based Instruction" (chapter 17), and, judging from the buzz at the local conferences, the chapter that will probably be of most interest to practicing teachers and students of TESOL today, "Task-Based Language Teaching" (chapter 18).

One interesting change in the second edition, reflecting shifts of more significance than the birth or death of this or that method, was the replacement of the final chapter of the first edition "Comparing and Evaluating Methods: Some Suggestions" (chapter 11, 1st ed.) with a new chapter titled "The Post-Methods Era" (chapter 19, 2nd ed.). While, in the first edition, the authors concluded by bemoaning the lack of systematically gathered data on the effectiveness of various teaching methods, in the second edition they discuss the relatively short shelf-life of methods and the criticisms leveled against the very notion of methods in the 1990s. This change is significant in that it reflects a questioning of the value of studying methods, never mind the value of training teachers in their application. The authors, needless to say, still see value in the enterprise.

What's Not So New in the Second Edition
Descriptions of the Methods

The 16 methods that are given their own chapter in AMLT are presented in the same descriptive framework. While the repeated use of this "framework" makes the book seem almost formulaic or mechanical, users of AMLT will appreciate the ease with which information on different methods can be looked up. This framework explicates several "levels of conceptualization and organization" that make up a method.

Each chapter begins with some background information on the method, introducing readers to key figures behind the methods, social or historical factors that spurred its development, and broader education trends from which the method drew inspiration.

The methods are then analyzed in terms of their "approach," which the authors describe as referring "to theories about the nature of language and language learning that serve as the source of practices and principles in language teaching" (p. 20).

"Design," the next level of method analysis, is a bit harder to grasp. The authors describe design as:

… the level of method analysis in which we consider (a) what the objectives of a method are; (b) how language content is selected and organized within the method, that is, the syllabus model the method incorporates; (c) the types of learning tasks and teaching activities the method advocates; (d) the roles of learners; (e) the roles of teachers; and (f) the role of instructional materials. (p. 24)

This seems to be a bit of a catch-all for how the theories of a method could be spelled out in the classroom, or, with some of the methods that originated elsewhere, how the theories might look when applied to the field of language teaching.

The final level of conceptualization is the level of procedure. With the first edition, I was always tempted to flip to this section first, and was usually disappointed. The authors use the term "procedure" to describe "the actual moment-to-moment techniques, practices, and behaviors that operate in teaching a language according to a particular method" (p. 31). For a teacher who spends more time in the classroom than the library, this section should provide the most tangible introduction to the method, with the rules or ideas behind the method being understood in this context. However, as with the first edition, the sections on procedure for each method in the second edition are too thin to be very effective and usually describe no more than one class or classroom activity. The authors leave the readers wanting more details of how the methods were applied by their proponents; wanting sample pages from classroom students' books no longer in print; and wanting more than one snapshot of one way of doing each of the methods. Unfortunately, what the authors would need to do to satisfy the appetite of teachers who want a teacher's perspective on these methods is far beyond the scope of this book.

Weaknesses of the Book

The structure of each chapter, described above, makes it more appropriate for readers who are prepared to begin from a more theoretical perspective and learn how the theory has been applied in various classrooms. Language teachers well versed in linguistic or learning theory might not be put off by this approach to teacher training. On the other hand, language teachers who have more experience in the classroom and less knowledge of language learning theory might prefer the second edition of "Techniques and Principle in Language Teaching" by Diane Larsen-Freeman (2000). Freeman introduces the methods from the opposite direction, beginning with an "experience" and then using that experience to illustrate some techniques and principles of the method being studied.

For language teachers who want a soft introduction to approaches and methods, Freeman's book might be a better first choice. Richards and Rodgers, however, give fuller coverage to some of the newer approaches. For example, Freeman devotes 22

pages to "Content-based, Task-based, and Participatory Approaches" (chapter 10), while Richards and Rodgers devote 19 pages to "Content-based Instruction" (chapter 17) and 21 pages to "Task-Based Language Teaching" (chapter 18).

A final word of caution: Richards and Rodgers (2001) may be essential reading and a very worthwhile addition to you personal library, it is not, however, likely to be a book that you "just cannot seem to put down." It is dry. This might be explained by the authors desire to inform rather than persuade. Richards and Rodgers write:

> We have avoided personal evaluation, preferring to let the method speak for itself and allow readers to make their own appraisals. … [The book] is designed to give the teacher or teacher trainee a straightforward intro- duction to commonly and less commonly used methods, and a set of criteria by which to critically read, observe, analyze, and question ap- proaches and methods. (p. ix)

The faith Richards and Rodgers place in their readers makes up for the dryness that plagues the book. While there are many places a reader might expect and want to find at least subtle barbs aimed at some of the more "out there" methods or approaches, the authors have restrained themselves admirably.

This is a book that requires an investment of time and energy by its readers, but the investment is one that will pay off. As a refresher on methods and approaches this book is one of the best. While there is no substitute for going to the original source texts, AMLT should be able to point you to many of those source texts as well as to critiques of them. It will also give you a context in which to place those source texts and offer insight into them that will increase their value.

The Reviewer

Trevor H. Gulliver teaches at Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST). His diverse academic interests include the development of English for Academic Purposes in Korea, input-processing theory, conversation analysis, and the sociopolitics of English language teaching. Email: lang2@mail.kaist.ac.kr

References

Howatt, A.P.R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

Ronald Carter and David Nunan (Editors).
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Pp. x + 294. (ISBN 0 521 80516 3 Paperback)

Reviewed by Roxanne Silvaniuk

As many of us do, I made an ambitious list of New Year's resolutions last January. I had decided too that this was going to be the year that I worked on my professional development. My intention was to catch up on the current developments in TESOL research by reading all the relevant journals. However, teaching soon demanded my time, and my professional development resolution moved over to the "to do" list and stayed there until a colleague suggested that I read Carter and Nunan's latest book. Their compilation of the latest research in TESOL goes some way towards writing "accomplished" next to one New Year's resolution.

The Cambridge Guide is composed of thirty chapters ranging from the traditional four skills and grammar to the technological in computer-assisted language learning and on-line communication. There are the expected chapters such as second language acquisition and teacher training alongside more administrative chapters on evaluation and program management. Some chapters focus on the individual learner regarding language-learning strategies and assessment while others focus on the group in classroom interaction and task-based language learning. Some current topics, such as pragmatics and corpus linguistics, have been relegated to brief mentions in other chapters. This is likely due to the fact that this volume is reviewing the field of TESOL research and practice rather than relevant research from peripheral fields of inquiry. Also, the major topic of communicative language teaching was deemed to be better covered in several related chapters than in a chapter of its own.

Why was this book written? To quote Carter and Nunan: "When we planned this book, we wanted to provide an introduction to the field of foreign and second language teaching and learning written by top scholars in the field" (p. 4). While I concur that this book offers an introduction and that it should be in every TESOL resource library, it is not an introductory text in the way that Brown (2000) is. I would consider basic foundation courses on first and second language acquisition and teaching methodology prerequisites in order for undergraduate students to benefit most from this book. The writing is dense with few figures and a glossary limited to selected key terms. As intended, the list of contributors is a who's who in TESOL:

Martin Bygate on speaking, Joy Reid on writing, Thomas Scovel on psycholinguistics, Kathleen Bailey on observation, Leo Van Lier on language awareness, Claire Kramsch on intercultural communication, and the list goes on.

The high caliber of the scholarship is why I recommend this book for those who want to stay current on how TESOL research relates to the classroom. The authors present their topics in a very accessible format. "Similarly, there is the following basic structure to each chapter: **introduction**, **background**, overview of **research**, consideration of the relevance to **classroom practice**, reflection on **current and future trends and directions** and a **conclusion**" (p. 5). Thus, within an average of six or seven pages, it is possible to become current with the latest developments in each of the thirty selected TESOL areas. Another advantage of the book's structure is that one can pick and choose those chapters of interest, as each is self-contained. (If there is some overlap with another topic, it is noted for you.) Also, should you wish to delve further into one of the topics, a concise list of key readings is given at the end of each chapter. For myself, the list of references makes this a must-have book. For those doing research in TESOL, the relevant bibliography is a very useful place to start.

Now, let me tell you what this book is not. Clearly, this book is not intended as a how-to book for teachers as the sections on practice serve to show in general terms how research informs classroom practice. To date, research offers an assortment of interesting insights, indicators, and tantalizing hints of what the future promises. So while we are pointed in possible directions, there are no definitive answers. Admittedly, that is not terribly useful for teachers standing at the chalkface. Nevertheless, as educators we need to be aware of what is happening in our profession because increasingly relevant knowledge is coming to light.

Here is an example of what I mean about the need to stay current. The chapter on grammar is very illuminating as new research is revealing new complexities that affect how we teach grammar. Larsen-Freeman explains the ongoing research on grammar from six very different foci: focus on form, UG-inspired second language acquisition research, sociocultural theory, discourse grammar, corpus linguistics, and connectionism (pp. 37-39). No one has gained dominance and *all* have been sources of pertinent findings in the last decade.

Research on grammar has the potential to help teachers improve what Hymes calls "communicative competence" (p. 36). As teachers, we know that the present-practice-produce approach to grammar does not automatically lead to acquisition and communicative use, which after all, is the point of oral communication. The question remains how can students learn the correct forms without some deductive and/or inductive attention to grammar. When, how often, and in what contexts do we need to teach and recycle grammar points when there are so many other teaching points in the syllabus and so few contact hours? Larsen-Freeman replies that the answer is "controversial" and then goes on to remark that, "It is doubtful that a

single method of dealing with grammar in class would work equally well for all learners" (p. 41). Here is where research coupled with the special knowledge teachers have regarding their particular situations can lead to informed decision-making on how to best meet student needs. As we come to realize that our situations are unique within our different contexts, we must be willing to adapt research and materials instead of accepting the whole package as a given.

How can you get the most out of this book? Although it is possible to dip into only those chapters of interest, I would, however, suggest reading the introduction and postscript first. There are several reasons for this. Even though we largely practice in isolation, what we do forms, and informs, discourse in the larger community. Everything that we do is linked to a larger discourse community, yet due to the pressures of day-to-day teaching, it is easy to lose sight of our interconnectedness. Carter and Nunan briefly discuss how English is evolving to become Englishes, and all the political socio-economic ramifications this has for learners, educators, and communities. Teaching is never value free. Thus, teaching in the pan-Asian community puts us in the forefront of dynamic language change, which in turn means what we have an increased responsibility to best represent the interests and needs of our particular students bodies.

The introduction segues into the postscript written by Jack C. Richards, where he lists nine assumptions that can be gleaned from the readings. After discussing the importance of our individual teaching contexts and the contributions of our students to the learning equation, he ends with a call for professionalism. We can best respond to the challenges of teaching if we know where we are and where we are headed. That is, what is the state of our craft, and where are we in it? Increasingly, the onus is on us to know and use research to justify what we do in the classroom to the various stakeholders, as well as improve our practice.

It is our knowledge of our specific situations and our students as well as pedagogical knowledge that guide the learning outcome. Titling this volume a guide is very apt because it focuses attention on how research can serve as a guide for teachers.

The Reviewer

Roxanne Silvaniuk has a Diploma in Applied Linguistics (major in ESL/EFL) from the University of Victoria, Canada, in addition to a B.A. from the University of Alberta. She is teaching undergraduate conversation and writing classes at Chosun University in South Korea. Her research interests include critical thinking, heuristics, and storytelling. Email: roxannesilvanuik@yahoo.ca

Reference

Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Teaching Culture: Perspectives in Practice

Patrick R. Moran.
Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 2001.
Pp. ix + 175. (ISBN 0-8384-6676-1 Paperback)

Reviewed by Steve Garrigues

For those EFL teachers who want to include cross-cultural materials in their courses, this little book, *Teaching Culture: Perspectives in Practice*, promises to be a welcome addition to their arsenal of resources. *Teaching Culture* is one title in a series of resource publications on second/foreign language teaching called TeacherSource, under the general editorship of Donald Freeman.

The author tells how he first came to grips with the issue of culture and language. As a new college graduate in French he joined the Peace Corps and was sent off to be an English teacher in the Francophone African nation of Côte d'Ivoire. Although French was the common language of communication, he soon realized that all his university studies had prepared him little for his encounter with the French language and culture of Africa. As he explains, "Suddenly, all my studies of France, French history, and French civilization were turned upside down" (p. 2). He later went on to learn Spanish, worked as a teacher of both Spanish and French, and finally took a position in the MAT Program at the School for International Training in Brattleboro, Vermont. This book is the fruit of his years of teaching and learning about culture and language.

One of the strengths of this book is that it addresses the broad issues of culture and language teaching, but it is not confined to English teaching alone, or even to native-speaker language teachers. It includes stories and perspectives from a wide range of language professionals, ranging from Korean teachers of English to American teachers of Swahili.

Each chapter of the book provides summaries of central theoretical concepts and the ideas of other writers, includes useful charts and figures which help clarify the concepts being explained, incorporates interesting personal stories and narratives of cultural encounters, provides suggestions for learning/teaching activities, and concludes with an annotated list of further readings. This is a well thought out approach, which makes each chapter not only clear and straightforward, but also a self-contained essay in its own right.

The book begins with a short introductory essay on the reasons and approaches for teaching culture as a part of language learning. The reality of the FL/SL classroom is accepted and never idealized. The author recognizes that there are many students with minimal interest and motivation, who will probably never make use of the language they are (reluctantly) learning, and that there are also those who are learning while already struggling with the day-to-day practicalities of living with a second language and culture.

In the second chapter, the author examines the nature of the cultural experience and looks at ways in which people come to know and reflect upon themselves as cultural participants. Here he describes the stages of the "experiential learning cycle" – concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation.

The definition of culture is discussed in the third chapter. The author describes the three major components of culture, which he terms "products, practices, and perspectives" (I prefer to call them "products, behavior, and values") and then adds two more items, "persons" and "communities," to produce a five-dimensional model of culture. He proceeds to show how this model of culture can be thought of as an "iceberg," with certain dimensions being "explicit" and easily visible (above the surface, so to speak), such as products, practices, individuals, and communities, while other aspects (perspectives) remain "tacit" and below the surface. Finally, he takes us through a couple of examples of examining a cultural whole to illustrate the use of this approach.

Chapter Four specifically addresses the relationship between language and culture, and examines how language is activated to manifest each of the five cultural dimensions already described. Here the author makes a distinction between "language used to participate in the culture" and "language used to learn the culture" (p. 42), and then describes the latter as language of description ("knowing about"), interpretation ("knowing why"), and response ("knowing oneself"). The following five chapters of the book each deal with one of the five dimensions of culture (products, practices, perspectives, communities, and persons), and constitute the "meat" of his exposition. Each chapter presents a succinct description of the topic, summaries of useful concepts from other writers, illustrative first-person stories, and examples of teaching activities. In the section on Cultural Perspectives, for instance, he discusses the difference between perceptions, beliefs, values, and attitudes in relation to tacit and explicit perspectives, which I found to be an interesting and useful approach. He then goes on to touch on other anthropological concepts such as worldview, emic and etic perspectives, and the functionalist and conflict approaches to interpreting culture.

I found that Chapters Eight and Nine provided some very thought-provoking perspectives on the importance of cultural communities and cultural persons in relation to language teaching. Every language learner is already identified with a particular

cultural community and already has an individual cultural identity, even though they may not have clearly visualized it that way themselves. One of the aims of the FL/SL teacher may be to help the learner develop a conceptualization of a new cultural communal identity related to the target language, and a new cultural persona for themselves. The author uses the examples of a Swahili teacher in the US fostering an African communal perspective among her students, and an Anglo high school Spanish teacher developing his own alternate "Hispanic" identity.

The final three chapters of the book deal with cultural learning outcomes, the cultural learning process and guidelines for teaching culture. The author identifies six different outcomes according to various approaches to cultural learning (culture-specific understanding, culture-general understanding, personal competence, adaptation, social change, and identity) and clearly explains each one, with pertinent first-person illustrative examples. He then goes on to discuss a timeline-based model of culture learning in the classroom and illustrates this model with an extended example, the story told by a Japanese English teacher. Finally, he presents a suggested set of guidelines for teaching culture and focuses on the distinct role of the teacher in the culture learning process. The book ends with two useful appendices, one on Etic Cultural Perceptions, which rates a number of universal human realities on a perceptual continuum (e.g., Perceptions of Social Relationships: authoritarian-group-individual), and the other which summarizes the major models of culture learning (e.g., Robert Harvey's "Levels of Cross-Cultural Awareness," H. D. Brown's "Stages of Acculturation," and Gochenour and Janeway's "Seven Steps in Cross-Cultural Interaction").

This book was a joy to read. It is clearly written, succinct, makes lavish use of fascinating personal stories, and presents many different models and approaches to the learning and teaching of culture without getting bogged down in theoretical jargon. I think most language teachers would find much of value, and even inspiration, within this small book. Although it is geared primarily toward teachers, and is not intended as a classroom textbook, I think *Teaching Culture: Perspectives in Practice* could also be used effectively as a supplementary text for graduate students or for upper level education students. I am already thinking about how I might incorporate it in one of my graduate classes.

The Reviewer

Steve Garrigues is a professor in the Department of English Language and Literature at Kyongbuk National University, where he has been teaching since 1986. His MA and PhD are both in cultural anthropology. His primary research interests are in intercultural communication and teacher training. He is a long-time member of KOTESOL and is currently the President of the Daegu-Gyeongbuk Chapter. Email: steve@knu.ac.kr

Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom

Zoltan Dornyei.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Pp. vii + 155. (ISBN 0 521 79377 7)

Reviewed by Douglas P. Margolis

Revising Motivation

Burned out, discouraged, frustrated students. Sound familiar? A major task of teachers in Korea, as elsewhere, is to motivate students for the long haul of language learning. Or as Zoltan Dornyei, the author of *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*, might put it: to generate, maintain, and automate student motivation.

Dornyei sees motivation not as a static possession, like a book – i.e., either you have it or you don't – but more as a constantly changing energy, something akin to gasoline. Students have different levels that are consumed and refilled over time, depending on circumstances. Even this gasoline metaphor fails to capture the full implications of Dornyei's perspective. To him, motivation, like language learning, must be viewed from a long-term perspective. He thus adopts a process-oriented approach to motivation that aims to account for the ebbs and flows that occur throughout the student's education. He distinguishes three distinct phases of the motivation process: 1) a generation phase, 2) a maintenance phase, and 3) a retrospection phase. The generation phase involves selecting goals and making choices about what to do. The maintenance phase pertains to maintaining and protecting motivation in the face of distractions and competing demands for attention. Finally, the retrospection phase relates to how students interpret their progress. Their retrospective evaluation will determine future action. This phase can lead students to be better motivators of themselves.

Breaking Down the Motivation Process

The book is part of the Cambridge Language Teaching Library, a series dedicated to covering central issues in the ELT field. Dornyei's target audience is teachers. Rather than theorize about motivation, he aims to give to teachers tools, or

strategies, that can be employed in the classroom. In this regard, the book is very practical and useful for teacher training as well as individual teacher development.

The book is divided into seven parts: an introduction, five chapters, and a conclusion. The introduction aims to briefly expose readers to the complexity of the motivation construct and to inform readers how to make the best use of the book. Chapter 1 provides background knowledge about motivation theory and the different approaches researchers and teachers have taken to dealing with the construct. Drawing from the field of psychology, in addition to education and second language acquisition, Dornyei presents and compares several theoretical perspectives. Readers looking for immediate solutions for solving classroom motivation problems, may not appreciate this chapter as much as following ones, but the writing is "teacher-friendly" and gives insight into factors affecting student attitudes and behaviors.

As stated above, Dornyei perceives motivation not as a static phenomenon, but rather as a dynamic, constantly fluctuating process. Therefore, the remaining chapters of the book divide this process into component parts and elaborate strategies teachers can employ for enhancing motivation within each respective part. Teachers anxious to find quick-fix motivation solutions will especially like Chapters 2 through 5.

Chapter 2 discusses how teachers can create the conditions for motivating students. For example, teacher behavior, classroom atmosphere, and group dynamics are examined to offer specific strategies for boosting motivating features. Chapter 3 goes beyond these basic conditions for motivation by examining what teachers can do to actually generate initial motivation. Teachers in Korea might find this chapter especially helpful for identifying strategies that will re-ignite the motivation of discouraged and burnt-out students.

Chapter 4 considers strategies for maintaining and protecting motivation. This chapter, too, seems particularly relevant to teachers in Korea because students here often are motivated but easily distracted. In the face of school festivals, exams, and demands of friends and family, for example, knowing strategies for protecting student motivation would be handy. Moreover, language learning requires time and patience. Having a repertoire of strategies to maintain and protect student motivation to endure the long haul is essential for all language teachers. In addition, self-esteem and self-confidence is often lacking amongst students faced with many years of ineffective language training. Dornyei (2001a) considers these affective factors important for the protection of motivation:

> The rationale behind connecting all these issues to classroom motiva-
> tion is that in order for students to be able to focus on learning with
> vigor and determination, they need to have a healthy self-respect and
> need to believe in themselves as learners. Self-esteem and self-confi-
> dence are like the foundations of a building: if they are not secure enough,

even the best technology will be insufficient to build solid walls over them. You can employ your most creative motivational ideas, but if students have basic doubts about themselves, they will be unable to "bloom" as learners. (pp. 86-87)

Given this position, Dornyei includes a number of strategies for improving student self-esteem and self-confidence.

Thus far, the book has primarily focused on teachers and their choices and actions. Chapter 5 alters this focus slightly to how teachers can help students increase their own motivation. Here, Dornyei aims to provide strategies that will guide learners to use retrospection and self-evaluation to improve their future efforts. The chapter particularly examines feedback and grading issues. For example, Dornyei asserts that teachers should provide feedback about student effort. In contrast, he suggests teachers should refuse to accept students attribution of poor results to ability, such as claiming they have no talent for language learning. Instead, teachers should express confidence in student ability and communicate that effort combined with effective learning strategies will yield success (pp. 120-121).

Dornyei concludes the book with a motivation strategy chart. First, he warns readers to recognize that the strategies are meant as tools to enlarge one's repertoire and prepare for every occasion, but not necessary or even desirable to use all the time. Then, the chart lists all the strategies introduced in the book so that teachers have a checklist for experimenting with new strategies to learn which ones work best for their particular contexts. This chart is an excellent aid for professional development.

In addition, Dornyei includes seven pages of references for those interested in pursuing the topic further and a brief index to help readers quickly navigate the text. There are also a number of tables, charts, and other graphics to facilitate communication. Thus, this book is one you will want to keep nearby for quick referencing, review, and ongoing study.

Dornyei

Every book has some weaknesses. *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*, however, lives up to its claim to provide 35 practical strategies that teachers can use to enhance their student motivation. The writing is clear and straightforward. Each chapter aims to give teachers something they can put to use in the classroom. Teachers who experiment and adopt strategies in the book will not be disappointed.

Readers, however, who may want a more theoretical or scholarly treatment about motivation, could feel disappointed. Chapter 1 touches upon theory a little but

not enough to satisfy the voracious appetites of serious researchers. Nevertheless, Dornyei cannot be faulted for not satisfying their hunger because in a separate book, *Teaching and Researching Motivation* (2001b), he addresses these issues in full.

The only complaint, therefore, that can be made about the book is that the publisher, Cambridge Language Teaching Library, doesn't include any information about the author, Dr. Zoltan Dornyei. After reading the book, readers will likely be interested in this remarkable man from Hungary, who has received several awards for outstanding research, including a Distinguished Research Award from TESOL, Inc., and who has written over 50 academic papers on various aspects of second language acquisition and language teaching methodology.

Currently, he serves on the School of English Studies faculty at the University of Nottingham in the United Kingdom. He is also an assistant editor for the journal *Language Learning*. He earned his PhD in Psycholinguistics from Eotvos University in Budapest. Moreover, he has authored or co-authored several books, a number destined to be classics in the ELT field. In addition to the two already mentioned above, readers will want to seek out *Interpersonal Dynamics in Second Language Education: The Visible and Invisible Classroom* (1998), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (2001), and *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing* (in press). Dr. Dornyei's works illuminate the direction forward for the ELT profession.

The Reviewer

Douglas Margolis currently teaches at the International Graduate School of English in Seoul. He is also the coordinator of KOTESOL Teacher Training (KTT) and a Tutor for the Birmingham University MA TESOL program. His current research interests include profiling Korean student use of compensation strategies and examining the relationship of compensation strategies to second language acquisition.

The reviewer wishes to express special appreciation to Dr. Zoltan Dornyei for providing his biographical data and resume via email and for great insights throughout his writings. Email: dpm123@igse.ac.kr

References

Dornyei, Z. (in press). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dornyei, Z. (2001a). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dornyei, Z. (2001b). *Teaching and researching motivation.* London: Pearson Education.

Dornyei, Z., & Schmidt, R. (Eds.) (2001). Motivation and second language acquisition. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Ehrman, M.E., & Dornyei, Z. (1998). *Interpersonal dynamics in second language education: The visible and invisible classroom.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

The Dynamics of the Language Classroom

Ian Tudor.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Pp. viii + 234. (ISBN 0 521 77676 7 Paperback)

Reviewed by Gerry Lassche

The Dynamics of the Language Classroom is a new addition to the growing Cambridge Language Teaching Library. While valuable for pre- and in-service teachers, practitioners interested in classroom and action research and teacher reflection would also find this an invaluable source of information regarding essential issues of educational change. The book is premised on the ecological perspective, defined as "a conception of the learning environment as a complex adaptive system" (Van Lier, 1997). The complexity is due to the differential and unique contributions of learners, teachers, and local classroom contexts. Thus, Tudor maintains that linear approaches to education typically fail to bring satisfactory results because many contextual factors are left out of consideration.

These issues also apply equally well for teachers of adult learners, who value independence and diversity (Nunan, 1989), as well as for teachers of young learners in ESL contexts. As Katz and McClellan (1997) note, today's ESL elementary school teachers are increasingly likely to have students from diverse cultural backgrounds, and helping these children to develop their social competence requires an appreciation of this diversity. Less certain, though, is the book's relevance in EFL contexts for young learners in Korea and Japan, where resident teachers face classes of students that approach being culturally homogenous.

The book can be described as being organized into three main sections. The first section, covering Chapters 1 and 2, serves as an introduction to the complexities of the teaching and learning context. The second section, covering Chapters 3 through 5, deals with the different perspectives of language, learning, teaching, and the classroom context held by the stakeholders in the educational process. The third section, covering Chapters 6 through 8, describes ways to better understand these complexities and what their implications are for teachers and learners. Chapter 9 offers some interesting points of departure on various issues of particular relevance to education reform.

The chapters follow a conceptual progression, from rather abstract theoretical discussions and descriptions of the nature of learning and the essence of an ecological

paradigm in the first section, to more practical and localized discussions of contextualized case studies in the third section. The layout of the book shortens the length of discourse into manageable chunks, allowing the busy person who may not be able to continue reading at long stretches to stick in a bookmark and pick up where they left off later. Each of these sections ends with several helpful questions concerning essential points, the intention of which is to personalize content and provide possible avenues for further reflective research.

Although integral to the position Tudor is building, there is a danger with using constructs such as "context," "teaching," and "learning" - one that Tudor is very much aware of. A repeated refrain from the book is that meanings can change, depending on the particular context. Such slippage, though, can prove a little disconcerting to the reader. The concept of "classroom" is a case in point. It is, in earlier discussions, the physical location of the event, but in later ones it becomes the collapsed realization of the administrative, teacher, and student culture rolled into one. As a result, the concept becomes at times too cumbersome, and invariably Tudor ends up covering ground already discussed. However, since his view is interactional, such a portrayal is probably obligatory, at the expense of occasional repetitiveness. This especially holds true in the first section, and less so in the second section. Both sections tend to proceed a little slowly through the defense and explanation of constructs that compose the ecological perspective. Further, Tudor does not provide a lot of substantiating evidence at this point in the book. On the other hand, he rarely if ever digresses into extended and complicated explanations. Some readers may very well appreciate the precise care with which Tudor is able to paint his ecological themes through the use of increasingly familiar, yet constantly expanding, icons and motifs.

I found the case studies explored in the third section as easily the strongest selling point of the book for readers in Asia in terms of information content. Tudor's insightful analysis of contextual features provides persuasive evidence for his ecological perspective of teaching and learning. What is compelling for me about these studies is their international flavor and depth of qualitative description.

First, it is perhaps in the EFL situation that cultural conflicts and fears of cultural imperialism wield their strongest influence. In such situations, an appreciation of how the context-specific characteristics of local learning events can only help to mitigate the tension. Tudor suggests that what is essential for initiating curriculum reform is a more complete understanding of the students' context and culture of learning. This is a familiar educational call to arms in many Asian countries these days and a position in close agreement with literature from the field of educational change (Curtis, 2000).

Second, Tudor's analysis actually demonstrates how one can proceed from an initial realization of a problem or case towards a description of essential qualitative

features. When one works with such "messy" contexts, the method of review must be based on the premise that perceptions of the nature of those factors differ across individuals and institutions (Cohen and Manion, 2000). Tudor's analysis investigates and aggregates as many of these essential perceptions as necessary to more closely approximate the nature of the case's "true" character. By doing so, he admirably demonstrates what qualitative action research "thick descriptions" look like.

In summary, the current movements in education reform and the increasing encouragement of reflective practices make this book an essential read, for it explains why such reflection is needed in contexts familiar and relevant to Asian educators.

The Reviewer

Gerry Lassche (MATESOL, RSA CELTA) is the lecturing professor of TESOL methodology and TESOL practicum in Ajou University's TESOL Certificate program. He has been in Korea for the last five years, and his publications include issues in syllabus design, language testing, and e-based language learning. Email: glassche@yahoo.ca

References

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge-Falmer.

Curtis, A. (2000). A problem-solving approach to the management of change in language education. *Korea TESOL Journal, 3*(1), 1– 2.

Katz, L., & McClellan, D. (1997). *Fostering children's social competence: The teacher's role*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Lier, L. (1997). Observation from an ecological perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 783–787.

The Art of Nonconversation: A Reexamination of the Validity of the Oral Proficiency Interview

Marysia Johnson.
London: Yale University Press, 2001.
Pp. 230. (ISBN 0-300-09002-1)

Reviewed by David W. Dugas

The place of the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) in the history of second language evaluation is firmly established. In the last 50 years, it has become widely used internationally by many universities, as well as by those in the U.S. government (Foreign Language Institute, Defense Language Institute, Peace Corps) and private sectors (Educational Testing Service, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages). Results from OPI interviews are typically used as a basis for college entrance, pay increases, promotion, and job assignment. In *The Art of Nonconversation*, Marysia Johnson reexamines the OPI from a current perspective using the current analytical tools of discourse and conversation analyses and semantic differential study. She aims at answering two questions: 1) Is the OPI a valid instrument for assessing language speaking proficiency? and 2) What is speaking ability?

The book is laid out in nine chapters, the first of which is an overview. Chapter 2 is an interesting and informative summary of the creation and development of the OPI. Chapter 3 is a critical look at the OPI which presents a brief review of *validity* and the aspects of the OPI which have been criticized. Chapter 4 explores the theoretical bases for assessing the OPI as a *speech event*. Here sufficient background is given to highlight the differences between several types of speech events and to support a rigorous description of what *conversation* actually is.

The discourse analysis study of 35 OPIs and the results from it are presented in Chapter 5. Most will not be surprised at the conclusion that the OPI is not conversation. In Chapter 6, the author reports the results of a qualitative assessment, i.e., a semantic differential study, of native speakers' perceptions of the OPI. The opinions of both testers and non-testers support the results generated in the previous chapter. In Chapter 7, the construct validity of the OPI is examined and found wanting. The OPI is shown to include two distinct types of interviews, neither of which resembles conversation. Having discredited the OPI, the author starts toward a replacement in Chapter 8. There she describes and compares two previously

proposed models, the *communicative competence* and *interactional competence* models, to get at what speaking ability really is. She points out that the two core concepts of *second language communicative competence* and *communicative language ability* have not been validated to date and are thus without formal support in spite of their widespread use in developing the communicative approach to ESL teaching. In this chapter, she also introduces the sociocultural theories of Lev S. Vygotsky and describes their pertinence. In the last chapter, Chapter 9, she points out some similarities between Vygotsky's theories and other work being done in the area of *second language acquisition*. She also proposes a new test of Practical Oral Language Ability and provides some guidelines for its development.

Johnson conducts and explains her work well. In particular, her use of dialog and conversation analysis studies allowed this reviewer a greater appreciation of the potential in these methods. Still, her explanation of the critical term *proficiency* is inconclusive, and her conclusion concerning the OPI's construct validity seems to be fuzzy and abrupt without precise exposition of reasons. Although at times clearly hostile toward the widespread use of the OPI, she supports her criticisms with clear new evidence. The impression that Johnson gives, however, is that she is inclined to graft her new test onto the still fresh carcass of the OPI. If true, this might not be surprising, since she is an OPI tester, but it would be disappointing. A more determined attempt at innovation would be preferred.

A complicating factor in applying the changes Johnson advocates is that the OPI has many proponents and has been considered an administratively successful test by many of those who have used it. The OPI, even with its faults, seems to have filled a "testing gap" pretty successfully for a long time. That it still does was demonstrated when a few minutes search of the Internet produced hundreds of sites currently using the OPI. Furthermore, development of the OPI has involved some fine people and institutions (North, 1993) giving it a great deal of "professional momentum." The OPI has also been used in calibrating the results of derivative language tests, e.g., the Simulated OPI, an audiotaped version for groups (Stansfield and Kenyon, 1996), and language tests based on new technologies, e.g., the computer-assessed PhonePass (Ordinate, 1999).

Clearly, even a vastly superior test will have to be administratively attractive to displace the OPI. This book shows why the attempt should be made and how it might be started. Those involved in ESL/EFL testing, whether for or against the OPI, would benefit from reading this book.

The Reviewer

David W. Dugas (M.S., Louisiana State University) has seven years university teaching experience, of which five have been focused on lower-level EFL students.

His language research efforts have focused on creation of an integrated syllabus design for lower-level students as well as achievement tests to support such a syllabus. He is currently in his sixth year as a writer and lecturer at Daejeon University in Daejeon, Korea. He divides his writing between EFL and environmental interests. Email: dwdugas@yahoo.com

References

Stansfield, C.W., & Kenyon, D. (1996). Simulated Oral Proficiency Interviews: An update. ERIC Digest #395501. Retrieved May 29, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed395501.html

North, B. (1993). The development of descriptors on scales of proficiency. NFLC (National Foreign Language Center) Occasional Papers. Washington, D.C.: Johns Hopkins University.

Ordinate. (1999). PhonePass test data analysis: Correspondence with oral interviews and first-language bias analysis. Ordinate Corporation Technical Report. Retrieved May 29, 2002, from http://www.ordinate.com/pdf/OPIAndL1Bias990826.pdf

Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners

Michael Rundell (Ed.).
Oxford: Macmillan Education, 2002.
Pp. xiv + 1658 (ISBN 0-333-96672-4 Am. paperback ed.
+ CD-ROM), 235x155x47mm.

Reviewed by David E. Shaffer

Four short years ago, Macmillan Publishers decided to begin a foray into the area of learner's dictionaries and create the first dictionary from scratch in almost a decade. The product of this undertaking is the Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners [MED], and the conclusion of this project has been so expeditious due to the veteran lexicographers, Michael Rundell and Gwyneth Fox, heading the editorial team. MED joins a formidable group of advanced learner's dictionaries vying for a share of the ESL/EFL market: *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* [OALD] (Hornby & Wehmeier [Ed.], 2000), *Longman Advanced American Dictionary* [LAAD] (2000), and *Collins Cobuild English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* [CCED] (Sinclair [Ed.], 2001). Jon Wright (1998) states that "each [learner's] dictionary is different and it is important…to find out what is in it, what it means, and how to use that information" (p. 10). The aim of this review is to delineate the ways in which MED differs from the others as well as point out the similarities.

The Meaning

MED contains over 100,000 references, slightly less than CCED's 110,000 but more than LAAD's 84,000 and OALD's 80,000. For these, it uses a defining vocabulary of 2,500 words – comparable to CCED, less than OALD's 3,000, but more than LAAD's 2,000. (Though "advanced" in name, LAAD is actually a high intermediate to low advanced learner's dictionary.) For the number of references it contains, MED is able to construct its definitions with a relatively few number of words, making them easy to understand. While most learner's dictionaries choose to give most of their definitions in the traditional phrase form (e.g., verb definitions beginning with "to"), MED employs a combination of this form and CCED's practice of defining each word with a sentence. Compare these examples entries:

OALD: **clout**. to hit sb hard, especially with your hand. (p. 224)
CCED: **clout**. If you **clout** someone, you hit them. (p. 275)

MED: **clout**. to hit someone or something hard with your hand. (p. 254)

MED: **cloud**. if an emotion clouds your eyes, your eyes show the emotion. (p. 254)

It is often the case that for words with multiple definitions, several of the definitions will be in sentence form in MED while others are in phrase form. The form selected is based on the ease with which that form can explain any given headword. What this practice loses in conformity, it more than makes up for in intelligibility.

Words with more than one meaning are arranged from most to least common meaning. Lexically related homographs of different word classes are entered as separate headwords. For example, the headword **fast¹ (adj)** is followed by **fast²
(adv)**, which is followed by **fast³ (verb)** and **fast⁴ (noun)** (pp. 498-499). By contrast, OALD and CCED list all different word classes under a single headword. Arguments can be made for either approach, but both work equally well if each word class is clearly marked.

A unique and very useful feature that MED employs for words with many multiple meanings is "meaning menus." Appearing immediately below each headword with five or more meaning is a menu containing a brief reference to the different meanings of the headword numbered in the order in which they appear below. This menu is to the headword what the table of contents is to a book. The menu is boxed in red for easy viewing as are various other elements of the dictionary. The menu for the headword **fast¹ (adj)**, for example, contains: 1. quick, 2. exciting, 3. of a clock, 4. of film, 5. of colors, 6. of a woman, + PHRASES (p. 498). The numbers correspond to the numbers of the definitions appearing below the menu.

MED comes in two versions – American English (AmE) and British English (BrE). The headwords defined in the two dictionaries are the same. The distinction lies in the version of English used in the definitions. In the American English version, definitions are in AmE. When AmE and BrE definitions differ, both are given – the BrE definition is last and clearly marked as BrE. When AmE and BrE pronunciation differ, the AmE pronunciation is first, followed by the BrE pronunciation marked as such. In the BrE version the opposite is true. This twin-version formula, eliminates the annoying priority, for AmE users, given to BrE pronunciations and definitions in OALD and CCED.

MED is not only a new dictionary, it is an up-to-date lexicon in that it contains some of the most recent words to enter the English language. A search for three new words arising from an email newsletter (R.S. Koch, The Grammar Exchange Letter 23, personal communication, November 22, 2002) revealed that MED contained them all – the newly coined word *digerati*, and the new meanings of *alpha male* and *anorak* (BrE), which refer to people. By comparison, CCED and OALD contained the new definition of *anorak* only, while LAAD contained only that of *alpha male*.

The Usage

A dictionary as comprehensive as MED contains many more words than any language learner can hope to learn, and even the number of words that a serious learner comes in contact with is more than they can learn. They must, therefore, prioratize, i.e., decide which words to concentrate on at present for internalization. MED helps the learner greatly in doing this by marking headwords for frequency of use by fluent speakers. The 7,500 most frequently used headwords appear in red and are followed by one, two, or three red stars to designate frequency of use (more stars designate higher frequency). The only other comparable learner's dictionaries to designate word frequency are LAAD, which uses a system of numbers (1, 2, or 3) in a grid, and CCED, which uses a five-diamond band system similar to MED's. The LAAD system applies only to the most frequent 3,000 words, and though CCED's 6-level distinction may be finer than MED's, the combination of this extensive detail and low perceptibility is likely to make the MED system the most user-friendly.

All major learner's dictionaries now pay special attention to collocation. MED does this in two ways: essential collocates are shown, as in all good learner's dictionaries, in the body of the dictionary entry with example sentences, but in addition, MED lists thousands of strong collocates with headwords in its 450 easy-to-read "collocation boxes," appearing in red.

MED is besprinkled on almost every page with numerous other red, actually pink, boxes that make information easy to access. It contains synonym boxes that contain synonyms of the headword, explanations of how they differ from the headword, and example sentences. There are boxes that contain interesting etymological notes that make the words easy to remember. For example, one of these boxes is for **Lolita**: "From Lolita, the main character in *Lolita*, a novel by Vladimir Nabokov" (p. 830). Similar boxes contain purely cultural information, e.g., the box for **log cabin** reads: "People typically stay in a log cabin when they are on vacation, especially to go skiing or hunting" (p. 829). Another unique MED feature is its metaphor boxes, which clearly explain the metaphor behind English speakers' choice of words. For example, the metaphor box for **relationship** reads in part:

> Physical relationships are like **weather** or **sunshine** and **temperature**. Being friendly to someone is like warmth, and being unfriendly is like cold.
> ... *They are very* **warm-hearted/cold-hearted** *people*….(p. 1173)

There are boxes explaining American and British English differences in lexical usage when an extensive explanation is required, and there are "academic writing boxes" explaining how to use more precise words closely related to the headword. The "academic writing box" for **related**, for example, offers more than sixty alternative words and expressions.

Where MED comes up short is in its treatment of grammatical usage of headwords. There are boxes of usage notes, but these are mainly associated with word meanings or give hints to avoid common errors related to wrong word choice. Grammatical information is limited to the basics: headword function, countability, transitivity, and little more. The incorporation of grammar notes containing the structural environments in which a headword occurs was opted against. The reason for this may be two-fold: 1) their incorporation, as in CCED, would be space consuming and 2) they have decided to follow the trend of placing emphasis on fluency at the expense of accuracy. This second point ignores the needs of the majority of eastern Asian learners, whose language proficiency assessment is based heavily on their knowledge of English grammar. To some extent, MED's abundant use of example sentences compensates for the scarcity of grammar notes.

The Package

The physical characteristics of a dictionary rank very high among learners' preferences (D. Kent, 2001) and, therefore, cannot be ignored. The paperback edition of MED combines the lesser thickness of CCED with the smaller length and width of OALD, making it smaller than either and relatively easier to carry, though not perceivably lighter in weight. The quality of the paper used in MED and the size of font used makes its readability higher than that of either CCED or OALD. MED could be called "the Red Book" due to its color motif, used not only for esthetic purposes but also for readability. Page design is more perceptually pleasing than that of CCED or LAAD, or even OALD, which was this reviewer's favorite until MED arrived on the scene. It is equal or superior to all three of its rivals in the use of illustrations, its color sections, and its language study section. [For more on CCED, LAAD, and OALD, see Shaffer (2000, 2001)].

Arguably just as important as what comes inside a dictionary is what does not. There is much to MED in the form of support that deserves mention. There is a CD-ROM, which includes everything in the dictionary in addition to sound. The learner can even record their own pronunciation for comparison purposes. Additional support comes in the form of a companion workbook (A. Underhill, 2002) containing innovative activities giving the learner practice in how to use a dictionary.

There is also extensive Web support available for MED, more than for any comparable dictionary. There are resources and activities for the teacher to use in the classroom, and interactive games, glossaries, and articles for the learner. Email services available include monthly lessons, a monthly magazine, and their archives.

The package's cost: $27.50 at Amazon.com, a couple of dollars higher than the competition, but still quite reasonable. In most cases, the MED producers have taken the best characteristics of the other learner's dictionaries on the market, combined

them, and added a few more of their own to produce a very useful dictionary. No one who gets "the Red Book" should be sorry they did.

The Reviewer

David Shaffer holds a Ph.D. in linguistics and has been a professor at Chosun University in Gwangju since 1976. In addition to semantics, his academic interests lie in TEFL methodology, teacher training, and Korean lexical borrowing from English. In recent years, he has been involved in the editing of Korea TESOL publications and is currently on the organization's executive council. Email: disin@chosun.ac.kr

References

Hornby, A.S., & Wehmeier, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Oxford's advanced learner's dictionary of current English* (6th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kent, D. (2001). Korean university freshmen's dictionary use and perceptions regarding dictionaries. *Korea TESOL Journal*, *4*(1), 73-92.

Longman Advanced American Dictionary. (2000). Essex: Pearson Education.

Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Collins Cobuild English dictionary for advanced learners* (3rd ed.). Glasgow: HarperCollins.

Shaffer, D.E. (2001). Learner dictionaries for the millennium [Review of *Collins Cobuild English dictionary for advanced learners* (3rd ed.) and *Longman advanced American dictionary*]. *Korea TESOL Journal*, *4*(1), 181-185.

Shaffer, D.E. (2000). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English* (6th ed.) [Review article]. *Korea TESOL Journal 3*(1), 106-110.

Underhill, A. (2002). *MacMillan English dictionary for advanced learners workbook*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Wright, J. (1998). *Dictionaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

New Idiom Software: A Comparison of IdioMagic 2002 and North American Idioms

IdioMagic 2002
East Brunswick, NJ: Innovative Software Enterprise, 1999-2002.
Distributed by ISE, (http://www.idiomagic.com).

North American Idioms
Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, 2001.
Distributed by Encomium Publications (http://www.encomiun.com).

Reviewed by David B. Kent

Students in language laboratories around the world often make decisions on what language learning software they will continue to use after a mere initial glance. As a result, software developers have become aware that looks are important or that "first impressions count," but one should never immediately "judge a book by its cover."

Innovative Software Enterprise, the developers of IdioMagic 2002, originally introduced the software a decade ago as a DOS-based program. Although it has come a long way in the intervening time period, the program still strikingly resembles a DOS version. The down side to this is that the Korean "Internet generation" may view it as too simplistic, but it is this simplicity that makes for very easy use of the program and may make it appealing to those students and teachers who do not possess a high degree of computer literacy.

Encomium Publications also has experience in the development of a range of software programs over the last several years, and their idiom-learning resource, North American Idioms (NAI), certainly contains numerous bells and whistles as well as a great deal more eye candy than IdioMagic 2002. Along with this, the program has a more complex look and feel, which in turn grants the program a more polished overall appearance.

However, it is not the look of language learning software that improves language proficiency. Language proficiency improves from factors such as ease-of-use, which leads to continued use of the product and thereby increases exposure to the learning material. So too, linguistic appropriateness maintains user interest and assists the user in developing their current language skills. At the same time, the testing

methodology and reinforcement processes implemented by the package in the virtual world further allows the user to employ the language material learnt and recall it for future use in the real world.

Student Suitability

The two idiom packages under review both present a great deal of specific idioms. The focus of NAI is solely on the intermediate level student and in reality tailored more for the younger adult learner, but also adequate for older learners, and aims at providing a thorough understanding of 192 idioms through 16 units and 4 review sections. The IdioMagic 2002 software, on the other hand, focuses on the beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels of learners from the 6th grader to the more senior student. Although the aim of this software is to provide an understanding of 510 idioms, with 20 units per level and 10 idioms per unit with a review quiz accompanying each unit, the focus is essentially on 200 idioms per level, and as a result, the number of items available for each level is about the same as that in the NAI package.

Both programs are extremely well suited for language laboratories and for student self-study, either at home or in schools, although practical classroom use of these products may be limited. However, the programs can be used supplement material in both conversation and writing classes and thereby allow students to develop their use of idiomatic expressions with limited or no teacher guidance.

Multimedia Interactivity and Presentation

The techniques adopted by both the IdioMagic 2002 and NAI software vary widely in approach to and application of the multimedia platform. In this regard, NAI lends itself strongly to the field of "edutainment," particularly since its design focus is the younger learner, while IdioMagic 2002 relies on a traditional presentation and testing format that many students are accustomed to yet may find very dry and, as a result, less engrossing.

While both programs offer adjustable settings, IdioMagic 2002 far outclasses NAI in this respect. NAI will allow the user to adjust the audio level and replay the audio components of the language activities, as well as allow the user complete control over video sequences. Although IdioMagic 2002, does not employ the use of audio (other than for sound effects) nor employ the use of video within the program, it does allow the user to change the difficulty and current level of the lesson as well as the scope of quizzes to include, for example, missed idioms from previous quizzes. Further, IdioMagic 2002 allows the user to not only turn on or off sound effects and visual effects but also allows such things as hiding hint buttons and correct answers during quizzes.

IdioMagic 2002 and NAI both present the initial idiom material in a similar fashion; that is, the idiom itself is presented along with examples and notes for various idioms. The definitions and examples of use in both programs are clearly worded in simple and plainly understood English. While this is certainly something essential for student understanding of the idioms and an asset for learners in promoting their understanding of the language and cultural ideals behind the expressions, NAI goes one step further to include audio for each of the idioms, examples, and notes. Immediate feedback is a further asset provided to the student by both programs, and although each program presents a great deal of information on screen, thereby maximizing use of screen real-estate, this does not represent a visual hurdle for users nor does it lead to obfuscation of the study material. In fact, both programs offer easy navigation between the various lessons and units available, along with excellent search facilities that allow users to type in keywords and jump to the idioms contained within the program.

Language Learning Approach

As IdioMagic 2002 aims to be both a learning and reference source for idioms for all levels and ages of student, the method taken to present linguistic data to the user is rather different from that of NAI, which aims at being a learning resource for young intermediate-level students. NAI attempts to be holistic whereas IdioMagic 2002 specifically targets understanding and testing of the idiom being focused on.

In scope, the NAI package aims at integrating all aspects of language use while maintaining a teaching focus reflecting the usage of idioms. This translates to emphasis being placed on practical language use, while IdioMagic 2002 tends to emphasize concise understanding of the idiom rather than integration and presentation of the idiom in various contextual settings. This focus is also clearly supported by the extra material provided by the NAI package. The package includes presentation of idiomatic expressions in extended multi-genre listening sections covering telephone English, radio broadcasts (news, interviews, and songs), and audio presentation of written material such as postcards and emails, along with a video section where dialogue scripts are shown on screen alongside video playback. IdioMagic 2002, however, relies on the presentation of textual examples and notes, as well as a multiple-choice testing format, to promote understanding and reinforcement of the material under study.

The use of an integrated dictionary within each package is also a valuable asset for the user, but it is limiting in both packages. With IdioMagic 2002, the user must search for terms that can be found within the definition of the idiom itself, whereas the NAI dictionary allows searching by word, by topic, and by presenting an entire list of the idioms in the package. IdioMagic 2002, however, also contains a thesaurus, and this extends the functionality of the dictionary, allowing users to

search for idioms based on keywords. The IdioMagic 2002 thesaurus presents all related idioms within the package associated with the search term. This is excellent for students, and it is this feature, along with the dictionary, that firmly establishes IdioMagic 2002 as a reference resource that students can return to even after completing all of the language material and quizzes that the program offers. So too, teachers can benefit from the resource nature of the IdioMagic 2002 package.

Linguistic Solidification

The testing and grading elements found in the IdioMagic 2002 and NAI packages are also rather different. The differences largely revolve around the visual presentation of the packages and the approach used by the programs in presenting the testing and reinforcement material.

IdioMagic 2002 employs a traditional systematic drill-type approach and standard multiple-choice testing system that ensure that students around the globe will be familiar with the format. Each quiz can cover a single lesson, all previous lessons, an entire difficulty level, or only previously missed idioms. Further solidifying the product as a resource, as well as a learning source, there is the functionality to print the various quizzes, along with answer keys, and the option of saving quizzes to disk. This feature can then be put to use by teachers for review purposes in the classroom or enable students to continue their studies without being tied down to a computer.

NAI, maintaining the "edutainment" element for the younger learner, conducts testing through the use of various activities or language games. These activities can be accessed at any time and left to complete later if students wish to further study the idiomatic lesson material before returning to the same point in the activity. Although there is no option to print these activities, they are visually rich and varied, including the identification of proper idiomatic replies to utterances as well as correct definitions for idioms, as in the IdioMagic 2002 package testing format.

Overall, both IdioMagic 2002 and North American Idioms effectively provide the means for students to increase their awareness of idioms, along with their understanding of the cultural values and attitudes we associate with such language use, and to accurately recognize and produce frequently used idioms in listening to, speaking, reading, and writing English. Since the approach and presentation style of these two packages vary widely, ultimately the user will have to decide which product will best suit their learning style and immediate study needs. One thing is certain though: Korean students often use English idioms in conversation and enjoy learning the cultural attitudes and values associated with their meanings. Both of these software packages will definitely be able to assist them in satisfying this desire.

Minimum Operating System Requirements

IdioMagic 2002
Windows: Windows 95, 98, ME, NT, 2000, and XP; Standard PC, 8 MB RAM, sound card and color monitor desirable, 640 x 480 resolution, CD-ROM drive, 5 MB free hard drive space. Network compatible.

Macintosh: Compatible using a Windows emulation program or a Power Mac equipped with a PC card.

North American Idioms
Windows: Windows 95, 98, NT, 2000, and XP; Pentium PC, 32 MB RAM, sound card, 8-bit color monitor, 256-color display at 640 x 480 resolution, 2x CD-ROM drive, QuickTime 4.0 (included on CD).

Macintosh: PowerPC, OS 7.5+, 16 MB RAM, 2x speed CD-ROM drive, 256-color display at 640 x 480 resolution, QuickTime 4.12 (included on CD).

The Reviewer

David Kent has a Ph.D. in TEFL and is currently working at Inha University in Incheon. He has worked in Korea for seven years and enjoys developing language software that provides relative socio-cultural learning for Korean students. Email: dbkent@mail.inha.ac.kr

Fish Trek: An Adventure in Articles

Tom Cole.
Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
Distributed by Encomium Publications
(http://www.encomium.com).

Reviewed by David D. I. Kim

English article usage presents a challenge for Koreans, primarily due to the lack of articles in the Korean language (Lee, 1996). Kim (1980) estimated an error rate of English article usage by Koreans to be approximately 60% for both incorrect inclusion and omission. Lee (1996) found the most frequent type of error was of omission – not using an article when one is required (nearly 60% of all errors) – which he attributes to L1 interference (i.e., absence of articles in Korean)[1]. Research studies such as these support the general awareness of Korean teachers and students alike about the use of English articles; that is, it is bewildering!

An instructional tool available for practicing English articles usage is *Fish Trek: An Adventure in Articles*. *Fish Trek* is an interactive computer-software application suited for all learning levels, but for neophytes to English articles, some supportive instruction would be required (further details below). The language format is English-only. Ideally, the program is suited for self-study, but with proper equipment could be adopted for use in the classroom.

Installation is quite simple, and on most systems it should take less than five minutes to get the application up and running. The program requires minimal system resources to run (details provided at the end of this review), and once installed operates entirely off the hard drive.

Fish Trek is a "drill and practice" type of software, and is packaged in a "snakes and ladders" game format to motivate the user. Users are presented with fill-in-the-blank sentences, after which one of four choices can be selected to fill-in-the-blank with "*the*," "*a*," "*an*," or no article. A correct choice will advance the game piece, a fish, while an incorrect choice will result in a loss of a "fish" (six fishes to start the game with bonus fishes awarded throughout the game). According to the software developers, 650 sentences are available for practice, presented in accordance to ten overlapping difficulty levels, with accompanying context sentences that provide examples of the article used in other sample sentences. The primary aim for the article drills is to aid in the acquisition of the 50-plus English article usage rules outlined in Cole (1997).

Fish Trek has many positive features. First, the article usage rules are made available after both correct and incorrect responses, along with the completed sentence, providing immediate response feedback. A running total/percentage of the number of correct and incorrect responses are always visible. In addition, incorrect responses are kept in a memory store so that they can be viewed at any time (printing them out is also possible). The user has the option of accessing the entire selection of fill-in-the-blank sentences (650) for extensive practice, or focusing upon only new material (*Focused Practice*), or simply reviewing the list of incorrect responses material.

Unfortunately, *Fish Trek* also has several drawbacks. First, in terms of instructional tutorials, although most of the article rules are easy to understand, some rules would be baffling to an English article neophyte (e.g., distinguishing between "superlative degree" and "comparative degree"). Therefore, some supplemental instruction in English article usage rules would be required[2]. Further, although after some time the design layout is simple to use, the initial encounter is somewhat confusing (e.g., icons leading to other features are not intuitively accessible, and only through trial and error would a user come to know of the full range of available features). Also, the overall look leaves much to be desired. One student[3] reviewer commented, "The graphical interface was reminiscent of programs from the 1980s."

In summary, *Fish Trek* does provide extensive and comprehensive practice in the use of English articles, with valuable feedback that is immediate and instructive, and is therefore excellent in terms of educational value. However, the design and graphical interface are somewhat wanting. The price tag for the software, US$34.50, is reasonable and within the range of affordability for most teachers and students in Korea.

Minimum Operating System Requirements

Windows: Windows 95 or higher; 386/33 MHz processor or greater, with 8 MB RAM; Single-speed CD-ROM drive; 256-color display at 640 x 480 resolution.
Macintosh: Apple Macintosh 68040 with 5 MB RAM; System 7.1 or higher; Single-speed CD-ROM drive.

Endnotes

1   Kim (1991) offers various alternative theoretical explanations for the difficulties experienced by Koreans with English article usage. Also of note, Park (1996) found significant differences in appropriate article usage between non-native English speaking groups of [-Art] languages, or lack of article system in native language (e.g., Korean and

Japanese), and groups of [+Art], or presence of an article system in native language (e.g., French and German). He also confirmed previous findings of an acquisition order of English article functions. Also, Yoon (1983) provides an interesting review of English article use from a psychological (cognitive) perspective to explore the possibility of deriving a simple set of rules to predict English article usage. He concludes, however, that the complexity of English article usage does not lend itself to such formulations.

2   Unfortunately Cole's (1997) textbook, *The Article Book: Practice Toward Mastering* A*, An*, *and* The, which the *Fish Trek* software is based upon, itself does not provide clear explanations for certain article rule terms. However, a good English dictionary does provide explanations of certain article rule terms, e.g., "superlative" vs. "comparative" degrees.

3   Two university student reviewers were recruited to evaluate the *Fish Trek* software. They were asked to use the software and comment upon the program in terms of ease of use, design, graphics, and instructional effectiveness. Both the evaluators thought the *Fish Trek* software was instructionally effective; however, both provided negative evaluations in terms of ease of use, design, and graphics.

The Reviewer

David Kim is presently teaching at Konkuk University in the Department of English Language and Literature. His areas of interests include, research in language learning, teaching and testing English pronunciation, cross-cultural issues in language learning, and teaching methodology. Email: kdi.kim@utoronto.ca

References

Cole, T. (1997). *The article book: Practice toward mastering* a*, an*, *and* the. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kim, H.Y. (1991). *Hanguk taehaksaengeui yeongeo gwansa seupdeuke gwanhan yeongu* (A study on English article acquisition by Korean university students). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hanyang University, Seoul, South Korea.

Kim, S.B. (1980). An experimental research: The teaching of the articles in English to Koreans. *English Teaching 20*, 65-80.

Lee, H.Y. (1996). English article usage of native Korean speakers. *English Teaching 51*(1), 163-179.

Park, K.H. (1996). The article acquisition in English as a foreign language. *English Teaching*, *5*(3), 37-49.

Yoon, H.B. (1983). A psychological study of the use of articles in English. *English Teaching 25*, 15-28.