# Korea TESOL Journal

Volume 6, Number 1

KOTESOL

**Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages**

## Korea TESOL Journal Volume 7
## 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*Korea TESOL Journal*, a refereed journal, welcomes previously unpublished practical and theoretical articles on topics of significance to individuals concerned with the teaching of English as a foreign language.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* has been 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 *Korea TESOL 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:** Shin Dong-il (Editor-in-chief) at *KOTESOL@Asia.com*

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

# Korea TESOL Journal

Volume 6

**The official journal of**
**Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages**
**(KOTESOL)**




ISSN: 1598-0464

**Korea TESOL Journal**, published annually, is the official scholarly journal of Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (KOTESOL) (a membership organization) and is distributed free of charge as a service to the members of KOTESOL.

We hope you will write to the editors and individual authors and let them know how useful you find the materials, and how you may have adapted them to fit your own teaching style or situation. An email address for each writer has been included, and you may also find contacts to this journal via the KOTESOL website (www.kotesol.org).



*Search for abstracts to Korea TESOL Journal at ERIC and other scholarly reference services.*

**Price:** Free to Members; 10,000won (US$10) to nonmembers.

KOTESOL

# Table of Contents

# 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, as well as IATEFL, an international education association of over 3,500 members with headquarters in Canterbury, Kent, UK.

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. and IATEFL, 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), TESL Canada, Far East English Language Teachers Association (FEELTA, Russia), and most recently with the English Language and Literature Teachers Association of Singaore (ELLTAS).

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 nine chapters: Seoul, Gangwon, Gyeonggi-Suwon, Cheongju, Daejeon, Daegu-Gyeongbuk, Busan-Gyeongnam, Gwangju-Jeollanam, Jeollabuk, as well as International members. Members of KOTESOL hail from all points of Korea and the globe, thus providing KOTESOL members the benefits of a multi-cultural membership.

**Visit www.kotesol.org for membership information.**

KOTESOL

# Editor's Note

This year's *Korea TESOL Journal* lists five articles, four of which deal with issues closely related to the Korean context. Also in this volume, we carry 12 review articles and a software review that cover a wide range of ELT materials.

Opening the journal, in the first article, "Promoting Revision and Development in L2 Writing through a Combination-Based Curriculum," Russell Arent has investigated the feasibility of a highly-structured, combination-based curriculum in an EFL context by utilizing a multi-method research approach, including authentic materials from an advanced writing course, as well as aggregate grade data, case studies and instructor participant observation. As a result, the author addresses the issues and challenges involved in adopting a more structured approach toward the teaching of second-language writing. He also proposes a general framework for identifying structural levels for writing courses in EFL settings.

In the second article, "Drama Techniques in English Language Learning," Brian Heldenbrand discusses the benefits of using drama and how to utilize it in the classroom and concludes with four diverse drama activities for assisting early language learners. Since the use of drama in the English language classroom will certainly enhance language retention and greatly assist language development, it is highly recommended that language programs and schools adopt and employ the power of drama that reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence in their own classrooms.

The third and fourth papers fit well with current climate of language testing in Korea, where more emphasis is placed on process-oriented, performance-based assessment of English in schools.

In "Portfolio Use and EFL Learning and Assessment in South Korea" Don Makarchuk examines the value of portfolios in a university-level public speaking course in South Korea. The author considers the value of portfolios as an assessment instrument in this particular context from the instructor's viewpoint. It is reported that the learners in his study regarded the use of portfolios as a positive addition to their class in that portfolios were regarded as an important contributor to learning.

In the fourth article, "Reflective Instruments for Self-Assessment in Korean EFL Classrooms," Andrew Finch suggests ways to introduce the concept of self-/peer-assessment into the Korean EFL classroom via a number of investigative and reflective instruments. In light of the recent shift in educational theory from transmission of knowledge towards transformation of knowledge, and to integration of knowledge with existing personal constructs and meanings, adoption of a reflective self-assessment system will heighten affective goals of learners and enable them to make more informed plans for better future study.

Finally, in “Acculturation and the EFL/ESL Hybrid: The Optimal Distance Model Revisited - A Study from South Korea,” Johnny Cooper aims to determine if anomic symptoms were present in Korean L2 Learners and bilinguals, and if these anomic symptoms were inhibiting their transition into the third stage of acculturation as described in Brown’s (1980) description of the Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition. The author argues that, in the case of Korean learners, especially adult bilinguals who are approaching or have mastered English linguistically, are exhibiting anomic symptoms while learning in Korea and are in need of some kind of acculturation program. This argument is based on the fact that the EFL situation in Korea has become more of a hybrid combining EFL and ESL where native speaker instructors teach English conversation in all areas of English education, and so calls for a reexamination of Brown’s acculutration model within the Republic of Korea. This kind of systematic analysis and description of Korean learners’ interlanguage development will greatly assist Korean learners of English to overcome acculturation problems.

The twelve review articles in this volume are in keeping with one of our missions: to provide an environment for aspiring scholars to publish their early studies. I think it is also one of the positive aspects of this volume. We look forward to more submissions of this type in the future volumes of this journal. All these papers contribute to the establishment of a world-caliber ELT journal that is firmly rooted in Korea.

There are many people responsible for this volume of *Korea TESOL Journal*. In particular, I would like to thank our managing editor, Dr. Robert Dickey, and reviews editor, Dr. David Shaffer. I would also like to point out the efforts of the board of editors who have made a long-term commitment to tending this flowering publication. Last but not least, I’d like to state our appreciation for the labor offered by our Editorial Assistants and production staff. Without their contribution this volume would not have been possible.

It has been my great pleasure to be associated with all of them.

Sangho Han, EdD
Gyeongju University

# Promoting Revision and Development in L2 Writing through a Combination-Based Curriculum

**RUSSELL ARENT**
*Mississippi State University*

## ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the employment of a highly-structured, combination-based curriculum in an EFL context. By utilizing a multi-method research approach, including authentic materials from an advanced writing course, as well as aggregate grade data, case studies and instructor participant observation, a picture emerges of the issues and challenges involved in adopting a more structured approach toward the teaching of second-language writing. A general framework for identifying structural levels for writing courses is proposed. The primary objectives of this paper are to determine whether a highly-structured, combination-based curriculum at a Middle Eastern Gulf university can lead to: (1) substantive revisions on student essay drafts; and (2) observable learner gains in second-language development.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Although it appears that a dominant theory of second-language (L2) writing is unlikely to emerge in the immediate future (Atkinson, 2000; Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998, pp.1-17; Silva, 1993, pp.668-669), L2 educators have learned much in the past decade about the issues and challenges involved in establishing and maintaining an effective ESL/EFL writing program. The following abbreviated literature review will focus on curricular types available to L2 writing educators, structural components of a writing course, critical reflection and L2 writing development. [1]

# 2.0 BRIEF REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

## 2.1 The Combination-Based Curriculum

In terms of curricular options, Reid (1993, pp.74-77) describes four different choices available to L2 writing teachers and administrators: (1) *the language-based curriculum*; (2) *the pattern-model-based curriculum*; (3) *the process-based curriculum*; and (4) *the combination curriculum*. Table 2.1 below summarizes the goals associated with each curricular type.

TABLE 2.1 MAJOR GOALS OF REID' S FOUR L2 WRITING CURRICULAR TYPES

| Curricular Type | Language | Pattern-Model | Process | Combination |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Major Goals | Grammatical accuracy and correctness | Forms for discovery, writing (thesis sentences, rhetorical modes) | Fluency, and individuality | Any combination of two or three of the previous types |

As can be assumed from the label, advocates of a language-based curriculum incorporate course objectives focused on grammatical accuracy and correctness and seek to assess the "ability of exiting writing students to use specific grammatical items such as verb tenses, articles and coordinating conjunctions" (Reid, 1993, p.74). The objectives of a pattern-model-based curriculum center on "functional and situational writing, and on the expectations of the audiences for that writing." Specific goals focus on the "forms for writing, including thesis sentences and rhetorical modes" (p.75). Common rhetorical modes employed in advanced writing courses include: comparison/contrast, cause/effect, critique (or critical evaluation) or argumentative essays, among others. The third category of L2 writing curriculum presented by Reid is the one which has perhaps been of the highest prominence for the past three decades or so: the process-based curriculum. For this curricular type, the goals focus "on the processes of communication and negotiation," more specifically, fluency, discovery and the "individual unique development of each student" (p.76). The last of the four types mentioned by Reid, and the one of primary import to this paper, is the combination-based curriculum. This type involves "two or even all three of the curriculum types described above in an effort to meet the needs of their students and their writing programs" (p.76).

Some researchers have developed alternative paradigms. One such framework is proposed by Raimes (1991): 1) focus on form and current-traditional rhetoric; 2) focus on the writer (expressionism and cognitivism); 3) focus on content and the disciplines; and 4) focus on the reader (social constructionism). Others have argued for (Atkinson, 2003; Matsuda, 2003) and against (Casanave, 2003) a 'post-process' framework. Reid's (1993) proposal was adopted for this paper, however, because it appeared to be more useful for the specific educational setting encountered in this study.

It is impossible at this point to recommend any of the specific curricular options outlined by Reid for at least two reasons: 1) advocates of needs analysis in the fields of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (see the next section) suggest that some effort should be made first to determine the most important educational and occupational linguistic requirements and the linguistic deficiencies observed for specific English language learners; and 2) research findings from the field of L2 writing (see Sections 2.3 and 2.4) do not converge strongly enough to mandate any particular curricular design. It seems that professional training, experience and good judgment will continue to be prerequisites for moving an L2 writing program in a positive direction. Aside from selecting a curricular type, consideration must also be given to how structured a particular writing course should be. The most ideal level of structure is determined by careful coordination of needs analysis, syllabus design, lesson planning and task design.

## 2.2 Structural Components of a Writing Course

The key structural components of an effective L2 writing course are minimally: needs analysis; syllabus design; lesson planning; and task design. Before an L2 writing teacher can design an effective syllabus, which will guide all future class activities, s/he ought first to conduct a thorough needs analysis (which, in the strong version of the process approach, may be ongoing since the students and teacher continue to negotiate the focus and content of the course throughout the term). The specific writing skills of most relevance to the course may be perceived differently by L2 writing teachers, students, major program advisors, administrators and employers (Dudley-Evans & St.John, 1998; Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998, pp.52-62; Jordan, 1997; Robinson, 1991; Swales, 1990; Tarone & Yule, 1989). Once the crucial writing skills have been identified, the syllabus can be constructed to address such concerns. Ferris & Hedgcock (1998, p.67) suggest that time be allotted in the course schedule for activities associated with the entire writing process: prewriting; planning and drafting;

rewriting and revising; feedback, incubation and revision; editing and polishing; and publishing. The authors recommend that important deadlines for drafts, peer response sessions and student/teacher conferences be listed in the course schedule and that the instructor should allow adequate time between drafts for related class activities and to allow both the teacher and student adequate time to read and respond to submitted writing (p.68).

Another consideration is lesson planning. Ferris & Hedgcock (1998) maintain that "If instructional objectives are clearly specified in the syllabus, identifying lesson objectives should be an easy task when it comes to planning individual class periods" (p.69). Reid explains that the precise form these lesson plans take may vary:

> Even the most experienced teachers make lesson plans, although their plans may not always be written. Formulating objectives, selecting and sequencing materials, and deciding upon interactional patterns are essential to class planning…The length and detail of the lesson plan depend on the needs of the teacher; however, if teachers are to learn from their successes (and failures), they must have the essential data of a fairly detailed lesson plan.
>
> (Reid, 1993, p.121)

So whether the instructor's lesson plan is in his/her head or on paper, it is important to refer back to the syllabus on a regular basis to ensure that class activities connect with the wider course objectives and scheduling considerations.

Ferris & Hedgcock (1998, p.95), drawing upon the work of Doyle (1983, p.162), suggest that course tasks should be designed to balance four factors: 1) product; 2) process; 3) content; and 4) form. Referring back to the discussion of curricular type above, if a process component is included in the customized combination-based curriculum selected, then it should not prove too difficult to balance the above four factors (product, process, content and form) when structuring class activities and major assignments. Following Ferris & Hedgcock (1998, p.113), the term *task* in this paper refers to any formal work that a student is explicitly asked to perform that is directly associated with class grade points (i.e., documented student progress). Examples of tasks include: major writing assignments (e.g. research paper), minor writing assignments (e.g., peer response forms), exams, quizzes, and even small or large group discussion (if used, for example, to determine class participation points).

## 2.3 Critical Reflection

Several researchers have focused on promoting critical reflection in second or foreign language classrooms (see Osborn, 2000 and Richards, 1994 for comprehensive surveys of the literature). Critical reflection applies not only to L2 educators, but also to the students whom they serve. Belcher (1995) offers a number of suggestions on how to promote such skills in the context of L2 writing. First of all, she suggests that we should allow L2 writing students to attempt to critique source materials in their respective disciplines, despite inherent limitations having to do with the fact that they are merely novices in training and may not understand all of the relevant issues (p.136). A reluctance by L2 writers to critique established authorities in the field may likewise be due to cultural factors (p.137), such as a desire for harmony and the preservation of positive social relationships. Such factors can bring about other classroom challenges as well, such as students hesitating to offer detailed opinions on classmates' compositions in peer response sessions (Carson & Nelson, 1994) or on assigned class texts or other class activities. A third reason for student resistance to engaging in critical writing has to do with disciplinary differences in reviewing or critiquing sources in fields such as the natural sciences, engineering and mathematics (pp.137-138). Belcher asserts, however:

> If we do not encourage students to read and react to texts that experts write for their peers, certainly there is little reason to expect students to be aware of the role that criticism plays in the natural sciences, or in any other discipline.
>
> (Belcher, 1995,p.138)

Despite the challenges outlined above, critical reflection is an invaluable component of any academic writing course, because student writers who practice it can better adapt and present genre-specific texts to their audience, potentially leading to original contributions in subsequent academic discussions.

## 2.4 Developmental Issues in L2 Writing

So how might we measure the development of second language learners into better writers? An important contribution in second-language acquisition and L2 writing development is the volume by Wolfe-Quintero, Inagaki & Kim (1998), which focuses on three assessment measures: fluency, accuracy and complexity. Their research was designed to address two questions: (1) How is second language development in writing evaluated by these measures?; and (2) Which measures are the best indicators of developmental level in writing? The authors reviewed thirty-nine studies in which writing was viewed as an act of communication, involving English and French as both second and foreign languages, Swedish as a second language, and German and Russian as foreign languages (p.1). The studies reviewed were also considered as developmental index studies (Bardovi-Harlig & Bofman, 1989; Pery-Woodley, 1991), which Wolfe-Quintero et al assert "attempt to gauge the development of learners at known proficiency levels through the use of fluency, accuracy and complexity measures that are not necessarily tied to particular structures" (p.2).

Following a detailed analysis of more than 100 specific writing assessment measures (p.117), the authors suggest that a distinction can be made regarding the best measures available to L2 writing researchers. Three measures were proposed for fluency (words/T-units, words/clauses, words/error-free T-units). Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991), drawing upon the work of Hunt (1965), define a T-unit as "an independent clause and any associated dependent clauses, i.e. clauses which are attached to or embedded within it" (fn 8, p.46). Complexity was broken down into two components: grammatical and lexical. Two measures were recommended for grammatical complexity (clauses/T-units, dependent clauses/clauses) and two for lexical complexity (word types/square root of two times the number of words, sophisticated word types/word types). For accuracy, two measures were endorsed as well (error-free T-units/T-units, errors/T-units). The above specific measures were recommended because they correlated well with the proficiency data available.

## 2.5 A Highly-Structured, Combination-Based Curriculum

Given the above discussion, it is now possible to sketch what a writing course in a highly-structured, combination-based curriculum would look like. A descriptive framework is proposed in Table 2.2 below, describing basic characteristics of curricular types and the key structural components which would allow for such a categorization. A *highly-structured,* combination-based curriculum is associated with the characteristics in the second column in Table 2.2 below. In fact, the specific advanced writing course discussed in Sections 3 and 4 below meets all of the characteristics delineated in that second column (i.e., including language, pattern-model and process components). Although not the subject of this paper, a *loosely-structured*, combination-based curriculum is associated with the characteristics in the third column in Table 2.2. A *medium-structured*, combination-based curriculum is associated with characteristics from both the second and third columns; in other words, these two columns represent opposite ends of a continuum.

This proposed framework also allows for the application of the terms *highly-structured* and *loosely-structured* to one or more of the components described in the last five rows. For example, it could be stated that a loosely-structured, process-based curriculum would be characterized as one in which: 1) fluency objectives were not explicitly stated or assessed; 2) only one draft was required for each major essay; and 3) tasks did not encourage individual expression or discovery.

TABLE 2.2
HIGHLY-STRUCTURED VERSUS LOOSELY-STRUCTURED
L2 WRITING COURSES ACCORDING TO COMPONENT TYPE.

| Components | Highly-Structured | Loosely-Structured |
|---|---|---|
| **Language** | ▪ Accuracy objectives explicitly stated and assessed formally<br>▪ At least three grammatical forms explicitly taught<br>▪ Tasks promote form, meaning and use approach | ▪ Accuracy objectives not explicitly stated or assessed formally<br>▪ Two or fewer grammatical forms explicitly taught<br>▪ Tasks do not promote form, meaning and use approach |
| **Pattern-Model** | ▪ Rhetorical mode objectives explicitly stated and assessed formally<br>▪ At least two different rhetorical modes explicitly taught<br>▪ Tasks promote effective essay organization<br>▪ Audience and purpose discussed | ▪ Rhetorical mode objectives not explicitly stated or assessed formally<br>▪ One or zero rhetorical modes explicitly taught<br>▪ Tasks do not promote effective essay organization<br>▪ Audience and purpose not discussed |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Process** | ■ Fluency objectives explicitly stated and assessed formally<br>■ At least two drafts required for major essays<br>■ Tasks promote individual expression and discovery | ■ Fluency objectives not explicitly stated or assessed formally<br>■ Only one draft required for major essays<br>■ Tasks do not promote individual expression or discovery |
| **Needs Analysis & Syllabus Design** | ■ Needs analysis conducted once or more per term<br>■ Syllabus distributed by second or third meeting and followed closely<br>■ Class grade points balanced across task types; values and deadlines for major tasks stated | ■ Needs analysis conducted infrequently or not at all<br>■ Syllabus distributed after third meeting or not closely followed<br>■ Class grade points imbalanced across task types; values or deadlines for major tasks left unstated |
| **Lesson Planning & Task Design** | ■ Lesson planning conducted before every class session<br>■ Tasks in sync with syllabus<br>■ Task process and objectives explicitly stated<br>■ Written peer or teacher response conducted frequently<br>■ Critical reflection encouraged | ■ Lesson planning conducted occasionally<br>■ Tasks out of sync with syllabus<br>■ Task process or objectives not explicitly stated<br>■ Written peer or teacher response conducted infrequently<br>■ Critical reflection discouraged |

Although it could be argued that effective teaching and learning can occur even with an unsystematic or random treatment of the above curricular and structural components, it is beyond the scope of this paper to determine the extent to which maximized learning is directly associated with a precise structural level (for a combination-based curriculum or any other curricular type). The above model has only thus far been applied to an advanced L2 writing course. The next section focuses on research design.

# 3.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

## 3.1 Research Questions

The following two research questions guided this study:

1. *Do large-scale student revisions of final drafts occur in a highly-structured, combination-based writing curriculum?*
2. *Do gains in individual learner second-language writing development occur in a highly-structured, combination-based writing curriculum?*

## 3.2 Sample

The sample was non-random and qualitative in nature and included select students enrolled across three semesters in seven sections of an advanced academic writing course at a Middle Eastern Gulf university. This study includes two participant groups: 1) 139 university undergraduates from various first language backgrounds (approximately 80% of the students speak Arabic; the other 20% speak American English, Chinese, Farsi, Hindi, Urdu, Turkish and various other languages) enrolled in the highest-level composition course available at the university; and 2) an instructor (also the author of this paper) assigned to teach this high-level composition course according to established departmental guidelines (which focus on the grading percentages, research genres and number and length of major assignments to employ).

The particular essay genre selected for analysis was the critique, since it employed a relatively fixed organizational structure, compared to the other major paper assigned in the course, the research paper, which employed a number of different organizational patterns (e.g., explanatory synthesis, argument synthesis, compare/contrast synthesis, cause/effect synthesis). The topic of the critique essay varied with the individual research paper topics selected by each student, since these two assignments were related to each other, though structured guidelines were in place for each draft of the critique (see Section 3.3.2).

## 3.3 Structural Components of an Advanced Academic Writing Course

### 3.3.1 Course Syllabus

Key information contained in the syllabus related to the grading percentages, weekly schedule and policy on late assignments. The grading percentages in effect were: critique essay (20%; first draft, 8%; final draft, 12%); research paper (30%; proposal, 6%; first draft, 8%; class presentation, 4%; final draft, 12%); midterm exam (10%); final exam (20%); mini-writing assignments (10%); and class participation (10%). The policy on late assignments was to enforce a 10% penalty for each weekday late. The weekly schedule meant that the first three chapters of the book (out of a total of five) had been covered in detail at the time that both drafts of the critique were assigned. These three chapters included information about summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting, critical thinking, critical reading, critical writing (including the basic structure of a critique, consisting of an introduction, summary, analysis, response and conclusion), thesis statements, introductions and conclusions.

A student/teacher conference was also held after about half of the class grade points had been determined. A Midterm Evaluation Worksheet was distributed at that time documenting student performance in each graded area. This conference did not count for class points directly, though absences would be recorded and participation points reduced for any students failing to attend; all students attended the conferences, however, and discussed their class progress up to that point of the term.

### 3.3.2 Critique Essay Guidelines

As was previously mentioned, a major formal task in the course was the critique essay, worth 20%, 8% for the first draft and 12% for the final draft. A number of specific guidelines influenced the final grade awarded (see Appendix A for the class handout). In terms of paper length, the first draft was expected to be at least two pages long (or approximately 500 words), while the final draft was supposed to be in the range of three to five pages (or 750 to 1250 words). Students were instructed that quantity was not as important as quality and that it was important to select a source to review that contained enough material to critique for several pages (and was also not too long). The instructions also emphasized the model provided in the textbook, which Belcher (1995) labels a *discrete review* (p.140). Such discrete reviews or critiques follow a prescribed order. The order of relevance to the critique assignment was: *introductio*n, *summary*, *analysis*, *response* (the latter two sections were allowed to be combined; also called the *evaluation* section) and *conclusion*. An additional requirement for the final draft was that two direct quotes from the source (including proper APA citations) were expected to be integrated into the student's source critique. This last requirement was a type of warm-up for the research paper assignment (the next formal task), which involved the synthesis of at least four sources and the frequent use of citations.

### 3.3.3 Peer Response

Peer response was employed for the first draft of the critique. At that point in the semester, students had already performed peer response once, for the research proposal (and they would do it one more time for the first draft of the research paper, which immediately followed the critique in the schedule, one week after the final critique drafts were graded and returned in class).

According to Ferris & Hedgcock (1998, pp.170-172), the advantages of peer response have to do with audience, quality of interaction, strengthening critical thinking skills, understanding multiple perspectives and learning to appreciate the strengths and weaknesses of submitted writing. The stated disadvantages appear to involve lack of awareness of the aims of peer response, an incomplete understanding of audience needs, and, possibly, a failure to take this class task seriously as a valuable component of the writing course – a point that will be returned to later in this paper.

The peer response sheet used in this study (see Table 3.1 below) contained seven question sets, focusing on each of the sections of a critique mentioned in the textbook (introduction, summary, analysis, response and conclusion).

TABLE 3.1 PEER RESPONSE QUESTIONS

1. What is the greatest strength of this critique? Be specific.
2. What type of introduction was employed? Was it effective? Explain.
3. Is the summary of the publication brief, comprehensive and objective? Explain.
4. Does the author of the critique analyze the evidence and the manner in which it was presented (in the original publication)? Explain. (Note: See p.58.)
5. Does the author of the critique respond to the viewpoints expressed in the publication? Explain. (Note: See p.58.)
6. What type of conclusion was employed? Was it effective? Explain.
7. How could this critique be improved? Be specific.

Students received 10 points for each completed peer response form. It is important to note that peer response forms were not completed anonymously. To get credit for completing a peer response sheet, the student was required to print his/her name and the name and topic associated with the student paper reviewed. They were instructed to answer each question in detail and to focus on what would help improve their peer's paper. Almost no students were observed going off task. Knowing that their identity was revealed, that the audience was real, and that class points were on the line, led to serious student engagement with the task at hand (i.e., reviewing their classmate's paper). Each student was expected to incorporate comments received on the peer response forms into their final drafts, along with the teacher-written feedback obtained on the first draft.

## 3.4 Data Collection Procedures

Following Fathman & Whalley (1990) and Ashwell (2000), a general coding scheme was adopted for student drafts that primarily identified locations where revision was expected, rather than correcting the mistakes themselves. For mistakes at the level of a word or small phrase, underlining was used to indicate the location of the incorrect or missing segment. For multiple, concentrated occurrences of mistakes involving larger phrases or sentences, square brackets were used to indicate the exact chunk of language needing to be revised. For cases where meaning was completely obscured, question marks were used to indicate that the teacher was unable to determine the underlying message. There were only occasional exceptions to this coding scheme, such as placing an "x" or cross out over words that were deemed unnecessary (and could be deleted) or writing detailed explanations for subject-specific or otherwise unusual or complex questions or comments (often for the students with the highest English writing abilities).

Other comments in the essay (more prevalent on first drafts than second drafts) focused primarily on content (e.g., wh-questions), organization (e.g., introductions, conclusions) and documentation (citations, photocopies of source materials). Following Ashwell (2000), teacher-written feedback involved mixed content and form. Given the difficulties involved in evaluating critiques with a broad range of topics, the guidelines provided in the course textbook were followed closely in the draft evaluation phase. These guidelines outlined five key sections to an effective critique: 1) introduction; 2) summary; 3) analysis; 4) response; and 5) conclusion (Behrens & Rosen, 2000, p.58).

As a participant observer, the instructor took note of each student's performance over the course of a semester and had the opportunity for in-depth interaction with each student at least once during the semester (for the post-midterm student/teacher conference held in the instructor' s office). Many students also visited with the teacher before or after class and during office hours. Regarding the two students included here as case studies, Jamila and Ahmed, a limitation of this study is that they were only interviewed in the course of everyday interaction (e.g., at the midterm student/teacher conference, during office hours), and these interviews did not focus specifically on the research questions delineated above.

## 3.5 Data Analysis

### 3.5.1 Research Question 1

The first research question was addressed by analyzing numerical student grades in aggregate along with critical reflections from the instructor. Simple frequency counts and percentages were employed to describe general trends, rather than quantitative statistics, since the seven sections included in this study constituted a sample of convenience and could not necessarily be assumed to represent the wider student population. Word counts were also employed to determine whether substantive revisions had been performed on the critique final draft for both students who consented to be included in the case study component of this research.

### 3.5.2 Research Question 2

Two case studies and critical reflections from the instructor were employed to address the second research question. Regarding the composition drafts from the case studies selected, fluency was analyzed as words per T-unit, grammatical complexity was analyzed as clauses per T-unit, and accuracy was analyzed as error-free T-units per T-unit. Lexical complexity was not included in this study due to confusion as to how to classify word types and sophisticated word types. Once again, simple frequency counts and percentages were utilized in the statistical analysis due to the type of sample obtained.

# 4.0 RESULTS

## 4.1 Research Question 1

### Numerical Student Grades in Aggregate

Below is the aggregate numerical student grade data for all seven sections of the advanced writing course taught. Twelve students were excluded from this analysis because they either failed to submit one of the two drafts required for the assignment or one of the drafts exhibited plagiarism. In order to protect confidentiality, further analysis of this numerical grade information was not performed.

TABLE 4.1 NUMERICAL STUDENT GRADES ON THE CRITIQUE ASSIGNMENT IN AGGREGATE

| Grade Level | Frequency/Total Grade Points on Draft 1 (D1) | Frequency/Total Grade Points on Draft 2 (D2) |
|---|---|---|
| **10** | 29/290 | 42/420 |
| **9** | 39/351 | 38/342 |
| **8** | 35/280 | 30/240 |
| **7** | 17/119 | 10/70 |
| **6** | 3/18 | 5/30 |
| **5** | 2/10 | 2/10 |
| **Overall Average** | 127/1068 = 8 | 127/1112 = 9 |

Key results in Table 4.1 above are: 1) an increase from 29 level 10 D1s (Draft 1s) to 42 level 10 D2s (Draft 2s); 2) a corresponding decrease in the frequencies of lower level D2 scores for all lower grade levels except level 6; and 3) an overall mean of 8 for D1 and 9 for D2.

Critical Reflections from the Instructor

Reflecting on the above information, the instructor/participant observer noted:

- The advanced writing course discussed in this study had one of the heaviest workloads in the program for students and teachers alike;
- During each of the three semesters of the investigation, the instructor was assigned a four-course teaching load with two sections of the advanced writing course (and once three sections), so marking loads were high and time was at a premium;

- The instructor verbalized high expectations for all students and had low tolerance for negative class behavior (late papers, plagiarism, excessive absenteeism, failure to complete assignments, failure to take responsibility for self-learning);
- Handouts were used nearly every class period;
- While this writing course was highly structured, the atmosphere in class was generally relaxed and easy going, with class activities divided between lectures, large and small groups, paired work and individual writing tasks;
- Few behavioral problems were encountered, and these were corrected immediately (e.g., late papers stopped when student noted penalty awarded);
- The instructor emphasizes that course grades are criterion-referenced, not norm-referenced, so theoretically all students could receive a high final grade if their performance merited such an award;
- Mixed content and form feedback was deemed the best option for providing useful teacher-written feedback on first drafts;
- The sequencing of assignments was considered important (following Ferris & Hedgcock (1998) key deadlines for drafts and peer response sessions were noted in the syllabus and other class handouts);
- Peer response sessions were well attended and expectations for these sessions were frequently reinforced throughout the semester;
- Students were required to perform large-scale revisions on final drafts just to maintain the same grade received on the first draft (and certainly to increase it).

The above results, from the numerical student grades in aggregate and the critical reflections from the instructor, suggest that the answer to Research Question 1 is affirmative.

## 4.2 Research Question 2

### Individual Student Cases

In order to better understand the complexities involved in teacher-student and student-student dialog about drafts, two student cases are presented here. Both students were Arabic first language users enrolled in the advanced writing course taught by the author.

The first student, Jamila,[2] conducted a veterinary science research project on the importance of the five senses to horse training. The book chapter selected for her critique focused on a horse's sense of hearing. Draft 1 (D1) contains 760 words, 198 clauses, 45 T-units and 19 error-free T-units, leading to a fluency rating of 17 (words per T-unit), a grammatical complexity rating of 4 (clauses per T-unit) and an accuracy rating of 42 percent (error-free T-units per T-units). Draft 2 (D2) contains 1079 words, 311 clauses, 58 T-units and 36 error-free T-units, leading to a fluency rating of 19 (words per T-unit), a grammatical complexity rating of 5 (clauses per T-unit) and an accuracy rating of 62 percent (error-free T-units per T-units). Jamila gained in all three measures. Her gains in fluency (12%; from 17 to 19) and grammatical complexity (25%; from 4 to 5) were modest, though the increase for accuracy was substantial (47%; from 42 to 62 percent).

The second student, Ahmed, conducted a sociological research project on misperceptions of arranged marriages in Great Britain. His article originally appeared in the *New Statesman*. D1 contains 619 words, 152 clauses, 28 T-units and 17 error-free T-units, leading to a fluency rating of 22 (words per T-unit), a grammatical complexity rating of 5 (clauses per T-unit) and an accuracy rating of 61 percent (error-free T-units per T-units). D2 contains 1507 words, 364 clauses, 54 T-units and 32 error-free T-units, leading to a fluency rating of 28 (words per T-unit), a grammatical complexity rating of 7 (clauses per T-unit) and an accuracy rating of 59 percent (error-free T-units per T-units). Ahmed gained in two measures, fluency (27%; from 22 to 28) and, most noticeably, grammatical complexity (40%; from 5 to 7), with a traceable loss in accuracy (3%; from 61 to 59 percent).

Table 4.2 contains unedited excerpts from both students D1 and D2.

The data illustrate that the English exhibited in the D2 excerpt for both students is much more developed than the corresponding text from D1.

## Critical Reflections from the Instructor

Reflecting on the above information, the instructor/participant observer noted:

- Jamila and Ahmed were both highly motivated, punctual and dedicated students, though both were regarded as somewhat timid, since they rarely spoke in front of the entire class;
- Ahmed had spent a great deal of time living in the United Kingdom and appeared to be fairly confident in his English writing abilities;

- Jamila had not lived outside the United Arab Emirates for any significant period and appeared to be somewhat anxious about her English writing abilities;
- Prior to writing the final drafts, both students individually verbalized to the teacher their disappointment regarding the overall quality of their first drafts;
- The instructor was left wondering whether Ahmed's slight drop in accuracy may have had anything to do with fewer grammar comments on D1.
- Noticeable gains in fluency, grammatical complexity and accuracy, such as those mentioned above for Jamila and Ahmed, were observed for other students as well over the course of the three semesters, though due to time and financial constraints formal statistical analyses were not performed on these essays.

The above results, from the two case studies and the critical reflections from the instructor, suggest that the answer to Research Question 2 is affirmative.

## 5.0 DISCUSSION

The critical reflections from the instructor in Section 4.1 above illustrate that the articulated expectations of the teacher and the corresponding course requirements made it difficult for students to do well in the course unless they consistently performed substantial revisions on their essay drafts. The aggregate grade data, although not statistically significant, suggest that students at the Middle Eastern Gulf university in this study, for the most part, performed large-scale revisions on their final critique drafts. In other words, a highly-structured, combination-based curriculum appears to have the potential to synergistically motivate L2 writing students to take the revision process seriously for their major writing tasks, such as critique essays or research projects, when they have a great deal of freedom to choose the writing topic themselves. Compared to the research paper, which is a much more difficult assignment (due to the synthesis component), the critique or discrete review was a well-structured genre that students were able to engage with, once they overcame writer' s block and saw their essay start to take shape. The peer response sessions in the observed classes fostered critical reflection and social interaction in a community of writers in training, a worthy goal for any academy of higher education (see Hyland, 2000).

TABLE 4.2
UNEDITED MATCHED EXCERPTS FROM CASE STUDENT CRITIQUE ESSAYS

| Student | Draft 1 (D1) Excerpt | Draft 2 (D2) Excerpt |
|---|---|---|
| **Jamila** | What's interesting is that the horse doesn't not only hear from the ears "but also of vibration reaching them through the ground traveling up to the limb bones and being conveyed through the bony skeleton on the skull and the middle ear." This mean that a horse uses it's whole body to sense and sounds in the surrounding. The horse also responds well to whispering with keeper, especially a closer one. (D1, pp.1-2) | What's interesting to know is that sound waves travel from the ground through the horse body to the ears, "but also of vibration reaching them through the ground traveling up to the limb bones and being conveyed through the bony skeleton on the skull and the middle ear." (Smythe, 1997, p.66). This means that a horse uses it whole body to hear sounds coming from far distances. Perhaps this is the reason that a thin-skinned horse hears well than other breeds of horse. We also know from the chapter that the horse's long neck and ears which can move in every direction help it to even know the quarter from which the sound originates. Hearing since seems to be very important in horses since they are easily affected by any king of noise such as rustling of leaves, band music, and thunder. Horses can also recognize sounds proceeding from humans. For example, hissing helps establishing a friendship between a horse and its keeper and that's where horse whispering comes from. Smythe also points that an ill-tempered horse could be charmed by just whispering into its ears. (D2, pp.1-2) |

TABLE 4.2 (CONT)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Ahmed** | Dr. Theodore Dalrymple argues that the ritual of arranged marriage should be discontinued or even banned in Great Britain. A liberal society should accommodate the "ways of life" of the various cultures that integrate themselves into their society. The author's patients relay to him the terror they undergo when forced into an arranged marriage. He commiserates with "traditional Indian parents" who are shocked by the customs of the West that totally contradict their customs, but they should abandon any beliefs not compatible with the culture with the beliefs of the culture they dwell in. (D1, pp.1-2) | The author commences his article by presenting the marriage of celebrities Imran Khan and Jemima Goldsmith. He then speculates upon the reasons of the dissonance in their marriage focusing on their customs of arranged marriage as the greatest possible cause. Although liberal societies might be able to accommodate various diverse cultures, they should be aware that some beliefs clash with some of their own and steps toward compromising some of these incompatible beliefs should be considered since their own beliefs should reign supreme. The author resides in an areas where locked up Indian girls are so common that a police unit is dedicated only to rescuing and protecting them from their parents. The author stresses the fact that he sympathizes with "traditional Indian parents" who are horrified with what they see in the cities of Britain from "violence on the streets and unwanted or grossly neglected children" (Dalrymple, 1998, p.28). (D2, pp.1-2) |

The notable gains in fluency for Ahmed and in accuracy for Jamila might be due to several variables. First of all, a casual glance at the drafts for both writers reveals that Ahmed is significantly farther along the L2 writing developmental continuum than Jamila, though both are considered advanced writers. Following is another brief excerpt (see also Section 4.2) from each student's conclusion to the final draft (D2). These unedited excerpts provide further evidence of the L2 writing and critical thinking abilities demonstrated by each student:

> **Jamila**:
> In conclusion, the chapter ends up with its aim, which is, to inform horse trainers or keepers about the sense of hearing in horses. There are parts of the chapter that prove and state the author' s good experience in this field. The chapter was simple and up to the point and this makes it not easy only for horse trainers but horse lovers in general.
>
> (Draft 2, p.4)

> **Ahmed:**
> I conclude by agreeing to the author' s opinion to the fact that a problem exists in Britain due to the clash of certain aspects of the diverse cultures, but disagreeing to his accusation of arranged marriage as the reason behind the clash. Although Dr. Dalrymple makes a compelling argument, he should have been addressing forced marriages instead of arranged ones. Since in his article his argument is mainly about the tradition, his misinterpretation of arranged marriage made it difficult for his arguments to be considered in the logical manner he worked on presenting.
>
> (Draft 2, pp.5-6)

Though these two students were at slightly different places along the L2 writing developmental continuum, they both demonstrated measurable gains.

Referring back to the results in Section 4.2 above, Ahmed's slight drop in accuracy is perhaps explained by the fact that his final draft (D2) was 243% longer (1507/619 words) than the first (D1). He was likely focusing on meaning to such an extent that he paid little attention to form. Jamila, on the other hand, was primarily attending to form. Her D2 was only 142% longer than the D1 (1079/760), but there is a noticeable difference in the readability of the two drafts; D1 is much harder to process due to the frequent lexical and grammatical errors. Although both writers gained in fluency, Ahmed's gains were more significant at 27%, compared with Jamila's 12%, since he was gushing forth with words as his ideas emerged and crystallized in the final draft. The accuracy numbers are a bit misleading (Ahmed's 3% loss to Jamila's 47% gain), since Ahmed is clearly using a much wider range of grammatical and lexical expressions. His sentences are much longer and more sophisticated than Jamila's, though these statistics do not clearly reflect this fact. As was already mentioned above, there are fewer grammar comments on Ahmed's D1, compared to Jamila's D1, perhaps because the instructor ran out of time while marking Ahmed's first draft (following Ashwell, 2000, fn 3, p.247, an attempt was made to allot the same amount of time for each student draft, averaging about five an hour, or 12 minutes per draft), or possibly because the content there was so engaging it was hard to remain focused on providing grammar feedback.

Wolfe-Quintero et al (1998, p.4) note that some researchers, in particular Casanave (1994) and Tedick (1990), have provided evidence that a tradeoff may exist between some or all of the three developmental measures included in this study (fluency, grammatical complexity and accuracy). Until we have a firmer research base to consult regarding the above three measures, as isolated variables as well as together, our discussion of L2 writing development ought to remain somewhat constrained.

Several limitations are associated with this research: 1) the instructor utilized participant observation and attempted to teach each section of the writing course consistently to the best of his abilities; it is possible, however, that some of the results could have been unintentionally influenced by his awareness of the research objectives; 2) the circumstances and processes by which case study results can be extended to wider populations remain somewhat unclear (cf. Nunan, 1992, pp.74-90); 3) much of the revision process occurs while writers are working online in a word-processing program (especially for the first draft) and is therefore not entirely accounted for in an analysis of hard copy drafts (cf. Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998, p.269); and 4) time and financial constraints precluded the analysis of data from other settings (outside the Gulf), genres (e.g., the research paper) or student cases; it is possible such additional results might have contradicted the interpretations presented in this paper.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

The present study reviews different aspects of a highly-structured combination-based curriculum in an advanced writing course at a Middle Eastern Gulf university and concludes that such an approach can lead to large-scale revisions of composition drafts. After receiving teacher-written feedback and peer response comments, the students in this course for the most part responded favorably by substantially revising the compositions on discipline-specific research topics which they selected themselves. Results from this study also suggest that individual learners experiencing the curricular approach outlined above may also benefit from explicit gains in second-language writing development, specifically in terms of fluency, grammatical complexity and accuracy. It is unknown, however, precisely how structural levels and curricular types influence student L2 writing development or revision practices; such avenues are recommended for future research.

## THE AUTHOR

*Russell Arent has research interests in L2 pragmatics and L2 writing. He has taught EAP/ESP courses in Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and the United States. Author contact information: Department of Humanistic Studies, TH 331, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, WI 54302, USA. E-mail: arentr@uwgb.edu*

## ENDNOTES

* This research was initiated while a member of the faculty at the American University of Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates. The author wishes to thank: the two anonymous reviewers; the editors; fellow teaching colleagues, especially Maher Bahloul, Cathleen Bridgeman, Christopher Horger, Kelly Marsh and Rodney Tyson; and the students who participated in the advanced writing course. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the above individuals. Any flaws remaining are mine alone.

1. Issues in writing assessment and evaluation have been thoroughly delineated elsewhere (cf. Cohen, 1994; Ekbatani & Pierson, 2000; Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Genesee & Upshur, 1996; Hamp-Lyons, 1991; Kroll, 1998; Reid, 1993; Silva & Matsuda, 2001).

2. The students' names are pseudonyms to protect confidentiality. All names on composition drafts were removed.

## REFERENCES


Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9,* 227-257.

Atkinson, D. (2000). On Robert B. Kaplan's response to Terry Santos et al's On the future of second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 317-320.

Atkinson, D. (2003). Writing and culture in the post-process era. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 49-63.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bofman, T. (1989). Attainment of syntactic and morphological accuracy by advanced language learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 17-34.

Behrens, L., & Rosen, L.J. (2000). *Writing and reading across the curriculum*, (7th ed.). New York: Longman.

Belcher, D. (1995). Writing critically across the curriculum. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp.135-154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Carson, J., & Nelson, G. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*, 17-30.

Casanave, C. (1994). Language development in students journals. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*, 179-201.

Casanave, C. (2003). Looking ahead to more sociopolitically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship (But should it be called post process?). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 85-102.

Cohen, A.D. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom*, (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Dalrymple, T. (1998, October 23). Can a liberal society tolerate eastern culture? *New Statesman*, pp. 28-29.

Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. *Review of Educational Research, 52*, 159-199.

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

Ekbatani, G., & Pierson, H. (Eds.). (2000). *Learner-directed assessment in ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D.R., & Hedgcock, J.S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Genesee, F., & Upshur, J.A. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (Ed.). (1991). *Assessing second language writing in academic contexts*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hunt, K. (1965). *Grammatical structures written at three grade levels*. NCTE Research Report No. 3. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London: Longman.
Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kroll, B. (1998). Assessing writing abilities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18*, 219-240.
Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M.H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
Matsuda, P.K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 65-83.
Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Osborn, T. (2000). *Critical reflection and the foreign language classroom*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
Pery-Woodley, M.-P. (1991). State of the art: Writing in L1 and L2 – Analyzing and evaluating learners texts. *Language Teaching, 24*, 69-83.
Raimes. A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 407-430.
Reid, J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Richards, J.C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP today: A practitioner's guide*. London: Prentice Hall.
Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 657-675.
Silva, T., & Matsuda, P.K. (Eds.). (2001). *On second language writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Smythe, R.H. (1997). *The mind of the horse*. Edison, NJ: Castle Books.
Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Tedick, D. (1990). ESL writing assessment: Subject matter knowledge and its impact on performance. *English for Specific Purposes, 9*, 123-143.
Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., & Kim, H.-Y. (1998). *Second language development in writing: Measures of fluency, accuracy and complexity*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

# APPENDIX A
# SPECIFIC GUIDELINES ON THE CRITIQUE ASSIGNMENT

This handout contains important information about the critique essay. As per the course syllabus, the critique essay is worth 20% of your final course grade.

## Important Deadlines and Guidelines for Each Stage

***October 7:*** *Submit two copies of a first draft of your critique essay in a pocket folder, which is at least 2 pages long. The source that you choose to critique should be one of the four (or more) sources you selected for your research paper. This source should be long enough so that you have enough material to discuss (to meet the minimum page length requirements for each draft). Along with your first draft, you must turn in the photocopy of the source (article, book chapter, web page, etc.) that you critiqued. Your critique should follow the guidelines mentioned on p.58 of your textbook.* The first draft is worth 8% of your final grade and is due at the beginning of class (for the peer response).

***October 21:*** Submit the final draft of your critique essay in a pocket folder, together with your first draft (with teacher comments), your peer response feedback sheets, and your photocopy of the original source (article, book chapter, etc.). Be sure to check that your final draft also contains at least two integrated direct quotes (with complete citations) from the source that you critiqued. The final draft should also address the issues mentioned in the handout *Revising Final Drafts. The final draft of your paper must be between 3 and 5 pages long. It is worth 12% of your final grade and is due by 3pm (in my office).*

## Paper Format

*Each draft of your paper must be typed, double-spaced, on white paper and have standard margins and fonts (12 pitch). The source used must be documented with citations in APA style, following the models provided in your textbook (pp.219-228).* You must include all required materials with each draft submission in a pocket folder that has your name and ID number clearly written on the front of the folder. *Loose drafts without folders will not be accepted.*

## Grading Scheme

*A 10-point grading scheme is used for each research proposal and draft. A 10 represents work that well exceeds the level expected for an A for the specific type of assignment. A 9 represents typical A-level work. An 8 represents B-level work. A 7 represents C-level work. A 6 represents D-level work. Any score of 5 or below represents a failing grade. See the section Late Submissions for details on how these grades are adjusted for late work.*

## Late Submissions

*All work related to the critique must be submitted to the instructor by the specific deadlines mentioned above or a late penalty will be assessed for each 24-hour period that the work is late (excluding holidays and weekends). For a late paper, the best option is to bring it to class or to my office. If I am not present in A244 when a delivery is being made, simply slide the late paper under my office door. In any case, the instructor will not be held responsible for any papers that are submitted late due to the negligence of third parties (such as friends or University staff workers) or due to last-minute computer problems.* The penalty for late submissions is equivalent to 10% of the total points possible (which equals approximately one full letter grade) for each weekday late. *For example, if a first draft of B-level work is submitted late at 9am on October 12, the original score of 8 would be marked down three notches to a 5.*

| Example (for B-level work): | Original Grade | Late 3 days | Adjusted Grade |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 8 | → | **[ 5 ]** |
| | | (Minus 30% of 10) | |

It is important to turn all of your assignments in on time! Mark your calendars. You have been given plenty of notice. Do not wait until the last minute to get started.

*An edited version of your critique can be incorporated into the first draft of your research paper (if you find the source of the critique relevant enough), so the work on this assignment is directly related to your research project. Good luck with your critique! Remember to address the issues in the gray box on p.58 of your textbook.*

# Drama Techniques in English Language Learning

**BRIAN HELDENBRAND**
*Jeonju University*

## ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the meaning of drama, its benefits to language learning, how to utilize drama in the classroom, and concludes with four diverse drama activities for assisting early language learners. The English language classroom becomes an active participant when the teacher actively utilizes drama techniques and activities. Although textbooks prepare the learner with language, drama activities propel the learner to participate with real communication and pave the way for the learner to experiment with personal language learning. Whether the learner participates with drama activities in the classroom or on the stage through actual drama competitions, his or her spirit awakens more and the learner firmly comprehends the benefits of learning a language through drama. As Whitear writes, drama "liberates the human spirit in a very social and playful way. It is a refreshing and energizing approach to language learning for both students and teachers" (1998, 36).

## I. WHAT IS DRAMA?

Charlyn Wessels, author of *Drama*, begins her book by stating, "drama is doing" (1987, p. 7). This simplified definition accurately depicts drama as the direct involvement of learning by experience. A famous Chinese proverb informs, "Tell me and I will forget; teach me and I will remember; involve me and I will learn". Rather than just listening and remembering, or seeing and explaining, the students take a personal journey through kinetic experiential learning. The student learns more than information, by developing practical "hands-on" skills for applying meaning into real-life situations. To emphasize this point, the author has blind-

This paper was partially supported by the Jeonju University Research Fund.

folded a student, placing a twenty-dollar bill somewhere in the room and allowing the student to find the money. For many, it is easy to understand the definition of being "blind," but to actually "feel" blind and "be" blind opens up another door to the learning experience.

Although texts and dialogues share vocabulary and expressions necessary for learning, they are lifeless words on a page that can stymie a learner, rather than invigorate him to speak. According to Wessels, using drama activities helps to bring the (written) materials to life, by infusing the lifeless print with feeling, imagination, and thought for the learner, who becomes an active participant in the learning process. (Wessels, 1987). Providing students the opportunity to place themselves directly in the learning experience greatly improves their chances of better comprehension.

Additionally, using drama techniques in the English classroom will certainly bring more enthusiasm to the classroom. Maley and Duff, in *Drama Techniques in Language Learning*, relate drama to "the naughty child who climbs the high walls and ignores the 'No Trespassing' sign" (1982), p. 15. Even though this is not the typical student most teachers wish to teach, the purpose is to lead students to involve themselves in the language. Wan Yee Sam agrees by stating, "Drama activities can be used to provide opportunities for the student to be involved actively. The activities involve the student's whole personality and not merely his mental process" (1990, 87). Drama allows students to become active participants in the learning of English. Making the classroom a small stage for everyday learning will better engage students for the larger stage known as life.

## II. BENEFITS OF USING DRAMA TECHNIQUES

In my experience, there exists many advantages to include drama within the classroom curriculum. Over the last ten years of preparing students for drama performances and judging drama contests, it has been exciting to see students excel in their language development after experiencing drama. A few years back, a student by the name of Soon-sik mentioned that his small role as a mouse in a drama performance gave him more personal confidence. He went on to say that this actual experience with drama encouraged him to enter the field of sales. Soon-sik's experience with drama opened the hidden personality within him.

Another student by the name of Hyun-hee, who experienced four years of drama in her university, is now working as an English teacher in a program that applies the beliefs of using drama in the classroom. Both of these students were affected by drama and realized the asset of using drama in language learning. Additionally, Stephen Whitear (1998) observes that speaking is not only about words, structure, and pronunciation, but feelings, motivations, and meanings. Listed below are some valuable benefits for bringing drama to the English language learner.

## A. Drama is fun

There is no better reason. A "fun" class improves the learning environment as the affective filter is lowered. Mordecai (1985) stresses that the combination of drama activities with learning a second language brings about a fun, enriching and purposeful experience. Truthfully, learners want to enjoy the learning process and drama allows them to experiment with language, and laugh at the same time. Nobody ever said the English classroom had to be serious. Drama lightens the academic mood, but enlightens the learner.

## B. Drama is a relaxed and informal way to learn English

Textbook English is very good at providing the structure of curriculum. However, at times, it doesn't provide the freedom to express something in a holistic way. A general textbook dialogue only provides one possible way to communicate the message, but when a learner is given individual choices of how to say something, allowing them the freedom to "step out of the box", the right answer/wrong answer concept is removed and communication becomes more informal while the learner can remain enjoyably relaxed. Maurer (1987) believes that "students should feel that they are investigating, discovering, fiddling around with the language in question without having too much riding on the outcome." (Maley and Duff (1982, p. 14) concur by stating, "every student needs periods in which to practise what he or she knows without restraint, without fear of being wrong."

## C. Drama helps to learn new vocabulary and expressions in their proper environment

Many times, the expression, "listen and repeat" is spoken by English teachers as they attempt to promote speaking in their classroom. My Spanish instructor used, "repeat after me" in Spanish more than five times a class, as he desired the students to remember each word or expression. I remember very few words in Spanish, but I will always remember "repeat after me." Unfortunately, simply verbalizing words and sentences does not solidify comprehension. However, drama activities help to reinforce language previously learned (Mordecai, 1985; Fernandez & Coil, 1986; Sam, 1990). Sam concludes that drama "helps to extend, retain and reinforce vocabulary and sentence structure through role-play and communication games" (Sam, 1990, 86). When a teacher brings in a particular scenario, along with some props and costumes, certain words and expressions take on a new meaning in context. Maley and Duff (1982) strongly insist that drama releases personal creativity and energy and this in itself is an excellent purpose for learning, while Fernandez and Coil (1986) state that drama encourages student sensitivity and imagination and thus makes learning more realistic and meaningful (Sam,1990). It is necessary for the teacher to provide the right classroom environment for learners to actually visualize and participate with the vocabulary in a real English language environment.

## D. Drama helps in proper pronunciation and intonation in English

Clarity of spoken English is absolutely essential for clear communication.

The teacher can use words and expressions found within the drama script to focus on particular phonetic sounds and assist with correction on an individual basis. Goodwin writes, "Drama is a particularly effective tool for pronunciation teaching because various components of communicative competence (discourse intonation, pragmatic awareness, nonverbal communication) can be practiced in an integrated way" (2001, p. 126). In an EFL environment, drama clubs, which perform in English, need assistance in correct pronunciation and proper intonation. With the help of drama, a learner is able to produce a variety of utterances, thus getting practice in the target language in an integrated and holistic fashion (Gill, 1995). The inflection of certain words, expressions and sentences tend to result in producing a different meaning in the language. Learning the proper way to speak sentence or question forms will add another element to communicating in English. As supplements, Carolyn Graham's *Small Talk* (1986) and *Jazz Chants* (2001) are excellent language resources to assist learners with intonation patterns.

## E. Drama builds confidence in the learner' s ability to speak English

The goal of many conversation teachers is to build confidence within their students. A large percentage of Korean students lack confidence in speaking, due to the limited opportunity for speaking in the classroom, combined with the cultural ideology of not making mistakes. Gill (1996) writes that "Many Asian students, because of social factors like culture and 'face', and barriers to communication like affective filters and monitors, initially lacked the confidence to participate. However, once their affective filters had been lowered and they had overcome the temptation to monitor their language output at every turn, they found that it was possible to have fun and still learn. They could experiment with the new language, and not fear the threat of an imposing teacher-figure constantly supervising and correcting them." (Gill, 1996). On the stage, exactness in language is not as critical as communication. The focus is not on exact speaking, but on enabling students to communicate. As students are provided various activities to get involved with the language, their personal outlook on the language and their speaking confidence become greatly enhanced.

## F. Drama motivates the student of English

There is nothing like a student who is motivated to speak. They are curious about everything and are willing to take a risk with English. Drama has enabled the student to take a risk and display communication in more ways than just words. Being able to use one's face, along with one's hands and eyes, to share a message builds communicative options and opens the learner to communicate more each time. The greater the participation, the better chances of the learner's language muscles being developed in the same way that one's bodily muscles are strengthened through physical exercise (Gill, 1996). A motivated student spreads excitement for learning English to other students in the classroom.

## G. Drama builds a better understanding of culture

There is a strong connection between language and culture and the teacher can help present the English world to the class. Miccoli (2003, 123) goes so far as to say that language and culture are married and "learning a language cannot be divorced from cultural learning." Within short skits and drama activities, cultural elements can be explained and better understood. Being able to include familiarity with these cultural learning points helps to bring a stronger relationship between the language and its meaning. Cultural awareness is easily communicated through drama.

### H. Drama removes the focus from the English textbook

It is crucial for the teacher to find a way to remove the English textbook from the learner. Although the textbook serves a purpose in the beginning, the actual learning of English comes when the learner can experience the language in a real environment. Gill (1996) reports that authentic language is "made up of verbal and non-verbal communicative messages produced on the basis of the demands of each societal situation, untextbook-like in design, and unrestricted by rigid structural accuracy or difficulty-indexed sequencing, the central motivation being to convey meaning." Role-play and simulations are good methods for learners to use language learned within the textbook. The goal of the teacher is to lead learners to use the language in real situations, not the memorization of textbook dialogues.

### I. Drama involves the whole person as a total physical activity

Dramatic activities in learning English apply a kinesthetic, emotional, and experiential approach to learning. Language, together with feelings and movement, blend together to affect the whole person. Abercrombie confirms this point by stating, "We speak with our vocal organs, but we converse with our whole bodies" (cited in Celce-Murcia, 2001), 127.

## III. VARIOUS WAYS TO EXPRESS DRAMA

Drama activities are seen all around us. Whether it be on television, at a lecture, or simply talking with friends, various ways of communicating meaning can be observed. For young English learners, pretending to be a tree or even an animal provides them a chance to enter the stage and take part in English, regardless of whether they are speaking or not. The element of mime or pantomime used early within the learning environment helps to set the stage for verbal communication later in learning. According to Sam (1990, 86), "Drama improves oral communication . . . Appropriacy and meaning are more important than form or structure of the language. Drama can help restore the totality of the situation by reversing the learning process, starting with meaning and moving towards language form." Harmer (2001) would agree as he strongly insists that students should focus on the content of language rather than the particular form of language.

As a learner recognizes how they can use their body to share their words and feelings, without needing to speak, it helps to bring them into the spoken language at their own pace. Comprehension does not always require words and young language learners can communicate their understanding by gestures, body movements and completing the task asked of them. When the child is ready to speak, they will display a confidence in their spoken words because no pressure was placed upon them to communicate from the very beginning. Over time, the learner will step up and begin to participate in the language.

For the learner who is prepared to speak, activities such as role-playing, reader's theatre, simple dramatic performances of children stories, along with making short speeches, will certainly provide the learner chances to incorporate speaking with both their bodies and their words.

## IV. VARIOUS DRAMATIC ACTIVITIES FOR THE CLASSROOM

Listed below are four diverse dramatic activities for teachers to incorporate into their teaching repertoire. These particular activities focus on the early language learner, where the learner is not required to actually speak with words, but rather display their comprehension by "doing" the language.

### A. Body Talk (No words or sounds)

The teacher can speak and demonstrate these actions or expressions for students and then have students respond by imitating the teacher. For more advanced students, they are ready to participate on their own. Ask for some volunteers, or choose students who are comfortable in front of their classmates to come to the front of the class and demonstrate their comprehension of the expression. After students have been given enough time to observe and understand, involve the whole class to express themselves in unison as the teacher shares each expression.

(a) Hello/Hi
(b) It's cold today./It's hot today..
(c) I'm hungry.
(d) I'm tired.
(e) I'm happy.
(f) I'm sad.
(g) I'm strong.
(h) I'm handsome/beautiful.
(i) I'm late.
(j) I'm in love.

## B. Going on a Trip (No words)

This activity involves putting a group of students in front of the class. They are taking a trip together and are using mime to share what items they need to take with them on a trip (e.g. miming a camera, a cap, or a pair of sunglasses). After all of the students in the group have finished miming their items, the students in the class attempt to guess which items the students put into the suitcase. When the first group concludes their miming, repeat the activity again within small groups in the class.

## C. Story-miming

There are many children's stories that are perfect for this type of activity. The teacher mimes the selected story and students attempt to guess the story and the actions of each character. Some pre-teaching might be necessary for this activity, but if students know the story or have studied/listened to the story in prior lessons, they should be able to follow the actions of the teacher. After the teacher concludes his/her miming of the story, he should allow the students to tell the story again themselves. Miming is quite enjoyable to watch and helps to solidify vocabulary and expressions as students listen to the teacher tell the story.

Below is an example from the story, "*The Fox and the Grapes*."

| Teacher's Actions | Typical Student Response |
|---|---|
| Pace around. Put hands on stomach. | "That's the fox. He's hungry." |
| Slightly bow your head. Hang your tongue out and slowly pant. | "He's very hungry!" |
| Continue as above. Look all around the area until your eyes open wide. | "He's looking for food." |
| Extend your hand to touch a long, high object. | "He sees something. "He sees a fence." |
| Stand on your tiptoes. Rest your hands on top of the object. Open your eyes wide and lick your lips. | "He's looking over the fence." "He sees some food—grapes." |

As students become more familiar with each story, they will want to take on a role or become the narrator in the story. This storytelling activity is excellent for overly shy students and for students who need movement to enhance their learning.

**The miming of the story can continue until the story is completed or until the section being reviewed has concluded.

## D. The Use of Meaningful Sequences

This type of activity involves both listening comprehension and physical response that can be done in short, ten-minute lessons. The teacher acts out appropriate commands to the class from a pre-recorded series of commands that are played from a cassette player. Each lesson includes a series of about 20 commands, centered on a particular theme. The teacher utilizes gesturing, pantomime and facial expressions to communicate the commands and expressions to the students. After the teacher demonstrates the actions for the students, the students involve themselves in the lesson. The benefit of this type of activity is that the student sees meaning as he/she hears sound and then provides a physical response to what he/she saw and heard. Meaningful sequences combine visual, auditory and kinesthetic elements within a listening comprehension activity.

Below is an example of a meaningful sequence adapted from John Oller Jr' s *Methods that Work* (1993:25).

You are at a restaurant.
1. Pick up your napkin.
2. Unfold it.
3. Put it on you lap.
4. Pick up your fork in your left hand.
5. Pick up your knife in your right hand.
6. Cut a piece of meat.
7. Put it in your mouth.
8. Chew it.
9. Swallow it.

Repeat steps 6-9 again.

10. Put down your knife and fork.
11. Pick up the bill.
12. Look at it.
13. Take out your wallet.
14. Pay the bill.
15. Leave a tip.
16. Leave the restaurant.

Teachers can create their own lessons to match the theme or topics being learned in their classes. One particular text that provides some good examples of basic meaningful sequences is *Operations in English* by Gayle Nelson and Thomas Winters (1993). Meaningful sequences provide opportunities for vocabulary acquisition in context, understanding of cultural concepts as well as a change of pace in learning.

## V. CONCLUSION

The use of drama in the English language classroom will enhance language retention and greatly assist language development. Language programs and schools would do well to imitate neighbourhood organizations by utilizing the power of drama that reflects the fullest possible range of linguistic competence (Heath, 1993; Elgar, 2002). Drama provides the learner an opportunity to simultaneously experience the language and experiment with it using their whole body. Richard-Amato writes, "Because students can lose themselves in the characters, plots, and situations, they are more apt to receive the benefits of reduced anxiety levels, increased self-confidence and esteem, and heightened awareness" (Richard-Amato, 1988, p. 145). Gill states, "drama helps shift the focus from teachers to learners, giving students greater opportunities to participate in the production of the target language" (Gill, 1996). Drama enables the teacher to break free from the textbook and focus on real, meaningful language. Although this author' s experience of language learning through the use of drama has been limited to work in Korea, he continues to do research in this area and desires to continue to share his work and research with other language teachers.

## THE AUTHOR

*Brian Heldenbrand is in his tenth year of teaching at Jeonju University. He completed his MATESL at Saint Michael's College in Vermont, U.S.A. and also holds an MA in English Language and Literature. Brian previously served as president of the Jeolla Chapter of Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (KOTESOL). Brian enjoys using speech and drama techniques as tools for developing English skills in Korean students. Email:*

## REFERENCES

Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle/Thomson Learning.

Elgar, Ann G. (2002). Student playwriting for language development. *ELT Journal, 56*(1), 22-28.

Fernandez, L., & Coil, A. (1986). Drama in the classroom. *Practical Teaching, 6*(3), 18-21.

Gill, C.S. (1996). Using drama techniques to encourage oral interaction. *The English Teacher, 25*, October. Retrieved March 2, 2004, from http://www.melta.org.my/ET/1996/main6.html

Gill, C. 1995. Building target language oral skills through drama. *Conference Proceedings, Second Biennial Conference, AALIT*, pp. 79-83.

Goodwin, J. (2001). Teaching pronunciation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Graham, C. (2001). *Jazz chants: Old and new*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Graham, C. (1986). *Small talk: More jazz chants*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex, England: Pearson Education.

Heath, S.B. (1993). Inner city life through drama: Imagining the language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(2), 177-192.

Maurer, J.K. (1997). Presentation, practice, and production in the EFL class. *The Language Teacher*, Retrieved March 2, 2004, from http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/97/sep/maurer.html

Maley, A., & Duff, A. (1982). *Drama Techniques in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miccoli, Laura. (2003). English through drama for oral skills development. *ELT Journal 57*(2), 122-129.

Mordecai, Joyce. (1985). Drama and second language learning. *Spoken English, 18*(2), 12-15.

Nelson, G., & Winters, T. (1993). *Operations in English: 55 natural and logical sequences for language acquisition*. Brattleboro, VT: Pro Lingua.

Oller, J., Jr. (1993). *Methods that work*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Richard-Amato, P.A. (1988). *Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Sam, W.Y. (1990). Drama in teaching English as a second language: A communicative approach. *The English Teacher, 9*. Retrieved March 2, 2004, from http://www.melta.org.my/ET/1990/main8.html

Wessels, C. (1987). *Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whitear, S. (1998). English through drama: A visual/physical approach. *The Language Teacher*. Retrieved March 2, 2004, from http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/98/dec/whitear.html

# Portfolio Use and EFL Learning and Assessment in South Korea

**DON MAKARCHUK**
*Kyonggi University*

## ABSTRACT

The study reported on in this paper examines the value of portfolios in a university-level public speaking course in South Korea with regard to their impact on learning from the learner's perspective. In addition, the study considers the value of portfolios as an assessment instrument in this particular context from the instructor's viewpoint. It is concluded that the learners in this study regarded the use of portfolios as a positive addition to their class in that portfolios were regarded as an important contributor to learning. In terms of assessment, portfolios were revealed to have both strengths and limitations with regard to practicality of use in this particular context.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper will examine the feasibility of using portfolios as a way to improve learning and assessment among South Korean university students taking a public speaking course. The paper will detail some of the ways portfolios have been conceptualized in the literature, review the advantages and disadvantages associated with portfolios and report the results of a study which sought to determine whether portfolio use was a beneficial addition to the learning process from the learner's perspective. In addition, the utility of portfolios as an assessment instrument will be examined with respect to this particular context.

The study reveals a positive attitude toward portfolio use by the learners in this context. The reasons given by the learners to explain this attitude are that portfolio use promoted learning by helping them to organize the content of their speeches, aided in the development of this content (by facilitating the redrafting process) and encouraged active participation in the speech-writing process. Participation was facilitated because a portfolio has value (1) as a record that documents work accomplished and which can assist in post-course speech-related activities, and (2) as an exam preparation tool. With regard to assessment value, while the use of portfolios had countervailing advantages and disadvantages as compared to the non-use situation, they had the benefit of motivating professional development.

## WHAT IS A PORTFOLIO?

Traditionally, portfolios have been associated with the crafts and visual arts fields. In these areas, people would typically compile a collection of their work for display to others when seeking to demonstrate their ability for the purpose of securing employment or admittance to an educational program.

In the language arts field portfolios have come to be seen as a means of describing a learner's ability in a way that provides a better portrait than traditional standardized tests alone (Balliro, 1993; Short, 1993) as they include artifacts of authentic work products which demonstrate mastery of real-life tasks. These artifacts may be entirely learner-chosen or almost wholly determined by others depending on the type of portfolio and the philosophy of the implementer. Valencia and Calfee (1991, p. 337) note three types of language learning portfolios: (1) showcase (a collection of the student's favorite work), (2) documentation (work which constitutes a record of the student's progress and which the student usually has a hand in selecting) and (3) evaluation (a collection of student work which is largely determined according to an evaluation scheme over which the student has little control).

## BENEFITS OF USING PORTFOLIOS

Various writers have noted the advantages of using portfolios in the language classroom. These are summarized below:

- promote learner autonomy by encouraging learners to select artifacts for their portfolios and sometimes evaluate them (Hancock, 1994)
- increase learning by enhancing the learner's awareness of what they have learned and how they have learned it as they have a concrete record of their work to refer to. Because portfolios can include a history of the developmental process (e.g., making repeated drafts of a composition) leading to a final product, learners can have a better understanding of how they changed (learned) in order to create the final product (San Diego County Office of Education, 1997)

- increase learner motivation by providing interesting activities (Brown and Hudson, 1998)
- improve student-teacher interaction through selection and review of portfolio contents and encourage student learning of metalanguage for talking about language learning (Brown and Hudson, 1998)
- encourage teacher professionalism as more responsibility is given to the teacher for creating the assessment instrument (Valencia and Calfee, 1991)
- provide teaching/learning opportunities as the portfolio review process highlights areas of student weakness on an on-going basis which can then be redressed through teaching (Tanner et al., 2000)
- provide an authentic description of learner achievement/ability (Gomez, 2000; Short, 1993)

## WEAKNESSES ASSOCIATED WITH USING PORTFOLIOS

While the writers mentioned above have noted many advantages of using portfolios, many of these same writers have highlighted problems with this approach-primarily related to implementation and assessment-as is seen below:

- time-consuming (e.g., negotiating artifacts with students, reviewing the contents, perhaps conferencing with learners during the review process as suggested by Valencia and Calfee (1991) (Gomez, 2000; Valencia and Calfee, 1991)
- costly (extra materials are often involved) (Valencia and Calfee, 1991)
- teachers and students often need training in order to implement the portfolio process, and this requires initiative that may be lacking (Tanner et al., 2000)
- difficult to choose evaluation content (Brown and Hudson, 1998) Who should choose, the students, teachers/administrators or both? Many benefits accrue from student involvement, but this may lead to widely divergent views as students may have different favorite products. Also, teachers may wish to include products which students object to in order to insure content validity for assessment purposes.
- difficult to select scoring criteria because it requires time and training that is often unavailable (Gomez, 2000)

- difficult to easily report results of portfolio evaluation to stakeholders as many different types of work can be involved (Brown and Hudson, 1998; Valencia and Calfee, 1991)
- low reliability of assessment results because of inter-rater disagreement due to differing tasks and contexts (Valencia and Calfee, 1991)

## PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT AND AN EFL PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE

In this section, I'll introduce a particular English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching/learning context and consider whether portfolios are appropriate for this context.

The writer currently teaches a public speaking class that focuses on the theory of effective speech/presentation writing and the presentation skills necessary to competently deliver a speech/presentation. The course consists of approximately 50 South Korean, junior-year university students in two classes of about 25 students each. The classes meet twice a week for a total of 150 minutes for 14 weeks a semester. Students are motivated to take the course in order to develop their general English ability and job-specific skills related to making public presentations.

The study reported on in this paper tests the hypothesis (from the learner's perspective) that *evaluation* portfolios (after Valencia and Calfee, 1991) would be an effective learning and assessment addition to the current course. From a learning standpoint, evaluation portfolios are held to have the advantages of increased learning as students are better able to monitor their development in the course. With regard to evaluation, portfolios are believed to be an improvement over the existing course evaluation scheme (see Table 1 below) which includes the instructor assessing, making suggestions for improvement and returning to learners various drafts of written work (homework), peer assessment of both written and oral work, and midterm and final graded speeches.

The benefit of using portfolios as an assessment instrument would be having a more authentic description of learner achievement/ability. (Both Moya and O'Malley [1994] and Valencia and Calfee [1991] suggest using portfolios in conjunction with other assessment instruments.) The portfolio mark would be based on three criteria: completeness, accuracy and quality.

TABLE 1. PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE ASSESSMENT SCHEMES

| | Current Assessment Scheme | Proposed Assessment Scheme |
|---|---|---|
| Attendance (%) | 30 | 30 |
| Homework (%) | 10 | discontinued |
| Midterm Exam (% | 30 | 30 |
| Final Exam (%) | 30 | 30 |
| Portfolio (%) | not applicable | 10 |
| TOTAL (%) | 100 | 100 |

The proposed assessment scheme has the advantages of maintaining the university-stipulated attendance and exam requirements and weighting the portfolio heavily enough to encourage the learners to take it seriously (extrinsic motivation).

The writer rejects the use of what Valencia and Calfee (ibid) call a showcase portfolio because some of its benefits like enhanced teacher-parent interaction are not relevant to this course. Documentation portfolios are also inappropriate for this course because they typically allow the learners to participate in the selection of portfolio content. As the portfolio will be used for assessment as well as learning purposes, the instructor wishes to determine the content to assure the content validity of the measure (see Appendix A for portfolio contents).

In addition, it is believed that the introduction of portfolios will encourage professional development in the implementer, the instructor, as new knowledge will need to be acquired to effectively realize the above goal.

Challenges to using evaluation portfolios include (1) training the learners in portfolio use, (2) finding the time necessary for the instructor to periodically review the portfolios and possibly (3) the cost of the portfolio materials for the learners. Inter-rater reliability will be less of a concern as there will only be one rater, the instructor, who has developed a strong understanding of the evaluation criteria by having applied the criteria over seven years of teaching the course. Another concern is guaranteeing that the work was actually done by the learner, a problem for all assessment in which the work is not completed in the presence of the assessor. However, by providing a record of the drafting process, a portfolio should make it easier to detect plagiarism as a final plagiarized work would likely differ from the learner's drafts.

With regard to the first challenge, training learners in the use of portfolios, it can be addressed through a comprehensive explanation of the portfolio process, a supportive classroom environment and by giving the portfolio a weighting in the course assessment scheme sufficient to motivate student involvement. Some might argue (Liu, 1998) that Asian students typically expect knowledge to be delivered by the instructor and may resist learner-centered activities like portfolios. A study by Littlewood (2000), however, indicates that South Korean learners quite strongly disagree with this view (more so than the average European learner), and, therefore, are likely to be receptive to an activity in which they have to construct knowledge.

The second challenge is more troublesome as the instructor does not have sufficient additional time to include instructor-learner conferences as a part of the portfolio review procedure. In place of conferences, the instructor will attempt to improve the quality of teacher feedback on assignments to be included in the portfolio by modifying the current draft review process (homework) to include the use of a feedback form based on the exam evaluation criteria. Using the feedback form (a copy of which will be given to the learner with each returned assignment and kept in the portfolio) will, it is hoped, provide the learner with an easily usable document of strengths and weaknesses and have the additional benefit of promoting awareness of the exam criteria. For the instructor, the feedback form is intended to be a user-friendly instructional guide (highlighting areas for remedial work).

With regard to the final challenge, it remains to be seen if the learners will find the portfolio materials expensive.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Certain of the above contentions were formulated for research purposes as follows:

### Learner-related questions

1. *Do the learners perceive the use of portfolios to be an effective aid to learning?*

1-1. *If the answer to Question 1 is 'yes', how did the portfolios assist learning?*

1-2. *If the answer to Question 1 is 'no', what problems did the learners experience using the portfolios?*

2. *Do the learners find the portfolio materials expensive?*

### Instructor-related questions

3. *Do the portfolios provide a more accurate picture of the learners' achievement in the course than the previously used instrument?*
4. *Does introducing portfolios in the course encourage the professional development of the instructor?*

## STUDY

TTo answer the research questions, learners in the above-mentioned public speaking course were asked to keep a portfolio of their work done in the second half of the semester. This would, it was hoped, allow them to compare the first half of the semester in which a portfolio was not kept and the second in which the portfolio was compiled. Initially, students were provided with information on the portfolio requirements (Appendix A) which included (1) choosing and researching topics for their speeches, (2) preparing outlines of the speeches (and possibly note cards), (3) writing first and second drafts, (4) doing peer evaluations of classmates delivering their speeches and (5) completing self-assessment forms (see Appendix D). They were also shown a model portfolio. In addition, throughout the second half of the semester, the instructor highlighted the importance of keeping the portfolio up-to-date by inserting the required work and briefly checked during class on learners' portfolio progress..

## RESULTS

To assess the learners' reactions to keeping a portfolio, they (n = 39) were asked to complete a survey (see Appendix B) when they submitted their portfolios at the end of the semester. The survey asked learners to rate their responses to 5 statements (see Table 2 below) and gave them the opportunity to describe their opinion of using the portfolio. To gain further insight into the learners' perspectives on portfolio use, the instructor conducted semi-structured interviews with 5 learners (see Table 4 below) after the completion of the portfolios.

To assess the instructor's perception of the value of portfolios as compared with the non-portfolio approach, a series of questions were prepared to guide a post-semester introspective inquiry of this matter (see Appendix C).

## Learner-Related Questions

TABLE 2. SPEECH PORTFOLIO SURVEY RESULTS: RATINGS

| Survey Statements | | Learner Responses* 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I enjoyed making my speech | | 9 | 18 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| portfolio. | % | 23 | 46 | 15 | 13 | 2.6 |
| 2. The cost of the portfolio | | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 18 |
| bothered me. | % | 2.6 | 7.7 | 18 | 26 | 46 |
| 3. The portfolio helped me to make | | 13 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| better speeches. | % | 33 | 33 | 23 | 7.7 | 2.6 |
| 4. It is a good idea to use a portfolio | | 10 | 17 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| for the whole course (first half and second half of the semester). | % | 26 | 43 | 18 | 10 | 2.6 |
| 5. It is a good idea to use a portfolio | | 15 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| in future speech classes. | % | 39 | 46 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.1 |

* 1 = I totally agree; 2 = I somewhat agree; 3 = I'm not sure;
4 = I somewhat disagree; 5 = I totally disagree

**n = 39**

TABLE 3. SPEECH PORTFOLIO SURVEY RESULTS:
SUMMARY OF LEARNERS' OPINIONS

| | Positive | Positive & Negative | Negative | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | 23 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
| % | 59 | 18 | 7.7 | 15.4 |

**n = 39**

Analyzing the responses according to frequency resulted in the following positive and negative comments:

Positive comments:

- helps me to organize the content of the speech (9 responses)
- shows and encourages speech writing development (7 responses)
- constitutes a record of work done in the course (7 responses)
- helps me prepare for the final speech exam (3 responses)
- imposes discipline on me (2)

Negative comments:

- difficult to make (3 responses)
- time-consuming (3 responses)
- difficult to carry to school (1 response)
- not helpful (1 response)

TABLE 4. SPEECH PORTFOLIO INTERVIEW RESULTS

| Questions | Responses |
|---|---|
| IER = Interviewer | |
| | IEE = Interviewee (Number) |
| 1. IER: Did you like making a portfolio? | |
| | Yes = 4 |
| | No = 1 |
| 2. IER: Why? | |
| | IEE 1: - helpful, could see errors<br>- helps to organize work |
| | IEE 2: - helped to make speech |
| | IEE 3: - easier to manage workload & see growth of ability |
| | IEE 4: - helps to organize work |
| | IEE 5: - took too much time to print out research materials to put in portfolio |
| 3. IER: Which word best describes your <u>impression</u> of the portfolio? | |
| | a) interesting = 3 |
| | b) OK = 2 |
| | c) boring = 0 |

**Table 4. Speech Portfolio Interview Results (cont.)**

4. IER: Which response best describes your opinion of the portfolio?
   - a) very helpful = 3
   - b) a little bit helpful = 2
   - c) not very helpful = 0
   - d) not helpful = 0
5. IER: Did the portfolio take a lot of time to make?
   - Yes = 2
   - No = 3
6. IER: Did the portfolio help you to understand the organization of your speech from beginning to end?
   - Yes = 5
   - No = 0
7. IER: If yes, was this helpful?
   - Yes = 4
   - Not sure = 1
8. IER: Did you work harder because you knew I would be assessing your portfolio?
   - Yes = 3
   - No = 2
9. IER: What are some good things about making the portfolio?
   - IEE 1: - helps to organize and reorganize work over time
     - can see my work displayed
   - IEE 2: - work is easy to find for review
     - better organization of work
   - IEE 3: - can see development of my work
     - good to have a record/collection of my work
   - IEE 4: - helps to organize material
     - improves confidence because I was well-prepared for the final speech
   - IEE 5: - helps with organization and preparation for final speech exam
     - will help me when I get a job

**Table 4. Speech Portfolio Interview Results (cont.)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. IER: | What are some bad things about making the portfolio? | | |
| | | IEE 1: | - time-consuming because difficult to access computer to get information for speech |
| | | IEE 2: | - none |
| | | IEE 3: | - none |
| | | IEE 4: | - a bit expensive to buy portfolio folder |
| | | IEE 5: | - time-consuming |
| 11. IER: | Do you think the portfolio helped you to produce a better speech? | | |
| | | Yes = 4 | |
| | | No = 1 | |
| 12. IER: | Why? | | |
| | | IEE 1: | - paid more attention to research materials included in portfolio<br>- was motivated/stimulated by research materials |
| | | IEE 2: | - encouraged me to work harder to complete drafting process<br>- easier to redraft because easy to refer to previous drafts |
| | | IEE 3: | - none |
| | | IEE 4: | - felt confident delivering the final speech because I knew the speech contained all the required parts |
| | | IEE 5: | - helped to organize the various assignments that were to be included in the portfolio<br>- kept me focused on the future delivery of the speech |

**n = 5**

### Instructor-related questions

#### Summary of Instructor's Assessment Introspective Inquiry Results

- portfolio assessment is considered to be about the same as the non-portfolio assessment procedure used in this course with regard to validity and reliability.
- advantages and disadvantages related to practicality:
  (1) Advantages:
  - easier to ensure that the work was done by the learner because a portfolio allows the instructor to readily compare drafts of a piece of work making it harder for the learner to submit a final work product not his/her own
  - easier to assess developmental effort of learner including attempts toimplement feedback recommendations as instructor can readily compare drafts and do so in light of feedback

  (2) Disadvantages:
  - takes additional class time to explain and support
  - adds another step to the evaluation process as the instructor must assess the portfolios at the end of the semester, and do so in a timely fashion if the learners are to collect their portfolios before the vacation period begins.
- introducing evaluation portfolios encouraged the instructor to carefully consider issues related to portfolio use in general

## DISCUSSION

### Learner-related research questions

This study was undertaken to test the hypothesis that keeping portfolios would be an improvement in terms of learning and assessment over the current practice of not requiring learners to compile their course work. Though portfolios are held to have learning and assessment benefits, in this study there was little difference between the portfolio part of the class and the non-portfolio part. That is, in both the first half and second half of the semester learners were given similar assignments that were assessed and returned. In the non-portfolio part of the course the assignments were graded and these scores were reflected in their final homework mark. It was left up to the learners to decide what to do with the assignments once they were returned to them. In the portfolio part of the class, the assignments were not graded (though the feedback form did contain ratings of excellent, average or weak to indicate learner strengths and weaknesses) and the learners were instructed to compile the returned assignments in a portfolio (which was graded as a whole at the end of the semester). Given the limited difference in the two parts of the class, it was an open question as to whether the learners would perceive much of a difference between using portfolios and not using them.

## Positive Factors

First, with regard to the statements about the portfolio experience that asked learners to rate their responses (Appendix B), the study shows that the learners had a generally favorably attitude toward portfolio use with 69% of learners enjoying making their portfolio and 15.6% who did not. When asked to give their opinion of using portfolios, 59% of the responses were positive and only 8% negative (Eighteen percent of the responses were neutral which meant the response included both positive and negative views of roughly equal intensity, and 15.4% of learners chose not to respond.) Question 4 of the interview similarly reports that all the interviewees found their portfolio helpful to some degree. Supporting this positive attitude, Statement 4 of the survey reveals that 69% of the learners thought that portfolios should be used for the whole course (12.6% disagreed), and responses to Statement 5 shows that 85% of those surveyed were of the opinion that portfolios should be used in future speech classes (with 10.2 % dissenting). This quite positive attitude toward the use of portfolios in future speech classes implies that the learners found portfolio use superior to the non-portfolio condition in that they were asked to compare the two when choosing their responses.

Not surprisingly, given the favorable attitude of the learners, the survey tells us (Statement 3) that 66% thought portfolios helped them to produce better speeches (10.3 % disagreed) as did 4 out of 5 interviewees (interview Question 11). To better understand why portfolios were perceived to be helpful, the learners' opinions were analyzed with respect to frequency of response and whether they were positive or negative. Nine learners reported that portfolios helped them to **organize the content** of their speeches. This reason was also given by 4 of the 5 interview respondents (Question 9). It would seem then that learners appreciated being required to order their assignments in a prescribed way in their portfolios because it helped them to organize a mass of information in an effective manner. In support of this view, responses to Question 5 of the interview indicate that the portfolio helped learners to understand the logic behind the organizational paradigm. It may be, then, that portfolio use promotes learning by providing a concrete representation of abstract ideas taught in the class. In the non-portfolio use context, learners were taught organizational principles related to speech writing, and submitted assignments based on them, but were not required to physically compile their assignments.

The next most common positive opinion about portfolio use is that portfolios **promote the development of the written speech** (7 responses). These learners wrote that it helped them in the drafting and redrafting process to view previous parts of the speech or previous drafts. IEE 1 (Question 2) wrote that the portfolio helped in seeing his/her errors. Why this should be superior to the non-portfolio-use context is uncertain. Perhaps collecting the various assignments in a portfolio makes it easier for learners to reference them whereas not being required to collect the assignments permits learners to file them in places that are more difficult to access. Another possibility is that collecting work in a portfolio adds an aura of prestige to it that does not exist when work is relegated to a drawer or stuck in notebook, and this motivates learners to work harder. In this regard, IEE 1 (Question 9) responded that it was important to see his/her work displayed and IEE 3 (Question 9) stated that it was good to have a collection of his/her work. Another related comment (IEE 3-Question 2) was that the portfolio helped the learner to see his/her growth in ability.

Next on the list of positive reasons for using portfolios (also 7 responses) is related to the value of portfolios as a **record for future reference and/or of achievement**. Four respondents said that their portfolio would act as record to which they could refer in the unspecified future when they needed to prepare for a speech. In a similar vein, IEE 5 (Question 9) claimed that the portfolio would be of help when s/he entered the working world. Three learners reported that the portfolio was a testament to work done in the class; one noted a sense of achievement associated with the portfolio and another that it would be a memento of the class. Related to the notion of achievement, two respondents noted that their portfolio acted as a kind of checklist, encouraging them to do the prescribed assignments. However, when learners were asked during the interview if they worked harder on their portfolios because they knew the instructor would be assessing them (Question 8), 3 learners answered 'yes' and 2, 'no'. Given this equivocal result, one wonders if, perhaps, in some cases, it was not external motivation, which encouraged the learners, but rather an intrinsic desire to produce a quality product. This may be because while a portfolio can be a vivid illustration of what has not been done or done poorly, it can also be a record of what a learner has done or done well (and thus can be source of pride).

Finally, three learners emphasized the importance of the portfolio in **preparing for the final speech exam** (also IEE 4 & IEE 5-Questions 9 & 12, respectively). IEE 4 mentioned the confidence that was generated by knowing that the speech was well-written and IEE 5 that the portfolio heightened his/her awareness of the delivery of the speech that was to come.

## Negative Factors

While the response to using portfolios was decidedly positive, there was a minority of learners (15.6 %) who did not enjoy this initiative. Three learners responded that the portfolio was difficult to make. Considering that three learners reported the portfolio to be onerously time-consuming, the portfolio may have been difficult because it required more time than the learners were able or willing give. Supporting this view are the interview comments of IEE 5 (Question 2), and IEE 1 and IEE 5 (Question 10), which highlight this time demand, especially in relation to accessing and printing from computers. The computer-related difficulties may have resulted from the display aspect of portfolios, which places an emphasis on appearance. Perhaps, learners used computers more in the portfolio part of the class as opposed to the non-portfolio part in order to produce more visually appealing assignments.

Also, it was thought that learners might regard portfolio use negatively because of the added expense involved in buying an extra folder or binder. Though IEE 4 (Question 10) did raise this point, the overall response was that the costs associated with portfolio use were not bothersome as was reported by 72 % of learners (Statement 2).

To sum up this part, with respect to **Research Question 1**, a majority of the learners in this study did perceive portfolios to be an aid to learning. This is because their portfolio helped them to organize the content of their speeches and promoted the development of this content (by facilitating the drafting process). Aside from these reasons, portfolio use seems to have encouraged active participation in that a portfolio has value as a record of achievement and/or a reference work, which can assist in future speech-related activities, and as an exam preparation tool.

With regard to **Research Question 2**, generally speaking, the cost involved in using portfolios was not considered to be a negative factor.

## Instructor-related research questions

Some writers have argued that portfolios provide a more accurate assessment of learner ability. This is because when thinking about assessment, it is not unusual to think of the traditional standardized tests that are a part of most students' educational lives. While these tests have their uses, it is unlikely that they are a sufficient way of assessing students. Short (1993, 630) writes the following about this matter:

> Educators now acknowledge that standardized tests with short answer or multiple-choice items do not provide an accurate picture of student knowledge as a whole [refernces omitted]; therefore, it is inappropriate to base placement, achievement levels, and instructional plans solely on standardized test results.

Given this perceived deficiency in traditional tests, alternative forms of assessment have been proposed for language education that 'include checklists, journals, logs, videotapes and audiotapes, self-evaluations, and teacher observations.' (Brown and Hudson, 1998, 653) Brown and Hudson (1998) list three categories of assessment that range on a continuum from traditional to alternative.

TABLE 5. ASSESSMENT CATEGORIES (BROWN & HUDSON, 1998)

TRADITIONAL– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –ALTERNATIVE

| selected-response | constructed-response | personal-response |
|---|---|---|
| true/false | fill-in | conferences |
| matching | short answer | **portfolio** (emphasis added) |
| multiple choice | performance | self/peer assessment |

While it seems uncontroversial that portfolios can have a place in assessment, the question asked in this study was whether portfolio assessment constitutes an improvement over the previously used procedure of students not collecting their assignments in a portfolio.

Assessment is often considered in terms of validity, reliability and practicality. With regard to validity (especially content validity) there was essentially no difference between the two assessment procedures, both of which required the learners to undertake the same tasks. In terms of reliability, both assessment procedures relied on one rater, the instructor, using the same assessment criteria (completeness, accuracy and quality). Thus, they were similarly affected by rater subjectivity.

Turning to practicality, portfolio assessment was found to have both advantages and disadvantages when compared with the not using it. The advantages consisted of making it more difficult for learners to submit work other than their own as a portfolio clearly displays the development of the written work from topic-choice to completed speech. Also, having access to the collected assignments allowed the instructor/rater to better determine whether learners incorporated suggestions for improvement as they progressed from draft to draft. The disadvantages were that introducing portfolios and supporting learners in their use of portfolios consumed additional class time. Furthermore, assessing the completed portfolios such that they could be promptly returned to their owners led to an increased demand on the instructor' s time during the traditionally busy period when final assessment is completed. Under the previous assessment scheme the workload was distributed throughout the semester.

The above discussion about the merits of portfolios as an assessment instrument versus the non-portfolio procedure used before the study reported in this paper (**Research Question 3**) suggests that the two procedures are highly similar with regard to validity and reliability. In terms of practicality, improvements in measuring achievement are countered by additional time requirements, which makes it difficult to claim that one assessment instrument is superior to the other.

**Research Question 4** was interested in whether evaluation portfolio use promoted the professional development of the instructor. While Valencia and Calfee (1991, p. 335) suggest that this is the case because the instructor must take responsibility for creating the assessment instrument, in this study this did not occur because the non-portfolio use assessment artifacts and the portfolio use ones were essentially the same. The difference was that the various assignments were collected in a portfolio in the latter case. However, the instructor was required to familiarize himself with current research on the use of portfolios, in general, to determine whether it was appropriate to ask learners to use them in the context in question, and to attempt to anticipate and prepare for potential difficulties in the implementation process. As such, professional development was encouraged.

## CONCLUSION

This paper takes the position that evaluation portfolios constitute a welcome addition to the public speaking course currently being offered at the South Korean university that was the subject of the study presented here. It is not, however, primarily because evaluation portfolio use represents a superior form of assessment (at least in this instance), but rather that it, according the learners, facilitates learning. It is suggested that portfolios do this in the following ways:

- by helping learners to organize content
- by promoting improved quality of content through enhanced redrafting
- by encouraging active participation in the writing process by being (1) a record for future reference and/or of achievement and (2) an exam preparation tool

In addition, the introduction of evaluations portfolios in this study spurred the instructor to increase his knowledge of portfolio use in general.

In sum, evaluation portfolios are at least equal to the non-portfolio assessment procedure that was previously used in this course, but have the additional benefit, according to the learners in this study, of promoting learning. Furthermore, they promoted the professional development of the implementer.

In terms of further research, it would be interesting to know how a documentation portfolio (one without an assessment function), with an instructor/learner negotiated list of contents, would be perceived by learners compared to an evaluation portfolio.

As always with small-scale studies of this kind, the reader is cautioned about overgeneralization of the results. Finally, it is hoped that this study will encourage others to test their teaching/learning context for the appropriateness of portfolio use.

## THE AUTHOR

*Don Makarchuk teaches in the Division of English Language 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

Balliro, L. (1993). What kind of alternative? Examining alternative assessment. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 558-561.

Brown, J.D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 653-674.

Gomez, E. (2000). *Assessment portfolios: Including English language learners in large-scale assessments*. ERIC Digest. Retrieved October 15, 2002, from http://www.cal.org/ericcll/DIGEST/0010assessment.html

Hancock, C.R. (1994). *Alternative assessment and second language study: What and why?* ERIC Digest. Retrieved January 1, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed376695.html

Littlewood, W. (2000). Do Asian students really want to listen and obey? *ELT Journal, 54*, 31-35.

Liu, D. (1998). Ethnocentrism in TESOL: Teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL students. *ELT Journal, 52*, 3-10.

Moya, S.S., & O'Malley, M. (1994). A portfolio assessment model for ESL. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 13*(1), 13-36.

San Diego County Office of Education. (1997). *Portfolios: Connecting learning and assessment*. Retrieved December 1, 2002, from http://www.sdcoe.k12.ca.us/notes/5/portfolio.html

Porter, P.A., & Grant, M. (1992). *Communicating effectively in English* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Short, D.J. (1993). Assessing integrated language and content instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 627-656.

Tanner, R., Longayroux, D., Beijaard, D., & Verloop, N. (2000). Piloting portfolios: Using portfolios in pre-service teacher education. *ELT Journal, 54*, 20-30.

Valencia, S.W., & Calfee, R. (1991). The development and use of literacy portfolios for students, classes, and teachers. *Applied Measurement in Education, 4*, 333-345.

# APPENDIX A
# SPEECH PORTFOLIO

Instructions

1) Use a 3-ring binder or clear file with at least 10 A4 size plastic pockets.
2) Write your name, student identification number, course and section number on the inside cover. For example:

**Don Makarchuk**
**Student number: 19960001**
**Speech: Section 1236**

3) Put the following items in your portfolio:

**PORTFOLIO CONTENTS***

**PART A**

1) Informative speech: topic & information relevant to the topic
2) Informative speech: outline
3) Informative speech: first draft (full written text of speech using complete sentences)
4) Informative speech: second draft
5) Informative speech: note cards or outline of speech
6) Informative speech: peer evaluations of your part of the speech
7) Informative speech: completed self-assessment form **

**PART B**

1) Problem/Solution (P/S) speech: your problem & solution
2) P/S speech: <u>outline and first draft</u> of *problem/solution* parts of the body
3) P/S speech: <u>outline and first draft</u> of *countering objections* part of the body
4) P/S speech: <u>outline and first draft</u> of *why solution is desirable* part of the body
5) P/S speech: <u>outline and first draft</u> of *introduction* & *conclusion*
6) P/S speech: second draft of entire speech
7) P/S speech: note cards or outline of speech
8) P/S speech: completed self-assessment form **

Evaluation

1) The portfolio represents ½ of your homework mark (5% of your total mark for the course).
2) Hand it in to the instructor when you have completed your final speech.
3) You can pick it up in the instructor's office two weeks later.

Evaluation criteria

a) Completeness (Is all of the work included in the portfolio?)
b) Accuracy (Is your work correct?)
c) Quality (Is your work well-done?)

* contents are based on the course text by Porter & Grant (1992)
** See Appendix D

# APPENDIX B
# SPEECH PORTFOLIO SURVEY

Instructions
Compare the first half of the semester (without a portfolio) and the second half of the semester (with a portfolio).

Read the following statements and then choose the best number to describe your response. Check (✓) the box under that number.

1 = I totally agree.
2 = I somewhat agree.
3 = I'm not sure.
4 = I somewhat disagree.
5 = I totally disagree.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I enjoyed making my speech portfolio. | | | | | |
| 2. The cost of the portfolio bothered me. | | | | | |
| 3. The portfolio helped me to make better speeches. | | | | | |
| 4. It is a good idea to use a portfolio for the whole course (first half and second half of the semester). | | | | | |
| 5. It is a good idea to use a portfolio in future speech classes. | | | | | |

What's your opinion of the speech portfolio?

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

# APPENDIX C
# EXAMINING THE ASSESSMENT QUALITY OF PORTFOLIOS: AN INTROSPECTIVE INQUIRY

1. Check one of the following words to describe your opinion of portfolios as an assessment instrument. Compare the first part of the semester (without portfolios) and the second half (using portfolios).

a) better _____
b) the same _____
c) worse _____

2. Describe in detail the advantages of using portfolios as an assessment instrument.

_______________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________

3. Describe in detail the disadvantages of using portfolios as an assessment instrument.

_______________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________

4. If you have not already done so, please compare using portfolios and not using portfolios with regard to the following:

a) validity:

_______________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

b) reliability:

_______________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

c) practicality:

_______________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

5. Did introducing the use of portfolios in the course encourage your professional development? If yes, in what ways?

_______________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

# APPENDIX D
# SPEECH SELF-ASSESSMENT FORMS

**<u>Informative Speech/Problem-Solution Speech</u>**

**Instructions**

Complete the form by choosing your response to the following statements. Mark your response by checking (✓) one box for each statement below.

**1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = not sure, 4 = disagree, 5 = strongly disagree**

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Content** | | | | | |
| 1. I thought carefully before choosing my speech topic. | | | | | |
| 2. I carefully researched the topic before writing the outline. | | | | | |
| 3. I wrote an outline that organized the content well. | | | | | |
| 4. The first draft of my speech contained all of the important information I wanted to talk about. | | | | | |
| 5. The first draft of my speech was well-organized. | | | | | |
| 6. I received helpful feedback on my first draft. | | | | | |
| 7. The second draft of my speech was better than the first draft. | | | | | |
| 8. I'm happy with the content and organization of my speech. | | | | | |
| **Delivery** | | | | | |
| 9. I made clear, easy-to-read note cards or an effective outline to help me deliver my speech. | | | | | |
| 10. I practiced delivering my speech well. | | | | | |
| 11. I was aware of all of the factors related to delivering a successful speech when I practiced (e.g., posture, gestures, eye contact, voice, comprehensibility, and so on.) | | | | | |
| 12. I prepared clear, easy-to-see visual aids. | | | | | |
| 13. I referred to my visual aids well during my speech. | | | | | |
| 14. I'm happy with the delivery of my speech. | | | | | |

# Reflective Instruments for Self-Assessment in Korean EFL Classrooms

**ANDREW FINCH, PH.D.**
*Kyungpook National University*

## ABSTRACT

In the recent shift in educational theory from transmission of knowledge towards transformation of knowledge, and to integration of knowledge with existing personal constructs and meanings, assessment has taken on new affective goals in which the personal growth of the learner is becoming increasingly important. In this context, the role of evaluation is to inform learners about their learning achievements, so that they can make informed plans for future study. This paper offers suggestions on how the concept of self/peer-assessment might be introduced into the Korean EFL classroom via a number of investigative and reflective instruments.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Various authors and researchers agree on self-assessment as a vital part of learner autonomy (Dickinson 1987, p. 16; Blanche 1988, p. 75; Harris 1997, p. 12), providing the opportunity for learners to assess their own progress and thus helping them to focus on their own learning. Hunt, Gow & Barnes even claim that without learner self-evaluation and self-assessment "there can be no real autonomy" (1989, p. 207). Rea (1981) sees self-appraisal as helping the learner become aware of his/her responsibilities in planning, executing and monitoring his/her language learning activities, and Oscarsson (1978) agrees on this formative prime aim, adding a secondary aim of enabling the learner "to assess his[1] *total achievement at the end of a course* or course unit." Dickinson points out that this does not necessarily devalue or conflict with external evaluation, which still has relevance for supplying official certification of learning (1987, p. 136; cf. Van Lier 1996, p. 120). Rather, as Dickinson & Carver observe:

> A language course can only deal with a small fraction of the foreign language; therefore one objective of language courses should be to teach learners how to carry on learning the language independently.

> Part of the training learners need for this purpose is training in self-assessment and self-monitoring.
>
> (Dickinson & Carver 1980)

In view of this consensus of opinion regarding the desirability of self/peer-assessment in the language classroom, it appears reasonable to try to introduce such practices into EFL classes in Korea. At tertiary level, an alternative approach to assessment does not present significant problems, since further education views students as adults who are studying of their own volition, and who can be expected to take on responsibility for learning. Whatever the prescribed (or non-prescribed) process, product, format and function of the course, there is always room for classroom-based, student-centered assessment, since this enhances learning by raising awareness of the learning process. The author has thus encountered few conceptual difficulties in terms of introducing alternative assessment methods to tertiary students (cf. this video on the use of portfolios: http://www.finchpark.com/videos/alt_assess/index.htm). When we look at secondary education, however, we find that the ultimate goal of the English language lesson is overwhelmingly extrinsic – to enable students to obtain an acceptable grade on the university entrance test. Irrespective of educational principles of the language teachers, they are judged according to their students' performance on this examination, and because of this, they face pressure from superiors, colleagues and parents. In such a climate, any teaching innovation can only be considered if it eases the burden of stress for the teacher, and if it helps students to succeed in passing the test.

In fact, there is significant evidence that the use of alternative assessment tools in the language classroom, while most effective in a student-centered learning environment of intrinsic motivation, can nevertheless foster the sort of autonomous learning that can enable students to become more efficient learners (e.g. Miller & Ng. 1996, p. 135; cf. section II). Oscarsson's rationale for the use of self-assessment (1989, p. 3) shows that: i) such an approach to assessment is beneficial for teachers and students; ii) students react favourably and reliably: iii) their assessments are valid; and iv) standards do not go down. The question remains of how to introduce alternative assessment into a test-driven environment, however. In view of the theoretical and practical advantages of self/peer-assessment, how is it to be brought into the secondary EFL classroom, without interfering with stipulated lesson content?

This paper suggests that (despite the pressures of the test-driven classroom) self- and peer-assessment can be used as effective learning tools in this situation, and that the process of conceptualisation can begin with a series of activities which examine the learning environment and the learning beliefs of the students. Interactive activities such as needs analyses, deficiency analyses and surveys about the learning environment, can become part of the day-today English class, offering opportunities for students to use the target language while investigating their perceptions about that language. The function of such activities is largely one of consciousness-raising - "getting the wheels turning." When invited to interact on questions relating to study methods, learning preferences, language-learning beliefs, and language abilities, students have the opportunity to think about topics that are normally not part of the English lesson. The resulting raised awareness leads to an active participation in language learning, and thus prepares students for alternative assessment methods such as self/peer-assessment, portfolios, learner journals, conversation conferences, and interviews. This is not a matter of finding time to insert extra activities into an already overcrowded learning environment. The increased motivation and confidence growing from student-centered classroom-based evaluation produce more effective learners and are therefore self-justifying. Whether the education system should be forcing these learners to engage in multiple-choice, discrete-item tests of language-as-code is another matter. It can only be hoped that the recent announcement by the Ministry of Education and Human Resources (Park, 2004) that the national test taken by high school students will carry less emphasis in future, and that classwork will become more important, will allow real language learning to occur in secondary EFL situations. If this is the case, then alternative assessment will provide an effective method of checking on and enhancing that learning.

## II. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

Self-assessment research in language education has had two main goals (cf. Oscarsson, 1984): i) the investigation of possible ways of realising the goal of learner participation in matters of assessment and evaluation; ii) the investigation of the degree to which self-assessment instruments and procedures yield relevant and dependable results. In terms of applied research, Oscarsson has designed a number of simple self-assessment questionnaires, using behavioural specifications as a general frame of reference (Oscarsson 1978), and has further proposed a form of 'continuous self-assessment' as a possible model for an instrument intended to be used on a regular recurrent basis (Oscarsson 1984). Other practical and useful presentations of learner-centered evaluative materials and activities have been offered by Lewkowicz & Moon (1985), LeBlanc &

Painchaud (1985 - substitution of self-assessment questionnaires for the previously-used standardised proficiency tests in the university of Ottawa's second language programs), Heilenman (1991 - description of steps that may be taken in the practical development of self-assessment placement materials), Cram (1992 - practical illustration of self-assessment applied in the second language classroom.), and Harris (1997 - further examples of the role of self-assessment in formal settings).

In terms of validation studies, investigation into the reliability and efficacy of self-assessment has shown an emerging pattern of consistent overall agreement between self-assessments and ratings based on a variety of external criteria (Palmer & Bachman 1981; Rea 1981; Blanche 1985; Oscarson 1978). Oscarsson (1978) observes that adult learners studying EFL are able to make fairly accurate appraisals of their linguistic ability using a variety of scaled descriptions of performance as rating instruments. Wilson (1996), using English, German and French language self-assessment adaptations of the FSI/ILR[2] oral proficiency rating scale, in conjunction with an objective norm-referenced test, found that participants were capable of placing themselves "as they probably would have been placed, on the average, by professional raters using the (FSI-type) Language Proficiency Interview procedure" (Wilson 1996).

Of particular significance for the present study, Harris (1997, p. 19) sees self-assessment as a practical tool that should be integrated into everyday classroom activities, and Blanche proposes that self-appraisal "would be particularly helpful in the case of false beginners" (1988, p. 85). Harris (1997, p. 13) also sees self-assessment as appropriate in test-driven secondary and tertiary education, claiming that it can help learners in such environments to become more active, to locate their own strengths and weaknesses, and to realise that they have the ultimate responsibility for learning. By encouraging individual reflection, "self-assessment can begin to make students see their learning in *personal* terms [and] can help learners get better marks." (Harris (1997, p. 13). Peer assessment (a form of self-assessment [Tudor 1996, p. 182] and justified largely by the same arguments) is especially applicable to the classroom setting, aiming to encourage students to take increased responsibility for their own curricula and to become active participants in the learning process (Hill 1994, p. 214; Miller & Ng 1996, p. 134). Tudor adds that critical reflection on the abilities of other learners with respect to a shared goal is a practical form of learner training which helps individuals to assess their own performance, and which reduces the stress of error correction through identifying them in others (Tudor 1996, p. 182). Thus Assinder (1991, p. 218-28) reports increased motivation, participation, real communication, in-depth understanding, commitment, confidence, meaningful practice and accuracy when students prepare and deliver learning tasks for each other. Haughton & Dickinson (1989) (cited in Miller & Ng 1996, p. 135) found "a relatively high level of agreement between the peer assessments and the marks given by the lecturers" in their study of a collaborative post-writing assessment (cf. Fok 1981). Students were:

i. able to assess their own work realistically (to a large extent), even though most felt inexperienced as testers (lack of reliability) and were not comfortable with being tested by classmates (fear of losing face);
ii. they were sincere;
iii. they demonstrated a similar level of assessment to that of the lecturers;
iv. the scheme did not result in a lowering of standards;
v. the students benefited in their understanding of and attitude towards assessment by taking part in the study (Miller & Ng 1996, p. 142).

## III. THE SITUATION

In view of the above findings, the question arises of how to incorporate self-assessment into traditional language learning situations (e.g. Korean state secondary schools). Governments often advocate alternative methods of assessment, claiming to be making "efforts to assess students authentically and holistically" (Korean Ministry of Education and Human Resources Website, 2004), but the need for an "objective" method of discriminating between students tends to over-ride such statements, and teachers find themselves back in the test-driven classroom, preparing students to be measured on language "usage" rather than "use" (cf. Widdowson, 1978). It is not surprising, in this situation, that high school English tuition focuses on knowledge of language-as-code, of which students typically absorb a considerable amount, despite limited exposure, large classes, long hours of study and low motivation (Lee, 1991, p. 18). This situation is compounded by the lack of a National English syllabus, with textbooks functioning both as syllabi and as teaching materials. These textbooks are sanctioned by the government and have till recently been grammar-oriented, treating language as a collection of discrete skills (Lee, 1991, p. 36). The university entrance exam is modelled on content in these textbooks and in the EBS test-preparation books (Finch, 2004a), though neither contain any assessment materials per se, and focus almost exclusively on reading and listening. Thus, despite the fact that objectives of the 7$^{th}$ Korean National Curriculum (cf. Korean Ministry of Education and Human Resources Website) state that high school students should be taught to develop listening, speaking, reading and writing in English, without any of these being emphasised or neglected, secondary teachers have little opportunity to promote development of performance skills in their students.

High school students thus generally perceive their English proficiency as very poor (whatever their level), and agree that their long-term *wants* have been contradicted by their short-term *needs* (Lee, 1991, p.79). An important part of any English course is therefore to address this lack of confidence, motivation and independence. In this situation, self/peer-assessment can be a useful supplement to the English lesson, taking the assessment burden away from the teacher, and promoting more effective learning. The question is whether it is ethical to motivate students to prepare for pedagogically unsound and socially destructive tests (cf. Neill, 1998; Sacks, 1999; Kohn, 1992). However, this dilemma (whether to teach English holistically or teach to the test), that has haunted EFL teachers at secondary level for so long, shows signs of being resolved. In the "Vision for Education beyond 2002: Creation of a New School Culture." (BK 21, 2002)

> The Ministry therefore recognizes that the evaluation system to date has been ineffective and carried out "at the expense of achieving the genuine goals and objectives of education: (BK, 2002), and intends to bring in new methods of assessment. This move away from norm-referenced tests heralds a new dawn for teachers. If the words of the Ministry announcement are to be taken seriously, then it will be the responsibility of teachers to focus on true language learning and education of the whole person. Self/peer-assessment and other types of classroom-based assessment have been shown to be effective for this, and the remainder of this paper suggests how basic alternative assessment instruments might be brought into the EFL classroom.

## IV. AN APPROACH

The gradual introduction of holistic practices such as self-assessment into a traditional learning environment need not be confrontational or subversive, since consciousness-raising, reflection, and development of learning strategies can be shown to enhance traditional study methods and goals *within* the framework of institutionalised definitions of achievement. As mentioned earlier, a number of authors have suggested ways of implementing self-assessment in such settings. This paper builds on those suggestions by suggesting that any learning environment can become reflective and can promote positive attitude change, and that this change of emphasis, in addition to making the classroom experience more enjoyable and fruitful for teachers and learners, will prepare the ground for alternative assessment.

Reid (1999) points to the responsibility of teachers to “provide the scaffolding for more effective and efficient learning” (Reid 1999, p. 305) by raising student awareness of affect, and then listening to the students as they express their needs, beliefs and perceptions. Underhill sees this act of “really listening to the student and to the content of what he or she says” (1989, p. 256) as having a dramatic effect on the learning atmosphere, since “our students don’t necessarily need reassurance, what they need is to be heard” (1989, p. 256). Thus, students might be encouraged to openly discuss the situation in which they find themselves (Appendix D), to reflect on their learning needs (Appendix A), learning preferences/ styles (Appendix E, H) and goals (Appendix I), and to identify what they need to do in order to achieve those goals (study skills). This could well mean continuing in the same vein as before, but with a different awareness, in which learner-training, autonomy, and self-assessment would be seen as means towards such goals - ways of satisfying externally-imposed criteria in the most effective and painless manner.

## V. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

The deficiency analysis (Appendix A) offers a tried-and-tested method of investigating student proficiency. When used interactively by students, to discover concepts that they had previously only been dimly aware of, this evaluative tool takes on a learner-training aspect. If the questions are designed to refer to linguistic/cognitive/affective/social goals of the course, then students can interview each other on how they perceive their readiness for the course, and can perform the same activity at the end of the semester, reflecting on their progress. Quite often these improvements will appear to be excessive. However, to make the observation that these are perceived improvements, does not devalue the assessment activity. Rather it indicates that students have learned to examine their learning more critically and realistically, instead of simply saying “I’m a poor learner." Thus, for Asian students, who typically under-estimate their abilities, this can be a means of showing them that they have progressed, according tot heir own assessment. Further meaning and relevance can be given to this activity by asking the students to design their own questionnaire.

In Appendix B, we see a pair-work activity in which grading and attendance policy is examined. Students discover the missing information together, and thus internalise the "rules" of the class. As with the previous activity, this introduction to accepting responsibility for what goes on in the classroom can gain increased meaning if it is owned and developed by the students. Rather than describe existing rules, therefore, students can be invited to participate in the definition of appropriate learning behaviour, by devising their own "Learning Contract" (Appendix C). The author has found that the preparatory groundwork for this activity can be effectively provided by a pair-work "Marriage Contract." When discussing what "should" and "should not" happen in class, students are becoming involved in management decisions, in addition to practising modals. An extension of this topic is to compare what *actually* happens in class (Appendix D, version 1: "How often do these things happen in class?") with what students (and teachers) would *like to* happen in class (Appendix D, version 2: "How often would you like these things to happen in class?"). These two instruments can be extremely effective in highlighting student/teacher expectations, and can lead to a number of investigative and formative activities. Meanwhile, in addition to exploring the learning environment, students are using the target language to talk about the target language.

Involving students in the decision-making process, and raising awareness about language-learning, are powerful rationales for any learning materials. As with most of the activities presented here, the aim in Appendix E (learning preferences) is to "start the wheels turning", rather than to analyse immediate outcomes. This is encouraged here through an interactive questionnaire dealing with learning preferences. The suggestion that there are many different learning styles might in itself be a novel one for individual learners, and would hopefully stimulate reflection and discussion on the topic. Comparing perceptions with classmates also helps to place self-assessment in the context of one's peers. The Multiple Intelligences Survey (Appendix G) and the Learning Style Inventory (Appendix H) are further examples of investigative instruments which students typically enjoy performing in an interactive format, and which enhance language-learning awareness while using the target language.

The topic of learning styles is addressed in a different fashion in Appendix H. This “True/false” activity, surveying class learning styles, leads to a “follow-up” activity, with students (in groups or pairs) compiling reports based on the data they found. If each student is responsible for researching one or two questions from the original survey, then this follow-up activity can offer an opportunity for cooperation and teamwork. Members of each group can then report to other groups, etc.

As with learning styles, the topic of learning goals is often ignored in state education in Asia. Not only do students have to pass national exams to enter university, but the actual subjects which they study once there are dependant upon entrance-examination scores. One’s occupation is not always a matter of choice! Awareness of learning goals can therefore be very general and ill-formed in students, leading to learning habits which show no particular sense of direction. Appendix I (learning goals) is an attempt to set the wheels in motion once more, raising the question of preferences, and leading by implication to consideration of effective methods of achieving those goals. The interview-format in allows students to interact and share ideas on a personal level, though responses could once more be the subject of a class report in a follow-up activity.

Finally, Appendix J offers a self-assessment that focuses on the performance of the individual on a learning project. This type of reflective activity can be devised for any learning situation (e.g. participation, composition, collaboration), and is an example of the sort of instrument that might be used in a more ongoing assessment approach – one in which the student is continually monitoring his/her progress. Other formats promoting such reflection are the learning journal and the portfolio. In the learning journal/diary, students write about learning experiences and perceptions, often including notes or letters to their teacher. These communications can then grow to become a source of joint reflection on the learning process, a possibility made more feasible in these days of email. An extension of this idea is the learning cassette, on which students record oral assignments in addition to describing their feelings about learning, providing a picture of the student’s progress. The same is also true of the learning portfolio, in which students enter examples of learning achievements over a period of time. The mixture of process and product in this approach not only shows students how they have progressed, but provides them with concrete evidence to show the next teacher, or the prospective employer.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Favourable correlations of self-rating scores and external test scores support the use of self-assessment in second language learning, such that self-assessment is to be recommended for the Korean situation, if only because it decreases the assessment burden of the teacher. However, a closer look at other factors shows that learning, awareness, goal orientation, and postcourse effects can all benefit from the use of student-centered assessment in the classroom. Self-assessment is also a powerful tool in the educational armoury of the language teacher, since it involves the student in the language course by raising awareness of the language learning process and by giving him/her responsibility for assessment.

This paper has not been concerned with self-assessment in terms of test scores, but has attempted to show how students can be eased into the concept of alternative assessment through participating in an investigation of the learning process via a series of interactive needs analyses and reflective instruments. Increased language-learning awareness, which results from such an investigation, fosters confidence and motivation, and facilitates the incorporation of self/peer-assessment into the curriculum. Once students are comfortable with analysing and reflecting upon their achievements (singly and in groups), it is a small step to extend such an approach to low-stakes testing and to ongoing performance assessment. Investigative questionnaires and surveys can supplement preset lesson goals, or can be integrated in other ways into the English curriculum, offering authentic practice in structure (e.g. Can you …? Do you …? We should …We would prefer it if …), while using the target language to explore concepts about learning.

With the approach of the 8$^{th}$ National Curriculum, and promises of a more .holistic approach to education, this is a good time for EFL teachers to reskill - to move away from test preparation towards pedagogically sound classroom-based evaluation, choosing formative assessment over summative, high-stakes assessment, and focusing on assessment practices which prepare their students to become responsible members of society.

## THE AUTHOR

*Andrew Finch is assistant professor of English Education at Kyungpook National University in Deagu. His current research interests include materials design, attitude change and alternative assessment, seen in the context of language learning as education. Most of Andrew's interactive materials can be downloaded from www.finchpark.com/books Email: aef@bh.knu.ac.kr*

## ENDNOTES

1 References to gender (e.g. “he”, “his”) are reproduced as in the original version.

2 Foreign Service Institute/Interagency Language Roundtable

## REFERENCES

Assinder, W. (1991). Peer teaching, peer learning. *ELT Journal, 45*(3), 218-228.

Bickley, V. (Ed.). (1989). *Teaching and learning styles within and across cultures*. Hong Kong: Institute of Education.

BK 21. (2002) *School reform in Korea*. The Institute of Asia Pacific Education Department. Retrieved September 10, 2004, from http://aped.snu.ac.kr/cyberedu/cyberedu1/eng/eng5-02.html.

Blanche, P. (1985). *The relationships between self-assessment and other measures of proficiency in the case of adult foreign language learners*. Unpublished master’s thesis, University of California Davis, Davis, CA.

Blanche, P. (1988). Self-assessment of foreign language skills: Implications for teachers and researchers. *RELC Journal, 19*(1), 75-93.

Cram, B. (1997). Training learners for self-assessment. *TESOL in Context 2*(2), 30-33.

Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dickinson, L., & Carver, D.J. (1980). Learning how to learn: Steps towards self-direction in foreign language learning in schools. *English Language Teaching Journal 35*, 1-7.

Finch, A.E. (2004a). An analysis of EBS preparation materials for the CSAT, English section. *English Teaching, 59*(3), 305-329.

Finch, A.E. (2004b). *English reflections: An interactive, reflective learning journal*. Daegu, Korea: Kyungpook National University Press.

Finch, A.E., & Sampson, K. (2003). *It’s up to you*. Seoul: Chonghap English.

Fok, A.C.Y.Y. (1981). *Reliability of student self-assessment*. Hong Kong: H.K.U. Language Centre.

Fraser, B.J. (1986). *Classroom environment*. London: Croom Helm.

Harris, M. (1997). Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *English Language Teaching Journal, 51*(1), 12-20.

Haughton, G., & Dickinson, L. (1989). Collaborative assessment by master’s candidates in a tutor-based system. *Language Testing 5*(2), 233-246.

Heilenman, L.K. (1991). Self-assessment of second language ability: The role of response effects. *Language Testing, 7*(2), 174-201

Hill, B. (1994). Self-managed learning: state of the art. *Language Teaching 27*, 213-223.

Hunt, J., Gow, L., & Barnes, P. (1989). Learner self-evaluation and assessment – a tool for autonomy in the language learning classroom. In V. Bickley (Ed.), *Teaching and learning styles within and across cultures* (pp. 207-217). Hong Kong: Institute of Language in Education.

Kohn, A. (1992). No contest: The case against competition. New York: Houghton Miffin..

Korean Ministry of Education and Human Resources. *Untitled*. Retrieved September 10, 2004, from http://www.moe.go.kr/en/index.html
LeBlanc, R., & Painchaud, G. (1985). Self-assessment as a second language placement instrument. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(4), 673-687.
Lewkowicz, J.A., & Moon, J. (1985). Evaluation: A way of involving the learner. In J. C. Alderson, (Ed.), *Lancaster practical papers in English language education, Vol. 6: Evaluation*. (pp. 45-80). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
McKenzie, W. (1999). *Multiple intelligences survey*. Surfaquarium Consulting. Retrieved September 10, 2004, from http://surfaquarium.com/MI/inventory.htm.
Martinez, M. (1997) *Developing an intentional learning orientation questionnaire*. Paper presented as a prospectus for a measurement project, IP & T 567R. Salt Lake City, UT: Brigham Young University.
Miller, L., & Ng, R. (1996). Autonomy in the classroom: Peer assessment. In R. Pemberton, S.L. Edward, W.W.F. Or, & H.D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. 133-146.
Neill, M. (1998). High-stakes tests do not improve performance. *Fair Test Examiner, 12*(1). Retrieved May 13, 2004, from http://www.fairtest.org/k12/naeprep.htm
Oscarsson, M. (1978). *Approaches to self-assessment in foreign language learning*. Strasburg, France: Council of Europe, Council for Cultural Co-operation.
Oscarsson, M. (1984). *Self-assessment of foreign language skills: A survey of research and development work*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
Oscarsson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: Rationale and implications. *Language Testing, 6*(1), pp. 1-13.
Palmer, A.S., & Bachman, L.F. (1981). Basic concerns in test validation. In J.C. Alderson & A. Hughes (Eds.), *ELT Documents 111: Issues in Language Testing*. London: The British Council.
Park, J. (2004) A new frontier in education. *The Korea Times*. Retrieved September 10, 2004, from http://times.hankooki.com
Rea, P.R. (1981). Formative assessment of student performance: The role of self-appraisal. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*, 66-68.
Reid, J. (1999). Affect in the classroom: Problems, politics and pragmatics. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 297-306). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sacks, P. (1999). *Standardized minds*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Underhill, N. (1989). Process in humanistic education. *English Language Teaching Journal, 43*(4), 250-260.
Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. London: Longman.
Wenden, A.L. (1991). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wilson, K.M., & Landsay, R. (1996). Validity of global self-ratings of ESL speaking proficiency based on an FSI/ILR-referenced scale: An empirical assessment. (ETS RR-99-13). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

# APPENDICES

*The materials shown in these appendices originally appear with 5-point Lickert scales in table forma, which have been omitted here for reasons of space.*

## APPENDIX A. DEFICIENCY ANALYSIS

5 = Yes, I can; 4 = Yes, mostly; 3 = maybe; 2 = Not really; 1 = No, I can't

Can I understand movies in English?
Can I understand the TV News in English?
Can I understand Talk Shows in English?
Can I understand when the teacher talks in English?
Can I understand other students talking in English?
Can I understand lectures in English?
Can I ask for information on the phone?
Can I ask for directions in English?
Can I ask questions abut personal information?
Can I ask about opinions in English?
Can I ask for permission to do something?
Can I talk about my lifestyle in English?
Can I talk about myself in English?
Can I introduce other people in English?
Can I hold a conversation in English?
Can I talk about my past experiences in English?
Can I talk about my opinions in English?
Can I make comments?
Can I talk about current affairs in English?
Can I tell a story in English?
Can I tell a joke in English?
Can I talk about a movie for two minutes?
Can I talk about my major in English?
Can I explain my ideas in English?
Can I debate in English?
Can I write my resumé in English?
Can I write letters in English?
Can I write reports in English?

Adapted from Finch (2004b, p. 8)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0009.html

## APPENDIX B. COURSE INFORMATION

**Pairs** **Answer** these questions (look in the **Introduction, pages vi to xi**).
**Work** together and compare your answers! This is a speaking/writing activity.

**Q. 1. Goals**

What are three short-term goals of this course?

1.___________________________________
2.___________________________________
3.___________________________________

What are three long-term goals of this course?

1.___________________________________
2.___________________________________
3.____________________________________

**Q. 2. Opportunities and responsibilities**

**Choose** the three questions which you think are most important for a learner to ask.
(Remember - this is your opinion. There are no wrong answers).
**Share** your opinion with your partner.

___ Do I take part actively in class activities?
___ Do I use my native language for positive reasons (e.g. effective communication) or negative reasons (e.g. avoiding the learning challenges) in the class?
___ Am I sincere about my classroom responsibilities? Do I do my best at all times?
___ Do I try to advance my current level of skill?
___ Am I enthusiastic in class (e.g. arrive on time, prepared for class)?
___ Do I do extra assignments to make up for missed classes?
___ How do I manage my emotions in class (e.g. fear, conflict, anxiety, stress, confusion)?
___ Am I committed to meaningful assessment (ongoing, self/peer-assessment)?

**Q. 3. Continuous Assessment**

What are the main factors that will be considered in assessment?

1.________________________________
2.________________________________
3.________________________________
4.________________________________

**Q. 4. Evaluation**

How will final grades be assigned? **(Ask your teacher for the details)**

Adapted from Finch & Sampson, (2003, pp. 9-10)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/u2u/course_questionnaire_1.pdf
AND http://www.finchpark.com/books/u2u/course_questionnaire_2.pdf

## APPENDIX C. LEARNING CONTRACT

**Groups of 4 people. Talk about** your expectations for this course**.**
**Make** a Learning Contract for your group.
**In our English class, and in our self-study times …**

***1. We should*** ………………………….

***2. We should*** ………………………….

***3. We should*** ………………………….

***4. We should*** ………………………….

***5. The teacher should*** ……………………..

***6. The teacher should*** ……………………..

***7. We should not***……………………………

***8. We should not***…………………………..

***9. We should not*** ………………………..

***10.The teacher should not*** ……………….

***Signatures*** ……………,…………….

***Signatures*** ……………,…………….

***Teacher's signature*** ……………………….

***Date*** ……………………

(Finch & Sampson, 2003, p. 13)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0052.html

# APPENDIX D. THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Preferred version:

1 = We would be happy if this never happened in class.
2 = We would be happy if this rarely happened in class.
3 = We would be happy if this sometimes happened in class.
4 = We would be happy if this often happened in class.
5 = We would be happy if this always happened in class.

Actual version:

1 = This never happens in class.
2 = This rarely happens in class.
3 = This sometimes happens in class.
4 = This often happens in class.
5 = This always happens in class.

Students come early to class.
Students talk in English before the teacher arrives.
The teacher comes early to class.
The teacher decides where students sit in class.
The teacher decides which students should work together.
Students choose their partners for group work.
Students choose which tasks to do.
Students work together in groups.
Students work at their own speed.
Students are responsible for much of the assessment.
The teacher explains how to do tasks.
The teacher explains grammar.
The teacher is friendly to the students.
The teacher talks and the students listen.
The teacher helps students who are having problems.
The teacher joins in class activities.
The teacher considers students' feelings.
The teacher talks with students individually.
The atmosphere of the room is friendly.
The learning activities promote collaboration.

Adapted from Fraser (1986).
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0053.html

## APPENDIX E. OUR LEARNING PREFERENCES

Responses: “No” “Maybe” “Yes”
Our Learning Preferences
1. We learn English well by reading in class.
2. We learn English well by listening to language cassettes.
3. We learn English well by playing language games.
4. We learn English well by speaking in class.
5. We learn effectively by watching English-speaking movies.
6. We learn English effectively by using a textbook.
7. We learn effectively by writing notes in the textbook.
8. We learn effectively when the teacher explains everything.
9. We learn effectively when the teacher corrects us.
10. We learn effectively when we work in pairs.
11. We learn effectively when we work in groups.
12. We learn effectively when we study outside of class.
13. We learn English effectively when we study grammar.
14. We learn English effectively when we study new words.
15. We learn English effectively when we study pronunciation.
16. We learn English effectively when we study writing.
17. We learn effectively when we watch English TV channels.
18. We learn effectively when we talk with native speakers.
19. We learn effectively when we study western culture.
20. We learn effectively when we go to conversation clubs.
21. We learn effectively when we reflect on (review) our progress.
22. Sending emails in English is a good way to learn English.
23. Joining online chatrooms is a good way to learn English.
24. Visiting English websites is good for learning English.
25. Making our own English website helps us to learn English.

Adapted from Finch (2004b, p. 14)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0014.html

# APPENDIX F: MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCE SURVEY

Complete each section by placing a “1” next to each statement you feel accurately describes you. If you do not identify with a statement, leave the space provided blank. Then total the column in each section.

Section 1
_____I enjoy categorizing things by common traits
_____Ecological issues are important to me
_____Hiking and camping are enjoyable activities
_____I enjoy working on a garden
_____I believe preserving our National Parks is important
_____Putting things in hierarchies makes sense to me
_____Animals are important in my life
_____My home has a recycling system in place
_____I enjoy studying biology, botany and/or zoology
_____I spend a great deal of time outdoors
**_____TOTAL for Section 1**

Section 2
_____I easily pick up on patterns
_____I focus in on noise and sounds
_____Moving to a beat is easy for me
_____I’ve always been interested in playing an instrument
_____The cadence of poetry intrigues me
_____I remember things by putting them in a rhyme
_____Concentration is difficult while listening to a radio or television
_____I enjoy many kinds of music
_____Musicals are more interesting than dramatic plays
_____Remembering song lyrics is easy for me
**_____TOTAL for Section 2**

Section 3
_____I keep my things neat and orderly
_____Step-by-step directions are a big help
_____Solving problems comes easily to me
_____I get easily frustrated with disorganized people
_____I can complete calculations quickly in my head
_____Puzzles requiring reasoning are fun
_____I can’t begin an assignment until all my questions are answered
_____Structure helps me be successful
_____I find working on a computer spreadsheet or database rewarding
_____Things have to make sense to me or I am dissatisfied
**_____TOTAL for Section 3**

Section 4
_____It is important to see my role in the "big picture" of things
_____I enjoy discussing questions about life
_____Religion is important to me
_____I enjoy viewing art masterpieces
_____Relaxation and meditation exercises are rewarding
_____I like visiting breathtaking sites in nature
_____I enjoy reading ancient and modern philosophers
_____Learning new things is easier when I understand their value
_____I wonder if there are other forms of intelligent life in the universe
_____Studying history and ancient culture helps give me perspective
**_____ TOTAL for Section 4**

Section 5
_____I learn best interacting with others
_____The more the merrier
_____Study groups are very productive for me
_____I enjoy chat rooms
_____Participating in politics is important
_____Television and radio talk shows are enjoyable
_____I am a "team player"
_____I dislike working alone
_____Clubs and extracurricular activities are fun
_____I pay attention to social issues and causes
**_____ TOTAL for Section 5**

Section 6
_____I enjoy making things with my hands
_____Sitting still for long periods of time is difficult for me
_____I enjoy outdoor games and sports
_____I value non-verbal communication such as sign language
_____A fit body is important for a fit mind
_____Arts and crafts are enjoyable pastimes
_____Expression through dance is beautiful
_____I like working with tools
_____I live an active lifestyle
_____I learn by doing
**_____ TOTAL for Section 6**

Section 7
_____I enjoy reading all kinds of materials
_____Taking notes helps me remember and understand
_____I faithfully contact friends through letters and/or e-mail
_____It is easy for me to explain my ideas to others
_____I keep a journal
_____Word puzzles like crosswords and jumbles are fun
_____I write for pleasure
_____I enjoy playing with words like puns, anagrams and spoonerisms
_____Foreign languages interest me
_____Debates and public speaking are activities I like to participate in
**_____ TOTAL for Section 7**

Section 8
_____I am keenly aware of my moral beliefs
_____I learn best when I have an emotional attachment to the subject
_____Fairness is important to me
_____My attitude effects how I learn
_____Social justice issues concern me
_____Working alone can be just as productive as working in a group
_____I need to know why I should do something before I agree to do it
_____When I believe in something I will give 100% effort to it
_____I like to be involved in causes that help others
_____I am willing to protest or sign a petition to right a wrong
**_____ TOTAL for Section 8**

Section 9
_____I can imagine ideas in my mind
_____Rearranging a room is fun for me
_____I enjoy creating art using varied media
_____I remember well using graphic organizers
_____Performance art can be very gratifying
_____Spreadsheets are great for making charts, graphs and tables
_____Three dimensional puzzles bring me much enjoyment
_____Music videos are very stimulating
_____I can recall things in mental pictures
_____I am good at reading maps and blueprints
**_____ TOTAL for Section 9**

Adapted from McKenzie, (1999)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0043.html
AND http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0044.html
AND http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0045.html
AND http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0046.html

## APPENDIX G. LEARNING STYLE INVENTORY

Responses: “Often” “Sometimes” “Rarely”

I remember more about a subject through the lecture method, with information, explanations, and discussion.

I prefer information to be written on the board, with the use of visual aids and assigned readings.

I write things down or to take notes for visual review.

I prefer to practice activities in class.

I need explanations of diagrams, graphs, or visual directions.

I enjoy working with my hands or making things.

I am skillful with making graphs and charts.

I can match sounds well (pronunciation).

I remember by writing things down many times.

I can understand and follow directions on maps.

I learn best by listening to lectures and tapes.

I play with coins or keys in my pockets when studying.

I learn to spell by repeating the words, rather than by

writing them down.

I understand an article best by reading it rather than by listening to it on the radio.

I chew gum, smoke, or eat a snack during my studies.

I remember something by picturing it in my head.

I learn spelling by ‘finger spelling’ the words.

I would rather listen to a good lecture than read about the same material in a textbook.

I am good at doing puzzles.

I hold and touch things when I am learning.

I prefer listening to the news on the radio rather than reading about it in a newspaper.

I learn about a subject by reading about it.

I feel good about touching other people.

I follow spoken directions better than written ones.

Adapted from Martinez (1997)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0056.html
AND http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0057.html

# APPENDIX H. LEARNING STYLES

Find out if these statements are true or false

Most people in this class study at home

Most people in this class like studying.

Most people in this class study at night.

Most people in this class study every day.

Most people in this class listen to music while studying.

Many people in this class study alone.

Many people in this class study slowly and carefully

Many people in this class make notes when they study

Some people in this class remember things easily

Some people in this class write in the textbook when they study

Nobody in this class studies before breakfast

Nobody in this class watches TV when they study

Adapted from Finch (2004, p. 12)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0012.html
AND http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0013.html

## APPENDIX I. LEARNING GOALS

1. What are my long term goals?
Become a teacher Become rich Become famous Get married
Have a family Help sick people Speak many languages
Start a business Study abroad Work abroad Write a book
Other

2. What are my short term goals?
Be punctual Exercise regularly Get good grades Graduate
Do research Get a job Learn computer skills Help my parents
Live by myself Make lots of friends Study regularly
Other

3. What language do I need to reach my goals?
Business-English Interview-English Communication
Writing about myself Making a speech News-English
Giving advice Writing a resumé Making a summary
Academic English Making notes Writing memos
Medical-English Diplomatic English Telling stories
Telephone-English Public-speaking Finding information
Teaching-English Presentation skills Writing business letters
Scientific English International Trade Writing reports
Other

Adapted from Finch (2004, p. 24)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0024.html
AND http://www.finchpark.com/books/lj/0025.html

## APPENDIX J. SELF-ASSESSMENT

1 = Never  2 = Rarely  3 = Sometimes  4 = Often  5 = As much as possible

**When planning and preparing the presentations**
I tried to use English for communication.
I listened carefully to my group members.
I contributed ideas to the group.
I helped to decide the goals for the presentation.
I helped to design and make the materials for the presentation.
I helped to make handouts.
I cooperated with my group members.
I asked the teacher for help when necessary.
I tried to learn some new language.
I did some preparation at home.
I did extra work that I wanted to do.
I practiced the presentation lesson with my group.
I thought about my learning goals and achievements.
I thought about my confidence and motivation.
I thought about my reasons for learning English.

**When performing the presentations**
I used relevant vocabulary (range).
I communicated without hesitations or errors (ease of speech).
I was confident and cheerful (attitude).
I spoke clearly, at a good volume, and with good intonation (delivery).
I interacted with other presenters and with the audience (interaction).

(Based on Finch & Sampson, 2003, p. 228)
Available: http://www.finchpark.com/books/u2u/self_assess.pdf

# Acculturation and the EFL/ESL Hybrid: The Optimal Distance Model Revisited - A study from South Korea

**JOHNNY O'NEAL COOPER, JR.**
*Jinju National University*

## ABSTRACT

In a study to determine if anomic symptoms were present in Korean L2 Learners and bilinguals, and if these anomic symptoms were inhibiting their transition into the third stage of acculturation as described in Brown's (1980) description of the Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition, it is argued that the implications to Brown's model need to be re-examined with reference to Korean learners within the Republic of Korea. This paper argues that Korean learners; especially adult bilinguals who are approaching or have mastered English linguistically, display anomic symptoms while learning in Korea, and are in need of some type of acculturation program.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The type of bilinguality that evolves in individuals is not independent of some kind of acculturation and deculturation process. Along these lines of reasoning the learner becoming fluent and maintaining his native language are also part of some kind of cultural adaptation. Accordingly, the processes of enculturation, acculturation and deculturation play an important role in determining bilingual skills and the bilingual's cultural identity.  As discussed in Hamers and Blanc (1989:239), "Cultural identity is an important aspect of personality. The bilingual develops a unique identity, different from that of the monolingual, but which can nonetheless

This paper derives from a thesis and ongoing research project entitled *"Investigating anomie and L1 deculturation in English L2 monocultural and bicultural-bilinguals: A study from South Korea."*

be harmoniously adjusted if society allows it; contrary to received opinion that bilinguality leads to a maladjusted personality, it should be stressed that anomie and psychological distress are not necessarily the outcomes of bilinguality but develop only when the individual has no possibility of resolving conflicts arising from dual membership."

In addition, Hamers and Blanc (1989) also claims it is important to stress that bilinguals should not develop two parallel identities, but integrate the two cultures into an identity in which aspects of both cultures are closely interrelated. For example, a perfectly balanced bilingual may be perceived as a member of either one of his ethnolinguistic groups. As opposed to a highly fluent dominant bilingual possibly being only perceived as a member of his/her own ethnolinguistic group because the 'foreign' language markers he/she uses in his/her speech are identified not only with ethnic group membership but also with ethnic allegiances.

Along these lines of reasoning, the type of bilinguality that evolves in individuals is not independent of some kind of acculturation and deculturation process and the learner becoming fluent and maintaining his native language are part of cultural adaptation. Accordingly, the processes of enculturation, acculturation and deculturation play an important role in determining bilingual skills and the bilingual's cultural identity.

In reference to bilinguals in the Republic of Korea where the society may be seen as ethnocentric when compared to many English speaking countries; the process of acculturation may be considered an unnecessary factor in many English curriculums' that are basically considered to be programs designed as English as a Foreign Language, such as the audio-lingual method which is taught in Korean middle schools and the grammar translation method taught in Korean high schools and universities.

However, as discussed in Li (1986) the South Korean government has placed English learning and teaching high on its agenda to ensure that South Korea will play an active and important role in world political and economic activities. The South Korean Ministry of Education published a series of policies regarding English learning and teaching. Choi, Park, & Kim (1986 as discussed in Li 1986: 682) explain that "Early in 1992, the South Korean Ministry of Education published *The Sixth National Curriculum for Middle Schools* (Grades 7-9) and *The Sixth National Curriculum for High Schools* (Grades 10-12), known among practitioners as the Communicative Curriculums. The new curricula, which are to guide Korean English teaching from 1995 to 2010, clearly state that CLT,)[1] should replace the dominant audio-lingual method in middle schools and the grammar-translation method in high schools in South Korea."[2] Furthermore, South Korea's policy towards communicative language teaching (CLT) and its practical limitations as discussed in Li (1986) along with the demand for native speaker instructors shows strong evidence of Koreas EFL[3] / ESL[4] Hybrid language learning situation and the possible need for acculturation especially where advanced L2 learners and adult bilinguals are concerned.

The purpose of this study is to determine if *anomic* symptoms are present in Korean L2 learners and bilinguals and if these anomic symptoms are inhibiting their transition into the third stage of acculturation as described in Brown's (1980) description of the Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition. Anomie is defined as social instability resulting from a breakdown of standards and values; or personal unrest, alienation, and uncertainty that comes from a lack of purpose or ideals.

It is argued in this study that the implications to Brown's model need to be re-examined in reference to Korean learners within the Republic of Korea. Brown (1980) claims that the limitations to the Optimal Distance Model are restricted to second language learning in the environment of the second culture and that Foreign Language Learning is excluded from the model because acculturation is not a factor in EFL teaching situations.

Brown (1980:162) also claims in the implications of his hypothesis that acculturation "does become pertinent" in the case of learning a foreign language in a country such as Korea and subsequently residing in the target languages country. In addition, Brown claims that such a pattern might give rise to a situation where a person achieves linguistic mastery too soon and as a result, suffers in acculturation.

This paper argues this point a step further and suggests that in the case of Korean learners; especially adult bilinguals who are approaching or have mastered English linguistically are having anomic symptoms while learning in Korea and are in need of some kind of acculturation program. This argument is based on the fact that the EFL situation in Korea has become more of a hybrid combining EFL and ESL, an example being the demand for native speaker instructors to teach English conversation in all areas of English education.

Brown's (1980) Optimal Distance Model suggests that some of the difficulties that adult learners experience in second language learning are attributed to inefficient synchronization of acculturation and language development. In the case of bilingual Koreans who study within the Republic of Korea this situation has been observed. Many Korean bilinguals become nearly fluent in English where it pertains to reading, writing and to some degree listening: oral communicative competence on the other hand is a major problem. Many Koreans have studied extensively for years but are not able to communicate in English; attributing their lack of communication ability to having no chance to communicate with the native speaker.

The following research argues that lack of acculturation may be a more important factor in the subjects failure to reach communicative competence and that the anomic symptoms, which are present in many of the subjects, are not being considered as factors in their language learning development.

# II. LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1 Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to investigate what Lambert (1967) and Gardener and Lambert (1972) refer to as Durkheim's (1897) theory of Anomie as it pertains to the transition into the third stage of acculturation as described in Brown's (1980) "Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition." The social psychological concept being applied to these transitional stages of additional language acquisition in this research is necessary because many bilinguals are possibly experiencing the condition of being anomic due to their concerns about becoming L-2 acculturated or deculturated.[5]

It is argued in this study that this anomic conditioning is inhibiting many Korean bilinguals transfer into the third stage of acculturation. The majority of the Bilingual Koreans questioned in this study where from the two most southern provinces of South Korea; and have classified themselves as both monocultural and bicultural bilinguals.

## 2.2 Acculturation: The Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition

As discussed in Brown (1980:157) "The Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition," has shown that sociocultural factors more successfully define a critical period in second language learning. Research in four related areas**;** the stages of *acculturation, anomie, social distance* and *perceived social distance* help**s** define the sociocultural determined critical period for successful second language learning. Brown's Optimal Distance Model has identified four stages of acculturation, which persons go through in adapting, or assimilating themselves in a new culture.

The first stage is the period of *excitement* over learning a new language and culture. The second stage may result in *culture shock* as the individual feels they are losing their cultural identity as more and more cultural differences confuse their cultural identity. In this stage, Brown claims that many learners seek out support by regressing back to using their native language. Brown also claims that anomie and culture shock for learners can produce feelings of estrangement, hostility, indecision, frustration and sadness, which in turn inhibit their cultural and bilingual development, as in the case of many of the subjects in this research. The third stage of acculturation is one of *gradual recovery* from anomie and culture shock. This stage is labeled *culture stress*. At this stage, some problems of acculturation are solved while other problems continue. Progress is made slowly as the person begins to accept differences in thinking and feeling, slowly becoming more adapted with the second culture. The fourth stage represents near or full recovery, assimilation or adaptation, acceptance of the new culture and self-confidence in the culture. At the societal level, acculturation occurs when two independent cultural groups come into contact over an extended period resulting in change in either or both cultural groups. (See appendix 6)

## 2.3 Anomie

The concept of "Anomie" first proposed by Durkheim (1897) and later by Merton (1938) refers to the feelings of social uncertainty or dissatisfaction, which are believed to be most characterized in serious students of a second language and those who become bilingual. As discussed in Brown (1980:159) the concept of anomie is a significant aspect of the relationship between language learning and attitude towards a foreign culture. Anomie is represented when the individual begins to lose some of the ties with his native culture and attempts to adapt to the second culture. This situation could occur when bilinguals are faced with proving their communicative competence in classroom and real life situations where they must communicate with native English speakers as a bilingual, not as an L2 learner, possibly causing an anomic situation leading to feelings of disappointment or regret mixed with the fearful anticipation of entering a new group.

As Brown (1980:159) points out in his explanation of "The Optimal distance Model of Second Language Acquisition," anomie might be described as the first symptom of the third stage of acculturation, a feeling of hopelessness or depression, where the learner feels neither bound firmly to a native culture nor fully adapted to a second culture. Brown claims this situation often causes the learner to revert or to regress back to their native language and to seek out situations where they can speak in their native tongue, as in the case of the subjects in this study.

Such desires are said to correspond to the third stage of acculturation and symptoms of culture shock. Brown claims that not until after a person is well into the third stage of acculturation do these feelings of anomie begin to decrease as the learner is becoming acculturated in the transition from one culture to another.

As discussed in Lambert (1972:290) studies have shown that-"the successful learners of a second language have to identify with the members of another linguistic-cultural group and be willing to take on the very 'subtle aspects' of their behavior, including their distinctive style of speech and their language.

Lambert continues to explain that there are various types of motivation, which can motivate the learner to want to be like the second language groups members. For example, the learner may find that in mastering certain features of another social group's language the learner has made an important step in becoming an acculturated part of a second linguistic-cultural-community. He continues by stating; "If pushed beyond a point this progress in a second language could engender an anomic symptom of not comfortably belonging in one social group or the other." Lambert (1972:290) argues that the social-psychological theory of language learning claims that-"an individual successfully acquiring a second language gradually adopts various aspects of behavior, which characterize members of another linguistic cultural group through acculturation."

## 2.4 Acculturation: Language Attitudes, Motivations and Language Identity

It is not always clear what the distinction is between attitudes and motivation. Schumann (1978 as discussed in Ellis 1985:116) lists 'attitudes' as a social factor with variables such as the size of the learning group and 'motivation' as an affective factor along with culture shock. Gardener and Lambert (1972 as discussed in Ellis 1985:17) define 'motivation' as the L2 learner's overall goal, and 'attitude' as the determination shown by the learner in striving for a goal. Gardener (1979) claims that attitudes are related to motivation by serving as supports of the learner's overall orientation. Brown (1981) defines motivation as three types: (1) global motivation; (2) situational motivation; and (3) task motivation.

Brown also refers to attitudes as the set of beliefs that the learner holds towards members of the target language group as well as his/her own culture.

As discussed in Hamers and Blanc (1989:205) "In a harmonious acculturation process a learner acquires the cultural rules and language skills of the new culture and integrates them appropriately with his primary culture defining the learner as bicultural bilingual."

According to Taft (1977, as discussed in Hamers & Blanc, 1989:205) an adult who has to adapt to a new culture must integrate new cultural elements, including language in an already well-established identity making it more difficult for older learners to acculturate, as is the case for many of the subjects in this research. Lambert (1972:291) claims, "The learner' s ethnocentric tendencies, attitudes toward the other group and his orientation toward language learning are believed to regulate or control his motivation to learn and ultimately his success or failure in mastering a new language." Lambert also argues that some learners may be anxious to learn another language as a means of being accepted in another culture group because of dissatisfactions experienced in there own culture.

Lambert also explains that learners may be as interested in another culture as they are in their own and that the more proficient the learner becomes in a second language, the more the learner may find that his place in his original membership group is modified. Depending on the compatibility of the two cultures, the learner may experience anomic symptoms such as, feelings of chagrin or regret as he loses ties in one group, mixed with the fearful anticipation of entering a relatively new group. Thus, Lambert's research has supported the view that the strongest measure of anomie is experienced when, linguistically a person begins to master a foreign language.

## III. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

### 3.1 The Korean English language learning experience

The majority of the subjects in this study trained under the audio-lingual method in middle school and the grammar translation method in high school and university. Their exposure to communicative language teaching was experienced through native speaker contact at the university or private institutes.

In reference to the audio-lingual method used in Korean middle schools, the method does equip the students to use the language at an extremely basic level, but for developing oral communicative competence several aspects are lacking. The aspects of communicative competence that are missing in the audio-lingual method are mostly pragmatic such as the functions and variations of interactional skills and cultural frameworks.

The grammar translation method used in Korean high schools and universities uses the student's native language as the medium of instruction. Grammar is taught deductively; vocabulary is based solely on the reading texts used. Reading and writing are the focus with little or no attention paid to authentic real life English communication. As discussed in Richards and Rodgers (1986:4) the grammar translation method is considered frustrating for students but makes few demands on teachers. The grammar translation method is taught in Korean high schools and universities where teachers are mainly trained in literature rather than language teaching or applied linguistics. Also due to the emphasis of Korean high schools on the university entrance exams and the universities emphasis on TOEIC, grammar and the understanding of literary texts takes priority over speaking knowledge.

In addition, the main goal of many of the subjects in this study is high scores on the university entrance exams and the TOEFL, TOEIC or TEPS. TOEIC being used for assessing student's English proficiency for the purpose of employment in the major industrial corporations, leaving oral communicative competence as an important, but secondary objective.

## 3.2 CLT and the EFL/ESL Hybrid

As discussed in Celce-Murcia (1991:8) Communicative Language Teaching originated from the research of linguists such as Hymes (1972) and Halliday (1973) who view language as a system for communication. The communicative approach contends that the goal of language teaching is the learner' s ability to communicate in the target language. The content of the courses should include semantic notions and social functions, not just linguistic structures and that students should work in groups or pairs to transfer meaning in situations where one person has information the others lack. Furthermore, the approach also contends that students should also engage in role-play in the target language in realistic social contexts and the classroom materials and activities should be authentic reflecting real life situations and demands. The approach also contends that the teacher' s role should be to facilitate communication and only secondarily, to correct errors and that the teacher should be able to use the target language fluently and appropriately.

The CLT teaching situation in Korea is taught in two ways, the 'strong version' and the 'weak version' of the communicative approach. As discussed in Howatt (1984:279) the weak version has become the standard in many language-teaching situations stressing the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and attempts to integrate activities into a wider program of language teaching. The strong version of communicative teaching claims that language is acquired through communication not just using an existing and inert knowledge of the language but also stimulating the development of the language system itself. Howatt sums up by stating that the weak version can be described as 'learning to use' English and the strong version as 'using English to learn'.

Consequently this is the case in the education history of the subjects of this research where the weak version of communicative teaching as been taught in the years after high school. Mainly native speakers have taught this weak version due to the fact that many of the Korean faculties are not able to use the target language fluently and appropriately.

In addition, the weak version of CLT has been found ineffective in the classroom when trying to incorporate group work for the purpose of transferring meaning in situations where one person has information the others lack. In most communicative language, teaching situations the students rarely engage in role-play in the target language or use social contexts that are authentic to reflect the real life situations and demands of English discourse. One of the main problems is that Koreans have maintained a history of a teacher led method in the classroom; leading to Korean students feeling uncomfortable with group work involving NNS to NNS English communication.

In addition, the use of NNS to NNS group work is often seen as the teacher not doing their job. Along with other sociological factors, such as learning English under 'duress' student motivation, face saving, and refusal of Koreans to speak any other language other than Korean to other Koreans makes NNS to NNS impractical in many classroom teaching situations.

In addition, the studies have shown that learners who received instruction only in the audio-lingual and grammar translation methods had more difficulty communicating their thoughts and intentions effectively than the students who had exposure to the strong version of a communicative practice component incorporated into their curriculum. It has also been found that in reference to the learners with no communicative language component it was difficult to determine what the learners knew about the target language. The emphasis on accuracy that is stressed in the audio-lingual and grammar based methods resulted in students who were inhibited in using their knowledge for communication.

## 3.3 Acculturation theory and Korean Language Learning

Due to the lack of socialistic and psychological features needed by the students for motivation; Acculturation Theories gain a certain degree of validity when Korean learners are concerned. The concept of learning English under 'duress' relates to the Acculturation Theory and the social and psychological distance factors discussed in Schumann (1978). Schumann claims for SLA to be effective the target language and the learners need to view each other as socially equal. This is not the case with Korean students. The feeling of being forced to speak English is manifested in Koreas desire to advance in world trade. Many Koreans feel forced to study English in order to obtain a high score on the TOEIC test that is needed for advancement in many of the major corporations in Korea.

The second social factor claims that the target language and L2 groups must both be eager for the L2 group to assimilate. This also proposes a problem socially and psychologically. Many Koreans have no plan to adjust or become accustomed to another culture and Korea having been considered the "Hermit Country " for so many years, does not attract the cultural interests of the western world as much as their larger brothers China and Japan.

In addition, the target language and the L2 group should expect the L2 group to share social facilities with the target language group. This is also a problem, Korean society being deeply rooted in Confucianism and nationalism and does not mix well socially with other cultures and Korean culture is not compatible with that of the western society.

Furthermore, the two groups needing to have a positive attitude towards each other is also a problem. In Korea TESOL is not considered a profession. This is directly associated with the fact that the majority of the native speaker instructors employed in Korea have very little or no qualifications to teach, such as the teacher traveler. Schumann also maintains that the L2 culture is congruent with that of the target language group that the L2 group foresees staying in the target language area for an extended period. For most Korean people this is not possible due to the fact that Korean culture and that of English speaking cultures are not compatible and chances to communicate in English are rare.

In summary, the Korean English teaching situation experienced by the subjects in this study shows that the lack of acculturation may be an important factor in many of the bilingual's oral English communication problems and that anomic symptoms may be present in many of the subjects. Consequently, these symptoms are not being considered as factors in their language learning development and in the case of bilingual Koreans who study within the Republic of Korea this situation is in need of further study. Many Korean bilinguals who have studied extensively for years, become fluent in English where it pertains to reading, writing and to some degree listening, but are not able to orally communicate in English. Many attribute their lack of oral communication ability to having little or no chance to communicate with the native speakers.

# IV. THE STUDY

## 4.1 Aims and rationale of the study

The aims of this research are to determine if Korean Bilinguals are experiencing anomic symptoms in the second stage of acculturation and to determine if the implications to Brown's (1980) theory of the Optimal Distance Model of Second language Acquisition need to be reevaluated in reference to Korean learners in the Republic of Korea. In addition, the research attempts to develop a better understanding of the problems Koreans have with acculturation and anomie and possible solutions to these problems in the interest of better language learning and teaching.

## 4.2 Interview research method and procedures

The first stage of research was conducted in the form of twenty-one interviews. Fifteen of the interviews were done individually with bilinguals who where able to demonstrate good English communication. The remaining six interviews were conducted with high school teachers in the form of English culture exchange retreats conducted over two weekends in both the Kyungsangnam and the Chollanam provinces of South Korea. The purpose of these retreats were to conduct research interviews and give the respondents a chance to communicate with the native speaker in a situation and setting that would minimize the respondents chances of loss of face with their colleagues. The interviews conducted at this time were to determine the participant's attitudes towards acculturation and the feelings of anomie they may have, had or were experiencing along with their attitudes towards Korean-to-Korean English communication. The respondent's attitudes and feelings were measured in the form of personal interviews and subsequent group discussions.

## 4.3 Respondent profiles

Fifteen of the twenty-one interviews were conducted individually with bilingual respondents consisting of students and individuals, which had never taught English. These fifteen respondents ranged in age from 18 -47 and had studied English EFL/ESL from 0-29 years. Two of the respondents, IF5 and IF6 claiming they had never studied English in an EFL or ESL setting due to the fact that they had learned to speak English naturally in an English speaking country during elementary school. Two of the respondents chose English as their language preference and nine claimed to have dreamed in English. Of these fifteen interview respondents, nine classified themselves as monocultural bilinguals and six as bicultural bilinguals. Eleven of these fifteen respondents studied under the audio-lingual method and grammar translation methods in middle and high school with two years exposure to CLT and the native speaker. Two studied under the audio-lingual method and grammar translation methods in high school with additional years of education in English speaking countries. The two respondents IF5 and IF6 were educated in United States in reference to English language training in elementary school.

The additional six of the twenty-one interview respondents were high school teachers ranging in age from 39-50 who had been teaching English from 6-19 years. The high school teachers had studied English from 8-26 years. All six respondent's language preference was Korean with only one respondent having claimed to have dreams in English. All six of the high school teachers classified themselves as monocultural bilinguals who had studied under the audio-lingual method and grammar translation methods in high school and university with very little exposure to CLT or the native speaker.

## 4.4 Research findings Interview Respondents

The research findings concerning the interview respondents in this study show that anomic symptoms are present in the in Korean bilinguals and these anomic symptoms may be inhibiting their transition into the third stage of acculturation as described in Brown's (1980) description of the Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition. Evidence for this argument is demonstrated in the researcher' s comparison of bicultural bilinguals to monocultural bilinguals. The bicultural bilinguals in the interviews having successfully transferred into the third stage of acculturation; experienced significant symptoms of anomie as compared to the monocultural bilinguals, who after considerable years of study were still in the beginnings of the second stage of acculturation.

This research argues that the implications to Brown's (1980) Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition needs to be re-examined in reference to Korean learners within the Republic of Korea. Brown (1980) claims that the limitations to the Optimal Distance Model are restricted to second language learning in the environment of the second culture and that Foreign Language Learning is excluded from the model because acculturation is not a factor in EFL teaching situations.

In addition, Brown claims that in the implications of his hypothesis; acculturation "does become pertinent" in the case of learning a foreign language in a country such as Korea and subsequently residing in the target languages country. This claim needs to be taken a step further in teaching situations where EFL and ESL have become a hybrid.

Along these lines of reasoning, it was discovered that the bicultural bilinguals interviewed experienced stronger anomic symptoms such as, social uncertainty, fearful anticipation of entering a new group and feeling neither bound firmly to a native culture nor fully adapted to a second culture than compared to the monocultural bilinguals who ranked these symptoms as low or non-existent.

This evidence shows that Brown's (1980) theory of the Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition concerning anomic symptoms is accurate. The bicultural bilinguals in this study had apparently moved through to the third stage of acculturation and had experienced anomic symptoms. The study also shows that the monocultural bilinguals having not experienced many of the anomic symptoms to the same degree as the bicultural bilinguals gives evidence that the monocultural bilinguals are still in the beginning of stage two of acculturation.

Consequently, the EFL/ESL hybrid-teaching situation in Korea may be creating a situation where some learners may achieve linguistic mastery too soon, and as a result suffer in acculturation, possibly causing many bilinguals to become fluent in reading, writing and listening, but poor in oral communicative competence.

In the case of the monocultural bilinguals interviewed, the research shows that some of the respondents in this study are mastering English linguistically and are beginning to acquire anomic symptoms while learning in Korea. Therefore, the hypothesis that Korean monocultural bilinguals' are in need of some kind of acculturation program to assist them in transferring through the remaining stages of acculturation is worth further study. This argument is based on the EFL situation in Korea becoming more of a hybrid teaching method combining EFL and ESL such as, in the case of the demand for native speaker instructors to teach English conversation in all areas of English education.

Brown's (1980) Optimal Distance Model suggests that some of the difficulties that adult learners experience in second language learning are attributed to inefficient synchronization of acculturation and language development. In the case of bilingual Koreans interviewed, this situation was observed. Many of the monocultural bilinguals in this research had studied extensively for years but were not able to communicate orally in English on the level in which they felt comfortable, attributing their lack of communication ability to having no chance to communicate with the native speaker.

The research findings argue that the lack of acculturation is an important factor in the monocultural bilingual subject's failure to reach oral communicative competence and that the anomic symptoms, which are present in many of the subjects, are not being considered as factors in their language learning development. (See Appendices #1-5)

## 4.5 Comparison of the anomic symptoms experienced by bicultural and monocultural bilinguals

Of the anomic symptoms experienced by the six bicultural bilinguals in this study; the symptoms of social uncertainty or dissatisfaction, fearful anticipation of entering a new group and feeling neither bound firmly to a native culture nor fully adapted to a second culture were almost equally as strong. The symptoms of chagrin or regret and feeling of hopelessness were ranked lower amongst the bicultural bilinguals.

The low ranking of the symptoms of regret and hopelessness amongst the bicultural bilinguals interviewed shows that the respondents have possibly progressed in the acculturation process and are contending with the process of social distance. In contrast, the fifteen monocultural bilinguals interviewed, ranked the anomic symptom of fearful anticipation of entering a new group as the highest, possibly showing that they are still in the second stage of acculturation.

Along those lines of reasoning, the equally low ranking of the anomic symptoms of social uncertainty, regret and feelings of hopelessness by the Monocultural Bilinguals show that the respondents are still possibly in the second stage of acculturation and have been in many cases for a long period. Additional evidence is also shown, by the anomic symptom of neither feeling bound firmly to a native culture or fully adapted to a second culture, not being experienced at all by the monocultural respondents, except for one respondent who ranked the symptom as serious.

## 4.6 Interview respondents' motivations for becoming bilingual

*Why did you want to become bilingual? "Why are you bilingual?" Explain.* (See appendices 3-5)

Below are some quotations from the respondents:

I= Interview

M=Male F=Female

Of the monocultural bilinguals, interviewed 12 were men and three were women. All of the men claimed to have extrinsic motivations except for one who claimed intrinsic. All of the women interviewed also claimed extrinsic motivations with one claiming some intrinsic motivations

IM2 (Monocultural Bilingual) "These days, society wants a person who is able to use more than two languages. I think becoming a bilingual is a social trend and requirement. I felt it necessity that I must adapt myself to these social trends and it is my desire to do so. Therefore, I can survive in the future at a higher state of social life. And I can get a little more of a competitive edge than others in this country."

IM3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "When I was child, I used to watch Hollywood movies and listen to English songs. I loved them, I did not understand what the actors said, but I liked imitating them. I naturally liked the language that they spoke with. But nowadays, English has become an international language"

IF1 (Monocultural Bilingual) "According to social surroundings, English is used as a worldwide language. We are compelled to learn English. Becoming bilingual gives you competitive power abroad. Why am I bilingual? Because I want to be a perfect bilingual. I have an occupation relating to English, but it is not of use in becoming bilingual."

IF3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "The world is changing rapidly, so we call it an international and global society. Being and becoming bilingual is so important and useful in this sudden changing society. I want to advance in the world and I need to be able express my own opinions to foreigners in order to survive in the world."

IM7 (Bicultural Bilingual) "To be bilingual has many merits in Korean society. Especially, if I can speak English fluently, I will have many opportunities to choose my job in many fields."

IM14 (Bicultural Bilingual) "For communication; reading, writing and talking. I studied in the U.S.A. as a graduate student as well as post-doctorate for 10.5 years."

IF5 (Bicultural Bilingual) "Being bilingual was not a choice for me, but a part of my environment. I was born to Korean parents and attended Elementary school in the US. I learned Korean at home and English at school. Korean was my first language but English was the language I used more. I went to middle and high school in Korea. I am fluent in both languages."

IF6 (Bicultural Bilingual) "I naturally became bilingual while living in the US (our family moved there when I was less than 2 years old). I never studied it as a subject; I just learned it by going to school."

This evidence also shows that the monocultural bilinguals in this study have not reached stage three of acculturation. Communication is a desire amongst the monocultural bilinguals but not a major concern due to the lack of chances to use English for the purpose of communication.

## 4.7 Interview respondents' problems becoming bilingual

*Please describe the main problems you have experienced or are experiencing in trying to become bilingual. What types of (linguistic and cultural) problems you are or have experienced as a bilingual. How do these problems occur? Please give examples.* **(See appendices 3-5)**

Of the fifteen monocultural bilinguals interviewed, nine-claimed linguistics as the main problems they were having in becoming bilingual claiming vocabulary, listening and grammar as the main difficulties in becoming bilingual. The remaining six respondents claimed cultural factors were inhibiting their development such as lack of native speaker contact, the use of idioms and peer pressure about speaking English.

IM2 (Monocultural Bilingual) "The problem was using the proper words with exact meaning. Some of the words have many of different meanings and many of words have the same meaning. So it's hard to use words properly. Furthermore, Idioms, for an example, "one's two cents", I cannot understand at all with only my limited knowledge of words. Also intonations, for example "come on"."

IM3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "The problem is peer pressure. Koreans don't like different things. They seem like a kind of the group that is all in the same uniforms."

IF1 (Monocultural Bilingual) “In my case, I do not have chances to talk to others very much.

IF3 (Monocultural Bilingual) “Sometimes we experience difficult situations when speaking English with foreigners. In fact I want to make conversation with foreigners using English, but because of my lack of English vocabulary and poor grammar it doesn’t occur to me what to say in English and then I feel nervous.”

IM7 (Bicultural Bilingual) “If I had been a child when I was in England, it would not have been that difficult for me to adjust myself to English culture. First, I think that I failed to make use of English culture. Secondly, I do not like to talk with strangers. I always refused to speak even though I realized that to communicate with English people was a great opportunity to understand and practice English culture. When I talked with my English friends they would use expressions such as, ‘a piece of cake’, I tried to search for the meaning of the expression. But finally, I had to ask my friend about it. I could not understand expressions like this which are from their culture.”

IM14 (Bicultural Bilingual) “The main problems were limited cultural contact, e.g. everyday living with English speaking people. The types of problems linguistically were that it was hard to understand dramas and carefree conversation between native speakers such as jargons and jokes. Culturally, human relationships and conversations seemed to be of a closer nature than what I expected and vice versa.”

IF5 (Bicultural Bilingual) “As a bilingual (I think bicultural is more appropriate in this case) I have always felt like an outcast. I did not completely fit-in in America because I was Korean (and my parents constantly made me conscious of the fact). And in Korea I was never able to blend with others because Koreans love communal activities and I am characteristically an individualistic person (and America had made me more so).”

IF6 (Bicultural Bilingual) “I’ve experienced several problems being bilingual. First of all, while living in the US, I felt that it was becoming harder to keep my Korean language, since I didn’t have much chance to use it. Although my mom tried to make us speak Korean in the house, I found myself mixing more and more English into it. In Korea, the opposite happened. I think it is only natural that your ability to speak a

> language gets dull if you don't live in a surrounding that constantly speaks it. Also, when I came to Korea when I was 11, I had no problems communicating in Korean with my friends. The problem was the 10-year cultural gap between me and my friends, which sometimes made me feel I didn't belong in the Korean group. Another problem I still experience is the unwillingness of other people to acknowledge that I am truly bilingual. Many times, teachers at school assume that I can't understand Korean, just because I'm good at English."

Once again, this shows strong evidence that the Bicultural Bilinguals have moved into the third stage of acculturation and the Monocultural Bilinguals have not. The bicultural bilingual respondents interviewed claimed that the main problems they had becoming bilingual were largely cultural and due to anomic symptoms and limited cultural contact.

## 4.8 Interview respondents' bilinguality and dreaming in English

*Do you ever dream in English? Explain.* (See appendices 3-5)

Of the twenty-one respondents interviewed, six bicultural bilinguals claimed to have dreamed in English and of the fifteen monocultural bilinguals studied, only four claimed to have dreamed in English showing some evidence that the bicultural bilinguals in this study had possibly transferred into the third stage of acculturation or further.

IM2 (Monocultural Bilingual) "Sometimes, I had dreams in English; mainly shopping, traveling and working. But I could not remember the spoken words."

IM3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "Yes, many times especially when I study English hard or when I have a day that I speak allot in English. In my dreams, usually I'm a good English speaker. I usually I speak fluently in my dreams."

IF1 (Monocultural Bilingual) "No. But I want to dream in English."

IF3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "No matter how much I have studied English, I never dream in English, but I heard some people do dream in English. They said, if they have devoted themselves to studying English constantly, they will dream in English. I think I have not devoted myself to do it yet."

IM7 (Bicultural Bilingual) "Yes, sometimes when I was in an English-speaking society, I used to dream in English. I think that whenever I was not satisfied with my English; for example, when asking for something or trying to communicate with foreign people, I seemed to dream in English. But more importantly, when I was dreaming, I always spoke in English fluently. That is, I could express everything which I did not tell them during the conversation."

IM14 (Bicultural Bilingual) "Yes, I did. Many times when I studied English before going to the U.S.A. and quite often while writing a paper or preparing a presentation in the U.S.A. More often than not while writing a paper during the past several years after coming back to Korea."

IF5 (Bicultural Bilingual) "Sometimes, but Korean and English are so closely intertwined in my head that usually I don't realize what language is being used."

IF6 (Bicultural Bilingual) "I used to dream in English when I was living in the US, but I don't think I dream in English anymore. Usually, my dreams take place in Korea, and the characters are also Korean, so I naturally speak in Korean.  This is probably because my dreams reflect my surroundings in real life."

## 4.9 Interview respondents' attitudes towards British or American culture

*Although you speak English, do you feel you understand and practice American (or British) culture? And is this an important part of your being bilingual?" Explain.* **(See appendices 3-5)**

Of the monocultural bilinguals interviewed, only five claimed to practice British or American culture. All but two claimed to have problems understanding western culture. In reference to the monocultural bilingual respondent's feelings towards American or British culture, two responded negatively, six responded positively and seven responded ambiguous.

IM2 (Monocultural Bilingual) "I've learned through the studying process not through experience. I think the best way to understand their culture is experiencing it firsthand. I am thinking that I would like to visit America or England because I'm learning English and I'd like to know if it would be useful to communicate with my English. I think that American and English cultures have pride in their countries. Sometimes it seems like they think they are superior to other cultures. An example would be considered in the actions and situations these days and the way they are dealing with terrorism in several countries."

IM3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "I don't have any problem with western culture. I even like American culture. I know that I have to accept the differences, because we are different. Having differences is not that bad, it is an interesting thing. Maybe western culture fits me better than Korean. Maybe I'm seeing only the bright side of the western culture or maybe I don't know enough about it."

IF1 (Monocultural Bilingual) "No. I do not have any problems with western culture. I approve and think well of western culture. I am unfamiliar with new culture. Even if I understand western society, it is only in my mind. I have never experienced it directly in person."

IF3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "I often feel an identity that is between two cultures; Korean and American while I am studying English. If I could understand western culture, especially American, before studying English, then maybe I would be able to study English much easier than now. I think the comprehension of western culture is an important part of becoming bilingual."

Of the six bicultural bilinguals interviewed four claimed to practice western culture and two did not. Only one respondent had problems understanding western culture and three of the respondents felt ambiguous towards western culture, two feeling negative and one with positive feelings

IM7 (Bicultural Bilingual) "I think that American or British cultures are based on individualism, which I do not like. But there are some aspects that are good for me. Generally I think, by not accepting western cultures, it was slow for me to learn English."

IM14 (Bicultural Bilingual) "Western cultures are pretty rational, exceptive and open but it sometimes looks dogmatic to me. Sometimes I don't understand the response of western people."

IF5 (Bicultural Bilingual) I practice American culture to a certain point. I never fully practiced American culture (even in the US) because of my conservative parents, but a considerable part of my values and thoughts are "American". I feel that it is an essential part of my being bilingual. After I came back to Korea, I never really gave up my American way of thinking and that has kept me looking for everything in English. I continued to read English books and newspapers instead of Korean ones because I felt I needed to preserve my "Americanism"."

IF6 (Bicultural Bilingual) "I understand western culture better than my friends (since I experienced it first hand), but I still have some problems understanding it completely. For example, I do not (and probably will not) understand the amount of sex and violence in their culture. It is completely unthinkable in Korea. I think this is because my parents influenced me greatly to have Korean values even while I was living in the US. I don't think anyone has the right to evaluate the culture of a country, not even their own. Americans have just as much right to be proud of their culture, as I am proud of mine. What I do not like is that the Americans try to homogenize the world with their values and culture, just because English is the world language of today. Although it is inevitable to learn about the culture while learning a language, it shouldn't be forced on anyone."

### 4.10 Attitudes towards the critical period hypothesis and development of NNS to NNS speech communities

*Do you believe that age is a critical in becoming bilingual? For example do you believe the only way to become truly fluent in English is to start studying as a child. Explain.*

*Do you feel that the development of speech communities (Korean NNS to Korean NNS) such this retreat can assist in overcoming the acculturation problems in the second stage of acculturation and provide a solution the situation of anomie that classifies many Koreans in the cultural identity group of monocultural bilingual? Explain.* (See appendices 3-5)

Of the fifteen monocultural bilinguals interviewed, five felt age was a factor in becoming bilingual, seven did not and three felt ambiguous towards the theory. Nine of the monocultural respondents interviewed felt that the development of NNS to NNS speech communities would be helpful in overcoming anomic symptoms; two did not and three were ambiguous.

IM2 (Monocultural Bilingual) "I think age is one of the important things in becoming bilingual. Childhood is the time to easily improve pronunciation, but I don't think a younger age is the only way to become truly fluent in English. I think a good age to start is 10-13.

IM3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "I believe age is not a problem at all, having good pronunciation is better for children. If someone can enjoy the language that he or she studies time will make him or her bilingual. The most important thing is meaningful conversation. So talking with Koreans in English is good chance. It makes you think in English and it creates a language system for English in our brains.

IF1 (Monocultural Bilingual) "No, I don't believe. It does not matter. Age is not what counts. If they are of strong will, the older students can speak fluently faster than the young do. I believe NNS to NNS communication is one of many solutions. It can be a useful solution. As a monocultural bilingual, I never feel like I am losing our cultural identity, confused or regressing back to using our native language when having problems.

IF3 (Monocultural Bilingual) "I think, there is a closer connection between age and language. The older you are the longer it takes to make sense of many things, especially learning. The young, they can easily adapt to new culture and language instead of our own."

Four of the bicultural bilingual subjects in this study felt that age was a factor in bilingual development; two did not. Of the six Bicultural Bilinguals interviewed, only one felt that the development of NNS to NNS speech communities would be helpful in overcoming anomic symptoms; two did not and the remaining three were ambiguous in their feelings.

IM7 (Bicultural Bilingual) "First, I think that it is impossible for non-native English speaker to master English. I had a Korean friend in England who was born and educated in England. One day, I saw and heard my Korean friend talking with his English friend. But I could not understand their talk. They talked to each other with mostly slang. I think that the younger a learner is, the more easily he or she acquires English, because he or she continues to learn all kinds of English throughout their whole life. If he or she is not born and educated in the English-speaking society, it is impossible to acquire various kinds of English. I think that someone who wants to become bicultural bilingual must overcome the acculturation problems by him or herself. Someone who has acculturation problems needs to try to overcome them rather than escape them. Therefore, I disagree with the development of speech communities (Korean NNS to Korean NNS) especially in learning English.

IM14 (Bicultural Bilingual) "Yes I think age is critical, except for some exceptional cases, adults and probably even adolescents cannot become truly bilingual, unless they start learning English from childhood. This is not because adults have a limited language sense or ability, but because they have a limited cultural acceptability, mentally or environmentally. Yes, I think the development Korean NNS-NNS communities will help a lot. First of all, it will provide chances for practice. I believe language is practice. Secondly, a Korean- NNS-to-Korean-NNS conversation may be comparable to a meeting or discussion of insane people, which is said to be very effective for stimulating the sanity by providing a chance to see the insanity in him or her self as well as others.

IF5 (Bicultural Bilingual) "I think that age is critical in becoming bilingual. I do not think it is impossible to become fluent in a language after adulthood, but I think it becomes extremely difficult. I think the best way to become truly fluent in a language is to live in a country in which the language is spoken at an early age (5-15) for at least 2 years. I think it's because children are more open to learning and are not afraid to make mistakes. Also, they don't "study" the language as a subject, but learn to actually use it in real life. I am not sure about NNS-NNS Speech communities, but I do not think that Koreans will become bicultural bilinguals in the near future. Koreans are much too conservative, and they view language as a subject to be studied and try only to score high on various English efficiency tests. Also English is not a great part of the lives of Koreans, and I do not think they feel the need to be bicultural yet."

IF6 (Bicultural Bilingual) "I do not think the only way to be fluent in English is to study it as a child, although it would help a lot. For example, my dad started studying English in middle school, and went to an English-speaking country for the first time at the age of 30. Although his pronunciation is not perfect, his grammar is better than the average American, and everyone acknowledges that his English is fluent. I just learned English the easy way, by learning it as a child, but I truly believe it can also be done the hard way at a much more advanced age."

## V. CONCLUSION

This study argued that Korean learners; especially adult bilinguals who are approaching or have mastered English linguistically are experiencing anomic symptoms while learning in Korea and are in need of some kind of acculturation program. The study based this argument on the fact that the EFL situation in Korea has become more of a hybrid-teaching situation combining EFL and ESL such as, in the case of the demand for native speaker instructors to teach English conversation.

Brown (1980's) claims that the limitations to the Optimal Distance Model; restricting it to teaching situations that exist only to second language learning in the environment of the second language culture, needs to be reconsidered along with its implications, especially in reference to Korean learners within the Republic of Korea. Many Korean learners in this study attributed their lack of communication ability to having no chance to communicate with the native speaker. The findings of the study show that a lack of acculturation may be a more important factor in the subject's failure to reach communicative competence and that the anomic symptoms, which are present in many of the subjects, are not being considered as factors in their language learning development.

Brown's (1980) Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition suggested that some of the difficulties that adult learners experience in second language learning are attributed to inefficient synchronization of acculturation and language development. In the case of bilingual Koreans within this study, this situation was observed. Many of the Korean bilinguals had become fluent in English where it pertains to reading, writing and to some degree listening but their communication skills were still poor after having studied extensively for years.

## ENDNOTES

1 **Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)** An approach to language teaching which uses almost any activity that engages learners in authentic communication.

2 See **Li, D. (1986)**"It's always More Difficult Than You Plan and Imagine": Teachers Perceived Difficulties in Introducing the Communicative Approach in South Korea. TESOL Quarterly Vol. 34 No. 4, pp 677-703

3 ***English as a Foreign Language (EFL)*** The term EFL is most commonly used to describe English language learning in countries where English is not an official first language.

4 ***English as a Second Language (ESL)*** The term ESL refers to English language learning in countries where English is the main and / or official language, and the student's own native language (first language) is not English.
5 ***Anomie-*** Instability resulting from a breakdown of standards and values; or personal unrest, alienation, and uncertainty that comes from a lack of purpose or ideals.

## THE AUTHOR

*John Cooper is presently a Visiting Professor at Silla University in Busan. Before joining the Silla University English Department in 2004, he was a Visiting Professor of English at Jinju National University for five years. His main research areas are sociolinguistics, teaching methodology and cross-cultural communication. Email: cooper@silla.ac.kr*

## REFERENCES

Acton, W. (1979). *Second language learning and perception of difference in attitude*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.
Brown, H. (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice -Hall.
Brown, H. (1980). The Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(2), 157-164.
Brown, H. (1981). Affective Factors in Second Language Learning. In J. Alatis, H. Altman, & P. Alatis (Eds.), *The second language classroom: Directions for the 1980s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Durkheim, E. (1897). *Le suicide*. Paris: F. Alcan.
Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Gardener, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowely, MA: Newbury House.
Gardener, R. (1979). Social psychological aspects of language learning. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Hamers, J., & Blanc, M. (1979). *Bilingualality and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Howatt, A.P.R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lambert, W. (1967). A social psychology of bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues, 23*(2), 91-109.

Lambert, W. (1972). *Language psychology and culture: Essays by Wallace E. Lambert*. A.S. Dil (Ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Lambert, W. (1977). Effect of bilingualism on the individual. In P.A. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, social and educational implications*. New York: Academic Press.
Li, D. (1986). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers perceived difficulties in introducing the Communicative Approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(4), 677-703.
Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*, (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
Merton, R. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Social Review, 3*, 672-682.
Montgomery, C., & Eisenstein, M. (1985). Reality revisited: An experimental communicative course in ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 317-334.
Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schumann, J. (1975). Affective factors and the problem of age in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 25*, 209-235.
Schumann, J. (1976). Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 26*, 135-143.
Schumann, J. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Taft, R. (1977). Coping with unfamiliar cultures. In N. Warren (Ed.), *Studies in cross-cultural psychology, 1*. London: Academic Press.

# APPENDIX 1. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1 Name
2 Age
3 Job description
4 How many years teaching?
5 How many years studying English?
6 What languages do you feel most comfortable/relaxed speaking using? What language best conveys your identity? Explain.
7 Do you ever dream in English? Explain.
8 Why did you want to become bilingual? "Why are you bilingual?" Explain.
9 Please describe the main problems you have experienced or are experiencing in trying to become bilingual. What types of (linguistic and cultural) problems you are or have experienced as a bilingual. How do these problems occur? Please give examples.
10 Although you speak English, do you feel you understand and practice American (or British) culture? And is this an important part of your being bilingual?" Explain.
11 Do you have any problems understanding western culture? Explain.
13 What are your feelings towards western society American or British cultures? Explain.
12 Are you or have you experienced the following in trying to become bilingual?

Please rate and explain your answers.

# 1 strongly experienced #2 somewhat experienced
#3 slightly experienced #4 did not experience at all

a Social uncertainty or dissatisfaction
b Chagrin or regret
c Fearful anticipation of entering a new group
d Feelings of hopelessness
e. Neither bound firmly to a native culture (Korean) nor fully adapted to a second culture. (Western)

14 Do you believe that age is a critical in becoming bilingual? For example do you believe the only way to become truly fluent in English is to start studying as a child. Explain.
15 Do you feel that the development of speech communities (Korean NNS to Korean NNS) such this retreat can assist in overcoming the acculturation problems in the second stage of acculturation and provide a solution the situation of anomie that classifies many Koreans in the cultural identity group of monocultural bilingual? Explain

# APPENDIX 2.
# RESEARCH FINDINGS MONOCULTURAL BILINGUALS

| Resp. Age | Dream in English | Motivations for becoming Bilingual | Problems becoming Bilingual | Practice American or British Culture | Problems understanding western culture | Feelings towards American or British culture | Age factor important | Korean NNS to Korean NNS Helpful |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IM1 25 | No | Extrinsic | Linguistic grammar | Yes | Yes | Ambiguous | Yes | Yes |
| IM2 32 | Yes | Extrinsic | Cultural Idioms cultural meaning | No | Yes | Ambiguous | Yes | Yes |
| IM3 28 | Yes | Intrinsic | Cultural anomic peer pressure | Yes | Yes | Positive | No | Yes |
| IM4 34 | Yes | Extrinsic | Linguistic vocabulary grammar | Yes | Yes | Positive | No | Yes |
| IM5 43 | No | Extrinsic | Linguistic listening grammar | No | Yes | Positive | Yes | Ambiguous |
| IM6 34 | No | Extrinsic | Linguistic grammar | No | No | Ambiguous | No | Ambiguous |
| IM8 50 | No | Extrinsic | Cultural No native Speaker Contact | No | Yes | Negative | Ambiguous | Yes |
| IM9 46 | No | Extrinsic | Cultural No Native speaker contact | No | Yes | Negative | Ambiguous | Ambiguous |
| IM10 45 | No | Extrinsic | Cultural No native Speaker Contact | No | Yes | Ambiguous | Yes | Yes |
| IM11 42 | No | Extrinsic | Cultural No native speaker contact | No | Yes | Positive | No | Yes |
| IM12 48 | No | Extrinsic | Linguistic Pronunciation vocabulary | NO | Yes | Ambiguous | Ambiguous | Yes |
| IM13 39 | Yes | Extrinsic | Linguistic grammar | No | Yes | Positive | No | No |
| IF1 34 | No | Extrinsic | Linguistic No chance To speak | Yes | No | Ambiguous | No | Yes |
| IF2 23 | No | Extrinsic | Linguistic No chance to speak | No | Yes | Positive | Yes | No |
| IF3 21 | No | Extrinsic | Linguistic vocabulary grammar | Yes | Yes | Ambiguous | No | Yes |

n = 15

# APPENDIX 3.
# LIKERT SCALE ANOMIC SYMPTOMS MONOCULTURAL BILINGUALS

| Resp. | Social uncertainty dissatisfaction | Fearful anticipation of entering a new group | Chagrin regret | Feelings of hopelessness | Neither bound firmly to a native culture nor fully adapted to a second culture. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IM1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| IM2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| IM3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| IM4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| IM5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| IM6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| IM8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| IM9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| IM10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| IM11 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| IM12 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| IM13 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| IF1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| IF2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| IF3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| calculations | #1 20%<br>#2 0%<br>#3 20%<br>#4 60% | #1 0%<br>#2 33%<br>#3 20%<br>#4 47% | #1 0%<br>#2 60%<br>#3 0%<br>#4 40% | #1 0%<br>#2 20%<br>#3 40%<br>#4 40% | #1 7%<br>#2 0%<br>#3 0%<br>#4 93% |

# 1 strongly experienced
# 2 somewhat experienced
# 3 slightly experienced
# 4 did not experience at all

n = 15

# APPENDIX 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS BICULTURAL BILINGUALS

| Resp. Age | Dream in English | Motivations for becoming Bilingual | Problems becoming Bilingual | Practice American or British Culture | Problems understanding western culture | Feelings towards American or British culture | Age factor important | Korean NNS to Korean NNS Helpful |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IM7 26 | Yes | Extrinsic | Cultural Anomic social uncertainty | Yes | Yes | Negative | Yes | No |
| IM14 47 | Yes | Extrinsic | Cultural limited cultural contact | Yes | No | Ambiguous | Yes | Yes |
| IM15 27 | Yes | Extrinsic | Linguistic speaking ability | No | No | Ambiguous | Yes | No |
| IM4 27 | Yes | Intrinsic | Linguistic Vocabulary pronunciation | Yes | No | Ambiguous | No | Ambiguo us |
| IF5 18 | Yes | Intrinsic | Cultural Anomic cultural conflict | Yes | No | Positive | Yes | Ambiguo us |
| IF6 18 | Yes | Intrinsic | Cultural Anomic cultural conflict | No | No | Negative | No | Ambiguo us |

n = 6

# APPENDIX 5.
# LIKERT SCALE ANOMIC SYMPTOMS BICULTURAL BILINGUALS

| Resp. Age | Dream in English | Motivations for becoming Bilingual | Problems becoming Bilingual | Practice American or British Culture | Problems understanding western culture | Feelings towards American or British culture | Age factor important | Korean NNS to Korean NNS Helpful |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IM7 26 | Yes | Extrinsic | Cultural Anomic social uncertainty | Yes | Yes | Negative | Yes | No |
| IM14 47 | Yes | Extrinsic | Cultural limited cultural contact | Yes | No | Ambiguous | Yes | Yes |
| IM15 27 | Yes | Extrinsic | Linguistic speaking ability | No | No | Ambiguous | Yes | No |
| IM4 27 | Yes | Intrinsic | Linguistic Vocabulary pronunciation | Yes | No | Ambiguous | No | Ambiguo us |
| IF5 18 | Yes | Intrinsic | Cultural Anomic cultural conflict | Yes | No | Positive | Yes | Ambiguo us |
| IF6 18 | Yes | Intrinsic | Cultural Anomic cultural conflict | No | No | Negative | No | Ambiguo us |

n = 6

# APPENDIX 6. BROWN' S (1980) OPTIMAL DISTANCE MODEL OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Stages of Acculturation

*Stage 1 Period of excitement or euphoria over the newness of surroundings.*

***Stage 2* Culture shock**

- Individual feels the intrusion of more and cultural differences into the image of self and security.
- An individual relies on and seeks out support of fellow countrymen in the second culture.
- Complains about local customs
- Feelings of estrangement, hostility, indecision frustration, sadness, homesickness and possibly physical illness. (Anomic symptoms are possibly beginning)

***Stage 3* Gradual recovery**

- Culture stress: some acculturation problems are solved
- General progress is made slowly.
- Individual begins to accept differences in thinking and feeling.
- Individual becomes more empathic with those in the second culture.

***Stage 4* Near or full recovery**

- Either assimilation or adaptation.
- Acceptance of the new culture.
- Self-confidence in the new person that has developed in the new culture.

# Reviews

## BOOKS

## 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

---

# From Input to Output: A Teacher's Guide to Second Language Acquisition

Bill VanPatten.
Boston: McGraw Hill, 2003.
*Pp. xv + 127. (ISBN: 0 07 282561 8 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY DOUGLAS PAUL MARGOLIS**

## BENEFITS OF UNDERSTANDING SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION THEORY

Few English teachers in Korea, and elsewhere, have had second language acquisition (SLA) theory in their training. Training courses often emphasize linguistic knowledge, methodology, and instruction techniques instead of focusing on the invisible process happening within the learners to cause them to acquire a foreign language. Given that language and how to teach it are the primary concerns for teachers in the classroom, this emphasis is not inappropriate. However, just as teachers need to understand the language itself and instruction methodology, a grasp of SLA theory can help teachers better understand students and the processes they are undergoing.

The fact that many excellent teachers have taught foreign languages without special SLA knowledge might suggest that little is to be gained from embarking on a course of study in this, sometimes esoteric, specialization. After all, some SLA researchers assert that they are not focused on instruction and advancing classroom effectiveness, only on the language acquisition process, whether via instruction in the classroom or naturally from within the social environment (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). In other words, the aim of their work is not teacher support. With this attitude, teacher reluctance to give time and energy to the SLA literature is understandable. Yet if teachers understand exactly what aids and obstructs foreign language acquisition, if they know what language items should be taught first and which put off until higher levels of foreign language proficiency, if they are aware of factors that facilitate acquisition and conditions that retard it, then their SLA knowledge might be translated into better decisions regarding course materials, lesson plans, and feedback for students. Moreover, SLA knowledge can cultivate appropriate expectations of students, which helps to generate a motivating classroom atmosphere. In short, SLA knowledge provides essential support to teachers, improving their judgment for impromptu decision-making and helping them become more effective and efficient with instruction time – regardless of whether or not SLA researchers intend this result.

Bill VanPatten, in his book *From Input to Output; A Teacher's Guide to Second Language Acquisition*, argues that SLA knowledge gives teachers a better understanding of what they can and cannot do in the language classroom. Lately, there have been a number of laments regarding whether or not teachers can actually help learners advance their foreign language acquisition. Nunan (2000), for example, complains about students who get items correct on a test, but when faced with authentic communication, revert to an earlier stage as if the instruction had never taken place. Van Lier (1996) asserts that the majority of the language acquisition process happens between classes, outside the teacher's instruction. In this context, VanPatten's prescriptions of what teachers can and cannot do in relation to SLA highlight the important relationship between SLA and teaching. For example, VanPatten asserts that teachers cannot alter the acquisition order because learners cannot skip developmental stages. Nor can teachers influence how the learner's developing system creates syntactic components. Thus, VanPatten writes, "The days of drilling, filling in blanks with the correct form, transforming sentences using slash sentences for practicing agreement, and performing other strictly form-focused tasks should be long gone" (p. 110). On the other hand, teachers can heighten learner attention to elements in the input that they might otherwise miss or get wrong, which could speed up acquisition. Teachers can also expose students, according to VanPatten, to a rich variety of quality input.

## BOOK CONTENTS

VanPatten's book aims to condense and simplify the SLA literature in order to help teachers understand and make use of SLA knowledge for improving classroom instruction. He has written the book for a general, non-technical audience, especially with foreign language teachers in mind. The simplification process may have downplayed some of the controversies in the field, but he does deliver on his promise to peel back the complexity of SLA discourse and provide a reader-friendly text.

The text is organized into seven parts: a brief introduction that identifies the purpose and scope of SLA research, five chapters that document SLA dynamics, and an epilogue that details five implications of SLA theory for language teachers. There is also a helpful glossary, reference list, and index. The chapters are all similarly organized into subsections, followed by a summary and a "read more about it" section offering sources for specific topics in the chapter. Chapter one puts forth five givens about SLA that form a foundation for the discussion throughout the book. Chapter two defines input and explains its importance to the SLA process and how learners get linguistic data from it. Then, in chapter three, VanPatten looks at how input interacts with the developing language system to advance interlanguage. The next element and most visible part of the SLA dynamic is output, so chapter four discusses output and its role in SLA, which, by the way, he sees as rather minimal. By the time readers reach the end of the chapter, they are probably brimming with questions, so chapter five addresses a series of "frequently asked questions."

## MEETING TEACHER NEEDS

The hundred and twenty-seven page book is obviously too short to do justice to the topic, but VanPatten achieves his goal: to provide teachers and non-researcher audiences a clear picture of current SLA theory. The book frequently interprets SLA findings in terms of their relevance to teaching foreign languages, thus increasing its service to teachers. The included glossary is a handy resource for readers new to the jargon of the field, and the reference sections ensure that readers can find more detailed accounts about specific issues of personal interest.

VanPatten's effort to keep teacher needs foremost in his mind is especially evident in the epilogue where he details the implications for teaching that can be drawn from the preceding chapters. These implications may come as a shock for some teachers – especially those who like drilling and isolated grammar-based approaches – but they are consistent with leading thinkers in the field (See for example, Ellis, 2002; Krashen, 2002; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; and Van Lier, 1996). One implication, for instance, is that teachers must increase input and interaction. Another implication is that when students produce language, their purpose should always be communicative and meaning-based, not focused on accuracy. Some teachers may argue that focusing student attention on accuracy is sometimes necessary to advance them toward proficiency, but VanPatten suggests that SLA occurs as a result of input only; output primarily serves to obtain more input or facilitate input comprehension.

If we expect accurate production from students, according to VanPatten, we may, in fact, be delaying student progress by retarding their natural progression through the SLA developmental stages.

For many teachers, these implications and others published in the book come across as a radical departure from traditional thought regarding language teaching. The fact that the book is clearly written and not too dense means that teachers without time to wade through complex academic tomes can quickly come to terms with the SLA field and easily absorb this knowledge to apply in their teaching contexts. On the other hand, VanPatten's simplification process means that some issues in SLA are not dealt with at all and others are only superficially addressed. Readers looking for comprehensive coverage of the SLA field will be disappointed. Nonetheless, armed with VanPatten's introduction to SLA, readers should find scholarly works more accessible.

## THE REVIEWER

***Douglas Margolis*** *is currently studying for a Ph.D. in Second Language Acquisition at the University of Hawaii, after having taught EFL in Korea for eight years. Email: margolis@hawaii.edu*

## REFERENCES

Ellis, R. (2002). The place of grammar instruction in the second/foreign language curriculum. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.) *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*, pp. 17-34. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.

Krashen, S.D. (2002). *Explorations in language acquisition and use: The Taipei lectures*. Taipei: Crane.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M.H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman.

Nunan, D. (2000). Seven hypotheses about language teaching and learning. *TESOL Matters*, *10*(2), 1-3.

Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy & authenticity*. New York: Longman.

# Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaring

Diane Larsen-Freeman.
Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2003.
*Pp. x+170. (ISBN: 0 8384 6675 3 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY MICHAEL DUFFY**

Grace me no grace, nor uncle me no uncle. *Richard II, Act ii. Sc. 3.*

It may have been all right for Shakespeare to go turning nouns into verbs, but how can a respected ELT author justify doing the same? The answer lies in the thesis that Diane Larsen-Freeman is promoting in this book, namely that grammar is the fifth linguistic skill, "something we do, rather than only something we know" (p.143). Grammaring is defined as "the ability to use grammar structures accurately, meaningfully and appropriately" (p.143). Acquisition of the grammaring skill involves not just knowledge of forms, but also of the meaning and use of structures. It is thus seen as a dynamic, empowering process rather than merely being a system of "inert knowledge" underlying other language skills. At different stages in the acquisition of any structure, learners will be faced with different "learning challenges"; at one time, the challenge will be the form of the structure, at another time, its meaning, and at another, the pragmatics of using it.

So, what are the implications of Larsen-Freeman's view of grammar for learners and teachers? First, if grammar is a skill, then it has to be learned, and as with many other skills, appropriate teaching can facilitate its acquisition. A constant theme of the book is the notion that the teacher has the responsibility of accelerating language learning, not merely of fostering natural acquisition; the idea that language and, in particular, grammar can be "picked up" is a myth. She might have added that this may be even more strongly the case when the syntactic distance between L1 and L2 is great.

How is the teacher to promote the acquisition of the grammaring skill? The author proposes three steps, consciousness raising, output practice, and feedback. A review of the research on SLA shows the importance of input processing and noticing in the development of interlanguage, though the author (like many others) strongly questions Krashen's claim that mere exposure to comprehensible input is a sufficient condition for syntax acquisition. The book enumerates a number of receptive practices, both implicit and explicit, which appear to be effective in accelerating acquisition. The suggestion that production directly promotes grammar acquisition may be seen as contentious, since the traditional view of speaking and writing practice, based on a psychological skill-learning model, has been that they are a means of practicing what the learner has already acquired. However, Larsen-Freeman proposes a number of rationales from psychological and from chaos theory for why this may not be the whole story, and concludes that "through language use, language changes; through language use, language is acquired." (p. 113). Two essential criteria proposed for practice activities are that they should be meaningful and engaging, and that they should focus on the appropriate learning challenge, whether it be form, meaning, or use.

The third component in the grammaring program, feedback, brings us to one of the most vexing problems in language teaching. After reviewing various objections to error-correction – that it is futile, and may be harmful, ambiguous or inconsistent – the author comes down in favor of it, but stresses that feedback should aim to meet the three criteria of being judicious (the learner must be ready to accept the correction), appropriate (regarding which technique is used) and non-judgmental. In this regard, she talks about mistakes being seen as "gifts" to the student and to the class.

In the final chapter, Larsen-Freeman offers some more proposals about teaching grammaring. She avoids prescriptions and admits that her proposals are tentative. One such is "horizontal planning" by which she means spreading out the teaching and practice of a structure over a period of time, thereby harmonizing with (though not merely mimicking) the natural acquisition process. Among recommended classroom activities are storytelling (to promote noticing), online chatting ("slow-motion conversation"), and dictogloss (which forces learners to confront difficult structures directly). This reviewer would have liked to have seen included in the list the curiously neglected practice of L1-L2 translation. This is an activity which, perhaps more than any other, brings the learner face to face with the mysteries of the target language's structure.

Referring to her practical proposals, the author admits that "not all . . . perhaps precious little – will differ dramatically from past practice" (p.141), and readers who are looking for recipes to add to their classroom repertoire may well be disappointed. I feel the book is best read as a journey of exploration, undertaken with an engaging expert guide who is modest enough to recognize that she is not completely sure of the way to the final destination. One of its most attractive features is "Teachers' Voices," views from practitioners who have wrestled with the problems addressed in the book. These voices do not always echo that of the author, and it is quite likely that the reader will also be stimulated to throw his or her own to cents' worth into the argument. This reader, for one, certainly did, but finished the book not only with a sense of reassurance regarding the centrality of grammar in language teaching, but also with a much clearer idea of the issues involved in teaching it.

## THE REVIEWER

*__Michael Duffy__ comes from England, and holds an M.Phil. degree in Psychology from Southampton University. He has taught English in the UK and Hong Kong as well as Korea, and is currently a visiting professor in the Department of English at Dong-A University, Busan.*

# Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice

Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renandya (Eds.).
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
*Pp. vii + 403. (ISBN: 0 521 00440 3 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY ROXANNE SILVANIUK**

The title of this resource text, *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice,* sums up what this book is all about. This anthology is designed to cover current practice in the world of English language teaching and serve as a resource for teachers as well as for TESOL teacher-training and teacher-development programs. Also, it is a succinct guide to what is happening in English language classrooms in a wide variety of contexts and countries. While most of the articles have been previously published elsewhere, they are still timely as they present topics of continuing interest. The majority of the articles have been written since 1996, and none were written before 1992. The contributors are academics and researchers committed to furthering the teaching of English language.

Even though 403 pages make for a hefty text, the organization allows the reader to focus on areas of interest. The Introduction (pp. 1-3) is a must-read as it informs the reader of the goals, issues, and topics covered. The Introduction begins by stating the overarching theme: improving the state of English language teaching and, consequently, student learning. The editors then consider four issues. First, they consider all the factors that learners bring to the classroom and the learning process. Second, the more complex issue of interrelationships between teachers, what teachers do, and the teaching-learning equation are linked throughout the text. The third issue looked at is what it means to learn the English language, the difficulties involved, and useful strategies for students. Lastly, there is the issue of how stakeholders, other than students, can work to improve English teaching and learning.

The 41 chapters are divided into 16 sections with each section having a brief introduction with pre-reading questions and post-reading questions, and two to four short articles written from different theoretical and practical perspectives. Although there are 16 sections, the Introduction groups the topics into nine general topics. These are: the nature of teaching, classroom interaction and management, teaching the skills, understanding learner variables, addressing linguistic competence, curriculum factors, assessment of learning, the role of technology and teacher development.

It should be obvious from the general list of topics of the role that methodology plays in this text. The anthology is not a historical review of methods such as audio-lingual, TPR, functional-notional, etc. There are, however, articles discussing the use of task-based learning (TBL) and content-based instruction (CBI). The introduction in Chapter 1 states what Brown means by *methodology* when it says,

For Brown, the term *method* is best replaced by the term *pedagogy.* The former implies a static set of procedures, whereas the latter suggests the dynamic interplay between teachers, learners, and instructional materials during the process of teaching and learning. (p. 6)

Such a complex mix of variables means that teachers can no longer rely on one method in the one-size-fits-all approach of previous methods. Again, quoting from the introduction, the teacher is central to creating a good learning environment.

In what has been called the "post-methods era," attention has shifted to teaching and learning processes and the *contributions of the individual teacher* (reviewer' s emphasis) to language-teaching pedagogy. (p. 5)

Clearly the paradigm of the academic-researcher providing the method and the teacher implementing it in the classroom no longer applies. The new paradigm has teachers moving from being implementers to becoming creators in the search to improve their teaching to create learning opportunities for their students. As a result, the role of the teacher has changed. The teacher must be knowledgeable, and stay current, on pedagogical theory and language-learning research in what Brown calls a "principled approach" (p. 11).

In the following chapter, Richards provides another perspective while continuing to speak to a "principled approach." Starting from an idea by Zahorik that there is a "relationship between theories of teaching and teaching skills" (p. 19), Richards sees the three conceptualizations of teaching (science-research, theory-philosophy, and art-craft) as fitting on a continuum. As teachers build a personal theory of teaching and develop their teaching skills, they become better teachers. He concludes:

…teacher development can be seen as a process of on-going self-discovery and self-renewal, as top-down approaches to teaching become replaced by more bottom-up approaches, or approaches which blend the two. (p. 25)

The following chapters continue to develop these themes introduced by Brown and Richards in a variety of English language-learning contexts, courses, and teaching environments.

Because this text covers the width and breadth of English language teaching, a discussion of the remaining sections must be brief. Rather than discuss each section, the following will attempt to illustrate the kind of articles the reader can expect.

Section 2: Lesson Planning and Classroom Management begins with a discussion of models of lesson planning, then considerations of lesson planning, and finally includes an actual lesson plan (Farrell). In Lewis's article, Classroom Management, she provides possible teacher responses to three situations: motivating students, managing constraints, and the teacher' s role.

In Section 3: Classroom Dynamics and Section 5: Task and Project Work, the writers offer how-to information and activity ideas. Jacobs and Hall respond to ten questions on how to implement cooperative learning. Bowler and Parminter illustrate how tiered tasks and bias tasks can be used in mixed-level classes. Beglar and Hunt present their task-based research at a Japanese university, including the week-by-week plan. Stoller integrates project work with content-based instruction in a 10-step plan that could work successfully in both second- and foreign-language settings.

Sections 7 through 13 address the expected "core" methodology topics: the four skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) plus the linguistic competencies of grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. To illustrate, Section 14: Teaching Writing begins with Raimes offering ten steps in setting up a writing course. Seow discusses the writing process approach with the addition of response, evaluation, and post-writing activities, and then gives five ideas on implementation. Reppen follows with an action-research project that combines the process approach to writing with the genre-based approach. An outline of the five-week unit on explorers is included. Finally, Ferris says that teachers need to teach self-editing to students to decrease common errors and errors affecting global meaning. Three sample activities are presented.

Section 14: Assessment highlights alternative assessment methods. Huerta-Macías explains the procedures and appropriateness of alternative assessment, Peñaflorida follows with five forms of alternative assessment for writing while Hingle and Linington discuss an English oral proficiency test they designed for beginners using question banks and story packs.

The final section, Professional Development, brings the discussion full circle. The titles of the three articles are self-explanatory: The English Teacher as Professional (Ur), Developing Our Professional Competence: Some Reflections (Pettis), and Research in Your Own Classroom (Taylor). The article by Taylor is especially recommended for those teachers contemplating action research in their own classrooms as it sets out the action research cycle well. If we are to become teaching professionals, we must constantly reflect on the what and why of our performance in the classroom.

This text addresses the issues and goals that Richards and Renandya set out in the Introduction; however, a few changes would be useful. First a quibble, this reader would have welcomed a brief biography of the contributors. While some of the contributors are well known (Nunan, Oxford, Ellis, Ur), some are not. Second, there is a dearth of recommended further readings. The Reppen article on writing is an exception. While space limitations are a factor, the lack of suggestions for further reading is a serious omission in a resource text for teacher training and development.

Finally, this text does not represent more traditional approaches to teaching and learning contexts. In those teaching situations where institutional or socio-cultural constraints limit the role and flexibility permitted the teacher, some of the sections may not be useful or applicable (for example, alternative assessment, learning strategies, TBL). Brown may be referring to these classroom situations when he says that teacher development can be a “blend” of top-down and bottom-up teaching approaches (p. 25).

Teaching is a continual process that evolves as the teacher tries to better meet the needs of students while training them to be active learners. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* makes a serious contribution to improving the teaching and language-learning dynamic.

## THE REVIEWER

***Roxanne Silvaniuk*** *earned her Diploma in Applied Linguistics (ESL/EFL) from the University of Victoria, Canada, and is a visiting professor at Chosun University, South Korea. Her interests include task-based learning, especially projects and process writing, and reflective teaching. Email: roxannesilvaniuk@yahoo.ca*

# Making It Happen: From Interactive to Participatory Language Teaching (3rd ed.)

Patricia A. Richard-Amato.
White Plains, NY: Longman/Pearson Education, 2003.
*Pp. iii + 562. (ISBN: 0 13 060193 4 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY PETER NELSON**

*Making It Happen* is among the latest of major contributions regarding the teaching of English to ESL and EFL learners. A vital sourcebook for teachers, it provides a comprehensive overview of second language teaching while exploring ways to create meaningful interaction within the classroom. It describes participatory teaching methods by which students may become empowered and autonomous learners; offers an in-depth yet reader-friendly approach to the interdependence of theory and practice; encourages teachers to reflect on their teaching; identifies the importance of teacher research and analysis, and presents both action programs and case studies. This is very much a book to include in your personal library, regardless of whether you are novice or expert, or whether you are reading for pleasure or to obtain an M.A./Ph.D. in TESL, linguistics, or a related language field.

It is conveniently divided into four main divisions. Part One covers theoretical considerations and guidelines for developing one's own teaching principles. The author first presents a historical overview of theories of language development – from grammatical to communicative language teaching approaches – identifying not only their highlights but also major proponents and specific criticism of each method. Chapters Two through Seven consider the classroom itself and conditions for successful participation. Here she notes major characteristics of first and second language acquisition, the role of interaction and participatory language teaching, integration of communication skills, aspects of affective domain (attitudes, motivation, anxiety levels, etc.), language assessment, and language standards. In addition to presenting baseline information, she begins each chapter with a short section entitled "Questions to Think About," which first draw on our recollections, attitudes and opinions, and then assist us in our understanding of concepts and practical applications. Also, summary questions and suggested projects at the end of many chapters serve to increase our awareness, reflection and, hopefully, discussion.

Part Two – *Exploring Methods and Activities: What Can we Learn?* – deals with physical considerations of language learning as well as with techniques that enhance it. The author begins by analyzing the importance of James Asher' s 1960's TPR (Total Physical Response) technique as a superior alternative to its audiolingual predecessor, and then identifies different activities based on TPR. This is followed by an overview of communicative practices, especially those that involve natural approaches in language acquisition. Common topics such as personal and group identification, description of recreation and leisure activities, discussing plans and dreams, or narrating past experiences, are all seen as valid avenues to encourage student participation and interaction within a friendly, student-centered environment. Later chapters deal with specific activities: chants, music, poetry, store telling, drama, role play, and games, as well as ways to advance L2 literacy. Perhaps most important, the techniques are linked to the underlying theory for them, especially to aspects of the affective domain that affect both language teaching and learning.

Parts Three and Four consider the teacher as a resource, facilitator, and learner. Part Three, *Putting It All Together: Some Practical Issues*, focuses on appropriate methodology and setting up a lesson plan. The author begins by emphasizing that what may be useful and appropriate in one setting may not be so in another, even within the same culture. Second, she notes that while differences exist between ESL and EFL, they are not always acknowledged in lesson planning but should be. Giving possible explanations to account for variations in learners' needs and motivation within these two groups, the author then introduces lesson planning by first posing important questions to the teacher. Among them are the implications for teaching based on the program to be taught, ways to involve peers in the teaching process, the degree of teacher dominance vs. student-centeredness, and the prospective syllabus to be used. How these questions are addressed by each teacher are at the core of the individualized lesson plan.

Richard-Amato's integration of methods and activities form the framework for this unit. She notes disagreement among experts regarding the proper focus for communicative programs, showing important divisions between those who concentrate on proficiencies and competencies, tasks, and content. The first group values "...mastery of basic and life skills necessary for the individual to function proficiently in society." Instruction may include the ability to distinguish among sounds, to produce and write the alphabet, to spell lists of two-syllable words and so on, by concentrating on learning outcomes that focus on skills and sub-skills. Task-based instruction considers tasks as "...things people will tell you they do if you ask them...." Implementation first requires a needs analysis, followed by separation of tasks into distinct categories. Tasks may include simple activities such as filling out a form, typing a letter, checking out a book from the library and the like, although meaning in each is negotiated as learners try to fulfill task goals. The last category, content-based instruction, is often associated with academic course content found in common subjects such as math, history, and science. Proponents argue that knowledge content should be organized around interesting topics such as travel destinations, effects of illegal drugs, types of ocean fish, and so on. However, regardless of the approach taken for syllabus and teaching plan development, its implementation should make the most sense cognitively to learners in a particular teaching situation, but it must not lead to a syllabus that concentrates on isolated elements of the language for study purposes. In essence, a variety of methods should be used to maximize learners' cognitive processes.

Following this general outline, the author builds upon lesson planning by examining tools for teaching languages. In addition to standard textbooks and articles, Richard-Amato notes the role and importance of newer methods, including computer programs, videos, and films, followed by reflective questions to guide the teacher when choosing among the mix of instructional media. A final chapter in the unit considers implications from the teaching of language through different content areas. Note is made of diverse techniques such as submersion, immersion, mainstreaming, and one-way and dual bilingual programs. Although EFL teachers in Korea may not be exposed to these programs, it is important to note they exist. They should also understand that instructional variations can be significant, resulting in a wide range of outcomes for different learning environments.

Part Four, *Programs in Action*, is perhaps of least direct relevance to teachers in Korea, who are often constrained in their freedom to design and implement courses. The three chapters in this unit identify actual working programs in the United States (where the author teaches). Among them are a college level ESL program, a life skills adult basic education program, a high school ESL academic program in the humanities, an elementary school program, and a kindergarten ESL program within a bilingual school. Following their description of themes and goals, methods of implementation and related elements, the author concludes the unit by providing four case studies of active programs. She also refers to social, political, and cultural politics of (US) classrooms, and to personal and collective transformation of (US) language teachers.

Readers familiar with Richard-Amato's second edition will question differences between the two works. As she indicates, this edition has updated supporting research and has expanded by adding new material. The latter includes descriptions of programs in action and case studies from various levels, a separate chapter on participatory teaching, and separate or expanded sections on teacher research, investigative inquiry, critical literacy, ESL and foreign language standards, bilingual education, and Internet applications for language teaching. The third edition covers more ground and is oriented better to recent teaching developments, especially those pertaining to computer assisted language learning (CALL), the Internet as a resource, and online instruction.

Second, readers may question her methodology and treatment of topics in relation to other important works in this field. In this reviewer's opinion, her work is an excellent compilation of existing psycholinguistic literature in second language acquisition and research, and of sociology as it pertains to ESL/EFL pedagogy and sociocultural influences. It does not, however, present a major new focus or offer a different paradigm. To her credit, her analysis of competing theories and approaches, as well as extensive documentation of important works in these areas, well compensate the reader who wishes to know more.

In sum, *Making It Happen* provides a solid theoretical and practical foundation for interactional and participatory approaches to second language teaching, ones that have wide-ranging implications for students and teachers alike. The author strongly favors programs that involve students in real communication about interesting topics and relevant subject matter, discussed in a low-anxiety environment. While she understands the importance of drills, grammar exercises, translation or related activities, she believes they are detrimental to learning when they become the focus of the curriculum. Proponents of communicative language teaching will identify with these views, and also will be pleased to know they are being increasingly accepted and endorsed by the Korean Ministry of Education.

## THE REVIEWER

***Peter E. Nelson*** *has a Ph.D. in Public Policy and TEFL credentials from RSA, Hastings, England. He has lived in Korea since 1995 and currently teaches at Chung Ang University in Seoul. He is active in KOTESOL as a presenter and writer, and also is the Coordinator for KOTESOL Teacher Training (KTT). Email: peternel@cau.ac.kr*

# Portraits of the L2 User

Vivian J. Cook (Ed.).
Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2002.
*Pp. vii + 347. (ISBN: 1 85359 583 7 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY CRAIG BARTLETT**

*Portraits of the L2 User* is the first volume in the Second Language Acquisition series published by Multilingual Matters under the general series editorship of Professor David Singleton (Trinity College, Dublin). This book contains thirteen essays on various research concerning second language users, written or co-written by a total of fourteen authors working in the Americas and Europe. The editor, Vivian Cook, has himself written a beginning and an ending essay for this book and has written an introduction for all essays except his beginning one. Cook has thus taken great pains to weave these essays into a unified whole, each one serving as a chapter.

The central premises Cook uses to cement these essays into a unifying whole are in his opening chapter – users of a second language (L2 users) are the norm, not the exception. They have varying levels of competence in their particular L2, depending on what they use it for, and they should be studied as users of language in their own right, not as people who have achieved varying levels of native speaker-type competence. While Cook has been advocating these ideas since the early 1990s (e.g., his comments at the end of Chapter 5 in Cook, 1993), looking at L2 language "in its own right" goes back to the initial work on idiosyncratic dialects (Corder, 1971) and interlanguage (Selinker, 1972). Cook argues that the SLA community did not embrace this approach and that one can see a native speaker bias in works that wonder why L2 users fail "to achieve native-speaker competence" (James, 1998, p. 2, for example).

The best way to review this book is to discuss the recurring themes or ideas encountered in its chapters. First, there is the universality of the SLA process. Now, one might automatically think of the Chomskyan concept of Universal Grammar (UG), and Flynn and Lust cover exactly this in Chapter 4. In comparing studies of L1 acquisition by Japanese and English children with English L2 acquisition by Japanese and Spanish adults, they conclude that UG appears to be available to adult L2 learners, suggesting that UG is separate from language specific grammars, not integrated into the L1. UG, then, is a set of basic principles, not constrained by L1 acquisition, to be mapped on the specific language input provided. However, universality does not end here. Major' s work on the L2 user phonology (Chapter 3) demonstrates that the L2 user has access to universal principles of phonology not found in the L1 or the L2. In addition, Perdue (Chapter 5), drawing upon data gathered from the European Science Project, shows quite clearly that L2 users, in the untutored process of acquiring a second language, follow similar word and phrase patterns for their utterances.

Second is the importance of neurological and biological processes behind language use. Cook (Chapter 1) and de Groot (Chapter 2) consider how L2 users make the connections between words and the concepts and ideas that underlie words in the human mind. Bialystok (Chapter 6) examines the results of a number of studies to see if the cognitive functioning of children who have learned a second language is different from monolinguals. Fabbro (Chapter 7) uses research done with those who have suffered language loss due to brain injury to find where the first and second languages might be located in the brain. Dewaele (Chapter 8) examines how explicit and implicit knowledge of a second language, as well as the roles of short-term memory, working memory, anxiety, and stress, can affect fluency in L2 production.

Third, a number of chapters give a resounding "Yes!" to bilingualism. Even though various countries (like my country of origin) have enshrined bilingualism or multilingualism as official government policy, it is important to remember that many teachers, authorities, and governments have discouraged use of multiple languages. This is clearly not the perspective taken here. Bialystok (Chapter 6) concludes from her research that bilingual children perform better than monolingual children on analysis tasks that require them to ignore potentially misleading information. Genesee's look at research on bilingual children in Canada (Chapter 7) concludes that bilingual language acquisition does not impede them in acquiring the language specific grammatical constraints of the two languages they are acquiring. Moreover, he concludes that any mixing of the two languages (called "child code-mixing") is not indicative of incompetence and almost always follows certain constraints.

Fourth, the end chapters in the book make the point that viewing L2 users in their own right has implications for teaching and research. De Bot and Hulsen (Chapter 10), in looking at issues of language attrition and loss among immigrants, come to some unique insights by getting the perceptions of the immigrants themselves. Pavlenko (Chapter 11) argues strongly for including social factors, and calculating for the effects of those factors, on L2 users. Gomes de Matos (Chapter 12) makes an eloquent plea for teachers and schools to seriously consider the linguistic rights of L2 learners, placing L2 education squarely in the realms of human rights, peace education, and formation of active world citizens. Finally, Cook's concluding essay (Chapter 13) strongly argues that L2 user concepts should shape the nature of language teaching, including class resources and activities, and even teacher identity.

It is only in the final chapter where there is an idea I find contentious. Cook writes that the goals of language teaching should be geared to the needs of L2 users and that the goal of language teaching should be to create successful L2 users, not to create imitation native speakers (p. 335 f.). Part of his basis for this conclusion is his critique of the native speaker standard: "students are usually supposed to say *I live in France* not *Me live France* in the classroom. Success in external goals is measured against the perceived norms of the native speaker" (p. 333). Now, *Me live France* communicates the message of residency just as well as *I live in France*. However, utterances or text constructed in a similar manner would be unacceptable in business, academia, or diplomacy. Not so many people need a level of proficiency in another language that is that high, but there are those who do. For these circumstances, the language of a native speaker community can still be an important source (not the only source, but an important one) of input. In addition, does not the concern over possible fossilization of errors require that students receive solid language input of which the native-speaker community can again be an important source? Or, to take an extreme view, is error fossilization, or error itself, a native-speaker construct that oppresses L2 users and prevents them from feeling a sense of ownership of the L2? No one addresses these questions, and that is unfortunate since one's answers to these questions affects one's future teaching practice.

This concern aside, there is a wealth of solid scholarship in this book. (Warning: For beginning teachers or those new to the applied linguistics field, it can be a challenging read! Cook's introductions are very helpful for orienting the reader.) It is filled with important insights and much food for thought, making it especially helpful for those wanting insight into SLA research and bilingualism.

## THE REVIEWER

***Craig Bartlett*** *is a lecturer in the English Education Department at Chuncheon National University of Education in Chuncheon, South Korea. He has been a member of the Korea TESOL Conference Committee for the last four years and is also a tutor on the MA TEFL/TESL Methodology Distance Learning Program with the University of Birmingham (UK). Email: kotesol2002@yahoo.com*

## REFERENCES

Cook. V.J. 1993. *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Corder, S.P. 1971. Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. *IRAL*, *9*(2). Reprinted in J.C. Richards (1974).

James, C. 1999. *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Harlow: Longman.

Richards, J.C. (ed.). 1974. *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*. Harlow: Longman.

Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *IRAL*, *10*(3). Reprinted in J.C. Richards (1974).

# Context and Culture in Language Learning and Teaching

Michael Byram and Peter Grundy (Eds.).
Clevedon, England: Multicultural Matters, 2003.
*Pp. 105. (ISBN: 1 85359 657 4 Hardcover)*

**REVIEWED BY MELANIE VANDENHOVEN**

Over the past ten years, a number of books have presented new considerations for teaching culture in the language classroom. Sensitive to the differences in EFL and ESL contexts, new discussions about whose culture to associate with the English language, the appropriate content and approach of culture lessons, as well as the ultimate aims of such lessons have been gaining currency. Greater awareness of the needs and realities of learners, with special attention on their affective needs and identities are common themes. In this way, ideas about the role of culture in language learning are adapting to EFL contexts, where English is increasingly being recognized as an international language. *Context and Culture in Language Learning and Teaching* similarly signals a burgeoning engagement in Europe with the intersection of culture, context, and language learning and teaching. For readers in Asia, this collection of articles brings to our tables discussions from another continent for comparison and contrast, and hopefully, response.

The text followed from a conference of the same title that reported research on learners and teachers as well as purposes and methods – all initiated from an interesting partnership between three European universities: the University of Durham in the UK, Universitat Bremen in Germany, and the Universite de Franche-Comte in France. From the University of Durham comes Randal Holmes as well as the editors of the collection. Contributors from the continent include Christian Facke, Stephan Breidbach and Michael Wendt from the Universitat Bremen, Helene Decke-Cornill from Universitat de Hamburg, and Reinhold Wandal from Otto-von-Guericke Universitat in Magdeburg. The other contributors are Gisele Holtzer from Universite de Franche-Comte, Ana Halbach from Universidad de Alcala, Spain, and by invitation, Claire Kramsch from the University of California, who has published a book (Kramsch, 1993) with a very similar title and focus. Together, these articles combine, to varying degrees, a treatment of research methods, theory, and implementation of practice.

Holmes begins with an analysis of the conceptual treatments of language and culture. Here the reader can be informed of five different stances on culture in language learning, which range from the view that it is marginal in effective learning, to the other end of the gamut, which states that it is central to meaning and perception. Within this essay, the latter view is valued as most relevant to English language teaching. He argues that both the deconstructionist view (which emerges from critical theory) and the competence view of culture and language are unique in treating language as a cultural construction. That is to say, culture affects language and this must be addressed for learners to have insightful interactions in their new language.

Facke and Kramsch both evaluate specific lessons using characters and issues generated from literature featuring cross-cultural encounters. Kramsch underscores the interplay of theory and practice by describing telling moments from one of her lessons to show how an unsettling incident in class can become the basis of a research project. Facke explores how mono-cultural and bi-cultural students can have differing responses and interpretations of a story, arguing that our histories affect the construction of meaning. Holtzer similarly tackles a classroom assignment involving research garnered from actual cross-cultural encounters of her students, noting some interesting observations about code-switching and the cooperative roles of language assistance.

Halbach, Decke-Cornill, Wandel, Breidbach, Wendt, on the other hand, do not address their practice as such, but rather analyze certain conceptual propositions for teaching language and culture. Halbach describes the paradox of introducing a reflective approach in a teacher-training program in Spain. As the problems involved in the export of ESL materials and inherited methodologies to EFL contexts became apparent, so too has a possible "solution" for these problems for new teachers: encourage reflection on the needs and issues within individual contexts. But promoting reflection in contexts where this concept is new and alien brings with it the ironic conundrum of once again exporting a methodology that is foreign and therefore potentially ill-suited to said contexts and cultures. Decke-Cornill, similarly explores attitudes and approaches towards teaching English by interviewing teachers in Germany. She finds that the shift toward teaching English as a lingua franca is better received by teachers who teach in comprehensive schools but less so by teachers of students who aim to go to university. The attendant fears and concerns are cogently presented. Following on from this, Wandel brings the claim that English is as an international language to the next level by teaching intercultural awareness using India as a focus. He examines the cognitive and affective value in his choice of India as a target culture (perhaps to shake up the prejudice that favors teaching about the UK or the US) and is careful in examining approaches that achieve this effect. Breidbach, more dryly, explains the paradox within the EU as it concerns teaching English. Despite the movement in Europe that promotes diversity in languages and culture, he contends that there simultaneously exists a push for one common language in Europe, for the sake of democratic participation. Lastly, Wendt analyzes the assumptions of research by questioning the concepts of objectivity. He postulates that since "objectivity" fails to address internal and external realities of mental processes, it is of little use to language-learning queries. The solution he proposes for research is to publish their processes so that the reader can clarify their own interpretations.

For readers in Asia, this treatment of the socio-political, cultural, and psychological context of Europe begs comment on its significance to our practice here. For starters, a fuller participation in the issues of the text and the possibility of follow-up Asian research projects necessitates having a working knowledge of three current propositions of the field. They include a working knowledge of the relationship of theory and practice. Claire Kramsch, in this text, begins to open the reader up to these possibilities. Next, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which was mentioned briefly in this text, deserves greater explanation and commentary. Whorf, who preceded Chomsky, was one of the first to argue that language shapes perception. This position has now been re-appraised, given the many language professionals who experience firsthand the cultural differences in perception. Lastly, the powerful reality of English as a global language, promoted by Crystal in the late 1990s and refracted here in Asia under the title of "globalization," is an influential force that necessarily alters the way of teaching and learning English. This text both presents the new terms defining culture and language teaching in Europe as well as inviting further dialogue. It is my hope that the reader in Asia is stimulated to undertake that challenge.

## THE REVIEWER

***Melanie vandenHovcn*** *holds an MA in TESOL from the School for International Training, USA. She is currently Lead Instructor of Intercultural Communication in the SMU-TESOL program at Sookmyung Women's University in Seoul. Her pedagogical interests are curriculum development and promoting cultural awareness. Email: vandenhoven@rocketmail.com*

## REFERENCE

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

# Designing Language Teaching Tasks

Keith Johnson.
Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
*Pp. x + 196. (ISBN: 0 33398486 2 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY ANDREW E. FINCH**

First impressions are important, especially for the EFL teacher hurriedly glancing at teaching resources and reference texts between presentations at a conference or book fair. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to mention that this title raised my expectations of the book being a successor to Nunan's (1989) *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom,* or Tomlinson's (1998) *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. There has been very little written about ELT materials design apart from these two books, though Johnson points out that the first of these, while offering "a useful taxonomy of language teaching tasks ... does not really make any attempt at procedural analysis," while the second "contains a useful section on 'The process of materials writing,' but the amount of actual procedural analysis is small.'"

In view of this lack of an up-to-date, practical handbook for EFL teachers wishing to make their own materials, and given the author's list of publications such as *Communication 1 & 2*, I was expecting to be guided through a practical investigation of materials design, and to be offered principles, guidelines, and checklists for the teacher facing the challenge of the blank computer screen. Johnson informs us very early on (p. 3), however, that this book is in fact an expertise study, an attempt to define what makes a Good Task Designer (GTD). He then refers to Bereter & Scardamali (1993), who argue for expertise studies in all areas (including applied linguistics), on the principle that the modern world requires people to acquire new skills and areas of expertise in a comparatively short time, and that a methodology which can systematically turn novices into experts is highly desirable. Johnson has thus identified an important area of research – identifying what it is that "expert" materials designers do, and inferring rules or guidelines for future designers (including teachers and teacher-trainers). Having said this, he recognizes that an analysis of the factors contributing to "good" task design, is a somewhat circular endeavor, since the acknowledged "experts" are not necessarily expert in anything apart form persuading well-known publishers to publish their books; an expertise study performed on such people (even if they were to agree to this) would not necessarily be definitive according to its own terms. It is significant that one of the units (7.3) of the book asks, "Are the experts expert?" The reader cannot be blamed, therefore, for wondering: i) how an "expert" task-based designer is to be identified and ii) how task-based design is different from any other materials-design in terms of procedure and content.

At this point, the issue of "What is a task?" raises its head, and we return to the title again. There is no suggestion of *expertise study* in the title, but there *is* mention of *teaching tasks*. In fact, Johnson gives us a page of definitions (p. 5), from Long (1985) to Skehan (1998). We don't remain long in this minefield, since the definition used in the book "is a general one," and "we cannot say the study is concerned with tasks in the specialized, task-based, teaching sense" (p. 4). It seems that the title has mislead us again, for this book is in fact a report of a research study performed with 16 MA students in Lancaster University. These individuals were asked by the researcher "to design an activity involving the function of *describing* people" (p. 4), and the book leads us through the research process, from data collection (mostly done through interviews and observation) to recommendations. Thus, the reader is taken through the rationale (*Why Study Task Design?* Chapter 1), the literature (*Some Studies in Expertise,* Ch. 2), the study (*Studying Task Designers at Work,* Ch. 3), expert procedure (*A Look at Two Designers,* Ch. 4), general procedure (*Designing Language Tasks: Beginnings, Middles and Ends,* Chs. 5 & 6), general hypotheses (*The Good Task Designer,* Ch. 7), and conclusions (*Evaluating and Teaching Task Design,* Ch. 8). These chapters are amply supplemented with six appendices, which offer useful reference materials such as the Task Design Code System (TADECS) (Appendix 1).

As the book progresses, Johnson depicts the stages of the research and comments on its findings, with a good deal of interesting verbatim comments from the 16 designers. In this way, we are invited into the minds of these people, and at the end, we are presented with a list of 27 factors which Johnson suggests describe a GTD. The reviewer is reminded at this point of the discussion in the 1970s about the "good learner," when researchers such as Naiman *et al.* (1978) produced similar lists of defining characteristics. The results of this research were to be implemented in learner-training programs, on the assumption that emulation of the practices of good learners would enable other students to become "successful learners." However, as Tudor (1996) points out, such characteristics and strategies cannot be simply "pedagogized." Besides the logical fallacy that imitating the result of actions will reproduce the cause of those actions ("A implies B, therefore B implies A"), these characteristics must be seen as growing out of and indicating a general active, inquiring and attentive approach to learning, "which can only be acquired integratively" (Tudor, 1996, p. 39). We must, therefore, ask the question whether Johnson is falling into the trap of ignoring the affective and social factors that lay behind observed "expert" behavior. Where does creativity appear in a procedural codified system? The practice of emulation and codification is well-established (Vaughan Williams claimed that creativity is 5% inspiration and 95% perspiration, J.S. Bach is said to have written down music of his contemporaries after hearing it, and Shostakovitch used the structure of a Haydn symphony as a template for his "Classical Symphony"), but when we try to explain how experts are different from their peers, we tend to resort to intangibles such as *intuition, fate, instinct,* and *creative genius*.

These considerations aside, Johnson has written a text that is important for its attempt to identify and codify factors and processes that appear in language-activity design. The book offers valuable insights into this under-researched field, and will be a helpful reference book for teacher-trainers and EFL professionals keen to take on materials design in a serious manner. As a reviewer, I am grateful to Johnson for laying the foundations in this way, adding significantly to the literature. As a teacher-trainer and TEFL practitioner, I urge him and other "experts" to make use of the findings of this book and to present them in a practical manner, providing EFL teachers with an extensive manual of materials design, along with step-by-step examples and a wealth of sample designs and materials. If this text were to include real task-based design, this would be a bonus.

## THE REVIEWER

***Andrew E. Finch*** *has a Ph.D. in task-based EFL program evaluation and is an assistant professor of English Education at Kyungpook National University in Daegu. He has been teaching in Korea for 10 years and has co-authored a number of task-based EFL conversation books, which can be accessed at http://www.finchpark.com/books*

## REFERENCES

Bereiter, C., & Scardamali, M. (1993). *Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature of expertise.* Chicago: Open Court.

Long, M.H. (1985b). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language training. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.). *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp. 77-100). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H.H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner.* Toronto: Modern Language Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (1998). *Materials development in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as language education*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

# Doing Second Language Research

James D. Brown and Theodore S. Rogers.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
*Pp. 314. (ISBN 0 19 437174 3)*

**REVIEWED BY DAVID D. I. KIM**

With growing awareness of the importance and need for language research in the ESL/EFL field, a good selection of "do-it-yourself" research instructional material are now available to guide the teacher-researcher through the, often, bewildering process of conducting language research (Burns, 1999; Freeman, 1998; Nunan, 1992; Schmuck, 1997; Stringer, 1996; Wallace, 1998, Wiersma, 2000, among many others). The increasing emphases of conducting research in our field is highlighted by the steadily multiplying volume of language research being published each year in an impressive and growing collection of journals accepting language/action research works (Applied Linguistics, Second Language Research, TESOL Quarterly, Educational Action Research, Action Research International, Korea TESOL Journal, PAC Journal, JALT Journal, as a small sample).

*Doing Second Language Research*, authored by Brown and Rogers, makes available to the teacher-researcher a useful instructional guide to understanding the process of conducting language research. Although designed for use in a formal learning environment, the book format also allows for self-study. The authors outline three specific goals for the book: 1) Familiarize readers with basic *types of research designs* used in language studies, 2) Provide *practical experiences* with research activities in taking on several roles within a variety of mini-studies, and 3) Introduce *classic research studies* into second language learning and teaching, as well as participating as subjects in adapted versions of some of these studies.

Within the book, the reader is presented with two categories of research types, qualitative and quantitative, with three specific research types representative of each category: i) case study, ii) introspective, and iii) classroom research designs for the former, and for the latter: i) descriptive statistics, ii) correlational research design, and iii) quasi-experimental research design. Each research type is organized into eight sections: 1) Introducing the research type, 2) Experiencing the research type, 3) Compiling the data generated by the research type, 4) Analyzing the data generated by the research type, 5) Designing the research type, 6) Interpreting the research type, 7) The significance of the research type, and 8) Reflecting on the research experience.

So, how accessible is the book to the teacher-researcher? For experienced researchers teaching their students about language research, the text offers an ideal format to develop a course curriculum around, and for those looking to supplement their formal instructional materials, the text is a wealth of material. As for the budding teacher-researchers who are curious and wanting to learn more about what is involved in the process of conducting language research, or for those who want to get their feet wet by attempting a research project of their own and are looking for material to walk them through the process, this text is a simple and well-organized source that should prove to be a helpful step-by-step guide in conducting research. Clear and easily understandable explanations of research terminology with supporting examples, along with a glossary of terms and an index section, will familiarize the reader with the potentially baffling "Researchese." The absolute novice, however, will likely need to consult secondary sources, preferably an experienced teacher-researcher, for additional tutelage.

As mentioned earlier, each of the six research methods is organized into eight sections. The first section, Introducing the Research, includes brief outlines of the specific research type and the teaching/learning situations for their use. In the next section, Experiencing the Research, exercises, in the context of the research types, are provided for readers to "experience research." These exercises put the reader "in-the-shoes" of the subjects/researcher, in asking him/her to participate in a study (some exercises are based on actual research in the field), giving the reader experiences in "participating in/doing" a research study as research-subject/researcher. Interestingly enough, classical studies in second language research are introduced in this section, providing research-being-conducted-in-our-field context in which to relate the exercises. The third section, Compiling Research Data, involves the reader in collecting actual data, related to the exercises in the previous "experiencing research" section. Detailed descriptions of a number of data collection methods and instruments available to the researcher, along with practical suggestions for their use, provides the reader with models for designing data collection procedures and instruments. The section that follows, Analyzing Research Data, contains descriptions of data analysis methods and procedures, along with exercises in using the data collected in the compiling research data section. Some descriptions of statistical procedures are rather thorough and well outlined, and should prove quite useful to readers that feel they are on “shaky grounds” when it comes to statistics.

In the fifth section, Designing Research, Brown and Rogers describe issues that should be taken into consideration in designing a research study. These issues include the importance of a thorough literature review in case studies, picking an appropriate observational technique in classroom research, and things to avoid in writing good survey items in descriptive statistics research, as well as, creating research questions and testing hypotheses in quasi-experimental research. The sixth section, Interpreting Research, covers a wide range of issues such as looking at research results in terms of the context of/purpose for a piece of research, in addition to, validity and reliability of research data, as well as, what the research data (qualitative and quantitative) are telling us. Also covered, is the issue of knowing the shortcomings of each research type in interpreting the research results. The Significance of Defining Research, the seventh section, outlines the impact of research upon a particular area of language learning/teaching. Examples include classroom research that guides researchers to a better understanding of the dynamics of the teacher-student-text interactions in the classroom, comparing teacher’s and student’s attitudes with correlational research, and uncovering the process of learning vocabulary with quasi-experimental research. In the final section, Reflecting on Research Definitions, the reader is provided with an opportunity to look back upon the material covered for each research type in the form of review exercises touching upon the various aspects of the previous seven sections.

In *Doing Second Language Research*, Brown and Rogers offer the reader an excellent treatment of the entire process of conducting language research. Their presentation of numerous examples of classical research in the ELT field provides a much-needed background to frame language research within a contemporary context. The plethora of hands-on exercises engages the reader not only as researcher, but also as subject, offering the teacher-researcher an opportunity to experience research from both perspectives (from the inside and outside). Their wonderful and clear examination of various research types establishes a sturdy foundation for neophytes aspiring to conduct language research, while the veteran researcher will find a wealth of resource material contained within.

## THE REVIEWER

***David D. I. Kim*** *is presently teaching in the Department of English Language and Literature at Konkuk University in Seoul, South Korea. His current teaching and research interests include cross-cultural issues in language teaching/learning, development of language testing instruments, materials development for writing, and teaching English pronunciation. Emails: kdi.kim@utoronto.ca; kdi@yonsei.ac.kr*

## REFERENCES

Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding.* Pacific Grove, CA: Heinle & Heinle.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schmuck, R.A. (1997). *Practical action research*. Arlington Heights, IL: IRI/Skylight Training.

Stringer, E.T. (1996). *Action research: A handbook for practitioners*. London: SAGE.

Wallace, M. J. (1998). *Action research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiersma, W. (2000). *Research methods in education: An introduction (7th ed.)*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

# Genre and the Language Learning Classroom

Brian Paltridge.
Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
*Pp. vi + 154. (ISBN: 0 472 08804 1 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY GERRY LASSCHE**

*Genre and the Language Learning Classroom* helps to bring Australia's Hallidayan version of the genre-based, also known as text-based, approach to the United States. This book is probably of most value to English teachers already in the field, who are looking to fine-tune their use of texts in their lessons. It was Halliday who devised the concepts of systemic functional linguistics, a field of linguistics which elevates the use of texts, rather than sentences, as the unit of analysis (Bhaktin, 1986). This view sees language as something socially constructed. In other words, people use language in particular places for particular purposes. Education, then, is about teaching students to recognize these textual features by examining language-in-context, in order to grow into competent, independent language users themselves (Feez, 1998). This approach assumes that students need to be explicitly drawn to notice these features of text and context. This is in contrast to an invisible pedagogy which assumes that students can pick up the required knowledge by simply being exposed to it (Martin, 2000).

The book proceeds in a logical way, gradually expanding on the issue of genre with each chapter building on the previous one. The first section of the book, covering Chapters 1 and 2, serves as an introduction to the genre-based approach, what genre is, and how genre can be applied in the classroom. The second section, covering Chapters 3 through 5, deals with a description of genre in relation to some important concepts. Chapter 3 discusses the notion of context, the quintessential concept in the field, and how it shapes the way texts are constructed. Once context is understood, it becomes clearer why people use written or spoken genres, and Chapter 4 covers this in a comparative/contrastive mode. The teaching and learning implications of these differences are then discussed in Chapter 5. The third section, comprising Chapters 6 and 7, offers a more general look at genre-based issues: in Chapter 6, how genre competence can be assessed in the classroom, and in the last chapter, which avenues yet need further exploration in the field.

Generally, the content is meant to be a summary of findings in the field, with Paltridge's interpretation of what that implies to the classroom. Indeed, the connection to classroom practice is made very strong with prolific, comprehensive descriptions of content-related activities and techniques in each chapter. These descriptions are detailed, many with illustrations, and I predict this particular style to easily be the most outstanding selling characteristic to the book's readership. The summaries or literature reviews are discussed in straightforward terms. While the amount of specific content might not satisfy the serious researcher, the book still provides an excellent menu of sources (the most extensive I have seen anywhere on the subject), which the reader is encouraged to explore.

*Genre in the Language Classroom* offers two rare, invaluable contributions within its pages. First, how to assess genre competence is not often discussed in the literature on this subject, often making teachers skeptical of using genres because of the complexities of assessing their students' growing competence. The inclusion of Paltridge's earlier (1992) research on stages of written and spoken genre characteristics greatly enhances the usefulness of these concepts to the classroom. Second, teacher-training manuals for text-based approaches often focus on classroom practice of written texts (for example, Collerson, 1994; Feez, 1998). Paltridge's book contains a balanced examination of spoken texts as well, something very often left out of books on this subject.

Paltridge would be hard-pressed to cover every issue facing contemporary literary practice. But there are three not dealt with in the book that I would have coveted his opinions on. The first concerns the issue of using simplified or genuine texts in the classroom, and how this concerns authenticity. This issue is of special concern to teachers in EFL situations, whose access to texts of high educational quality is limited, due to the inaccessibility of much native-English spoken media. The second concerns the syllabus design. How does one conscientiously sequence content, avoiding the pitfalls of notion-functional syllabi, for example? As Richards (2001) notes, such syllabi sequences on inspection can appear arbitrary. The third is a desire to see the concepts of genre-based teaching tied more explicitly to the objectives of many contemporary national curriculums: the development of communicative competence. Developing communicative competence naturally encompasses genre competence

(Bachman and Palmer, 1996), and thus by definition students need to explore language at the textual level at some point in their academic careers in order for them to become competent language users.

In summary, this book provides a masterful survey of issues in genre-based teaching, in both broad and fine brushstrokes. It most definitely belongs in the library of practitioners seeking to encourage critical language awareness and develop the capacity for making independent language choices in their students.

## 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 seven years, and his publications include issues in syllabus design, language testing, and e-based language learning. Email: glassche@yahoo.ca*

## REFERENCES

Bhaktin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Collerson, J. (1994). *English grammar: A functional approach*. Sydney: Primary English Teaching Association.

Eggins, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. New York: Continuum.

Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research (NCELTR).

Martin, J. (2000). Design and practice: Enacting functional linguistics in Australia. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20* (20th Anniversary Volume, "Applied Linguistics as an Emerging Discipline"), 116-126.

Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

# Teaching ESL K-12: Views from the Classroom

Helene Becker with commentary from Else Hamayan.
Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2001.
*Pp. ix + 229. (ISBN: 083847901 4 Paperback)*

**REVIEWED BY KIRSTEN REITAN**

Ask any two or more Korean primary or secondary school English teachers to describe the curriculum they follow in their classrooms and you are likely to get a pretty similar answer. In Korea, the Ministry of Education sets and controls the standards of curriculum and education in all the primary and secondary schools. It also has strong control over and great influence on the educational environment of universities and colleges. This same situation can be observed in several other Asian countries, and in other parts of the world as well. It is easy for teachers, parents, and students to know what to expect in educational environments such as these. But imagine what happens when a Korean primary or secondary student accompanies his or her parents abroad and attends school in the United States. Parents and students might expect that the standards and approaches to education would be pretty uniform and well developed in all school districts in the US. But they would be in for a surprise. Although Washington has a Secretary of Education which helps to set up national standards and curriculum, it is really each state which is responsible for setting the curriculum and the standards, and each school district has a different way of implementing these, depending on needs and resources. Ask any two or more primary or secondary school ESL (English as a Second Language) teachers to describe the curriculum they follow in their classroom or school district and you are likely to get a whole variety of answers. Even the same ESL teacher might experience different environments in formats within the same school district depending on which school they are at.

*Teaching ESL K-12* does much to explain the many environments, approaches, and standards faced by ESL teachers in the United States. As soon as I started reading the book, it became clear that the target audience is practicing ESL teachers in primary and secondary schools in the US. The two authors are both experienced professionals in the ESL teaching environment and do much to shed light on all the possibilities in the US. Having been a secondary English teacher in the US, I was aware of the variety of teaching situations for ESL teachers there, but this book really opened my eyes to how challenging the ESL teacher's job can be. Not only are you a language teacher, you are often a content area teacher as well. Unlike the Korean English teacher, whose main job is to bring up the proficiency of their students and help them to be more communicative, the ESL teacher's job is to create a proficient, academically-ready, culturally-savvy student who can survive within all content area classes within as little as three years.

This books shows the number of different programs that can be used from newcomer schools to sheltered classes to pull-out classes. Students can be put into exclusively ESL classes with content area learning, or they could be placed in some academic classes with additional ESL classes everyday. Another possibility is that they could be mainstreamed right away with ESL classes either daily or several times a week. I myself taught in a school district that mainstreamed ESL students right away. Imagine having a student who spoke no English in your English literature class when you are teaching Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* to native speakers who barely understand what is written. What do you think the ESL student must be experiencing? And how might a content area teacher handle this? I wish this book had been around back then because maybe we would have been able to make a case to the school district for not having our ESL students tackle Shakespeare before they were at least moderately proficient. This book also shows how much awareness has developed over ten years in regard to helping content area teachers better serve the needs of their ESL students.

The book not only clearly illustrates and explains the possible environments, but also takes some stands on the strengths and weaknesses of each program and talks a bit about how the ESL teacher might be able to help support the students in the varying environments. It also examines various issues relevant to teaching ESL in public schools in the United States. It is possible to pick up the book and read any chapter at random, or to skip a number of chapters. However, to get the big picture of ESL public school education in the United States, I recommend you read at least chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Chapter 2 looks at the ESL curriculum – the limitations, meeting the basic language and sociocultural needs of beginners, and preparing intermediate and advanced students for content area classes. It gives practical suggestions on what kind of curricula will work, and the two authors share some examples from their own teaching experiences. I think the inclusion of these personal experiences and examples is one of the greatest strengths of the book. It brings the reader from the abstract to the real.

Chapter 3 is a particularly interesting chapter, as it introduces the various program models in the elementary schools. First, it discusses the various considerations in choosing a particular model of ESL instruction. Then, it introduces the reader to the inclusion (pull-in/push-in) model, the pull-out model, and the team-teaching model. All three systems were used within the city of Houston, Texas, in the early 1990s. Likewise, the models for teaching ESL in secondary schools, covered in chapter 4, were also all in use in Houston at that time. The considerations for high school are even more complex than for elementary school due to the greater number of content classes, the pressures to graduate, and the difficulty of coordinating between the ESL teacher and *all* the content area teachers for each student. This chapter lays down six clear guidelines for a successful secondary ESL program. They are well worth considering for any second-language schooling situation.

Korean teachers, students, and parents are, of course, very familiar with the idea of testing. This book tackles the idea of assessment in its fifth chapter, encouraging teachers to take a positive view. It categorizes assessment into district-level and classroom-based assessment and talks about issues related to parents, native language assessment, dealing with low-literacy students, standardized tests, and forms of assessment. Even the experienced EFL teacher might find it interesting to read about choosing appropriate assessment and alternative forms of assessment (observation, portfolio, etc.). These are issues that are relevant in the Korean context as well.

Chapter 6, on the other hand, is not very relevant to the Korean context. This section looks at special education and the placement or non-placement of ESL students in them. Here background knowledge about what special education is and the extensiveness of it in US school districts is helpful. Even those who attended schools in the United States may be unaware of the extent of special education in public schools and its purposes. This chapter assumes that the reader is already familiar with the processes and terminology. Unless you have a particularly strong interest in the intersection of ESL and special education, I would recommend skipping this chapter.

Other issues of relevance to a US-based ESL teacher include the involvement of parents and the promotion of effective schoolwide instruction. Parents can play a key role in the success of their child's learning of English. However, a number of factors including awareness and culture hinder parents' participation in the educational process. Chapter 7 discusses the above issues and makes many suggestions for greater parental involvement here. This may be of interest to parents who are going to the United States with their children. Otherwise, I would recommend the reader move directly on to Chapters 8 and/or 9. Chapter 8, though short in comparison to the previous chapters, taps into ways to make ESL instruction more effective schoolwide. There are ideas in this chapter that may be of service to teachers in Korea, particularly with the continued push towards making English a second language. The crowning glory of the book, however, is its final chapter. "Lessons From My Students" is something all teachers can relate to at one time or another. Helene Becker tells the story of Jessica and the things she has learned from the many Jessicas in her classrooms. Among other things Jessica taught her teacher is that not all students are at the same level or have the same learning styles. Mrs. Becker needed to plan her lessons to meet the needs and levels of all of her students. Helene Becker also shares the stories of four other students and what she learned from them.

Overall, I gained great insight into how ESL education functions in US public education and found many of the suggestions and ideas applicable to my teaching abroad. If I ever find myself teaching English or ESL in a public school in the US again, this book will figure prominently in my library.

## THE REVIEWER

***Kirsten Reitan*** *taught secondary English for five years in the United States before switching to ESL and EFL. She holds M.Ed. degrees in both English Education and TESOL. She lived and taught in Korea for seven years before recently moving to Taiwan, where she currently teaches freshman English at National Tsing Hua University. Email: kotesolkirsten@yahoo.com*

# Cambridge Advanced Learner' s Dictionary

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
*Pp. xii + 1550. (ISBN: 0 521 53105 5 Paperback, 1.94 x 9.32 x 6.24 in.)*

**REVIEWED BY DAVID E. SHAFFER**

The *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* [CALD] is the latest to join the formidable contingent of advanced learner' s dictionaries published for the 21st century. CALD is actually a completely overhauled version of the Cambridge International Dictionary of English [CIDE], updated and redesigned to better compete with the established leaders in the field, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* [OALD] (Hornby & Wehmeier [Ed.], 2000), *Longman Advanced American Dictionary* [LAAD] (Gadsby [Ed.], 2000), and *Collins COBUILD English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* [CCED] (Sinclair [Ed.], 2001), as well as with last year' s newcomer, *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* [MED] (Rundell & Fox [Eds.] 2002). It is obvious that the CALD editors have done in-depth research in lexicography for this dictionary, not only for lexical entries but also of the design and layout of competing dictionaries, incorporating some of the best ideas from them and adding a few of their own. This review aims to delineate the ways in which CALD differs from the other major advanced learner' s dictionaries (ALDs) as well as point out the similarities. It will look at individual entries for headwords, general features, and the packaging of the product.

## Individual Entries

CALD contains references to slightly over 75,000 words and phrases, which surprisingly is less than CCED, MED, LAAD, and OALD, containing 110,000; 100,000; 84,000; and 80,000, respectively, even though CALD is comparable to the others is size. CALD references to its defining vocabulary inexplicably omit reference to the number of words in its defining vocabulary. However, CIDE used a defining vocabulary of only 2,000 words, and if this is also true of CALD, its definitions are exceptionally easy for advanced learner' s to understand. However, this low number of headwords and smaller defining vocabulary actually make

CALD a high-intermediate-to-advanced learner' s dictionary, which is also the case for LAAD. Other ALDs have a defining vocabulary of 2,500 or 3,000 words.

While many ALDs, on the one hand, choose to give of their definitions in the traditional phrase form (e.g., verb definitions beginning with "to"), CCED, on the other, chose the practice of defining each word with a sentence. What CALD has chosen to do was adopt both of these strategies. Compare these different dictionary entries:

> OALD: **clout**. to hit sb hard, especially with your hand. (p. 224)
>
> CCED: **clout**. If you **clout** someone, you hit them. (p. 275)
>
> CALD: **cloud**. **1**. If something transparent clouds, …, it becomes hard to see through. **2**. to make something confused, or make something harder to understand. (p. 224)

Similar to MED, CALD uses sentential definitions in about one out of six or seven cases. The utility of sentential definitions is that they tend to make meaning more comprehensible. Therefore, considering the level of learner English proficiency that this dictionary is best suited for, this reviewer would have preferred the use of a higher percentage of sentential definitions.

Words with more than one meaning are nicely arranged from most basic or common meaning to least common or most extended meaning. While some dictionaries opt to list all homographs with or without related meanings under a single headword, CALD has provided separate headwords for homographs with unrelated meanings. You will accordingly find the headword **fast** QUICK *adj*. followed by **fast** FIXED *adv*., **fast** NOT EAT *noun*, and **fast** IMMORAL *adj*., in that order. Under the first of these headwords, you will also find the semantically related **fast** *adv*., and under the second, the semantically related **fast** *adj*. and **fastness** *noun*. This more logical and coherent arrangement is also followed in MED, but unlike MED, each different word class entry begins on a new line with the word in bold font and colored, making it more easily discernible.

Homographic headwords are always followed by a boxed "guideword," as shown in the above paragraph, a device also employed in OALD and LAAD. What is unique to CALD, though, is its treatment of phrasal verbs. After a headword, or group of homographic headwords, follows a clearly labeled list of defined phrasal verbs incorporating the headword for that entry. For example, a list of 84 phrasal verbs follows the 17 headwords at **get** (pp. 521-524), and another list of 104 phrasal verbs follows the 24 headwords at **go** (pp, 533-537), many containing guidewords to make them more easily accessible.

CALD fully covers both British and American English. (The full coverage of Australian English in CIDE has been excluded.) When British and American pronunciations of a headword differ, the British pronunciation precedes the American pronunciation. The same ordering is followed for headword definitions. If a headword has different meanings in British and American English, such as with **vest**, the British English meanings precede the American English ones. This is a mild inconvenience to the many learners, such as those in Korea, who are learning American English.

The new CALD edition boasts the inclusion of over 1,000 new words, over the 1995 CIDE edition. Among these, CALD cites Internet words such as *broadband* and *clickable* – two words found in MED a year ago. Shaffer (2002) used three words discussed in an email newsletter (R.S. Koch, *The Grammar Exchange Newsletter 23*, personal communication, November 22, 2002) to gauge the currency of a dictionary's lexicon: the recently coined word *digerati* and the more recent meanings of *alpha male* and *anorak* (BrE), which all refer to people. MED contains all three; the earlier publications, CEED, OALD, and LAAD, contain one each; CALD regrettably contains none. This is more likely a result of its smaller store of words and word meanings than of any oversight, but it does indicate a limitation of CALD as an ALD.

## GENERAL FEATURES

One very useful feature incorporated in CALD is its *Common Learner Error* boxes that are so prominent throughout its pages. There are hundreds of these boxes, based on a 16 million-word learner corpus, highlighting common errors made by learners (i.e., "**fun** or **funny?**" and "**hour** or **time**?") and immediately following the entries under the corresponding headwords. These closely resemble the useful "which word?" boxes in OALD. The other boxes found in CALD's pages, though to a more limited extent, are usage boxes. These are often used to explain common verbs and their forms as different tenses, but they cover a wide range of usage topics (i.e., avoiding the use of **he** to avoid sexist language).

Besides error and usage boxes, the only other items highlighted in boxes are a very few illustrations, leaving many pages with only two continuous columns of uninterrupted text. What could have been employed to informatively break this visual monotony are collocation boxes. CALD has instead opted to include its 25,000 collocations as example sentences in the entry itself, with the collocating word in bold font. The entry for *sunken*, for example, includes: *They're diving for sunken **treasure***.

CALD's pages are not as dull as the above description may suggest. Each headword, each box title, and some box content is in light blue. Blue is a good choice as it signifies tranquility, confidence, and trust and because it is often considered to be the safest global color. The shade of blue is quite light, though, and may cause some readers to strain. This color idea undoubtedly derives from the red (= warmth, energy, desire) motif of MED. However, MED uses color to designate frequency of use by having only the 7,500 most frequently used headwords appear in red. CALD, however, has chosen not to indicate frequency of use in any way, though this is a point of considerable importance to the average learner.

A number of other things highlighted in other ALDs have not been included in CALD. There are no synonym boxes. CALD does sometimes include a single synonym at the end of a definition in bold font, though it is not otherwise marked. There are no etymological or cultural notes. For example, it would be nice to know that the common noun **Lolita** (p. 735) is derived from a Vladimir Nabokov novel. There are no metaphor boxes, even though it has been shown that conventional metaphor is central to the way we use language (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). And there is little attention paid to the grammatical usage of headwords. 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 has been opted against. This may have been due to space considerations or the trend of placing emphasis on fluency at the expense of accuracy, but considering that CALD is advertised as "everything you need to pass exams," more grammar information would have been helpful, especially to meet the needs of so many Asian learners, whose language proficiency assessment is based heavily on their knowledge of English grammar.

As has become standard for ALDs, CALD has a 16-page pictorial section of categories of everyday nouns and a 16-page language study guide. The study guide is full of all sorts of useful general information from vocabulary to grammar to letter writing. The pictorial section, however, does not exhibit the rigor of the dictionary entries. One vegetable is labeled "sweetcorn (UK) / corn (US)," though the American English for this humanly consumed vegetable is *sweet corn*. Two office items are labeled *coathook* and *mobile/mobile phone (UK) cellphone (US)*, even though the more frequent American English spelling of both of these items is as two words, i.e., *coat hook* and *cell phone*. The back of the dictionary, however, offers a real treat for English learners – a 31-page Idiom Finder. Idioms are notoriously difficult to find in a dictionary, as it is often not apparent which of their words they will be listed under. The Idiom Finder makes multiple entries of idioms with different keywords in alphabetical order. For example, *go a long way* is listed in the Idiom Finder under *go*, *long*, and *way*. We are informed that it can be found on page 736, under **long**. This useful section is followed by others on word families, prefixes and suffixes, regular and irregular verbs, and geographical names, among others.

## PACKAGING

You may not be able to tell a book by its cover, but we often buy books by their cover. Kent (2002) shows that physical characteristics of a dictionary rank very high among learners' preferences and, therefore, cannot be ignored. The paperback edition of CALD is the same length and width as MED, OALD, and LAAD, a very comfortable size, and is just a bit thinner than the others. The quality of the paper used in CALD and the size of font make its readability higher than that of either CCED or OALD, and equal to that of MED. CALD is similar to its competitors in its color section and language study sections but has a dearth of illustrations throughout the dictionary. [For more on MED, CCED, LAAD, and OALD, see Shaffer (2000, 2001, 2002)].

CALD doesn't have the web support that accompanies MED, but with the CD-ROM that can be bought with the dictionary, or separately, that is not so necessary. In addition to the text of the print version, the CD-ROM contains the British and American English pronunciation of each headword, with a mike for the learner to record their own pronunciation for comparison. It has a thesaurus that can be accessed by clicking on any word, an advanced search that makes words and expressions easy to find, a "quick-find" function that takes you directly to a dictionary entry by just pointing to a word on the Internet with the mouse. It also has a "grammar-help" function that provides grammar, collocation, and idiom information to aid the learner in their writing. Also included are exercises on grammar, usage, and vocabulary.

At US$21.00 with CD-ROM at Amazon.com, CALD is slightly less expensive than the other ALDs without a CD-ROM. At this price no one should be disappointed with what they get. It is an ALD high in scholarship that is especially suited for those learners making the change from high-intermediate to advanced proficiency.

## 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.

Gadsby, A. (Ed.). (2002). *Longman advanced American dictionary*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

Procter, P. (Ed.). (1995). *Cambridge international dictionary of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rundell, M., & Fox, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Collins COBUILD English dictionary for advanced learners* (3rd ed.). Glasgow: HarperCollins.

Shaffer, D.E. (2000). [Review of *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English* (6th ed.)]. *Korea TESOL Journal*, *3*(1), 106-110.

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. (2002). [Review of *Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners*]. *Korea TESOL Journal*, *5*(1), 183-187.

# The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language

Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
*Pp. xvii + 1842. (ISBN: 0 521 43146 8 Hardback, 2.73 x 10.05 x 7.42 in.)*

**REVIEWED BY DAVID E. SHAFFER**

*The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (CamGram) is an exceptional tome of scholarship, the first comprehensive grammar reference of international Standard English to be published in nearly two decades. Ten years in the making, its size and its authors are testimony to the magnitude of this achievement. Huddleston and Pullum, two of the most reputable authorities on English grammar, have contributed considerably to individual chapters and have collaborated with an outstanding international team of co-authors on the volume as a whole. CamGram has been produced to compete with Quirk et al.'s (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (CompGram), which has established itself over the years as the authority on English grammar. By having available to it 17 years worth of linguistic research since the publication of CompGram and drawing upon this research in a systematic way, CamGram presents itself as a formidable competitor to CompGram.

## OVERVIEW

CamGram is a 20-chapter compilation with each chapter authored totally or partially by either Huddleston or Huddleston and Pullum. The first of these 50-to-200-page chapters, "Preliminaries," states the aim of the book as synchronically describing the grammar of modern English and providing a detailed account of the principles governing English constructions. The analysis is descriptive rather than prescriptive and is done without espousing any one of the competing theoretical frameworks of grammar. However, the concepts that they do embrace are often closely related to those of generative grammar. Chapter 2, "Syntactic Overview," starts by clarifying the relationship between sentence and clause and goes on to provide a brief synopsis of the chapters dealing with syntax and how their treatment in CamGram differs from that of traditional grammar. Of particular note is the introduction of the distinction made between canonical and non-canonical clauses and how it plays an important role in syntactic analysis.

The ensuing chapters follow the order of treatment given the subject matter in the overview: Chapter 3, "The Verb"; Chapter 4, "The Clause: Complements"; Chapter 5, "Nouns and Noun Phrases"; Chapter 6, "Adjectives and Adverbs"; Chapter 7, Prepositions and Preposition Phrases"; Chapter 8, "The Clause: Adjuncts"; Chapter 9, "Negation"; Chapter 10, "Clause Type and Illocutionary Force"; Chapter 11, "Content Clauses and Reported Speech"; Chapter 12, "Relative Constructions and Unbounded Dependencies"; Chapter 13, "Comparative Constructions"; Chapter 14, "Non-finite and Verbless Clauses"; Chapter 15, "Coordination and Supplementation"; Chapter 16, "Information Packing"; and Chapter 17, "Deixis and Anaphora." The following two chapters deal with morphology: Chapter 18, "Inflectional Morphology and Related Matters" and Chapter 19, "Lexical Word-Formation." Chapter 20 concludes the grammar with a discussion of English punctuation. The chapters are followed by a 14-page section on further reading and both a lexical and a conceptual index.

The organization of the material in many ways closely resembles that of CompGram. The decision to include chapters on morphological issues is a welcomed one. The treatment of word-formation processes and noun and verb inflections brings together in an organized manner what CompGram handled less comprehensively in a number of separate chapters. On the other hand, CamGram does not bring together intonational material is a single section, but instead treats it more piecemeal as part of its treatment of adverbial phrases, scope of negation, alternative questions, and right dislocation vs. extraposition, and others. A rather unique feature in CamGram is its inclusion of "specialist passages." These are passages in the main text that are intended mainly for the expert grammarian, as they are concerned mainly with providing linguistic support for the analysis adopted in the text rather than for the general reader. Accordingly, they are set off in a blue, shaded background and may be skipped without any loss of cohesiveness.

## CRITIQUE

CamGram has gone to great lengths to systematize the linguistic research that has been done since the beginning of the Chomskyan Revolution in linguistic theory in the 1950s. Its description of grammar is enhanced by the introduction of new concepts and terminology. One of these is the systematic distinction made between "canonical and non-canonical constructions," i.e., basic and non-basic clauses, such as affirmative vs. negative, declarative vs. interrogative/imperative/exclamatory, active vs. passive/preposed/existential/*it*-cleft, and main vs. subordinate (p.46). Also introduced is the concept of "presentational status," which accounts for the differences in syntactic function that semantic role does not account for. For example, in *Kim shot Pat* and *Pat was shot by Kim*, the semantic roles are identical, but the perceived difference in perspective is analyzed as being due to a difference in presentational status (p. 229). Elsewhere, the word *as* in *That counts as excellent* is analyzed as a "predicative oblique" and the phrase *as excellence* as a "marked predicative compliment" (p. 255).

CamGram is much more influenced by generative grammar than CompGram. This is due to Huddleston's and Pullum's close association with research in generative grammar over the years and the increased influence that generative grammar has had on linguistics since the preparation of CompGram. CamGram sees phrase structure rules as mainly binary or singulary. The frequent multiple-branching analyses of CompGram are a rarity in CamGram.

In this age of corpus linguistics and corpus-based research, one may be surprised to find that CamGram is not corpus-based in any significant way. The authors state that their evidence came from "our own intuitions as native speakers of the language; the reactions of other native speakers we consult when we are in doubt; data from computer corpora (…); and data presented in dictionaries and other scholarly work on grammar" (p. 11). The four corpora referred to are quite small by today's standards. With 100-million-word corpora now the norm, it is difficult to conceive why the authors would rely so much on consulting individual native speakers for evidence. A major deficiency in CompGram, one that actually developed after its inception, was the lack of corpus-based evidence. The main purpose of Longman publishing Biber et al. (1999) was to fulfill this need for corpus-based data with a companion volume. Why Cambridge University Press would two decades later create a grammar relying little more on corpora data than CompGram and rarely supporting their claims with frequency figures or statistical analyses is difficult to fathom. Although a descriptive grammar should not be based primarily on corpus data, the dearth of corpus-based support in CamGram may prove to be one of its few weaknesses.

The final two points to be mentioned have not to do with the content of the text itself but with the manner in which it is presented. Although CamGram is full of lists of example sentences, words, and phrases, there is a conspicuous lack of visual aids such as tables, charts, diagrams, and figures, which could have made its immense amount of text more reader-friendly. A survey of the middle 200 pages of the text reveal only three simple diagrams on pages 800-900 and only two tree diagrams on pages 900-1,000, with no tables, charts, or figures. At over 18,000 pages, CamGram is both weighty and bulky, making it undesirable to carry from home to office. It would increase convenience considerably if CamGram were to come with its text also on an accompanying CD-ROM, or on one available separately.

All things considered, CamGram is nothing short of a remarkable piece of scholarship, comprehensive in both its depth and breadth of coverage. It is well structured and presents linguistic research in a systematized manner. It is also innovative as a reference grammar in its presentation of new concepts and terminology.

It would be almost impossible for a single reference grammar to win the hearts of all grammarians and linguists in a field of so many competing theories of grammar, but CamGram has much to offer the specialist and the English instructor, as well as the general reader. Anyone with a serious interest in the grammar of English should have a copy of *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* by their desk.

## THE REVIEWER

***David Shaffer*** *holds a Ph.D. in linguistics and has been a professor of English at Chosun University in Gwangju since the 1970s. In addition to semantics, his academic interests lie in TEFL methodology, teacher training, and Korean lexical borrowing from English. In recent years, he has become increasingly involved in the editing of Korea TESOL publications and is currently on the organization's executive council. Email: disin@chosun.ac.kr*

## REFERENCES

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvick, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London/New York: Longman.

# Study Skills Success!

Clarity Language Consultants Ltd., 2003.
[*http://www.clarity.com.hk*]

**REVIEWED BY DAVID B. KENT**

With a heavy emphasis on IELTS (International English Language Testing System), *Study Skills Success* focuses on providing learners with a means to engage in the study of academic English as well as competently prepare for the IELTS exam. As a result, the software is aimed at high school and early tertiary-level students preparing for academic study in English-speaking countries. The program would also prove useful for more advanced or upper intermediate Korean students in mandatory University English programs, as the content is relevant to a wide variety of majors. Yet, as Choi (1997) informs us, the Korean education system traditionally does not emphasize creative, critical, or analytical thinking. With this in mind, the *Study Skills Success* package also comes to offer something even more valuable to Korean students – the ability to learn and understand elements of research skills they will need to apply at the university level in English-speaking nations.

Two versions of the software are available, one for use in educational settings and another for home use. The professional version is reviewed here and offers two features not available on the home version: an Authoring Kit, and a Results Manager. A range of extension activities and a teacher support site are also available.

## LEARNING FOCUS

*Study Skills Success* units concentrate on listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary skills, as well as research methods and the use of visuals in presenting and understanding material. The package incorporates accents of speakers from across the English-speaking world, and this should prove valuable for Korean students since they are typically acquainted with only the North American accent. Each section includes an "IELTS tie-in" feature which is useful for clarifying to the student the relevance on the content. Oxford, Rivera-Costillo, Feyten, and

Nutta (1998) also determine feedback to be an important form of learner "consciousness-raising," as do others (Mayer, 2001; and Soper, 1997), and indicate that computers can provide much more than simple right or wrong responses as interaction with students. In the *Study Skills Success* package, extensive feedback provides analysis of student answers and is structured to provide relevant explanations for both correct and incorrect responses. It is such feedback that can foster continued learner motivation in both strong and weak students.

Each unit contains twelve sections designed to develop learner strategies for IELTS test taking. Record and playback functions are available in the speaking section, along with native-speaker samples presenting good and bad methods as models. The speaking section concentrates on other areas, such as stress, and offers students much needed practice for the IELTS interview section. It is the interview that students from an EFL background would find to be the most difficult aspect of IELTS, and the speaking unit meets the challenge of preparing students well for this section. On the other hand, Korean students inundated with the study of grammar throughout their high school years would find this unit very dry. The grammar unit also provides tips for improving grammar, but unfortunately the first "tip" suggests that students buy a Clarity grammar product. Teachers, and perhaps also students, would find this type of suggestion annoying, and it somewhat detracts from the professionalism of the product. Nonetheless, the design of each unit is uniform and prompts are provided for grading and presentation of feedback when appropriate. Each section is designed well and offers students study and test-taking support, as well as a comprehensive means from which to develop academic English skills and successful study habits.

## LEARNER MANAGEMENT

Although perhaps a little awkward to work with at first, the click-driven nature of the Results Manager soon becomes familiar and allows for tracking of individuals or class progress through units. A great timesaving feature is that of student self-registration. Alternatively, teachers may wish to enter individual records themselves. Students can be assigned to group/class lists, and it is an easy matter to clear student records.

A range of reports are available. Single-user and group reports include individual unit and exercise scores, highest and lowest scores, average scores, and time on task for units and exercises. These reports are especially useful for comparing individual and peer performance as well as class scores on particular units, so that weak areas can be identified and addressed. Exercise reports are also available and would prove beneficial when evaluating student completion of any content constructed with the Authoring Kit. Detailed help is available, and results can be printed if desired.

## CONTENT DEVELOPMENT

Anyone familiar with web authoring will find the click-driven interface of the Authoring Kit easy to use. Teachers lacking such skills will still find authoring content very straightforward. An extensive range of question types can be constructed, each allowing for individualized feedback and the ability to incorporate an array of multimedia. This allows for great freedom when developing fresh and relevant material uniquely tailored for use with classes. The Authoring Kit offers functionality over packages like the Quia puzzle maker, and although not as powerful as Macromedia Director, it is much more intuitive for the first-time multimedia developer.

## INTERNET EXTENSION AND INSTRUCTOR ASSISTANCE

The main *Study Skills Success* website focuses on providing IELTS support material for each area of the software system, and being laid out in much the same style as the program, interface should prove very familiar to users. Further, a teaching support page offers a range of downloads and information.

The website extends the focus of each unit. For example, the listening section offers both support activities and a range of links, presenting students with both authentic up-to-date content and providing a guide to such material that many students lacking computer and Internet search abilities would much appreciate. Other sections of the website, such as that for grammar, are simply pure advertisement for related Clarity products and unfortunately offer no real support activities for students. A less blatant display of advertisement, such as a list of texts and products located after support activities, would be more welcome. Nonetheless, teachers would be well advised to keep this in mind and view available material before directing students toward the site.

The teacher support site should prove immensely valuable for new teachers or even more seasoned teachers new to integrating aspects of ICT (Internet communication technology) within their lessons. Teachers will find downloads of the *Study Skills Success* syllabus as well as transcripts, an authoring guide, and support material for the Authoring Kit. A range of other material is also available, including documents for getting to know the *Study Skills Success* package and using it with students. Further, a direct link is available to other Clarity software sites as well as technical support and upgrades. Clarity should be commended for providing such extensive product assistance to teachers. As Gaer (1998) notes, familiarity with software and adequate technical support is essential for effective use and incorporation of computer-based content in classrooms.

The content in *Study Skills Success* is based on a range of authentic material and the program is well suited for integration within a taught IELTS course, as an academic English resource within self-access centers, or for personal home use. At a base price of US$149, the program is certainly not on the cheap side, but for the price and the range of content available both over the Internet and from within the software, the cost is minimal. Overall, the educational value of this software is excellent, and not only would I recommend the product to students and other teachers, but I would utilize it when next teaching IELTS.

## MINIMUM OPERATING SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

Windows 98/NT/2000/ME/XP, 800x600 display resolution, microphone and sound card, CD-ROM drive for network or stand-alone installation, 250mb local or server hard drive space (cannot be run from the CD), and the minimum amount of RAM needed to run the Windows system.

## THE REVIEWER

***David Kent*** *has a Ph.D. in TEFL and is currently working at Inha University in Incheon. He has been teaching in Korea for eight years and enjoys developing multimedia software for language learners. Email: dbkent@mail.inha.ac.kr.*

## REFERENCES

Choi, M. (1997). Korean students in Australian universities. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *16*(3), 263-282.

Gaer, S. (1998). Using software in the adult ESL classroom. *ERIC Q & A. National Center for ESL Literacy Education*. Retrieved January 27, 2003, from http://www.cal.org/ncle/digests/SwareQA.htm

Mayer, R. (2001). *Multimedia learning*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R., Rivera-Costillo, Y., Feyten, C., & Nutta, J. (1998). *Computers and more: Creative uses of technology for learning a second or foreign language*. Retrieved January 27, 2003, from http://www.insa-lyon.fr/Departments/CDRL/computers.html

Soper, J. (1997). Integrating interactive media in courses: The WinEcon software with workbook approach. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education, 97*(2), 1-39. [Electronic Version] Retrieved January 27, 2003, from http://www-jime.open.ac.uk/97/2/winecon-01.html