

# Learning, Working and Communicating in a Global Context

*Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting  
of the British Association for Applied Linguistics*

4-6 September 2014

University of Warwick, Coventry



Edited by  
Jo Angouri, Tilly Harrison,  
Stephanie Schnurr and Sue Wharton







Learning, Working and Communicating  
in a Global Context  
Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting  
of the  
British Association for Applied Linguistics

*4–6 September 2014  
University of Warwick, Coventry*



Edited by  
Jo Angouri, Tilly Harrison,  
Stephanie Schnurr and Sue Wharton



# **Learning, Working and Communicating in a Global Context**

Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting  
of the  
British Association for Applied Linguistics

*4-6 September 2014  
University of Warwick, Coventry*

Published by Scitsiugnil Press  
1 Maiden Road, London, UK  
and produced in the UK

Copyright © 2015  
Copyright subsists with the individual contributors severally in their own  
contributions.

This publication may be reproduced in part or whole only with  
acknowledgement of the source.

First Published 2015  
By the British Association for Applied Linguistics  
Edited by Jo Angouri, Tilly Harrison, Stephanie Schnurr and Sue Wharton

*Product Design by Martin Edwardes  
Scitsiugnil Press logo design by Jack Bruce*

ISBN: 978-0-9559533-7-8

---

# Learning, Working and Communicating in a Global Context

Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting  
of the  
British Association for Applied Linguistics

*4-6 September 2014  
University of Warwick, Coventry*

## Contents

---

Chapter	<i>Authors</i>	Page
<b>1</b> Bridging Vocabulary Knowledge Gap between Language Learners and ELT Textbooks	Thamer Alharthi	1
<b>2</b> Softening the Boundaries: Academic Discourse Socialisation through Instruction in Japanese and English Writing	John Bankier	13
<b>3</b> Lexical Semantics of English Loanwords in Japanese	Keith Barrs	29
<b>4</b> The role of speaker identification in Taiwanese attitudes towards varieties of English	ShouChun Chien	37
<b>5</b> Learning, Teaching and Assessment in Multilingual Classrooms	Rosie Hedger & Dr Rachel Wicaksono	53
<b>6</b> Lexical ambiguity and L2 visual word recognition	Tomomi Ishida	67
<b>7</b> Promoting literature-focused cross-cultural communication and collaboration between Taiwanese and Japanese EFL university students through technology-enhanced literature circles	Wan-lun Lee	79
<b>8</b> Identifying the Functions of Communities of Practice in an EFL Classroom	Akiko Nagao	85
<b>9</b> Learning and working for meaningful communication in interviews: Making a transition from the teacher's questions to the student's questions and why it matters	Ian Nakamura	101

---

Chapter	<i>Authors</i>	Page
<b>10</b> Distributing a monolingual strategy through English language teaching policy: A critical analysis of discourse practice by Japanese government officials	Mamiko Noda	115
<b>11</b> Corpus analysis technology and a new blended EFL e-learning: toward real-time classroom management strategies	Takeshi Okada	123
<b>12</b> Authenticity in a Global Context: Learning, Working and Communicating with L2 teachers of English	Richard Pinner	135
<b>13</b> The use of oral narrative tasks in second language learning: does a familiar topic make a difference?	Xuyan Qiu	141
<b>14</b> Do short-term study abroad experiences help L2 learners to become pragmatically more appropriate?	Yoko Sato	155
<b>15</b> English in Bangladesh: Is There a Bangladeshi English Creeping In?	Shaila Shams	165
<b>16</b> Constructing and contesting the ‘ideal learner’: multilingual children in the UK school system	Robert Sharples	179
<b>17</b> The impact of teacher questions and task design on L2 performance –complexity, accuracy and fluency- in EFL classrooms	Natsuyo Suzuki	191
<b>18</b> Competence in building intercultural relations: Case study insights into the development process	Jiayi Wang & Helen Spencer-Oatey	205
<b>19</b> Predicting Chinese Students’ Academic Achievement in the UK	Wang Yixin & Michael Daller	217
<b>20</b> A critical thematic analysis of York’s Hidden Stories	Rachel Wicaksono & Darya Zhurauskaya	229
<b>21</b> The Value of Teacher Portfolios for Professional Development in TESOL	Daniel Xerri	243
<b>22</b> When Do You Use Pronouns? An Entity Coherence Approach	Mitsuko Yamura-Takei & Etsuko Yoshida	251
<b>23</b> Translanguaging as a language contact phenomenon in the classroom in Ghana: Pedagogic relevance and perceptions	Elvis Yevudey	259
<b>24</b> Personal Identity and Global Engagement: Chinese University Teachers’ Use of the L1	Dr Xiaozhou Zhou	271



# 1 Bridging Vocabulary Knowledge Gap between Language Learners and ELT Textbooks

Thamer Alharthi  
*King Abdulaziz University*  
talharthi@kau.edu.sa

## Introduction

No one denies the essentiality of vocabulary knowledge as a key yet challenging component, across all stages of second language acquisition. It is without doubt, however, that learners will often encounter unknown words through a variety of authentic sources among which are textbook and material input to help them tackle such lexical learning challenge. Empirical studies have shown that Saudi students graduated from high school with a relatively small number of words that they were supposed to acquire (Al-Hazemi, 1993; Al-Akloby, 2001 and AlSaif, 2011). The aim of this research is to discover how vocabulary input in textbooks relates to the Saudi learners' low level of vocabulary size. To the best of our knowledge, this is a pioneering study in the target context as it investigates the role of a yet unexamined potential factor, textbooks' vocabulary input, in the vocabulary learning of Saudi EFL learners at university level. The study also aims at measuring the vocabulary size of the participants in relation to the textbooks as well as examining the effect of other learnability factors such as word frequency, part of speech, and recycling.

Al-Hazemi (1993) investigated the vocabulary knowledge of students who had just finished their high school education. His work revealed that Saudi high school leavers and military cadets acquire about 1,000 words out of the 2,000 most frequent words in English. A few years later, Al-Akloby (2001), relying on conclusions obtained from Al-Hazemi, 1993, conducted an exploratory study to examine the factors behind the Saudi learners' failure to learn English vocabulary in Saudi public schools without formally establishing the actual size of the vocabulary knowledge i.e. vocabulary measurement tools. He reported a number of factors contributing to Saudi EFL public schools' vocabulary learning failure such as: inadequate use of vocabulary learning strategies, insufficient presentation of vocabulary, limiting the lexical presentation in textbooks to pronunciation and meaning,

ineffective use of vocabulary recycling and testing, and some socio-psychological factors (e.g. attitude, motivation, classroom anxiety, and parental encouragement). Recently, AlSaif (2011) further asserted previous findings where Saudi EFL learners in both public schools and university showed poor vocabulary knowledge. He concluded that the insufficient presentation of vocabulary in Saudi schools' textbooks might be responsible for not achieving the coverage needed for adequate comprehension of written or spoken text.

## **Literature review**

Vocabulary knowledge has been perceived by educators and researchers as the most essential building block in authentic communication (Milton, 2009). It is the first step in learning any language as can be seen from Wilkins's (1972, p. 111) strong and famous claim that, "while without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed". Nation (2001) has identified three dimensions with nine multiple components which must be known about vocabulary including written and spoken form, meaning and association links, and grammatical characteristics, collocations, and contextual constraints on use like register and frequency. For each component, Nation categorized lexical knowledge into receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. It is of great importance to establish a good understanding of the amount of vocabulary a foreign language learner needs in order to comprehend written or spoken discourse, that is, text more than one sentence long. For university EFL learners, knowing 2,000 words will give them the competence to communicate effectively in speaking and writing modes (Schmitt, 2010). Therefore, at the tertiary level, the task of learning a large vocabulary is quite different for EFL learners and 3,000 words is crucial to handle authentic texts (Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2000). It is not realistic or even possible to include all vocabulary in the instructional materials at once. However, it is worth considering the above pickup rate in the first two years of studying the target language.

In relation to our context as a university level instructor for almost five years, English instructors share with us their worries that an overwhelming majority of Saudi EFL learners have a language problem due mainly to their vocabulary which is prone to attrition at the end of a two-year university language course (Alharthi, 2014). When prompted for the possible reasons for their deficit in vocabulary size and learning, textbook materials might be one major source of difficulty. In many EFL environments, the textbook

materials are the only written content learners have available to them, and hence their main source of vocabulary learning. This belief has been empirically supported by Al-Akloby's (2001) study. He highlighted a number of sources of vocabulary learning breakdown in the Saudi English language curricula and textbooks including, insufficient presentation of vocabulary items, which was also found to be confined to pronunciation and meaning only. Moreover, it was found that unproductive use of vocabulary recycling and testing was another source of vocabulary learning failure. In a similar effort, Al-Hazemi (1993) and AlSaif (2011) concluded that Saudi EFL school leavers' vocabulary size was estimated at around or below 1,000 word level, a finding far from the size targeted by previous research and the Saudi Ministry of Education norms and an acceptable vocabulary level for reading authentic texts i.e. 3,000 words. These serious issues stimulated our attention to address the following questions:

- What is the vocabulary size of EFL university level students?
- Do they attain adequate high-frequency words to cope with the reading materials to start with?

As Schmitt (2014, p. 942) succinctly notes, "The message about the need for a large vocabulary size to be able to function well in English seems to be taking hold". If it is the case that the study participants' vocabulary knowledge is below 3,000 word level based on our local vocabulary test, the following step will involve examining the vocabulary textbooks introduced to our participants at King Abdulaziz University (KAU). The present study investigates the size of vocabulary knowledge that university students gain from vocabulary textbooks and how the selection and presentation of vocabulary in these textbooks may influence their learning. That is the study examines the impact of some potential factors including frequency, recycling and word class on the students' achievements in vocabulary knowledge. This would provide further information about the learnability of English vocabulary.

### **The study: The research objectives and questions**

Our study is predominantly quantitative with a view to measuring the vocabulary knowledge size of Saudi EFL learners at the tertiary level. In accordance with the previous literature, we expect that the participants in this study would score low in the vocabulary test. The current study also intended to examine in depth textbook input as a possible factor that might influence

the participants' poor vocabulary knowledge. The main purpose of the present study was to provide insight into the following questions:

- How much vocabulary out of the most frequent 3,000 English words do Saudi EFL students know at KAU?
- What is the effect of word class on vocabulary learning?
- How much vocabulary do the EFL textbooks under investigation offer?
- What is the frequency and distribution of these words?
- How much is vocabulary recycled in the EFL textbooks?
- What is the effect of recycling on vocabulary learning?
- Is there a significant relationship between frequency, recycling and word class and the participants' achievement scores in word knowledge?

## **Sampling and method**

The participants in this study are 40 male third-year university students studying in the Department of European Languages and Literature. The students are all Saudi and Arabic is their mother tongue. Recruiting participants from the third year was necessary since our home-made test includes items taught to the participants in their first two years. Also, the test was administered when the participants had only a few weeks before the end of their formal instruction.

## **Data collection instruments**

### ***Local vocabulary test***

The current study measures the students' receptive vocabulary knowledge by employing a local vocabulary test constructed by the researcher. This test is in a pencil and paper form and modelled on the Vocabulary Levels Test (Nation, 2001). While the VLT tests the learners' vocabulary knowledge of the most frequent five levels in English, the RVT is designed to measure how much vocabulary of the most frequent 3,000 words the participants know from their textbooks. The target words were based on the contents of the participants' instructional materials. The examinees are presented with 60 multiple choice items where learners are asked to choose the correct definitions of the items from another corresponding 240 definitions, half of which are distractors. The first two word levels have 7 clusters while the last one has 6. Therefore, the first two 1,000 word frequency levels tests the

knowledge of 21 items, however, the third 1,000 word level has 18 items due to there being fewer words from this level in the textbooks. Both corresponding definitions and distractors are taken from the textbooks. However, definitions consisted of words from a higher frequency band to ensure that the learners are tested for the target items. The test minimizes guessing by arranging the items alphabetically and based on word length while keeping all the words in each cluster from the same class removes any grammatical clues. Moreover, the test can be administered in little time because the definitions are in short forms. Participants were also told that the results of the vocabulary test would not affect their current studies in any way.

The vocabulary test was analysed as follows: a correct answer was given one mark and a wrong one zero.

### ***Textbook materials***

The students in the English department at KAU have a number of modules introduced to them during their four years of study to get a BA in English Language. In the first two years, they attend two intensive vocabulary modules, Vocabulary 1 and Vocabulary 2. Vocabulary is also introduced to them in three reading modules during the first three semesters. The textbooks under investigation are Nelson's (1986) Intermediate Vocabulary and Nelson's (1986) Elementary Vocabulary; they are introduced during the first and second semester in the English department at KAU. We will pay special attention to the presentation and recycling of target words in these materials.

Both of the textbooks, Intermediate Vocabulary and Elementary Vocabulary, were scanned and digitized. The researcher used the PDF-XChange Viewer to convert the scanned images into editable text. The converted text was later examined and corrected to avoid any misspelling and/or changes (e.g. some letters were converted into numbers such as w0rd or scho1l). Afterwards, we only extracted content words presented in exercises and wordlists in each classroom lesson. The vocabulary got extracted and put into two different text files for each textbook. After a final thorough revision, all the items in both text files were merged into a third file.

In three separate steps, the researcher pasted each text file into the Vocabprofiler BNC-20 programme in Cobb's 2009 Compleat Lexical Tutor website. The VocabProfiler BNC-20 analyses the text and divides the words into the 20,000 word frequency bands. The output of the programme contains the number of word families, types, token, type coverage, and cumulative

coverage. In order to check how a word is repeated in these textbooks, we use another programme from Cobb's (2009) website, namely, Text-Lex Compare. The researcher pasted the wordlist gathered from the first textbook into the first window then pasted the wordlist from the second textbook into the other window. The Text-Lex Compare analyses two or more texts and gives the degree of repetition of words in these texts. The output of this programme includes the number of tokens and word families recycled in reference to another text, as well as to the amount of not shared or new words in each text.

## Results and Discussion

### *How much vocabulary out of the most frequent 3,000 English words do Saudi EFL students know at KAU?*

The results revealed that the estimated vocabulary size of Saudi EFL students at KAU, a few weeks before the end of their second year of studies, was around 1,447 words out of the 3,000 most frequent words in English. Table 1 shows the number of known words for each of the first three BNC 1,000 word levels and in total. The standard deviations and the minimum and maximum vocabulary scores indicate high variation in the students' vocabulary scores for the words within each frequency level, as well as for all of word levels together.

BNC word frequency level	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
1000 word level	636.25	257.36	190.48	1000.00
2000 word level	481.49	295.04	0.00	952.38
3000 word level	330.25	276.97	0.00	833.33
Total	1447.98	776.71	285.71	2738.10

**Table 1: Number of words known in each word level and in total**

The participants' vocabulary size is therefore in harmony with the previous findings obtained by Al-Hazemi's (1993) high school leavers but less than AlSaif's (2011) university students. However, comparing the results of this study with Al-Hazemi's might not be suitable. The subjects in Al-Hazemi's study were high school leavers and military cadets who had a chance to study English for a period of two hours a week while the participants in our study were third year university students who studied English intensively for four semesters. In contrast, AlSaif (2011) concluded that Saudi EFL university students know an average of 2628.57 words by the end of their second year. The higher estimate of the vocabulary size of Saudi EFL university students

in AlSaif (2011) might be interpreted as a result of the vocabulary size test he employed. The current study measures the learners' vocabulary knowledge of the most frequent 3,000 words presented to them in their textbooks. On the other hand, AlSaif (2011) uses a yes/no test designed to measure the vocabulary size out of the 5,000 most frequent words in English. Such test format might have overestimated the vocabulary knowledge of AlSaif (2011) participants.

### ***What is the effect of word class on vocabulary learning?***

The mean scores for each part of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, and adjectives) show that adjectives are the most known followed by nouns then verbs. This seems to contradict the existing views and findings of Horst & Meara (1999) and Alharthi (2014). A possible reason for this finding might be that the distribution of correct answers in one or more word classes is not normal and, therefore, the mean correct scores are not the right indicators of central tendency for the scores of the words from one or more word class. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk normality tests as well as histograms and Q-Q plots revealed that scores for verbs and adjectives in the vocabulary test were not normally distributed. Table 2 displays the median scores for each part of speech.

Part of speech	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Nouns	46.47	44.44	18.96
Verbs	43.52	36.11	25.39
Adjectives	52.77	47.22	23.99

**Table 2: mean and median scores for each part of speech**

As shown in table 2, the median scores still suggest that adjectives are the most known by our participants followed by nouns and by verbs. In addition, the unequal distribution of parts of speech in the RVT might also explain the order of the most known part of speech that we have obtained in the current study. Table 7 below summarizes the results of the RVT mean scores for each part of speech in each frequency band as well as the number of words for each part of speech in each frequency band and in total:

The lack of equal presentation of different parts of speech in the vocabulary test might give more chances for error in nouns than in the remaining parts of speech. For example, the test has 12 nouns and 3 adjectives from the first 1,000 frequency band. If participants respond correctly to only one adjective, they score 33.33% in adjectives from the first 1,000 frequency level. On the other hand, participants have to know 4 nouns to achieve the same score. However, for this explanation to make sense, verbs should be the most

known part of speech, not adjectives, since only 9 verbs were tested in the RVT. It could be argued that 9 items would be insufficient for testing word knowledge of a certain part of speech, and vocabulary size tests should include a bigger number to test the vocabulary knowledge of that part of speech. In addition, the researcher thought of the possibility that the textbooks under investigation might have offered more adjectives than the other word classes. In order to find out the number of each part of speech in these textbooks, the researcher tried tagging the word lists from the textbooks with CLAWS4. The analysis showed that the textbooks' wordlists together consist of about 53.84% nouns, 33.45% verbs, and 12.73% adjectives. This finding does not explain the vocabulary test results. Based on the percentage of each part of speech that the textbooks offer, the order of most known words based on part of speech should be in the following order: nouns, verbs, and then adjectives. The present findings are in line with Laufer's (1997) alternative argument that part of speech has no clear effect on learnability.

Part of speech	Number of items		Frequency band	Mean	Std. Deviation
	All levels	Each level			
Nouns	33	12	1000	62.04	28.77
		12	2000	47.22	29.21
		9	3000	34.26	32.47
Verbs	9	3	1000	62.97	32.64
		3	2000	43.52	32.68
		3	3000	22.22	28.73
Adjectives	16	4	1000	80.56	25.44
		6	2000	52.32	35.67
		6	3000	35.65	32.41

**Table 3: mean scores percentage for each part of speech and word frequency**

***How much vocabulary do the EFL textbooks under investigation offer? What is the frequency and coverage distribution of these words?***

The analysis of each textbook separately shows the lack of sufficient presentation of the 2,000 most frequent words in English. The cross check of the first textbook, namely, Nelson (1986) Elementary Vocabulary, with Vocabprofile BNC-20 shows that there are 1116 tokens or 760 word families from the BNC. Only 544 tokens or 304 word families are from the first 1,000 frequency band while 280 tokens or 215 word families are from the second 1,000 frequency band. The distribution of words along the remaining frequency bands decreases. For example, there are 141 tokens or 115 word



families from the third 1,000 frequency band while there are only 38 tokens or 35 word families from the fifth frequency band. In sum, the number of words presented in the first textbook from the 2,000 most frequent words is 824 tokens or 519 word families which together have a cumulative percentage of 73.84% out of the 20 most frequent 1,000 BNC bands.

Milton (2009, p. 207) suggests that offering a large amount of vocabulary in textbooks would enable learners to learn more vocabulary autonomously because it appears that the “more vocabulary that is presented in course books, the more vocabulary learners seem to acquire. Learners do not appear to get overloaded in this area of acquisition”. Clearly, both the amount and frequency selection of vocabulary offered to our participants are not adequate and fall way behind the suggested figure by Nation (2001). The first book is designed as an elementary-proficiency textbook; however, this does not justify the presentation of about 41.2% of the 2,000 most frequent words which as a result might not help learners achieve adequate comprehension.

The examination of the second textbook, Nelson (1986) *Intermediate Vocabulary*, shows similar results. The total number of words in the second textbook is 1263 tokens or 1006 word families. Strikingly, only 367 tokens or 251 word families are from the first 1,000 frequency band while only 273 tokens or 204 word families are from the second 1,000 frequency band. In total, a dismaying figure of 640 tokens or 455 word families from the 2,000 most frequent words in English are presented in the first textbook. The presentation of the 2,000 most frequent English words in the second textbook, which claims to be targeting intermediate-proficiency learners, is also extremely insufficient. Only 32% of the 2,000 most frequent words are covered, a percentage which is even lower than the one in the first textbook. Similar to the first textbook, the distribution of the words in the remaining frequency bands decreases for each less frequent band.

Merging the lexical input of both textbooks into one file and cross-checking it with the Vocabprofiler BNC-20 gives a complete picture of the amount of vocabulary these textbooks offer. The examination of the textbooks under investigation revealed that these textbooks offer an amount of 2379 tokens or 1493 word families. More specifically, taken together these textbooks offer 1464 tokens or 782 word families from the 2,000 most frequent words. Moreover, the textbooks include only 344 tokens or 257 word families from the third 1,000 frequency band. To draw a conclusion based on the test scores, there seems to be a direct impact of the presentation of new words and

selection based on frequency bands. In relation to the most frequent 3,000 words, the percentage of vocabulary presented to our participants in their textbooks is 38.29% from the first 1,000 frequency level while 23.25% and 14.46% words are presented from the second and third 1,000 frequency bands, respectively. The frequency distribution in these textbooks might be responsible for the pattern we have concluded above, where most known words come from the first 1,000 most frequent band. The examination of the textbooks shows that the Saudi EFL students at KAU might not have enough vocabulary presented to them. It is possible to conclude that these textbooks are not appropriate for this level of English students and would not enable them to have a sufficient comprehension of written text. Moreover, the two textbooks have 75 classroom teaching hours during the first year which means students need to learn 31.72 words per hour in order to learn all the words in the textbooks. This might well be another possible cause for the apparently low vocabulary knowledge of our participants. There should be more time allotted for vocabulary learning which may provide more chances of learning.

***How much vocabulary recycling is in the EFL textbooks? What is the effect of recycling on vocabulary learning?***

In order to investigate the recycling of the textbooks under investigation, the researcher copied the vocabulary of each textbook and inserted it into the programme Text-Lex Compare, which is available on the Compleat Lexical Tutor website (Cobb, 2009). Text-Lex Compare calculates recycling by counting the number of word repetitions in one text file as well as processing two text files at the same time. The mean percentage of the repeated words that are shared in the two textbooks is 22.09% with 279 tokens which have been repeated more than once. In total, the compound amount of recycled words which occur in both textbooks and occur only in one of the textbooks is 469 out of 2379 tokens, none of which are from our test items. Therefore, we cannot run a statistical analysis to measure the correlation between recycling and correct test answers. However, in a recent study, AlSaif (2011) found a positive correlation (0.590) between recycling and learnability, which supports the hypothesis that the more a word is encountered in a textbook; the more likely it is to be learned. Therefore, the lack of recycling in the textbooks might explain our participants' poor achievement scores in the vocabulary test.

***Is there a significant relationship between frequency, recycling and word class and the participants' achievement scores in word knowledge?***

As it has been mentioned earlier, the examination of the textbooks under investigation shows the absence of recycling any test item. Therefore, it is not possible to investigate the effect of recycling on vocabulary learnability. Consequently, we carried out analyses to examine the impact of frequency and part of speech on learnability. There was only a negative correlation between the participants' test scores and frequency, ( $r = -0.595$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), which is expected since the less frequent a word is, the harder it is to be learned. We can conclude, based on these results that frequency stands out as the only factor affecting the learnability of vocabulary. The remaining difficulty factors, such as part of speech, and recycling, have no clear impact on the level to which a word becomes easier or harder to learn.

## **Conclusion**

Measuring the Saudi EFL learners' vocabulary size reveals similar findings compared to previous studies (Al-Hazemi, 1993; AlSaif, 2011). The vocabulary size of our participants is around 1447 words out of the most frequent 3,000 words. Frequency alone shows a statistically significant effect on words learned, whereas part of speech and recycling do not have a significant impact. There is a significant correlation between frequency and test scores. This is predicted since frequent words are easier to learn while infrequent words are not. In general, frequency accounts for 35.4% of test scores variance.

The examination of the vocabulary textbooks reveals the lack of sufficient lexical input. The two textbooks offer 1493 word families in total, around half that number come from the 2,000 most frequent words, an even smaller number of words in less frequent bands. In addition, recycling is almost absent in these textbooks because only 19.71% of words have been recycled. In fact, not one word from the vocabulary test was among recycled words which did not enable us to run a further investigation of the effect of recycling on learnability. To conclude, the findings of this study are in agreement with Milton's (2009), where only frequency shows a clear effect on vocabulary learning difficulty.

## References

- Saad Al-Akloby** (2001). *Teaching and learning English vocabulary in Saudi Arabian public schools. An exploratory study of some possible reasons behind students' failure to learn English vocabulary*. University of Essex, Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Hassan Al-Hazemi** (1993). *Low-level EFL vocabulary tests for Arabic speakers*. University College of Swansea, Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Thamer Alharthi** (2014). The impact of attrition on vocabulary knowledge among Saudi teachers. In *English Language Teaching*, 7(4), 111-118.
- Abdullah AlSaif** (2011). *Investigating Vocabulary Input and Explaining Vocabulary Uptake among EFL Learners in Saudi Arabia*. Swansea University, Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Tom Cobb** (2009). *The Complete Lexical Tutor (Version 6.2)*. [Computer software]. Retrieved 14.7.2012, from <http://www.lex tutor.ca/>
- Marlise Horst & Paul Meara** (1999). Test of a model for predicting second language lexical growth through reading. In *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 56(2), 308-328.
- Batia Laufer (ed.)** (1997). *What's in a word that makes it hard or easy: Some intralexical factors that affect the learning of words*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Richard O'Loughlin** (2012). Tuning into vocabulary frequency in coursebooks. In *RELC*, 43, (2), 255-269.
- James Milton** (2007). Lexical profiles, learning styles and the construct validity of lexical size tests. In M. Daller, J. Milton & J. Treffers-Daller (eds.), *Modelling and assessing vocabulary knowledge*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 47-58.
- James Milton** (2009). *Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Paul Nation** (2001). *Vocabulary learning in another language*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Thomas B.J. Nelson** (1986). *Elementary Vocabulary*. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd: Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.
- Thomas B.J. Nelson** (1986). *Intermediate Vocabulary*. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd: Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.
- Norbert Schmitt** (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Norbert Schmitt** (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, UK.
- Norbert Schmitt** (2014). Size and depth of vocabulary knowledge: What the research shows. In *Language Learning*, 64(4), 913-951
- David A. Wilkins** (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. Arnold: London, UK.

## 2 Softening the Boundaries: Academic Discourse Socialisation through Instruction in Japanese and English Writing

John Bankier  
*Soka University, Japan*  
johnbankier@yahoo.co.uk

### Introduction

Learning to write in an academic context does not simply mean learning a set of skills, but involves joining a community with shared concepts and practices. For those learning to write in a second language, these practices can be viewed as new and alien, or can be accepted, often by emphasising similarities rather than differences between languages. Teachers have a powerful role to play, as the ideas about writing are expressed in all of their pedagogic practices, and influence learners' views in turn. This paper describes a small qualitative study of seven Japanese learners of English. Their experiences of writing instruction in both Japanese and English were investigated through retrospective literacy history interviews (Lillis, 2008). The analysis demonstrated that participation in intensive English academic writing programmes led one group of respondents to consider English and Japanese writing practices to be similar. This allowed them to transfer skills learnt in English into Japanese. In contrast, participants without extensive instruction in English writing considered the two languages to have important differences in their textual organisation and citation practices, and did not feel able to draw upon instruction in Japanese when writing in English. As part of the broader framework of academic discourse socialisation, this study also illustrates how teachers' expectations, evaluation or feedback can foster such attitudes.

### Review of Literature

According to Duff (2010), academic discourse socialisation examines how newcomers learn to take part in a particular academic community, both orally and through writing. Newcomers learn to behave in certain ways, or are

socialised, through interactions with “peers, instructors, tutors, and others” (p. 170). Such socialisation can be both explicit and implicit, and occurs in many spaces within and without the classroom (Potts, 2005; Seloni, 2012). As academic writing is a high-stakes activity with a central role in university education (Belcher, 2013), writing has been the focus of much academic socialisation research. Instruction has an important role to play in socialisation into ways of writing, as teacher views about academic writing are represented in the tasks they set and assumptions they make about their students (Macbeth, 2006). These instructional experiences have been shown to influence future learner attitudes about how to write academically (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2009; Sasaki, 2009). Indeed, the process of academic socialisation has been described as learning how to play a “game”, the rules of which are determined by professors (Casanave, 2002; Fujioka, 2014).

Learners developing academic writing skills in a second language (L2) can face many challenges. For instance, Li and Casanave (2012) showed how non-native English speaking (NNES) writers were often categorised as deliberate plagiarists by native English speaking (NES) teachers, even though such plagiarism had been unintentional. Studies by Macbeth (2006, 2010) showed how NES teachers take for granted their cultural knowledge of academic discourse. These cultural assumptions can lead NNES learners to misinterpret writing assignments and to take model essays as “a right answer” rather than as an example (Macbeth, 2010, p. 33). Thus, obstacles can be related to conflicts or confusion between learner and teacher concepts of what written academic discourse consists of.

Research on Japanese learners has investigated both the process of developing academic writing skills and the role of past instructional experiences, although it has not typically used terms like “academic discourse socialisation”. In particular, studies by Hiroe Kobayashi and Carol Rinnert have illuminated many aspects of this process. Rinnert and Kobayashi (2009) summarise 12 of these studies published from 1984 to 2007, grouped into three stages. Stage One focused on experiences of English writing, and suggested that L2 writing experience leads NNES readers’ “perceptions of English essays [to] change gradually from preferring L1 [first language] writing features to preferring many of those of L2 writing” (p. 27). Stage Two consisted of large-scale surveys to better understand L1 writing instruction. These revealed that considerably more time was spent instructing in reading than writing in high school Japanese classes; however, many students were being instructed in writing for entrance examinations outside of regular classes. At university, respondents

mentioned a “strong need” for instruction in citation of sources in L1 academic writing (p. 30). A second important finding was that L1 writing instruction encourages “rhetorical conventions similar to those of English opinion-writing” (p. 30). Stage Three consisted of in-depth case studies of individual or small groups of Japanese learners to investigate a wide variety of L2 writing experience both in Japan and through study abroad. Positive transfer from L1 to L2 was shown, in which learners made use of features of Japanese writing to help their writing in English, mirroring findings by Kubota (1998). In addition, when L1 and L2 writing were understood to share common features, students with experience in both L1 and L2 were able to use their English writing skills to help their Japanese writing. Thus, some learners made use of bidirectional transfer (Uysal, 2008) to good effect.

These findings were confirmed by Kobayashi and Rinnert (2013a), in which their participant was able to merge her writing knowledge in L1 and L2 only when she began to perceive the two languages as similar. Kobayashi and Rinnert link this to the concept of soft and hard boundaries between languages (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011). When boundaries are considered “hard”, languages are separate, and knowledge about writing learnt in L1 cannot be applied in L2, for instance. In contrast, when boundaries are considered “soft”, knowledge about writing forms “a single overlapping system” (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013b, p. 442).

Academic discourse socialisation adds a focus on explicit and implicit socialisation practices to the study of English academic writing in Japan. Research described above has provided invaluable insights by showing how types and amounts of experience may lead to different concepts about L1/L2 writing in learners. However, writing is not about learning a set of skills, but about “participatory practice” (Casanave, 2008, p. 16). Most studies have not highlighted the role of interactions between teacher and student in developing these concepts. Therefore, the study described in this paper investigated the academic discourse socialisation of seven Japanese learners of English, comparing their instructional experiences in the L1 and L2. Through these experiences, their concept of soft and hard boundaries between L1 and L2 discourse communities was explored.

## Research Questions

- How have Japanese learners of English been socialised into writing practices in their first language?

- How have these learners been socialised into writing practices in English?
- Do these learners believe that Japanese and English writing practices belong to the same or different academic discourse communities?

## Methods

### *Participants*

Pseudonym	High school	University	Highest education	Japanese writing instruction	English writing instruction
Chihiro	1990s	1990s	Master's	Very little	Extensive: High school, postgraduate
Maya	1990s	1990s	Two Master's (Japan and UK)	Very little	Little: University
Mio	2000s	2000s	University (nursing school)	Very little	Little: IELTS preparation
Yurina	2000s	2010s	University (recent graduate)	Quite extensive: Junior/senior high school	Little or none
Hiroshi	2010s	2010s	University (1st year)	Little: junior/senior high school	Extensive: University
Kazumi	2010s	2010s	University (1st year)	Very little	Extensive : University
Umeko	2010s	2010s	University (2nd year)	Extensive: Elementary school to university	Extensive: University

**Table 1: Interview participants**

Participants were solicited from 71 Japanese learners of English who had responded to an online questionnaire in a previous study (Bankier, 2014). These 71 had been drawn from current students and alumni of four institutions in Japan: a university, a foreign language college, an English conversation school, and a study-abroad preparatory school, the latter three at which the author had previously been employed. Questionnaire



respondents had been given the opportunity to elect to participate in further research, eight of whom were contacted and asked to take part. The eight were chosen to provide a wide range of ages, education and experience of Japanese and English writing. Seven were available to be interviewed. Table 1 summarizes the participants' backgrounds, showing that their academic enrolment spanned two decades, from ongoing undergraduate to completed postgraduate.

### ***Design and Procedure***

Semi-structured interviews of one hour were conducted predominantly in English (6) or in Japanese (1, Mio) by the author, based on interviewee preference. Although the focus of the study was on the participants' own emic descriptions, samples of their English and Japanese writing were used to provide "talking points" during interviews. To provide a fresh experience of Japanese academic writing, respondents were also asked to write a short essay of 700-1500 Japanese characters, equivalent to around 400-700 English words, on the below question:

Communication in the modern era has changed greatly, and we tend to use email or telephone more than writing letters. In the same way, we also rely more and more on information from the Internet and TV. Therefore, some people argue that it is less important than in the past to teach writing. Do you think we should continue to teach writing in schools? [translated]

The interview was conceived as a "literacy history" (Lillis, 2008, p. 356), in which the researcher elicits an autobiographical account of academic literacy learning to better understand current beliefs and perspectives within the particular individual context. Interviews followed a set of questions, but participants were asked to elaborate on issues outside the original questions. The interview consisted of three parts. In the first, participants were asked about the writing instruction they received in Japanese and English from elementary school to university. Secondly, they were asked to describe good writing in both languages, and to speculate about how similar or different English and Japanese writing were. In the third part of the interview, participants explained the knowledge they had drawn on when writing assignments and were encouraged to identify influences from L1 and L2 instruction.

### ***Data Analysis***

Interviews were transcribed in their entirety. The data were then coded and analysed based on procedures in Hatch (2002) and Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005). Firstly, the transcripts were read through to identify recurring themes,

including *teachers*, *feedback*, and features of academic discourse with sub-codes such as *overall text organisation*, *sources and references* and *sentence-level expression*. The themes were identified based on their frequency and salience. Further themes included those brought up by interview questions, such as *elementary school*, *high school* and *university*. The transcripts were then coded based on this list of themes, with some codes omitted or re-categorised as sub-codes after several periods of re-analysis. Frequency counts of the codes were then compiled to obtain a general picture of the most common themes. Additionally, a narrative summary of each interview was written, consisting of a paragraph for each of the main interview themes, such as “Experience in elementary school”. Finally, data from all seven participants were compared to draw parallels between similar concepts of academic discourse and similar experiences, leading to the identification of two groups who shared both a similar concept of boundaries between academic discourse communities and a similar amount of writing-focused English instruction.

## Results and Discussion

Although the interviewees’ academic experiences were varied, analysis of the data revealed two groupings based on the extent to which they identified differences in the L1 and L2 discourse communities. Specifically, one group did not identify strongly with English discourse practices and characterised them as “different” from Japanese. In contrast, the second group identified strongly with English, and downplayed any differences. The similarities and differences both between and within the groups will now be described with reference to interview data.

### ***Group H: “It’s totally different.”***

The first group consisted of Maya, Mio and Yurina. All had received little direct English academic writing instruction. They describe their English experience as primarily “just sentences... short paragraphs” (Maya), or as grammar-based textbook exercises; “We had a textbook... and we answered the question. And last we write a little sentence” (Yurina). Although Maya studied her Masters overseas and received help in content and citation practices from her supervisor in writing her thesis, she did not attend an EAP writing class except for a short course to prepare for the IELTS test. Miho also attended a similar course.

Their experiences writing in Japanese were more varied. Although all were instructed by their high school Japanese writing teachers to write in a particular organisational style, neither Maya nor Mio considered this to be preparing them for university; Maya says that she had “very little experience to learn how to write in Japanese” and that preparation for university entrance exams was the purpose of the class, echoed by Mio who says the main goal was to pass tests. In contrast, Yurina explains how she was taught “to write a good sentence, a fascinating sentence” in high school, while at university she was taught an organisational essay pattern known as *mondai-teiki*, similar to a problem-solution pattern; she was later able to make use of these skills in her Japanese writing at university.

Group H were brought together by their emphasis on differences between Japanese and English written academic discourse, identifying a number of different features. Firstly, the group thought that lack of a strong initial statement of purpose was a feature of Japanese academic writing, a contrast to English. Based on her experience of postgraduate study in Japan and the UK, Maya believes Japanese writing is “totally different from English writing.” Japanese writing begins with “some cause, background or situation”, followed by a sequence of explanations. Although she views logic in English and Japanese as fundamentally similar, “There is a big difference [in] how to express or how to write.” She adds, “In my image, English writing is most focused on the conclusion. Or the result... Japanese writing or Japanese expressions focus on the process, not only the results.” Similarly, Mio describes Japanese style as “saying what you wanted to say at the end” (translation), in which it is often necessary to read a whole paragraph to understand its main point. For Yurina, English writing requires the writer to state an opinion or solution to a problem first, whereas the Japanese *mondai-teiki* style allows the opinion to be given later, with the introduction stating a situation or background (*mondai* meaning problem in Japanese).

Secondly, Maya compares use of sources in English and Japanese. She explains that Japanese academic writing, particularly at the graduate level, requires fewer citations; “Japanese Master’s students have to refer to some other sources, but still we can insist something more strongly.” In contrast, “Master’s dissertations in English are not written by specialists, that’s why we have to refer ... from other papers or sources.” Thus, Japanese written discourse is considered to be more original.

When asked about their own L1/L2 writing, Group H describe the newness of English writing when compared to their Japanese experience. Maya describes her first experience of English writing thus:

I think in English we have to explain something in a different way. So, at first we have to express something, our main points, and we have to supplement with other information. At the time, I did not know how to do it. (Interview, February 13, 2013)

When asked to comment on how she wrote her English essays, Mio describes the experience as something that she had not done before, a completely different way of writing.

When discussing the essays they had been asked to write in Japanese and their previous written assignments, the three respondents refer only to what they had learnt in L1 classes. Yurina says that she knows “only that [*mondai-teiki*] style”. Interestingly, Mio does notice that she had used what she views as an English style when writing the Japanese essay written for the interview:

**Researcher:** Let’s talk about this essay. How did you structure it?

**Mio:** Introduction, body, conclusion. Recently I haven’t written these kinds of longer essays in Japanese. But recently I’ve been learning English, so in terms of the Japanese way of writing it’s a little bit strange. Some parts aren’t very good.

**Researcher:** So this is like an English essay?

**Mio:** Yes. (Interview [translated], June 12, 2013)

Although Mio was not able to explain what she meant by “some parts”, this illustrates that, even when L2 to L1 transfer does occur, it can be viewed as an error.

Therefore, Group H viewed boundaries between Japanese and English discourse communities as “hard” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011), in which socialisation into a new discourse community required effort to learn new organisational practices and other expectations. However, none claimed to have been taught this distinction, but had inferred it from experience: Maya, for instance, from reading a large amount in L1 and L2 as part of her postgraduate study, and Yurina from comparing Japanese to the English texts she had read for TOEIC test preparation.

### ***Group S: “It’s the same.”***

The second group consisted of Chihiro, Hiroshi, Umeko and Kazumi. As with the first, this group was unified by experience of English instruction and

views on boundaries between academic discourse communities. Most of Group S also had not been taught English writing in high school; as Hiroshi says, “The English in high school is called ‘passing exam English’.” Chihiro is the exception, as she attended a “special school for learning foreign language” and wrote short English essays for two years in high school.

In higher education, Group S’s experiences in English were extensive. Hiroshi, Kazumi and Umeko enrolled in different year-long intensive EAP programmes with a focus on academic writing at a university in Tokyo. Likewise, while Chihiro “didn’t have much practices for [English] writing” during her undergraduate degree, she was “forced to study in Australia to get a Master’s degree” as a requirement of her job as a high school English teacher. She participated in a demanding three-month course in academic skills with a focus on academic writing, followed by her Master’s.

Like Group H, Group S’s experiences of Japanese writing varied considerably. Kazumi describes writing some book reports, but sums up her experience as “basically nothing.” Hiroshi is also clear that he had not been explicitly taught written organisation in his first language:

Probably so the very basic things I learned in the Japanese class. But it’s unlike what we’re doing in university English class. How should I organize the essays - at the university I have to make an introduction, body paragraph, and conclusion. This kind of thing I’m not told [in my Japanese classes].  
(Interview, July 26, 2013)

Similarly, Chihiro states, “We didn’t learn what is called the academic writing that would be used for when I moved to university.”

Umeko’s experience stands in contrast to the other interviewees; she was given advice by her Japanese teacher about signal phrases and conjunctions even in elementary school. In junior high, she wrote a reflection paper on her school trip to the UK in which it was necessary to do research and follow a structure, an introduction and body paragraphs, “like essay style.” In university, her Japanese teacher gave her advice about adding quotations and a reference list.

Group S make explicit mention of transfer of writing knowledge. In explaining the process she went through to write her Japanese essay, Chihiro states that it was “training in English” that influenced her organisational choices, adding, “The teachers that really asked me to write in this way were native English teachers.” Kazuko describes her Japanese essay as “this

semester's product", referring to what she had learnt in her EAP class. Similarly, Hiroshi explains how he noticed some features he was taught in his EAP class in Japanese written texts; "After I read the books, I realize the books is organized like academic writing, with a thesis statement, body, or conclusion." Umeko is the only respondent of either group who has received intensive and long-term (a year or more) L1 and L2 writing instruction. Of L2 to L1 transfer: "I didn't know how to include any thesis statements before I took the EAP class. So after I took the EAP class I try to include the thesis statements in Japanese." She is not able to identify L1 to L2 transfer, however, as her initial "struggle" with English writing was dominated by grammatical and vocabulary issues, such as conjunctions and subordination.

Thus, in terms of their concept of academic discourse, Group S viewed the boundaries between Japanese and English as "soft" (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011), in which practices learned in one language could be applied to another (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013a). These four interviewees thought Japanese and English written academic discourse was basically equivalent. For instance, Chihiro says, "I think it's the same, especially in academic writing. In both cases, in Japanese and English, I need to write in a pretty organized way." She describes this as, "It starts from the introduction, reason 1, 2, 3 and conclusion. That was the way we wrote in English so I found that maybe in Japanese I also needed to write in that way." This interpretation is echoed by Umeko, who says that academic writing in both languages should comprise an introduction with a thesis statement, "body 1, 2, 3" and a conclusion. This style of writing, beginning with a strong statement of purpose and supporting it, accords with the description of English writing given by Group H, but not with their description of good writing in Japanese.

Similarly, uses of citations and referencing were described as similar across languages. For instance, Umeko lists similarities between Japanese and English to include "how to quotes, how to put a reference list, or like trying to avoid *I* or *He* or *She*, or such vague words." Like Maya, Chihiro is initially surprised by the amount of citations needed in her English academic writing whilst studying abroad:

I wrote an essay and sent it to my teacher, but in her feedback to my essay she said that 'How come you can say in this way?', or 'You need to have citations in every part.' That was my first surprise. Sometimes I think that this is just the normal way to think for everybody. But in an academic writing we need to be really specific, and if we say something we need to show who has said that, and is there any evidence. (Interview, March 10, 2013)

However, her response is different from Maya, as Chihiro's belief is that citations are "the same between Japanese and English", in both quantity and purpose. Thus, Group S emphasise similarities rather than differences.

As shown above, the two groups are differentiated by how they view written academic discourse across cultures. For Group H, Japanese and English have separate literacy practices, while Group S views the experience of socialisation as akin to joining a single academic discourse community. In the final section of the paper, the ways that the interviewees' Japanese and NES writing teachers socialised them into the discourse practices of their respective communities will be contrasted.

### ***Written Academic Discourse Socialisation in Japanese and English***

For most participants of both groups, the role of the teacher in Japanese writing classes is not to impose a way of writing. Kazumi describes her high school writing as "Just hand in. It is not for a grade." Japanese teachers may not have time to give feedback to large classes; "A lot of students are taking in [my freshman undergraduate Japanese writing class] so I couldn't get any feedback" (Hiroshi). In writing her nursing college graduation dissertation, Mio was given a general outline, but from then on was required to write without feedback from professors.

Japanese teachers "had some expectations" (Chihiro), but these were rarely explicated through models of writing. Despite enrolling in an elective Japanese writing class to prepare for her university application, Chihiro felt compelled to seek material of her own:

I could find by myself from the Internet or in books, or when we go to the bookstore there are books about how to write essays in Japanese. And there are so many examples of writing in Japanese. 'If you write in this way you can get a higher score', or something like that. (Interview, March 10, 2013)

Maya echoes this; "[At university], if I wanted to learn how to write Japanese correctly, I had to buy some books or search the information on the Internet."

A common thread for most was the focus in Japanese writing classes on sentence-level language use combined with free, personal expression. As Chihiro explains:

I didn't think that [my Japanese writing teachers] taught me a lot about the structure, but rather they were interested in what was interesting in this story

or what was impressive for me... The story was more important rather than writing in organized or well-written Japanese. (Interview, March 10, 2013)

Overall, the interviewees use phrases suggesting a number of possible choices for writers, such as “be interested in”, “be important to”, or Yurina’s comment that “there are many structures that we can learn.”

In contrast, the NES teachers of Group S’s intensive EAP classes were considerably more “hands on”. Their activities included providing a proscribed essay structure, explicit feedback and evaluation. In terms of writing structure, Chihiro explains how her high school NES teacher made her follow a particular essay pattern:

It seemed she almost forced us to write in that way... Even if we are writing really higher level English, and if we used difficult words, it didn’t matter... it was just how essays were structured, that was her point. So I found that to get the higher score, a higher grade in the class, I really needed to follow what she asked me to do. (Interview, March 10, 2013)

Hiroshi’s comments are very similar; “At first I was confused because the evaluation was how can I organise the essay. So of course the grammar is necessary, but most of what the instructor focused on was organising.” Indeed, all participants in Group S are clear that there was only one appropriate response to teacher feedback: to follow it. Disregarding such teacher comments would lead to a significant reduction in their grade for the assignment.

In describing instruction from NES teachers, the interviewees make use of words and phrases about obligation, such as “have to”, “be forced to” and “need to”, exemplified by Kazuko; “I have to make three reasons, and more detail. And don’t go off-topic.”

## Conclusions

Although the respondents in this study who participated in intensive EAP writing programmes found the initial socialisation experience to be new and different, by the end of their instruction they viewed academic writing as a single discourse community with shared features that they strongly identified with. In contrast, those respondents whose experience did not include intensive EAP writing instruction considered Japanese and English academic discourse communities to be separate, and stressed the disparities in features.



Therefore, this study suggests that intensive EAP instruction, with its use of explicit feedback and grading geared towards an “enforced” socialisation, encourages learners to identify strongly with the English academic discourse as “the right way to write”; contrastively, Japanese instruction appears less proscriptive.

It is noteworthy that it was instruction, and not experience that appeared to foster the differing views. For instance, Maya and Chihiro both had extensive experience in L1/L2 writing, yet held opposing views. Group S’s strong identification with L2 writing may be a reaction to the type of instruction they received. For newcomers to discourse communities, particularly second language speakers, the experience can be disempowering (Leki, 2001; Morita, 2004). I would suggest that the participants in Group S were faced with the choice of resistance (Norton & Toohey, 2011) to socialisation or acceptance of it. Claiming that the two languages were the same allowed the learners to take back the power they would otherwise have lost through the socialisation process. Instead of students being made to learn, these respondents were invested in an “imagined community” (Norton & Toohey, 2011) of written academic discourse, which had an empowering practical value as it spanned both Japanese and English.

For teachers of EAP writing, imposing certain practices of an “EAP discourse community” may have the benefit of fostering an inclusionary attitude to writing skills, allowing beneficial transfer across languages (Gentil, 2011; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2009; Morita, 2004). However, discourse communities are not homogenous and vary a great deal across disciplines (Duff, 2007; Hyland, 2013). Teachers should be aware and should make learners aware that the academic discourse community into which they are being socialised is not the academic discourse community, but rather is one of many possible communities (Duff, 2010), the literacy practices of which may differ markedly.

This study was limited by its retrospective nature, as while the literacy history approach allowed for a wide picture, it did not capture the full social context and was limited by recall. In addition, it is important for future research to include the views of the teachers in both languages to illuminate their views of the writing they teach. Therefore, future research in Japan could benefit from long-term ethnographic methods (Seloni, 2012) to capture the process of academic socialisation in situ and in process.

## References

- John Bankier** (2014). Experiences of Japanese writing instruction: Beliefs about rhetorical organization. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (eds.), *JALT2013 Conference Proceedings*. JALT, Tokyo, Japan.
- Diane Belcher** (2013). The scope of L2 writing: Why we need a wider lens. In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 22, pp438-439.
- Christine P. Casanave** (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, USA.
- Christine P. Casanave** (2008). Learning participatory practices in graduate school: Some perspective-taking by a mainstream educator. In C.P. Casanave & X. Li (eds.), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation*. University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, USA.
- Jasone Cenoz & Durk Gorter** (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. In *The Modern Language Journal*, vol 95 3, pp356–369.
- Patricia A. Duff** (2007). Problematising academic discourse socialisation. In H. Marriot, T. Moore & R. Spence-Brown (eds.), *Learning discourses and the discourses of learning*. Monash University Press: Victoria, Australia.
- Patricia A. Duff** (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol 30 1, pp169-192.
- Rod Ellis & Gary P. Barkhuizen** (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- Mayumi Fujioka** (2014). L2 student–US professor interactions through disciplinary writing assignments: An activity theory perspective. In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 25, pp40-58.
- Guillaume Gentil** (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 20, pp6–23.
- Amos J. Hatch** (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. SUNY Press: New York, USA.
- Ken Hyland** (2013). Writing in the university: education, knowledge and reputation. In *Language Teaching*, vol 46 1, pp53-70.
- Hiroe Kobayashi & Carol Rinnert** (2013a). L1/L2/L3 writing development: Longitudinal case study of a Japanese multicompetent writer. In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 22 1, pp4-33.
- Hiroe Kobayashi & Carol Rinnert** (2013b). Second language writing: Is it a separate entity? In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 22 4, pp442-443.
- Ryoka Kubota** (1998). An investigation of L1–L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 7, pp69–100.
- Ilona Leki** (2001). “A narrow thinking system”: Non-English-speaking students in group projects across the curriculum. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 35, pp39–67.
- Yongyan Li & Christine P. Casanave** (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 21 2, pp165-180.
- Theresa Lillis** (2008). Ethnography as method, methodology, and “Deep Theorizing” closing the gap between text and context in academic writing research. In *Written Communication*, vol 25 3, pp353-388.

- Karen P. Macbeth** (2006). Diverse, unforeseen, and quaint difficulties: The sensible responses of novices learning to follow instructions in academic writing. In *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol 41, pp180–197
- Karen P. Macbeth** (2010). Deliberate false provisions: The use and usefulness of models in learning academic writing. In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 19 1, pp33–48.
- Naoko Morita** (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 38 4, pp573–603.
- Bonny Norton & Kelleen Toohey** (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. In *Language Teaching*, vol 44 4, pp412–446.
- Diane Potts** (2005). Pedagogy, purpose, and the second language learner in on-line communities. In *Canadian Modern Language Review*, vol 62, pp137–160.
- Paul Prior** (1998). *Writing disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, USA.
- Carol Rinnert & Hiroe Kobayashi** (2009). Situated writing practices in foreign language settings: The role of previous experience and instruction. In R. Manchon (ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research*. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK.
- Miyuki Sasaki** (2009). Changes in EFL students' writing over 3.5 years: A sociocognitive account. In R. Manchon (ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research*. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK.
- Lisya Seloni** (2012). Academic literacy socialization of first year doctoral students in US: A micro-ethnographic perspective. In *English for Specific Purposes*, vol 31 1, pp47–59.
- Hacer Hande Uysal** (2008). Tracing the culture behind writing: Rhetorical patterns and bidirectional transfer in L1 and L2 essays of Turkish writers in relation to educational context. In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 17 3, pp183–207.



# 3 Lexical Semantics of English Loanwords in Japanese

Keith Barrs  
keithbarrs@hotmail.com

## Introduction

The Japanese language is home to tens of thousands of English loanwords, many having become fully integrated and frequent parts of the general Japanese language. Japan's largely welcoming attitude towards these loanwords means they are encountered frequently throughout society, from words on shop signs, to phrases on clothing, to messages on product packaging. Many fill lexical gaps opened up in the Meiji period with Japan's efforts to modernise and globalise (e.g. エンジン, *enjin*, engine), while others sit alongside semantic near-equivalent terms in the Sino-Japanese lexicon, and fulfil more pragmatic purposes within the language (e.g. ピーチ *pīchi*, peach, with its semantic near-equivalent 桃, *momo*, peach). In the former case, the words have been given the label 'catachrestic innovations', meaning loanwords which "introduce a new concept into the language" (Onysko & Winter-Froemel, 2011, p. 1555). In the latter case, they are known as 'non-catachrestic innovations, or loanwords "characterized by the existence of a semantic near-equivalent"' (2011, p. 1555).

Focusing on non-catachrestic English loanwords, a question arises as to their function within the language compared to the semantic near-equivalent term. Modern corpus tools, in particular the Sketch Engine corpus query system, allow these functions to be empirically researched. The 'sketch-diff' function of the Sketch Engine corpus query system compares two 'word sketches', defined as "one-page automatic, corpus-based summaries of a word's grammatical and collocational behaviour" (Kilgarriff, Rychly, Smrz, & Tugwell, 2004). Sketches of two near-synonyms (i.e. a loanword and its semantic near-equivalent term) can be compared to identify and visualise where similarities and differences lie in the behaviour of the words within the corpus. These corpus-based lexicographic findings have theoretical importance in illuminating the motivations behind the borrowing of non-catachrestic loanwords, and practical importance in helping language learners to disambiguate between two seemingly near-equivalent words.

In order to conduct such a sketch-diff study, a suitable list of non-catachrestic loanwords and their accompanying semantic near-equivalents needs to be prepared. Whilst a model exists for how to do this with anglicisms in German (Onysko & Winter-Froemel, 2011), there was no such previous study in the Japanese context. The study described here involved the extraction, filtering, and preparation of a list of suitable non-catachrestic English loanwords for analysis within the sketch-diff function of the Sketch Engine. It discusses the selection of a suitable resource of loanwords, the extraction of the individual items, the various stages of filtering, and the selection of semantic near-equivalents.

## **Background**

English loanwords in Japanese have been extensively researched from a number of different angles. They have been investigated in terms of their historical development within their new home (Irwin, 2011a), their sociolinguistic positioning within Japanese society (Stanlaw, 2004), their influence on the culture of Japan (Kay, 1995), their importance in English education (Daulton, 2008), and the modifications that are made into order to mould the words to the lexico-grammatical structure of Japanese (Preston & Yamagata, 2004). In this latter area, the phonological adaptations made to English loanwords have been investigated (Blair, Alan & Ingram, 2003), along with the morphological and syntactic changes that are common to many of the borrowings (Irwin, 2011b). In contrast, however, is the marked lack of empirical research in the area of the semantics and pragmatics of the English loanwords. Despite the acknowledgement that an understanding of the semantic and pragmatic nature of English loanwords in Japan is of value in areas such as education (Daulton, 2008; Inagawa, 2010; Ringbom, 2007), linguistics (Irwin, 2011a) and cultural studies (Kay, 1995; Loveday, 1996; Stanlaw, 2004), currently there is no large-scale empirical study in this area. Much of the existing literature has relied on introspective comments and observations; with researchers either briefly stating themselves how the words are variously used in the different languages, or asking a small number of research participants for their intuitions (see Daulton, 2008; Irwin, 2011; Takashi, 1990).

A notable departure from the introspective method is the research undertaken by Inagawa (2010) for a PhD thesis, summarised and published in the journal ‘Japanese Studies’ (2012). She claims it to be the “first attempt to describe the evolution of loanwords...in a systematic and informed way” (Inagawa,

2012, p. 394). She extracts a collection of loanwords from a newspaper corpus and selects several of them for in-depth analysis. With the help of two research assistants, she analyses every concordance line of the loanword to examine the meaning(s) that arise from the word in all of its contexts in the corpus. She compares this data with that for the parent word of the loanword as described in its entry in the Oxford English Dictionary, to investigate where meanings overlap and where they differ. From this comparison she is able to comment on the evolution of the loanword as it moves from the English language to Japanese, and to describe how the loanword may come to have Japan-specific usages.

Ironically, the greatest strength of this study is also its greatest weakness. Because she manually analyses every single concordance line of the loanword (sometimes this is over 400 lines) she is able to build-up an in-depth description of the meaning(s) of the loanword, but simultaneously is restricted in the number of loanwords which she can analyse. As a result, her entire study comprises the analyses of only eight loanwords. This makes it difficult to construct a general picture of the presence and behaviour of English loanwords in Japanese. If she had been able to automate part of her research, she could have combined the depth of analysis with breadth, which would have greatly enhanced the value of her findings.

## **Methodology and findings**

Using Inagawa's (2012) research as a model, but focusing on increasing the breadth of research possible when investigating loanwords individually, a study was devised that would explore the one hundred most frequent English loanwords in Japanese. The aim was to combine automated and manual methods of analysis, in order that a detailed case study could be made of each word, and the case studies could be brought together to build up a larger picture of the loanwords in general.

It was initially assumed that the first stage of the analysis would involve the relatively unproblematic extraction of one hundred loanwords from a suitable corpus, and cleaning up the list such as removing proper nouns. This list could then be taken forward for use within the sketch-diff function. However, this first stage proved to be a significantly more problematic undertaking than first planned. The following sections outline the steps taken, the problems encountered, and the methods used to overcome the problems.

### ***Finding English loanwords in Japanese***

The first step was to select a suitable resource for the extraction of loanwords. Previous studies, including Inagawa's (2012), have relied on newspaper corpora for their data (Daulton, 2008), as these have been the most accessible corpus type available in Japan (Erjavec, Erjavec, & Kilgarriff, 2008). However, newspaper corpora have been shown to be genre-specific in nature, both in terms of their content (e.g. news articles and opinion pieces) and also their linguistic style (e.g. use of the past tense) (Erjavec et al., 2008). For this study a more general picture of loanwords within Japanese society was desired. Despite concerns over the content of web corpora (Suchomel & Pomikálek, 2012), they have been shown in several studies to be a more heterogeneous source of language data than that offered by newspaper corpora (Erjavec et al., 2008). Several web corpora are available for Japanese, and are easily accessed online for low cost. Referring to the development of the JpWaC web corpus in 2007, housed within the Sketch Engine, it has been described as having "more informal and interactional material, and more diverse content" than that from a newspaper corpus, which gives a "fuller picture of current Japanese than do newspaper corpora" (Erjavec et al., 2008, p. 10). For this reason, the ten billion token jpTenTen11 web corpus, which developed out of the JpWaC, was chosen as the source of loanwords.

### ***Selecting a word list***

Because loanwords are overwhelmingly written in the katakana script, they can be easily extracted from a corpus with the help of a regular expression. The regex [ア-ン]+ was used to extract a list of 10,000 katakana strings from the jpTenTen11 corpus. The software gives several options of the type of list desired, such as word list or lemma list. To decide which was preferable, both lists were extracted and compared. It was found that a word list was more appropriate, because a loanword lemma includes all other script variants of the search term. For example, the lemma マン (from English *man*) in katakana also included hits of 万 (the counter of 10,000) and 満 (meaning *full*) in kanji which refer to different words than the katakana form. The word list option isolates only the katakana instances of the search term, so this was chosen as the method of extracting the loanwords.

### ***Filtering for only English loanwords***

Katakana is not only used for foreign words, but also for emphasis and other stylistic purposes. Therefore the list was filtered by using the unidic dictionary that tags words with their stratum within the lexicon (Sino-Japanese, native Japanese, or foreign). With reference to an English



dictionary, the list was further reduced by excluding loanwords derived from other languages.

### ***Filtering for heterographic and monosemous English loanwords***

A major problem encountered was that quite often two or more distinct words in English (e.g. road and lord) become homographs in their Japanese loanword form (e.g. ロード *rōdo*, road/lord). This is problematic for the corpus software because it is unable to isolate the specific meanings of the homographic sets. As such, the list had to be filtered to exclude any katakana homographs.

Similarly, if a single loanword has several different meanings (e.g. サービス, *sābisu*, service) then again the software will encounter difficulties in isolating the different meanings. This would make the manual analysis of the data complicated, with the output of the word sketch combining results of the grammatical and collocational behaviour of the word spread across all of its senses within the corpus. The decision was therefore made to restrict the word list to those items that were monosemous (one meaning), done by cross-referencing the word with its entries in a monolingual and loanword dictionary. The previous two processes reduced the list in size by about 80%. This was an unexpected result, but can be addressed by greatly increasing the initial size of the word list.

### ***Categorising the loanwords as catachrestic and non-catachrestic***

The final stage involved examining the loanword for the presence of semantic near-equivalent terms. This was done by combining the data from the thesaurus function of the Sketch Engine, which produces a list of similar words to the search term, with the descriptions of the entry of the search term in the monolingual and loanword dictionaries. For example, the loanword デスク (*desuku*, desk) is judged to be similar in behaviour in the corpus to the Sino-Japanese word 机 (*tsukue*, desk). Also this word appears in the dictionary entry for デスク. Therefore, 机 is considered a semantic equivalent term for デスク and makes this loanword non-catachrestic.

As previously explained, the earlier stages of filtering reduced the list of possible loanwords to categorise as catachrestic or non-catachrestic down from one hundred to twenty one. Of these, eleven were categorized as non-catachrestic and the remainder as catachrestic. This shows that only about 10% of the initial list of one hundred items was considered suitable for the next stage of analysis, using the sketch-diff function. This suggests that

possibly up to one thousand loanwords will be needed in order to produce a final list of one hundred. This dramatically increases the workload and time-scale involved with the preparatory stage of the research.

## Conclusion

This article has outlined the methodological processes and important considerations involved in producing a list of loanwords suitable for analysis within the sketch-diff function of the Sketch Engine. Rather than simply extracting one hundred common loanwords from a corpus and categorising them as catachrestic or non-catachrestic, there are several intermediary stages involved that significantly reduce the number of words on the list. This means that the initial starting number of loanwords needs to be significantly larger than the number that are to be analysed within the corpus query system. This is an important consideration to have in mind when undertaking research in this area.

## References

- Alan D. Blair & John Ingram** (2003). Learning to predict the phonological structure of English loanwords in Japanese. In *Applied Intelligence*, 19, 101-108.
- Frank E. Daulton** (2008). *Japan's Built-in Lexicon of English-based Loanwords*. Multilingual Matters Ltd: Clevedon, UK.
- Irena S. Erjavec, Tomaz Erjavec & Adam Kilgarriff** (2008). A web corpus and word sketches for Japanese. In *Journal of Natural Language Processing*, 15(2), 137-159.
- Mayuko Inagawa** (2010). *A Corpus-Driven Study of Loanwords: Synchronic and Diachronic Change of English-Derived Words in Contemporary Japanese*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Queensland.
- Mayuko Inagawa** (2012). Evolution of the English-derived word “karā” in contemporary Japanese. In *Japanese Studies*, 32(3), 377-397.
- Mark Irwin** (2011a). *Loanwords in Japanese*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.: Philadelphia, USA.
- Mark Irwin** (2011b). Mora clipping of loanwords in Japanese. In *Journal of Japanese Linguistics*, 27, 71-81.
- Gillian Kay** (1995). English loanwords in Japanese. In *World Englishes*, 14(1), 67-76.
- Adam Kilgarriff, Pavel Rychly, Pavel Smrz & David Tugwell** (2004). The Sketch Engine. In *The Proceedings of the Eleventh Euralex International Congress*, 105-116. Information Technology Research Institute: Lorient, France. Retrieved from <ftp://ftp.itri.bton.ac.uk/reports/ITRI-04-08.pdf>
- Leo Loveday** (1996). *Language Contact in Japan: A Socio-Linguistic History*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- Alexander Onysko & Esme Winter-Froemel** (2011). Necessary loans – luxury loans? Exploring the pragmatic dimension of borrowing. In *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1550-1567.

- Dennis R. Preston & Ayako Yamagata** (2004). Katakana representation of English loanwords: Mora conservation and variable learner strategies. In *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8(3), 359–379.
- Hakan Ringbom** (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.: Clevedon, UK.
- James Stanlaw** (2004). *Japanese English: Language and culture contact*. Hong Kong University Press: Hong Kong, China.
- Vit Suchomel & Jan Pomikálek** (2012). Efficient web crawling for large text corpora. In A. Kilgarriff & S. Sharoff (eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh Web as Corpus Workshop (WAC7)*, 1–5. Lyon, France.



# 4 The role of speaker identification in Taiwanese attitudes towards varieties of English

ShouChun Chien

*School of Critical Studies, University of Glasgow*

s.chien.1@research.gla.ac.uk

## Introduction

A number of language attitude studies towards non-native listeners have indicated that native varieties are generally preferred over non-native varieties (Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; Ladegaard, 1998; McKenzie, 2008; Yook & Lindemann, 2013; Zhang, 2010). Similar findings in favour of native varieties, which are usually regarded as standard models, have emerged when Taiwanese perceptions were investigated (Kobayashi, 2008; Cheng, 2009; Lee, 2013). While some studies demonstrated differences in evaluation of varieties of English speech corresponding to identification accuracy (McKenzie, 2008; Yook & Lindemann, 2013), others have not discovered such a connection (Zhang, 2010). In this paper, I contribute to the body of language attitude research by investigating the possible correlation between identification and evaluation of English varieties among Taiwanese participants, for whom English plays a vital role in everyday life. Traditionally categorized by Kachru (1992) as an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) territory, the Lingua Franca role of English in Taiwan has made the English language of paramount importance for enhancing career prospects, educational advancement and international trade. Accordingly, what remains unknown is whether Taiwanese participants' understanding of speaker origin influences the way they subsequently judge different English varieties. This study aims to provide a discussion of Taiwanese attitude research through the examination of EFL speakers' perceptions towards varieties of English, and offers an analysis of how they consequently evaluate each type of English speech, based on correct or incorrect identification of the speakers.

## Previous Research

### *Attitudes towards Native vs. Non-native English Varieties*

The findings of language attitude research involving native speakers show consistently that prestigious native varieties, such as RP and Northern Michigander dialects of American English are preferred over their stigmatized counterparts from the perspective of status, which implies that these varieties are better evaluated on traits such as intelligence and education (Giles, 1970; Hiraga, 2005; Preston, 2004). Discrimination of English varieties revealed that Taiwanese listeners also rated a prestigious English variety, such as Standard American English, the most highly (Cheng, 2009; Lee, 2013; Yang, 2013). “Native speakerism” (Holliday, 2006:385) and the “ideology of standard variety” (Milroy, 2001:532) play a vital role among Taiwanese learners. In other words, native varieties such as American English are seen as providing the standard cultural and linguistic models for EFL speakers (Cheng, 2009; Kobayashi, 2008). For example, American English is more positively evaluated from the perspectives of having better pronunciation and being easier for EFL students to listen to (Lee, 2013; Yang, 2013). Moreover, the variety that is predominantly used in Taiwanese ELT classes is American English (Cheng, 2009; Kobayashi, 2008; Lee, 2013). However, this situation may be changing as Taiwanese learners are gradually exposed to both native and non-native varieties of English in a globalized world. Given the growing number of non-native English speakers, there is an increasing opportunity for Taiwanese to encounter and interact with speakers of diverse English varieties. In addition to the variety of American English that Taiwanese learners would encounter in school, EFL speakers are likely to be exposed to, and further acquire, stereotypes of other varieties of English via widespread mass media, including TV series, movies and pop music. A question that arises from such situations is: what are Taiwanese attitudes towards distinct varieties of English?

To direct Taiwanese people’s awareness of the existence of Asian forms of English, Kobayashi (2008) examined a group of Taiwanese students taking an intensive English course in a private university’s language centre in the Philippines. Interview results indicated that Taiwanese students studying English in an ESL environment had little recognition of the importance of L2 varieties of English spoken in Asia. For example, it was found that native standard varieties such as American and British English are more desirable than Philippines English as a target-learning model. Moreover, Philippines English was regarded as different from “correct varieties” and was negatively evaluated owing to a “heavy accent” (Kobayashi, 2008:90-91). The negative attitudes towards Philippines English may impede non-native-

to-non-native communication and, thus, Taiwanese perceptions of non-native varieties are worthy of further investigation.

In exploring the extent to which Taiwanese perceive different types of English speech, Lee (2013) investigated 70 university students' attitudes towards Australian English, American English and Taiwanese English speakers who were delivering the same lecture. While the American English speaker was the most positively evaluated, the Taiwanese English was judged the most unfavourably. The finding that the Australian English speaker was perceived to have a foreign accent might result from participants' limited exposure to the Australian variety. Furthermore, the result of a mock TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) listening exam demonstrated that Taiwanese speakers' unfamiliarity with Australian accents is likely to hinder them from comprehending the language of Australian speakers (Lee, 2013). Yang (2013) investigated non-English major university students' perception changes in learning English variation. Multimedia texts, such as a song from the film "Three Idiots", were adapted to help students understand the pronunciation features of Indian English. For example, the sentence "All is well" in the song may well sound like "All-iz vell" to most students. The teaching instrument helped students to understand that the consonant /w/ would be pronounced as /v/ in Indian English (Yang, 2013:107-108). The results suggest that after the detailed phonetic attributes of Indian English were introduced in class, the majority of the students benefited from the phonetics teaching and adopted a more positive attitude towards Indian English, especially its accent.

### ***Correlation between Identification and Evaluation***

Positive or negative attitudes towards a speaker's accent may be influenced by background information, such as nationality or ethnic group membership that is correlated with speech (Edwards, 1997). While one's accent provides significant cues for listeners to recognise the geographical origin or identity marker of a speaker (Milroy & McClenaghan, 1977; Wright, 1996), most language attitude studies disregard the issue of speaker origin classification on evaluating the different varieties of English (McKenzie, 2008; Yook & Lindemann, 2013). Studies (e.g. McKenzie, 2008; Yook & Lindemann, 2013) have shown that listeners evaluated a variety more positively when speaker provenance was correctly identified.

When Japanese university students' evaluations of different English varieties are investigated, accurate identification of speaker origin demonstrated a significant positive effect upon the evaluation of native varieties of English,

including Glasgow Vernacular, Southern US English and Midwest United States English with regard to status (McKenzie, 2008:150). This is reinforced by the findings attained in South Korea, which revealed that a more favourable evaluation was given to the same European-American English speaker when she was accurately recognized as being from the USA (Yook & Lindemann, 2013:292). In turn, the results of Zhang (2010) confirmed that evaluation might not differ according to identification. Other than an American English speaker and a RP speaker, Hong Kong University respondents' ratings of most of the native and non-native English speakers failed to reach statistical significance between the correct identification and inaccurate identification group. One intriguing question arising from these studies (McKenzie, 2008; Yook & Lindemann, 2013; Zhang, 2010) is whether correct identification forms the basis of the stereotypes held by listeners, when assessing different English voices.

Many (including Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; McKenzie, 2008; Yook & Lindemann, 2013) propose that whether prejudice is against the community it is perceived to be from should be examined carefully in language attitude studies by engaging an indirect method, the Verbal Guise Test (VGT). For instance, perceptions towards speech are shown to be misleading when listener-judges misidentify a speaker from another speech group and thus make stereotyped judgements on the variety they believe they are hearing, instead of the variety they are actually hearing (Preston 1989, 2004). The task of identification has drawn some attention in Taiwanese language attitude studies, demonstrating how conscious informants are of speaker provenance of the different varieties of English speech (Lee, 2013; Yang, 2013).

Lee (2013) found that Taiwanese English (62%) and American English (61%) shared a similar accuracy rate of speaker origin identification. Moreover, the infrequent exposure to Australian English helps to explain why the Australian speaker (10%) is rated the lowest (Lee, 2013). On the other hand, Yang (2014) found that the ESL variety of Indian English (46%) was identified the most highly in comparison to American English (40%) and Taiwanese English (28%). Specifically, the correct rate of identifying Indian English (94%) increases substantially after the phonetic features of Indian English are taught in class. Nevertheless, to what extent identification would potentially influence speaker evaluation has not yet been examined.

From the vast body of language attitude research, studies explicitly examining the correlation between the variation pattern of speaker origin and



evaluation in Taiwan appear to be limited. This study aims to extend the investigation of how Taiwanese listener-judges identify with the linguistic diversity of English, and whether different classifications of the origin of individual speakers have a part to play in the formation of a more positive or negative judgement of speakers. Specifically, this study aims to address the following three research questions. 1. How do Taiwanese speakers perceive L1, ESL and EFL varieties of English? 2. To what extent can Taiwanese speakers correctly identify the speaker origin of different types of English speech? 3. How are attitudes toward English varieties affected by Taiwanese respondents' knowledge of the speakers' provenance?

Following this review of existing literature on the correlation between speaker identification and evaluation of different types of English speech, I will outline the methodology adopted. Then I will present the results of speaker evaluation of the seven selected English varieties according to speaker status and solidarity, as well as the responses of speaker identification. I will conclude by discussing whether evaluation differences according to identification exist among Taiwanese participants.

## Methodology

### *The Research Instrument*

The research sample was composed of 371 Taiwanese participants, including 200 females and 171 males. Following the methodology of previous studies examining the role of speaker identification in non-native speakers' attitudes in Japan (McKenzie, 2008) and South Korea (Yook & Lindemann, 2013), the research instrument consisted of a VGT and a speaker identification task via an online survey. Since accent has an influence on the listener's judgements about the social status of the speaker, VGT has been widely employed as a perceptual experiment within language attitude studies (Ryan & Giles, 1982). VGT uses different speakers to represent varieties so that natural voices are adopted in the reading of the passage, instead of artificial guises (Garrett et al., 2003). In essence, the purpose of VGT is to "elicit the stereotyped impressions or biased views which members of one social group hold of representative members of a contrasting group" on the basis of their speech cues (Lambert, 1967:93). The speech stimulus is a short passage consisting of 69 words available from The Speech Accent Archive (TSAA) developed by George Mason University (Weinberger, 2012). The passage was specifically designed to elicit a number of target phonemes known to be difficult for non-native speakers and which were verified in different

contexts (Cheng, 2009; Eisenclas and Tsurutani, 2011; Yook and Lindemann, 2013). For this reason, the passage serves as an appropriate speech stimulus for the current study. To avoid the potentially confounding variable of gender difference, the selected recordings were of seven native male speakers of their respective accents. In addition to the gender factor, attempts were made to keep extraneous variables, such as voice quality and speed, constant.

The VGT and the identification section of the experiment were divided up according to the seven different speakers. A practice example was presented at the beginning to help participants to familiarize themselves with the completion of the evaluations. Participants were asked to rate the speakers on a six-point semantic-differential scale composed of the following six traits: “confident”, “intelligent”, “educated”, “authoritative”, “friendly” and “lively”. A rating of 1 indicates the least favourable rating and 6 indicate the most favourable evaluation. These personality traits were selected on the basis of traits that had been used in examining non-native speaker attitudes and they were then tested in a pilot study for validity.

The recording on the website was controlled in such a manner as to be played only once to elicit participants’ intuitive responses when answering the VGT. After evaluating the seven speech samples on the semantic-differential scale, informants were asked to listen to the recording again and try to identify the nationality of each speaker from a predetermined list of ten different options of countries arranged in alphabetical order. The list of options provided for participants was: Australia, India, Japan, Russia, South Africa, Spain, Taiwan, UK, USA and “Not Known”. The options of Russia and South Africa were included to further enhance the difficulty of the task and the validity of the results. When the correct identification rate had been analysed, it was intended to better reveal participants’ ability to recognise different varieties.

### ***The Varieties of English Selected***

With the emerging concept of “World Englishes” for global communication (Matsuda, 2003) and the increasing recognition of distinctive varieties of English (Kirkpatrick, 2007), the English varieties selected for the VGT and identification task were chosen according to Kachru’s (1992) three-circle model. General American English (GAE) was selected, as it is presumed to be the variety participants are most familiar with. Standard Southern British English (SSBE) was chosen, as studies in Taiwan have not yet examined Taiwanese attitudes towards British English varieties, despite the fact that

SSBE is perhaps the second most popular reference variety for pedagogical purposes. Although Australian English (AE) has been tested in Lee (2013)'s study, it is worth re-examining AE along with the other prestigious native varieties of GAE and SSBE in this same study to allow comparison. The only outer circle variety is Indian English (IE), given that India has the largest population of ESL speakers in Asia. Japanese English (JE) was included in the experiment so that result can be compared with research done in Japan (McKenzie, 2008). Spanish English (SE) was chosen in order to include a European English variety in the research. Lastly, the inclusion of Taiwanese English (TE) serves the purpose of examining how participants view their own variety.

## Results and Discussion

### *Speaker Evaluation*

The aim of this section is to answer the first research question, that is, to find out which varieties Taiwanese participants preferred. Initial analysis involved Principal Component Analysis (PCA), which demonstrated that the traits employed in the VGT could be divided into two latent factors of status ("confident", "intelligent", "educated" and "authoritative") and solidarity ("friendly" and "lively"), accounting for 64% and 17% of variance respectively. Consequently, ratings for the seven speakers were calculated according to the two dimensions of status and solidarity (See Table 1). In order to investigate the significance of the evaluations, a one-way repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The results demonstrated overall significant effects for speaker status ( $F(6, 1896)=243.82, p<0.05$ ; partial eta square=0.44), and for speaker solidarity: ( $F(6, 1896)=41.30, p<0.05$ ; partial eta square=0.12).

Speaker	Status	Speaker	Solidarity
GAE	*4.29 (0.78)	GAE	*3.75 (1.06)
SSBE	*4.07 (0.87)	IE	3.48 (1.14)
IE	*3.81 (0.80)	AE	3.40 (1.02)
AE	*3.65 (0.86)	SSBE	3.34 (1.08)
JE	3.12 (0.90)	TE	3.28 (1.11)
SE	3.01 (0.85)	JE	*3.17 (1.04)
TE	2.91 (0.78)	SE	2.71 (1.04)

**Table 1: Mean evaluations (and standard deviation) rankings in descending order according to speaker status and solidarity (N=317)**

With regard to speaker status, participants rated standard varieties (GAE, SSBE) more positively than the less prestigious L1 variety of AE, as well as the ESL varieties (IE) and EFL varieties (JE, SE and TE). The results of a pairwise comparison test (with Bonferroni correction) showed that the speakers of GAE & SSBE, SSBE & IE, IE & AE and AE & JE reached statistical significance ( $p < 0.05$ ; shown with \* in Table 1). The non-significant differences between JE & SE and SE & TE suggest that Taiwanese informants consistently hold low evaluations towards these EFL varieties. Three distinct hierarchies reappeared among participants' evaluations of speaker solidarity. The prestigious variety of GAE was most valued, followed by the ESL variety of IE. The "less-standard" L1 variety AE received a more positive rating than the prestigious native variety of SSBE (Jenkins, 2007:150). Lastly, the three non-native varieties were perceived as conveying less solidarity.


When the mean evaluations for speaker solidarity were analysed in the pairwise comparison test, significant differences were found between GAE & IE speakers as well as JE & SE speakers ( $p < 0.05$ ; shown with \* in Table 1). Although IE is the second most favoured variety in the solidarity dimension, participants evaluated GAE significantly higher than the ESL variety of India. This exemplified that participants' higher preferences for the L1 variety over the L2 variety are distinctively marked. Among the three most stigmatized EFL varieties of TE, JE and SE, participants tend to perceive the Asian variety and European variety as substantially different and therefore rated JE significantly higher than SE.

Similar to the previous findings among Taiwanese participants (Kobayashi, 2008; Lee, 2013; Yang, 2013), it is perhaps not surprising to see GAE receiving the most favoured evaluation. Although Indian English was once perceived unfavourably in terms of having "bad pronunciation" and an "annoying accent" (Yang, 2013:121), the ESL variety of IE in the current study was positively evaluated when compared to the EFL varieties of JE, SE and TE. On the solidarity dimension, IE speakers even received a higher rating than native speaker varieties such as AE and SSBE. The fact that participants' own variety, TE, was the most stigmatized variety on speaker status corresponds to the finding in South Korea, where the Korean English speaker was consistently rated lowest on the status dimension (Yook & Lindemann, 2013). Moreover, both the TE of the current study and the Korean English speaker in the study of Yook and Lindemann (2013) were judged slightly more positively where speaker solidarity is concerned. Such an evaluation pattern conforms to the social judgement of the diverse ways

of speaking English across cultures: while speakers with a standard accent are often perceived more positively on the status-related traits, speakers with non-standard or non-native accents are more highly evaluated on the solidarity dimension (Giles & Coupland, 1991).

### *Identification of Speaker Origin for Each Variety*

This section will discuss participants' responses with a view to answering the second research question, that is to investigate how correctly and consistently participants were able to identify the origin of the seven speakers. The correct percentage for each English variety in descending order is shown in Figure 1.



**Figure 1: Percentage of correct and incorrect identifications of country of origin of speaker (N=317)**

Of the seven English varieties, GAE and TE received the most accurate level of identification. Similar to the findings of Cheng (2009) and Lee (2013), GAE acquired the highest correct identification. As Taiwanese listeners are exposed to the model of American English almost exclusively through English classes (Cheng 2009; Lee, 2013) and the media (Bayard et al., 2001), the high level of preference and recognition of American English is to be expected. This is parallel with McKenzie's study (2008:146), in which the US English variety was identified most successfully as a consequence of the "prevalence of American culture" in Japan.

Similarly, the widespread American culture within Taiwanese society may have played a role in EFL speakers' familiarity with American English.

According to Ladegaard (1998), the media serves a function of transmitting stereotypes and attitudes. The Americanized nature of the media in Taiwan, which is widely influenced by the USA, might help to explain why the category of American English is most salient for Taiwanese participants. As for participants' own variety, participants identified TE with a high level of accuracy. Respondents' high levels of familiarity and accurate identification of a TE speaker who shares their native language is likely to result from the fact that their friends and family use this variety frequently in their daily lives.

Besides GAE and TE, the rest of the speakers of the different English varieties had a generally low rate of identification. Although British English accents such as RP have traditionally been perceived as a pronunciation model (Kachru & Nelson 2006), participants' correct recognition rate for the SSBE speaker was less than 50%. The reason why SSBE had a lower accuracy rate than GAE is probably a result of Taiwanese people's infrequent exposure to British English in comparison to American English. The findings are in contrast to studies in Denmark (Jarvella et al., 2001) and South Korea (Yook & Lindemann, 2013), in which a British English speaker from England was more accurately identified than an American English speaker. Moreover, the IE speaker did not have a high rate of identification: this finding stands counter to Yang's research (2013) which found that university students were able to recognize IE more successfully than American English and Taiwanese Mandarin English.

Lastly, although AE is an L1 variety, it received the lowest recognition rate among the seven speakers, with only 17%. This result conforms to previous studies in the non-English speaking environment of Denmark (Ladegaard, 1988), South Korea (Yook & Lindemann, 2013) and Taiwan (Lee, 2013) in the respect that AE is the least identified variety when compared to the other native varieties of American or British English. This clearly indicates Taiwanese participants' relative unfamiliarity with AE when GAE and SSBE are both considered. The generally low identification rate might also result from the two "distractor" options of South Africa and Russia in the list, which made the task more challenging than if the choices had been composed of only the origin countries of the seven speakers. This should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of misidentified speakers.

### ***Effects of Correct and Incorrect Identification***

This section investigates the role of speaker identification in Taiwanese EFL speakers' attitudes towards varieties of English and thus contributes to a response to the final research question, that is, whether correct and incorrect

identifications of speaker origin have a significant effect on the evaluations of each speaker in terms of speaker status and solidarity. To begin with, the descriptive statistics of speaker status and solidarity of the seven different varieties were calculated according to correct and incorrect identifications (see Table 2).

Speaker	Recognition			
	Status		Solidarity	
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect
AE	3.63(1.02)	3.66(0.83)	3.69(1.06)	3.34(1.01)
JE	3.01(0.82)	3.16(0.92)	2.94(1.00)	3.25(1.05)
GAE	4.30(0.78)	4.27(0.79)	3.80(1.08)	3.40(0.80)
TE	2.91(0.76)	2.87(0.92)	3.30(1.09)	3.13(1.23)
IE	3.82(0.80)	3.81(0.81)	3.45(1.07)	3.50(1.19)
SSBE	4.26(0.84)	3.92(0.86)	3.28(1.12)	3.38(1.05)
SE	3.15(0.84)	2.98(0.85)	2.84(1.11)	2.68(1.02)

**Table 2: Mean evaluations (and standard deviation) of speaker status and solidarity according to correct and incorrect identifications (N=317)**

From the descriptive data in Table 2, it is evident that participants who correctly identified speaker origin evaluated the seven speakers differently from those who incorrectly recognised each English variety. Taking GAE, TE and SE for example, those who correctly identified speaker origin in both the status and solidarity dimension gave a more positive evaluation. Nevertheless, to further explore the correlation between evaluation and patterns of identification, one-way between groups Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) were conducted to examine the existence of significant difference in the ratings for each speaker.

The results of the MANOVA found only one significant effect on evaluations of SSBE speaker status ( $F(1,315)=12.65$ ,  $p<0.05$ ; partial eta squared=0.04), where the SSBE speaker received a significantly higher evaluation from those who correctly identified his origin than those who failed to recognise him as a speaker of British English. One of the most plausible explanations is the “prestige” associated with British English, where native varieties are perceived as the standard norm to aspire to (Zhang, 2010: 215). The result is in direct contrast to the findings of Yook and Lindemann (2013), in which participants who were informed of British speaker origin evaluated the British speaker lower than listeners who had not been informed. A conclusion can therefore be drawn that the role of identification, in terms of how different varieties of English speakers are perceived by Taiwanese, did not have a significant effect on the relative

evaluation they receive, except for the speaker of SSBE, on the status perspective.

## Conclusion

The present study set out to establish whether there is a correlation between speaker identification and evaluation of different English varieties by Taiwanese individuals. Results firstly show that, while the three EFL accents are connoted with low status and are generally stigmatised, overall favour for the native varieties is found, with a special preference for GAE among Taiwanese participants. Next, the prevalent exposure to the learning models of American and participants' own variety of Taiwanese English account for the high identification of these two varieties. Lastly, the inspection of the role of speaker recognition on evaluation confirmed that whether or not Taiwanese participants have knowledge of speaker origin did not have a significant impact on their evaluation of the seven English varieties.

Although the interplay of speaker identification and evaluation can be context dependent, as shown in previous studies, the extent of Taiwanese understanding of speaker provenance in mediating evaluation judgement of the varieties of English appears to be limited. One possible explanation for such a result might be the consequence of participants drawing upon preconceived stereotypes when judging different English voices in spite of Taiwanese informants' difficulties in accurately recognising speaker origin, except for GAE and TE. Consequently, it is speculated that, whether or not the listener is able to consciously relate accents to a reference country, the stereotyped judgement triggered by accent is latent for Taiwanese participants when evaluating different types of English speech.

These findings concur with the arguments made by many scholars (Milroy & McClenaghan, 1977; Ladegaard, 1998) regarding the way in which biased perception of various forms of English speech might take place below the level of conscious awareness of speaker provenance. The intrinsic quality of speaker voices is a further explanatory factor to be taken into consideration when interpreting the findings. In other words, the result may in fact be an artefact of the methodology design of the research. Therefore, the potential hypothesis is that, instead of the knowledge of speaker origin, voice qualities such as pitch and speed may thus have a bearing upon listeners' evaluation of the varieties of English and could be considered in further research.



Since listener categorisation of a speaker is complex in nature and is likely to be influenced by the factors such as “linguistic analysis abilities, prior travel experience, other languages studies, past friendship, and other personal experiences of language contact” (Scales et al., 2006:727), further analysis of misidentification patterns would help to explore listeners’ specific types of evaluative reactions to languages. A case in point is the findings of misidentification patterns among Austrian (Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997) and Japanese (McKenzie, 2008) listeners, who evaluated participants’ own non-native varieties more highly when they wrongly categorized the speaker as native. Studies (Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; McKenzie, 2008) exhibited non-native participants’ general preference for native speaker varieties when a voice is perceived as native. Owing to the fact that Taiwanese EFL listeners are likely to hold a salient distinction of favour between native and non-native varieties, research on how well participants can dichotomize accents into native and non-native could help to illustrate the evaluative bias in language attitude research.

The methodological differences of the speaker identification task between this study and previous research suggest that more work is needed. In particular, this could include future studies incorporating the instruments of perceptual dialectology, such as asking participants to draw the regional boundaries of each variety heard on a map instead of locating each voice from the pre-determined options of regional places (Preston, 1999). Open-ended identification questions would allow listeners to give their own labels of origin and are believed to better elicit participants’ social categorization of English varieties (Yook & Lindemann, 2013). This would contribute to an understanding of how EFL listeners evaluating speakers of different types of English speech in everyday situations are affected by whether or not they have the background information about which country or region the speaker comes from.

With regard to the sociolinguistic profile of Taiwanese attitudes towards English, these findings hopefully contribute to an understanding of EFL speakers’ stereotyped judgements of different varieties of English in the non-native speaking repertoire. Moreover, listeners’ identification of varieties demonstrates which social categories are salient to Taiwanese informants. This, in turn, can shed light on the development of language programs, the design of pedagogical materials, and innovations in language teaching to better equip EFL learners with an awareness and appreciation of the distinctive varieties of English for international communication.

## References

- Donn Bayard, Ann Weatherall, Cynthia Gallois & Jeffery Pittam** (2001). Pax Americana? Accent Attitudinal Evaluations in New Zealand, Australia and America. In *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol 5 pp22-49.
- Chun Fen Cheng** (2009). *EFL Children's Perceptions and Attitudes toward English Accents: A Case in Taiwan*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, National Pingtung University of Education.
- Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Gunther Kaltenboeck & Ute Smit** (1997). Learner Attitudes and L2 Pronunciation in Austria. In *World Englishes*, vol 16 pp115-128.
- Harold T. Edwards** (1997). *Applied Phonetics: The Sounds of American English*. Singular: San Diego, CA, USA.
- Susana A. Eisenclas & Chiharu Tsurutani** (2011). You Sound Attractive! Perceptions of Accented English in a Multi-Lingual Environment. In *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol 34 pp216-236.
- Peter Garrett, Nikolas Coupland & Angie Williams** (2003). *Investigating Language Attitudes: Social Meanings of Dialect, Ethnicity and Performance*. University of Wales Press: Cardiff, UK.
- Howard Giles** (1970). Evaluative Reactions to Accents. In *Educational Review*, vol 22 pp211-227.
- Howard Giles & Nikolas Coupland** (1991). *Language: Context and Consequences*. Open University Press: Milton Keynes, UK.
- Yuko Hiraga** (2005). British Attitudes towards Six Varieties of English in the USA and Britain. In *World Englishes*, vol 24 pp289-308.
- Adrian Holliday** (2006). Native-speakerism. In *ELT Journal*, vol 60 pp385-387.
- Robert J. Jarvella, Eva Bang, Arnt Lykke Jakobsen & Inger M. Mees** (2001). Of Mouths and Men: Non-native Listeners' Identification and Evaluation of Varieties of English. In *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol 11 pp37-56.
- Jennifer Jenkins** (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- Braj B. Kachru** (1992). Teaching World Englishes. In Braj B. Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English Across Culture*. University of Illinois Press: Chicago, IL, USA, pp355-365.
- Yamuna Kachru & Cecil L. Nelson** (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong University Press: Hong Kong, China.
- Andy Kirkpatrick** (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Iori Kobayashi** (2008). "They speak 'incorrect' English": Understanding Taiwanese Learners' Views on L2 varieties of English. In *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, vol 39 pp81-98.
- Hans J. Ladegaard** (1998). National Stereotypes and Language Attitudes: The Perception of British, American and Australian Language and Culture in Denmark. In *Language and Communication*, vol 18 pp251-274.
- Wallace E. Lambert** (1967). A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. In *Journal of Social Issues*, vol 23 pp91-109.
- Jia Fei Lee** (2013). *Taiwanese University Students' Attitudes towards Australian English in Comparison with American English and Taiwan English*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, National Yunlin University of Science and Technology.

- Aya Matsuda** (2003). Incorporating World Englishes in Teaching English as an International Language. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 37 pp719-729.
- Robert M. McKenzie** (2008). The Role of Variety Recognition in Japanese University Students' Attitudes towards English Speech Varieties. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol 29 pp139-153.
- James Milroy** (2001). Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. In *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol 5 pp530-555.
- Lesley Milroy & Paul McClenaghan** (1977) Stereotyped Reactions to four educated accents in Ulster. In *Belfast Working Paper in Language and Linguistics*, vol 2 pp1-11.
- Dennis Richard Preston** (1989). *Perceptual Dialectology*. Foris Publications: Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Dennis Richard Preston** (1999). A language attitude analysis of regional U.S. speech: Is northern U.S. English not friendly enough? In *Cuadernos de Filologia Inglesa*, vol 8 pp129-146.
- Dennis Richard Preston** (2004). Language Attitudes to Speech. In Edward Finegan & John R. Rickford (eds.), *Language in the USA*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, pp480-492.
- Ellen Bouchard Ryan & Howard Giles** (1982). *Attitudes towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts*. Edward Arnold: London, UK.
- Julie Scales, Ann Wennerstrom, Dara Richard & Su Hui Wu** (2006). Language Learners' Perceptions of Accent. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 40 pp715-738.
- Steven H. Weinberger** (2012). *Speech Accent Archive*. George Mason University: Fairfax, VA, USA. <http://accent.gmu.edu> (accessed November 2012).
- Susan Wright** (1996). Accents of English. In David Graddol, Dick Leith & Joan Swann (eds.), *English History, Diversity and Change*. Routledge: London, UK, pp259-292.
- Hsiao Tzu Yang** (2013). Taiwanese Perceptions of Indian English: A Perceptual Change in the Learning of English Variation. In *English Teaching & Learning*, vol 37 pp91-148.
- Cheongmin Yook & Stephanie Lindemann** (2013). The Role of Speaker Identification in Korean University Students' Attitudes towards Five Varieties of English. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol 34 pp279-296.
- Qi Zhang** (2010). *Attitudes beyond the Inner Circle: Investigating Hong Kong Students' Attitudes towards English Accents*. PhD Thesis: Newcastle University.



# 5 Learning, Teaching and Assessment in Multilingual Classrooms

Rosie Hedger & Dr Rachel Wicaksono  
*York St John University*  
r.hedger@yorks.j.ac.uk  
R.Wicaksono@yorks.j.ac.uk

## Introduction

In recent years, staff members in the Business School at York St John University have been required to teach and assess a rapidly growing number of multilingual students. In these multilingual classrooms, both our Home and our International students are experiencing the affordances and the limitations of their own variety of English in an international, multilingual context. Our students, like all students at York St John, are faced with the challenge of learning to use their English in new, ‘academic’ and discipline-specific ways. This project focuses on the experience of staff and students on the BA Business Management and related awards. The focus of the research was twofold:

- **Research Question 1:** How are we currently supporting our students, both Home and International, to acquire these new academic literacies? Could we be providing these opportunities more effectively and efficiently? What are the gaps in our provision?
- **Research Question 2:** What are the ways of writing and talking that are valued in the academic discipline of Business Management? Where opportunities for students to develop are currently insufficient (leading on from RQ1), the project will create/curate a collection of additional materials.

## Methodology and data collection

With the research questions in mind, the project team embarked upon the process of data collection in January 2014. Staff and students from York St John University Business School were participants in this research, which was funded by the Faculty. Students interviewed were engaged in or recent

graduates of undergraduate and postgraduate Business Management programmes at York St John University in spring 2014. Of the 9 students interviewed, 5 were dual-role participants and researchers taking part in the Undergraduate Researchers scheme established by the Academic Development Directorate at York St John University. Interview participants were selected through a process of purposive sampling ‘with a specific purpose in mind, and that purpose reflects the particular qualities of the people or events chosen and their relevance to the topic of the investigation’ (Denscombe, 2010, p. 35). Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 9 students and 4 academic staff members and audio recordings were made during May, June and July 2014 using a Sony IC Recorder. Semi-structured interviews were selected as the most suitable method of extracting information, allowing for a range of topics to be covered whilst retaining an overarching theme throughout. The semi-structured interview schedule was adapted from a previous study by Martineau (2012), who explored academic literacy skills within the Faculty of Education at York St John University. The data was subjected to thematic analysis during August and September 2014.

## **Limitations**

There were several research limitations to contend with during the project. The research team was required to collect and analyse the collected data within a relatively limited timeframe, and whilst the process of data collection produced approximately 15 hours of audio recordings, the number of research participants was slightly lower than anticipated due to the time of year in which interviews took place, which coincided with assignment deadlines. Nonetheless, purposive sampling and extensive qualitative interviews ensured the collection of a great deal of interesting data for thematic analysis.

In order to support the progress of this funded research project, 5 undergraduate researchers were employed to carry out interviews. These researchers, all of whom were students on Business Management programmes, were offered instruction in the chosen research methods before being asked to practise these skills and to contribute towards the data set by interviewing one another. They were subsequently encouraged to take advantage of their insider status within the social group under scrutiny, employing established community links with the student population that included marginalised groups that can be difficult for researchers to access

(Blythe et al, 2013). As peers, differences in power relations between student participants and student researchers were minimised. However, students were also asked to interview Business Management staff members, 4 of whom agreed to participate in the study. Vähäsantanen and Saarinen (2013, p. 495) touch upon the significance of context and setting in the interview process, suggesting that power relations between interviewer and interviewee can be affected by these factors. Several of the students were taught by the staff members they interviewed, and a desire to maintain a good relationship with that member of staff is likely to have factored into their approach to the interview, perhaps leading them to withhold from probing too extensively in some cases for fear of appearing critical. As a result of this possible lack of willingness to challenge certain interviewees, it is necessary to consider the fact that the student researchers carrying out interviews with staff members may not have explored the issues under discussion as thoroughly as might have been possible.

## **Research findings**

The challenges faced by the Business School at York St John University in recent years are not entirely unique, and the necessity to convey academic literacy skills to a growing and diverse student cohort remains a relevant topic of discussion in numerous HE institutions. Whilst several key themes emerged from the data, three have been selected for further exploration within this paper due to their universal applicability: current provision, staff expectations of students' written assignments and language.

### ***Current provision***

In response to the first of two research questions, the researchers explored the nature of current provision for students on Business Management programmes. Within the field of academic literacy skills it has generally been acknowledged that the acquisition of academic literacy skills takes time, and cannot be conveniently compressed and conveyed in a set of lectures at the beginning of a programme or semester (Boughey, 2011, p. 281). Learning academic literacy is similar to learning a new language: it is a process that takes time and cannot be absorbed and applied in one fell swoop, though it is true that the introduction of academic literacy skills at the earliest possible point supports successful academic transition, provided that these skills are also further embedded in the pedagogy (Tinto, 2003). In spite of these assertions, it is common that courses of study follow a similar route to that identified on Business Management programmes at York St John University,

in which students are required to take a 'Study Skills' module in their first semester, designed to equip them with the required academic literacy skills to ensure success in the following years of study.

During the interview, Tutor C expressed some concerns about the current model, recognising that academic literacy skills have been 'divorced' from the rest of the programme, taught entirely separately to other programme content and partly by lecturers who do not teach elsewhere on the Business Management programme. This separation is problematic in the learning process, which can only be successful when this allows for practice and reinforcement and recognises the essential nature of being able to transfer skills to other modules and tasks (Gunn et al, 2011, p. 2). Tutor B suggested that the attempt to convey all necessary skills during the first 12 weeks of study was challenging, commenting that 'we tend to bombard them with it all in semester one [...] There's so much being chunked at them that maybe we need to have a think about how we can spread it out a little bit.' The current system, which attempts to neatly package necessary skills in such a way that these do not interfere with course content that is somehow different was picked up on by students, with Student B acknowledging 'a general consensus in our year that it was just a doss module [...] It wasn't taken very seriously.'

Perhaps as a result of students' mixed success in this module, during the interviews tutors mentioned attempts they had made to introduce such academic literacy skills during class time. Tutor B reported occasionally using the final 10 minutes of class time to introduce a theme such as referencing, whilst Tutor A reported briefly touching upon skills such as essay-writing and structure before adding that 'the time is very limited in the classroom; I can only do so much'. Whilst the good intentions of these (and other) staff members are clear, this approach to squeezing in essential academic literacy skills does not constitute teaching 'with' academic literacies (Dunham, 2012, p. 687), instead treating these as an inconvenient addition to be covered in limited depth only after the teaching of more important 'subject content', and largely with a remedial motive having identified weaknesses in the work of some students. Gunn et al (2011, p. 3) point out that 'qualifications from disciplines other than education may leave [staff members] ill-equipped to address [academic literacy skills]'. Whilst academic staff members are likely to have honed their own writing skills by observing and interacting with the academic community until these became natural to them (Boughey, 2011; Lea and Street, 1998), they may be capable of performing a range of academic skills without necessarily being in a



position to talk about how these are performed in a way that is accessible to those yet to learn. As Chanock et al (2012, p. 4) aptly describe, these skills may have become ‘transparent with use’. This sentiment was evident in a number of the interviews with staff members, with Tutor B admitting that he ‘think[s] there are people in the university who specialise in those areas who could probably do a better job’. Gunn et al (2011) consider this lack or perceived lack of expertise among teaching staff to compound the problem when teaching staff members do not regard the teaching of these skills to be their responsibility.

In relation to the acquisition of these skills among his students, Tutor D was asked to comment on how his students adapt to the context-specific nature of communicating in Business Management studies from level 1 to level 3:

Students who get the better marks [...] are those who have built on their experience, developing their critical piece of work; well-formed, well-constructed arguments with good referencing and good supporting points being made. I think [...] those who engage at the start obviously do better in the future.

Engagement was frequently mentioned by staff and students alike, with little explanation of this term in greater depth. The idea that exposure to and ‘engagement’ with different types of writing and assignments serve to improve students’ understanding and attainment is not guaranteed. Student K spoke of his experiences writing critical reviews, commenting that ‘because I just learned how to do the critical review last semester and I only write just two essays for the critical review, I am not really familiar with the critical review.’ Whilst many students adapt to new academic conventions with relative ease and may find exposure to a new type of assignment sufficient to assist them in constructing their own, others are likely to experience difficulties without any explicit instruction or guidance in the techniques and strategies required for successful execution of a task.

### ***Staff expectations of students’ written assignments***

The interviews with students and staff revealed varying reports of familiarity with the expectations of written assignments in UK HE, conveniently addressing Research Question 2 insofar as they indicated the elements that teaching staff value and/or are perceived to value in students’ written work. The interviews also revealed varying levels of detail and support from staff members in completing these assignments. There appears to be a lack of recognition that approaches to academic writing and assignment completion are different among students from the wide variety of backgrounds to be

found within Business Management programmes. Hunter and Tse write that 'subject lecturers are not intentionally keeping their expectations hidden, nor are they unwilling to articulate what they are looking for' (2011, p. 228), and all staff members interviewed expressed a desire to help students to perform to the best of their abilities in their assignments.

Both the literature and research findings suggest that lecturers in a number of studies were unable to explicitly describe the features of a 'well-structured' or 'well-argued' student assignment (Lea and Street, 1998, p. 162). During interviews, staff members taking part in this study were asked about the features of a successful piece of writing. One staff member described an essay as 'more free flowing so less structured' (Tutor B), whilst another staff member contradicted this, describing 'very good structure' (Tutor A) as being of foremost importance in an essay. Several staff members mention the need to 'be critical', with few providing further explanation of exactly what they mean by this. These findings confirm that staff members may experience difficulty in accurately conveying detailed expectations to students when it comes to their written work. Perhaps predictably in light of the findings outlined above, students interviewed as part of this study perceived a range of difficulties associated with assignment submission. One student described the differences between the assessment requirements that his tutor conveyed verbally in class and those which the same tutor subsequently reported as lacking in his written work:

I still feel there is miscommunication between the lecturers and the students [...] when we discuss about the question [...] he will say "that's right, you are right, this is how you are supposed to answer" but once you produce the assignment with the same answer that we discussed in the class they will say "you need to do more reading". So what is the difference? In the class you say correct this is what you are supposed to do whereas when we stick the answer in the assignment - exactly what he taught us in the class - he will come back and tell us "no you need to do more reading". (Student F)

This student's negative experiences dominated the interview, and it is clear that he felt that there was a lack of clarity about assignment requirements. That which is implicitly obvious to a staff member with years of experience in UK HE may not be equally obvious to students from a variety of backgrounds. For staff members, the inclusion of theory taught during class time in combination with independent reading is obvious, but it cannot be assumed that students who have not previously constructed assignments in a similar context will share this awareness. Academic staff must be sensitive

to the needs of those who come from different academic cultures, being explicit in their expectations relating to student work.

Several students interviewed mentioned the ways in which their tutors provide detailed guidelines or sample assignments intended to help them to complete their assessments. In contrast to this type of guided approach, one staff member stated that he did not assign any guidelines to students for assignments. Tutor C reported that ‘students say “how do you want me to answer these tasks?” and I often say “I don't really mind” because quite often we want to be able to access the understanding of their knowledge in a range of different topics.’ Whilst this tutor seems to be making particular efforts to be flexible to the wide variety of student backgrounds and experience, it is reasonable to suggest that this lack of structure or guidance may not prove liberating, but instead somewhat intimidating to some students. Student K commented on the structure of assignments on his programme, stating that he preferred the less prescriptive approach to essay-writing in the UK when compared with his home country but that it was simultaneously more difficult for him, ‘because in the past there was only one step to follow but now I get so many things I can choose [...] just like the more things to choose just the more difficulty you will meet.’ An enhanced awareness among teaching staff of assignment requirements and the varied approaches to and experience of assessments is required in order to make successful execution equally accessible for all students, regardless of educational background.

### ***Language***

The issue of language emerged frequently in connection with Research Question 2, among staff and student interviewees alike. Where language is concerned an issue in relation to academic literacies, there is a common misconception that this relates solely to non-native users, predominantly international students who are perceived to encounter problems with using English in academic environments. However, this is an unjust approach that fails to tackle the issues faced by many other groups, such as Home students ‘whose problems are not that obvious’ (Wingate & Tribble, 2012, p. 491). Tutor B mentioned that he was initially hesitant to correct grammar and language in his students’ work, but gradually changed his approach to include feedback on this:

[I]f I’m given a draft to look at or if I’m marking a piece of work and I can see that the grammar is not quite there, my bug-bear is slang words so using things like don’t and doesn’t, I’ll make a point of correcting the first paragraph of the first couple of times I see it so I can then make a point of saying you then need to try and get this right. So I won’t do the whole thing but I’ll

certainly pick out where it's a problem and say that you need to focus on these areas.

Student B, a 'traditional' Home student, discussed the way in which she had benefitted from the type of feedback that Tutor B reported giving to his own students. Student B highlighted her struggles with adapting to the academic written conventions of Higher Education, commenting that when compared with her experiences of GCSE and A-level work, 'university writing is a lot more... superior almost, like you've got to write a lot clearer [...] and there's different styles of writing. It was a bit intimidating at first.' Upon receiving feedback she had been able to address concerns raised by her tutor, stating that 'I can't really remember writing any different, but I know I did.'

In spite of the often-neglected issues faced by Home students outlined above, which are key to an understanding of academic literacies as a broad and varied field of study, the multilingual nature of Business Management classrooms featured heavily as a topic for discussion during interviews, with English language proficiency being a topic that several students and tutors were keen to discuss from various perspectives. Some international students interviewed described their own difficulties in adapting to academic English language conventions. Student K, an International student from China, commented on his perceived connection between English language proficiency and intelligence, stating that students admitted to the university with the requested IELTS levels had 'simple logic' and would not be accepted at more prestigious institutions. During interview, Student K acknowledged his own difficulties with language throughout his studies. He talked at length about the group work element of his programme, and the ways in which working in mixed groups with Home students did not work, in his view:

It depends on our kind of situation, if you do the group work with local student you cannot do that, and for the people who have very low English ability that means you cannot do the work. You just listen and for people who have higher English level you can do a good job but the normally you just support the other people. You cannot lead them, you know, or give a very interesting idea because it is a little bit different.

Student K's comments during interview are unfortunate as they demonstrate the ways in which he has not always been fully able to partake in his programme of study due to issues relating to language. Unfortunately the experience described closely resembles that outlined by Student F, a student from South-East Asia, who provides an additional perspective on events. He

reported dissatisfaction at what he perceived to be his fellow International students' inadequate proficiency in English to perform to the required standard on the course, including partaking equally in group work and passing written assignments. In their research, Volet and Ang (1998) discuss a general lack of goodwill from both Home and International students in terms of making themselves understood and making efforts to understand one another in mixed nationality groups. A study by Wicaksono (2012) found that successful interaction between Home and International students required communicative adjustments on behalf of both the native and non-native English-speaking students. This research indicates that both parties involved in the interaction held responsibility for overall successful communication, contradicting the commonly held assumption that students speaking non-local varieties of English are responsible for adjusting the ways in which they communicate. In spite of these findings, interviews such as that with Student F suggested that many students were unwilling to make such adjustments to those students speaking varieties of English that they considered to be less prestigious, or had simply not felt that it was their responsibility:

[I]f I get a proper students and proper group mates, it's fine. If you get mingled with Chinese students who doesn't speak proper English... for us to work with them is going to be a bit difficult because they don't understand grammar and vocabulary so how can we explain it to them? So, that's one part in which we are facing difficulty. I don't think only me, I think most of us are facing these difficulties, when it comes to that. Other than that if our group mate is fine we don't have to seek help from the lecturer, because if we don't understand certain things we can just ask our fellow classmates or fellow group mates. But if, let's say the full group is like, only you understand proper English and the rest don't understand English, that's going to be a problem for you.

Student F made frequent mention of what he perceived to be the additional difficulties of working with Chinese students, distinguishing between students he describes as 'fine' and 'proper' due to their linguistic background and/or perceived proficiency in English, contrasting these students with their Chinese peers, who he claims 'suddenly just pop into the Masters and the only language they know to speak in English is "OK" and "don't know"'. Perhaps surprisingly given his own different educational and cultural background, the student does not demonstrate an awareness of the differences in educational culture that may be at the root of attitudes to group work and participation in discussions. Several comparisons can be drawn with the published case study by Cathcart et al (2006), in which the researchers explore the lack of interaction, engagement and successful cooperation between Home students and their educationally mobile peers,

with a further stark divide observed between Chinese students and those from other countries. Volet and Ang describe the divide between Home and International students as ‘the most disturbing aspect of the internationalisation of higher education’ (1998, p. 5), and it is clear from the interviews carried out that various students feel their experiences are negatively impacted by the international, multilingual cohort, with no mention of the positive aspects of working in such a culturally diverse academic environment.

In addition to negative perceptions of fellow students’ language ability, one student specifically mentioned issues that she and her classmates had perceived around being taught by a ‘foreign’ member of teaching staff. She described the tutor as a non-native speaker and drew some worrying conclusions between the staff member’s variety of English and the significance of the course content:

But it didn’t help that our tutor, our lecturer, I don’t know if I can say this, we basically couldn’t understand him. English wasn’t his first language and I can understand him now, like having had a year of him I know what he’s saying but back then I didn’t understand what he was talking about, let alone the content he was talking about. And I think he got frustrated with our class in particular because we couldn’t understand him and we weren’t listening and it was just like a circle. (Student B)

Comments of this nature raise concerns about attitudes towards non-local varieties of English, but also of attitudes towards non-local languages and cultures. Student B elaborated on the module in question, describing it as being of little importance and benefit to students. The lack of goodwill noted by Volet and Ang (1998) is evident here in the admission that students ‘couldn’t understand him and we weren’t listening and it was just like a circle’. Whilst the connection between her negative views of the staff member and the module may be coincidental, the dismissal of subject content and unwillingness to make adjustments to better understand her lecturer and the material being taught is a matter for serious consideration. Nyiransekuye and Manning (2010, p. 113) touch upon the experiences of non-native academic staff, with Nyiransekuye stating that ‘[p]eople already decide that they do not understand what I am saying because I speak with an accent.’ Nyiransekuye and Manning continue by stating that experiences have been such that non-native academic staff members are ‘viewed as having a deficiency in your thinking ability as well as a deficiency in English’. Much like Student K’s perceptions about his own and his peers’ ‘simple logic’ due to his English language competency, non-native members of the academic

community are also often considered by others to be deficient in various respects. The Business School at York St John employs a significant number of international and/or multilingual staff members, and this diversity is widely regarded as a great advantage to students at the university, who benefit from staff members' varied backgrounds, knowledge and experience in business and academia on a global scale. Nonetheless, it is important that students are made aware of these benefits, in addition to their shared responsibility in facilitating successful communication with their international and local peers.

## Conclusion

It is clear through analysis of the literature and project research data that academic literacy skills cannot be 'fixed outside the discipline' (Wingate & Tribble, 2012, p. 481), and in spite of assumptions that these skills primarily present issues for International students taking programmes in UK HE institutions, it is essential to recognise that various vital skills such as reading, writing and speaking in academic disciplines are challenging for native and non-native speakers alike. Analysis of both interviews and the literature demonstrate that students are often deterred from seeking extracurricular help from student academic support services through the fear of stigmatisation (Warwick, 2006, p. 7) or existing heavy workloads for credit-bearing subjects that cause a great deal of pressure for students (Chanock et al, 2012; Warwick, 2006). One potential and promising solution to this issue is the option to further embed academic literacies within the curriculum. This would reduce pressure on students, making these fundamental skills 'part of the workload' for the module or programme of study. This approach is also consistent with best practise according to the literature, supporting students in the process of 'becoming academically literate as a situated developmental process' (Dunham, 2012, p. 687).

Nevertheless, embedding academic literacy skills into the wider curriculum brings challenges and it remains the case that research into the field of academic literacies remains relatively limited. Whilst research thus far has highlighted existing inadequacies in many institutional approaches, the field of research 'has not yet filled the existing pedagogical gap' (Wingate and Tribble, 2012, p. 491). Just as the field of academic literacies requires further development, so too does the teaching of these skills in the Business School at York St John University. Teaching staff must effectively equip their students in order that they are able to achieve success, and this is only

possible through further research and development of materials and policy to address current shortcomings. It is hoped that the findings of this research might provide a model on which to base the development of embedded academic literacy skills into the Business Management curriculum, benefitting students and staff members through a more effective system of conveying essential academic skills to the diverse, growing cohort of students at York St John University and beyond.

## References

- Stacy Blythe, Lesley Wilkes, D. Jackson & E. Halcomb** (2013). The challenges of being an insider in storytelling research. In *Nurse Researcher*, vol 21(1), pp8-13.
- Chrissie Boughey** (2011). Multiple metaphors in an understanding of academic literacy. In *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, vol 6(3), pp279-290.
- Jude Carroll** (2014). *Diversity in the classroom*. Presented at York St John University, York.
- Jude Carroll & Janette Ryan** (2005). *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*. Routledge: London, UK.
- Abbey Cathcart, John Dixon-Dawson & R. Hall** (2006). Reluctant Hosts and Disappointed Guests? Examining Expectations and Enhancing Experiences of Cross Cultural Group Work on Postgraduate Business Programmes. In *International Journal of Management Education*, vol 5(1) pp13-22.
- Kate Chanock, Craig Horton, M. Reedman & B. Stephenson** (2012). Collaborating to embed academic literacies and personal support in first year discipline subjects. In *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, vol 9(3), pp1-13.
- Martyn Denscombe** (2010). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. McGraw-Hill/Open University Press: Maidenhead, UK.
- Nicola Dunham** (2012). A Date with Academic Literacies: Using Brief Conversation to Facilitate Student Engagement with Academic Literacies. In *US-China Education Review*, pp682-688.
- Cathy Gunn, Shari Hearne & J. Sibthorpe** (2011). Right from the Start: A Rationale for Embedding Academic Literacy Skills in University Courses. In *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, vol 8(1).
- Kerry Hunter & Harry Tse** (2011). Making disciplinary writing and thinking practices an integral part of academic content teaching. In *Active Learning in Higher Education*, vol 12(1) pp69-81.
- Mary Lea** (2004). Academic Literacies: A pedagogy for course design. In *Studies in Higher Education*, vol 29(6), pp739-756.
- Mary Lea & Brian Street** (1998). Student Writing in Higher Education: an academic literacies approach. In *Studies in Higher Education*, vol 23(2), pp157-172.
- Charlie Martineau** (2012). *Academic literacies in the Education Faculty at YSJ*. Dissertation, Business School, York St John University.
- Andrew Northedge** (2003). Rethinking teaching in the context of diversity. In *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol 8(1), pp17-32.



- Hadidja Nyiransekuye & Susan Manning** (2010). The Contradictions of Multicultural Rhetoric and Academic Privilege: The Teacher is Always Right. In *Reflections: Narratives Of Professional Helping*, vol 16(1), pp107-121.
- Vincent Tinto** (2003). Promoting student retention through classroom practice. Paper presented at *Enhancing Student Retention: Using International Policy and Practice*, an international conference sponsored by the European Access Network and the Institute for Access Studies at Staffordshire University, Amsterdam, 5-7 November 2003. Available at: [www.staffs.ac.uk/access-studies/docs/Amster-paperVT\(1\).pdf](http://www.staffs.ac.uk/access-studies/docs/Amster-paperVT(1).pdf) [Accessed 21 January 2013].
- Katja Vähäsantanen & Jaana Saarinen** (2013). The power dance in the research interview: manifesting power and powerlessness. In *Qualitative Research*, vol 13(5), pp493-51.
- Simone Volet & G. Ang** (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses; an opportunity for intercultural learning. In *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol 17(1), pp5-23.
- Peter Warwick** (2006). *International Students in the UK: how can we give them a better experience?* Working Paper, Department of Management Studies, University of York, York.
- Rachel Wicaksono** (2012). *Accommodating understanding in English: an applied linguistic analysis of UK and international university students navigating TESOL tasks*. PhD dissertation, Institute of Education, University of London: London, UK.
- Ursula Wingate & Christopher Tribble** (2012). The best of both worlds? Towards an English for Academic Purposes/Academic Literacies writing pedagogy. In *Studies in Higher Education*, vol 37(4), pp481-495.



# 6 Lexical ambiguity and L2 visual word recognition

Tomomi Ishida  
Nagoya University  
ishida\_tomomi@nagoya-u.jp

## Introduction

People often encounter words that have multiple semantically distinct meanings. These lexical ambiguities play a crucial role in helping to comprehend language processing. In fact, the study of lexically ambiguous words may not only be viewed as a particular aspect of understanding language processing, but may also help in the comprehension of the general characteristic of most words (Wollen, Cox, Coahran, Shea, & Kirby, 1980; Simpson & Burgess, 1988).

In the studies on L1 lexical processing, there is a consistent indication that when an ambiguous word is encountered, multiple meanings are accessed and meaning dominance sustains an advantage even at a long stimulus-onset asynchrony (SOA). (Tanenhaus, Leiman, & Seidenberg, 1979; Simpson & Burgess, 1985). In the existing literature on second language (L2) psycholinguistic research, however, very few findings have revealed how second language readers process lexically ambiguous words. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to examine the L2 word recognition of ambiguous words (homographs) out of context with a long SOA in order to investigate the L2 processing of lexical ambiguity further. Using a lexical decision task, the study compares the performances of groups of native speakers of English and Japanese learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) who have acquired advanced and intermediate proficiency in English.

## Background

### *L1 Processing of Lexical Ambiguity in Word Recognition*

Several experimental studies have been conducted regarding lexical ambiguity. Three main models of lexical access have been proposed for the processing of lexical ambiguity in the research on L1 word recognition. The first approach is known as a selective access model, which presupposes that

contextual information affects lexical ambiguity processing so that only a contextually appropriate meaning of an ambiguous word is initially activated. According to the model, lexical ambiguity processing is assumed to be context-dependent and top-down. When an ambiguous word is presented in isolation, the semantic context of the preceding words may affect the access to the following words (Schvaneveldt, Meyer, & Becker, 1976). Schvaneveldt et al. (1976) conducted a lexical decision test in which research participants were presented with sequences of three words. The participants made a lexical decision faster when the meanings of the first and third words were closely linked to the second ambiguous word (e.g., SAVE-BANK-MONEY) than when the first and third words were associated with the different meanings of the second ambiguous word (e.g., RIVER-BANK-MONEY).

The second access model of lexical ambiguity is a multiple access model, which assumes that multiple meanings of ambiguous words are first activated in the context, followed by contextual information at a later stage of lexical processing. This model regards lexical ambiguity processing as context-independent. Many behavioral studies have supported the model (e.g., Foss & Jenkins, 1973; Conrad, 1974; Swinney, 1979; Holley-Wilcox & Blank, 1980). In terms of the processing of ambiguous words out of context, multiple meanings of an ambiguous word are initially accessed.

A third alternative is the ordered access model proposed by Hogaboam and Perfetti (1975). The model regards the role of meaning frequency as a prominent factor in lexical ambiguity processing. It holds that a dominant, or the most frequent meaning is activated in the initial stage of processing when an isolated ambiguous word is encountered. Simpson (1981) conducted research in which participants made lexical decisions to target words related to either a dominant meaning (e.g., MONEY for the word “bank”) or a subordinate meaning (e.g., RIVER). In the study, dominant targets were responded to faster than less frequently used meanings. Simpson and Burgess (1985) conducted two experiments that controlled the SOA (amount of time elapsed between presentation of the ambiguous word and the target). Only a dominant meaning was accessed with a very short SOA, while a subordinate meaning became activated as the SOA increased. The facilitation of the subordinate meaning decreased at a longer SOA (750 ms), though the dominant meaning remained activated. The result showed that the dominant meaning was facilitated first and the subordinate meaning was activated more slowly. They concluded that “both meanings were activated, but at a rate commensurate with their relative frequencies” (Simpson &

Burgess, 1988, p. 275).

Developmental changes in lexical ambiguity processing have been recognized, demonstrating that older children might be as sensitive to the frequency of meanings of ambiguous words as adults. Simpson and Foster (1986) conducted a study in which second-, fourth-, and sixth-grade students were asked to name stimulus words primed by ambiguous words. The study found that the younger pupils exhibited the same patterns of multiple access, implying both meanings were facilitated. On the other hand, ordered access was observed among sixth graders. The result suggested that children become more selective in lexical processing with age.

### ***L2 Processing of Lexical Ambiguity in Word Recognition***

The first behavioral study of L2 lexical ambiguity processing in the absence of context was that of French-Mestre and Prince (1997), in which a lexical decision task was employed to observe the autonomy of L2 word recognition. In their single-word semantic priming task, advanced French learners of English exhibited the activation of both dominant and subordinate meanings of homographs at 100-ms and 300-ms SOAs, which demonstrated the same patterns of facilitation as native control participants. On the other hand, among intermediate learners, only dominant meanings of homographs were activated. The findings imply that the activation patterns of advanced learners are similar to those of native speakers, and the activation of subordinate meanings indicates different levels of language proficiency. However, the research applied experimental materials based on pretests solely designed for native speakers, and L2 learners' word associations and meaning dominances were not taken into account. Therefore, the question remains as to what extent some of the norms used in the experiments were appropriate for analyzing the lexical ambiguity processing of L2 learners.

To eliminate this methodological issue and fully investigate the L2 learners' lexical ambiguity processing out of context, Ishida (2013) conducted research using primes and targets, selected from pretests taken by native speakers and non-native speakers of English. In the research, a lexical decision task was employed and homographs that both native and non-native speakers defined with the same dominant and subordinate meanings were collected first. Next, two associations for each homograph were determined based on the associations most commonly used in the pretest. The study found that advanced and intermediate Japanese learners of EFL showed the facilitation of dominant and subordinate meanings in the L2 processing of lexical ambiguity at 300-ms SOA, which was similar to native speakers'. At

an SOA of 700 ms, however, the absence of explicit priming effects in the processing of ambiguous words among intermediate learners was observed, while significant priming for the native speakers and the advanced EFL learners was confirmed. The result signified that the activation of lexical ambiguity processing for intermediate learners might be transient and weak.

Taking Ishida's experiment (2013) a step further, the present study analyzes the processing of homographs out of context with a long SOA of 900 ms based on the above-mentioned two models: the multiple access model and the order access model. Using a lexical decision task, the study compares the performances of three groups: native speakers of English and advanced and intermediate Japanese learners of EFL. If the activation in intermediate learners' lexical ambiguity processing is transient, it can be argued no clear priming effect is confirmed at 900-ms SOA.

## **Methods**

### ***Participants***

In total, 19 undergraduate and graduate students whose L1 is English and 49 Japanese undergraduate and graduate students studying EFL participated in the lexical decision task. However, one native speaker's data and four Japanese students' data were excluded from the analysis because of a procedural problem. Before the analysis, a cloze test (Bachman, 1982) was administered to divide Japanese participants into two groups according to their levels of English proficiency. 19 students categorized at the advanced level showed substantially better performances in the test than 26 students in the intermediate group ( $t(43) = 11.28, p < .001$ ). The students in the advanced group had studied English in formal education for 10.6 years (SD 3.2) on average, while the participants in the intermediate group had learned English for 9.9 years (SD 2.4).

### ***Materials***

In the present research, 32 homographs and two associations for each of the homographs were employed to analyze the L2 activation of lexical ambiguity. The set of homographs and associations chosen for inclusion in the experiment were collected in an experiment conducted by Ishida (2013). In the study, four pretests were administered to determine appropriate homographs and their associations for the research.

For the first test, 86 homographs with two associations for each were selected

from previous norming studies (Nelson, McEvoy, Walling, & Wheeler, 1980; Wollen et al., 1980; Onifer & Swinney, 1981; Elston-Güttler & Friederici, 2005). 21 Japanese university students who did not participate in the experiment took the test. The students were asked to read each English homograph and confirm the meanings written in their L1. Among the 86 homographs and their associations, 35 homographs and their two associations, of which more than 70% of the participants could recognize their correct meanings, were selected for the second test.

Next, a word association test was conducted to collect homograph norms and determine the associations that share the same meaning for both native and non-native speakers of English. In total, 14 native speakers of English and 14 Japanese EFL learners who did not participate in the lexical decision task or in the first test took this test. The participants were instructed to read 35 homographs and write down any word that came to mind in response to the homographs. The first associations taken by the native speakers and the EFL learners were compared. Three homographs with different dominant and subordinate meanings for the native English speakers and the EFL learners were eliminated from the stimulus list.

EFL learners determined the dominant meanings for all homographs in the word association task, but there were some homographs whose subordinate meanings had no association the learners thought of. Thus, for eliciting associations related to the subordinate meanings, sentences that contained a homograph and its biased subordinate meaning were visually presented to 26 Japanese EFL learners who did not take the lexical decision task or the first two tests. When reading the biased sentences, all participants wrote down any word that came to mind. Two associations for each homograph were determined based on the norms most commonly used in the two above-mentioned word association tests. For each of the 32 homographs, two associations related to dominant or subordinate meanings were selected.

In addition, another test was administered to confirm whether primes and targets categorized as semantically unrelated word pairs in previous research studies were also defined as unrelated by the participants in this study. 10 Japanese EFL learners who did not participate in the lexical decision task or in the first three tests took this test. Items specified as unrelated in research by Elston-Güttler and Friederici (2005) and Onifer and Swinney (1981) were verified by checking their degree of relatedness on a scale of 1–5. The unrelated items with high scores of relatedness were replaced with other new words.

The homographs whose validities were confirmed in the above tests served as the primes, and their associations were the targets in the present study. There were no differences in the frequency of occurrence,  $t(62) = -.021$ ,  $p > .05$ , or in the length,  $t(126) = -1.503$ ,  $p > .05$ . There were four stimulus lists containing pairs of dominant-related words (e.g., bank-money), subordinate-related words (e.g., bank-river), dominant-unrelated words (e.g., sword-money), and subordinate-unrelated words (e.g., sword-river). If the hypothesis of the ordered access model, which assumes dominant meanings are exclusively activated, is correct, dominant-related word pairs, such as “bank-money,” would be recognized faster than unrelated word pairs, such as “sword-money”. Moreover, no significant difference in reaction time should be observed when subordinate-related word pairs, such as “bank-river,” and unrelated word pairs would be recognized. On the other hand, the multiple access model predicts that related word pairs (e.g., “bank-money” and “bank-river”) should be responded quicker than unrelated word pairs (e.g., “sword-money” and “sword-river”). Even though two meanings would be activated, dominant-related word pairs that are more strongly associated with the meanings of primes (e.g., bank-money) would be activated faster than subordinate-related words pairs (e.g., bank-river) if word recognition speed varied according to meaning dominance.

### ***Design and Procedure***

To analyze the mean correct lexical decision latencies, a 3 (Proficiency: native vs. advanced vs. intermediate)  $\times$  2 (Relatedness of prime and target: related vs. unrelated)  $\times$  2 (Meaning: dominant vs. subordinate) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the participant data. 900-ms SOA was used for examining the speed of the facilitation of dominant and subordinate meanings of ambiguous words.

Procedures for how to complete tasks were clearly described to the participants orally and visually. The homographs were presented on the computer screen one by one for 900-ms SOA, followed by their targets. The participants were instructed to read the first letter string (homograph) and judge whether or not the second letter string (target) was an English word as quickly and accurately as possible. After the lexical decision task, EFL learners took a comprehension test to verify whether they had known both meanings of the homographs. Homographs that the participants could not identify the meanings of were excluded from the analysis. All participants were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their profile and language skills. Apart from the questionnaire, all participants took a cloze test



(Bachman, 1982). It was used for categorization into two proficiency groups, advanced and intermediate, based on the results of the test.

## Results and Discussion

Only correct responses were used for analysis of mean reaction times in the research, and the following four elements were excluded from the analysis. Responses faster than 400 ms or slower than 2,000 ms were eliminated. Reaction times outside of 2.5 standard deviations from an ex-Gaussian distribution in both the high and low range were excluded from the analysis. All errors made by the participants were also removed (8%). Homographs whose two meanings could not be determined by participants correctly on the comprehension test were deleted from the data set on a subject-by-subject basis accordingly (2% of primary meanings and 17% of secondary meanings).


The mean response times for each participant group and each word pair type at 900 ms are shown in Figure 1. Significant main effects were observed for the relatedness of word meanings and proficiency levels in the experiment. Related targets were identified faster than unrelated targets,  $F(1,60) = 5.4$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta^2p = .08$ . A significant interaction of relatedness and meaning was determined,  $F(1,60) = 6.89$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta^2p = .10$ . Regarding the dominant meanings, the simple main effect of relatedness was significant and the related targets were responded faster than the unrelated targets, while the simple main effect of relatedness was not significant in the subordinate meanings. This demonstrates that dominant meanings are activated, but not subordinate meanings.

Post-hoc analyses based on the participants' proficiency levels showed a significant main effect,  $F(2,60) = 10.67$   $p < .001$   $\eta^2p = .26$ . Multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni method proved that the native speakers of English responded faster than the advanced and intermediate learners. Furthermore, the advanced learners responded significantly faster than the intermediate learners.

As considering the divergence in lexical ambiguity processing with proficiency is crucial for the research, separate relatedness  $\times$  meaning analyses were performed for each proficiency group.

In the native speakers' group, the mean reaction times showed a main effect

of relatedness. The related target was recognized faster than the unrelated target,  $F(1,17) = 6.30$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta^2p = .27$ . There was no interaction, but there was a main effect of meaning,  $F(1,17) = 4.53$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta^2p = .21$ . The main effects indicated that both meanings of the homographs were activated at 900-ms SOA in the L1 mental lexicon. Contrary to the finding, Simpson and Burgess (1985) claimed that only dominant meanings were facilitated at 750-ms SOA. The discrepancy between their argument and the result of the present study could be due to the fact that the present experiment used the targets selected from word association tests taken by both native speakers and EFL learners. The chosen targets might be lexically easy and highly familiar to the native speakers.



**Figure 1: Mean reaction times in milliseconds for participant groups and word pair types**

*D-rel = dominate-related; D-unrel = dominate-unrelated*  
*S-rel = subordinate-related; S-unrel = subordinate-unrelated*

The mean reaction times for the advanced learners of EFL showed a significant interaction between relatedness and meaning,  $F(1,18) = 7.27$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta^2p = .29$ . The simple main effect of relatedness regarding the dominant meanings approached a significant value. On the contrary, no significant difference in the mean reaction times of related targets and unrelated targets was detected for the subordinate meanings. The result indicates that only dominant meanings were activated at 900-ms SOA in the L2 mental lexicon of advanced learners. The activation pattern, through which only dominant meanings are processed at a long SOA, is comparable to the findings in previous studies, which are the patterns observed in adult native speakers (Simpson & Burgess, 1985) and older children (Simpson &

Foster, 1986).

Simpson and Burgess (1985) argued that the tendency that showed the activation of dominant meanings at a long SOA and the inhabitation of subordinate meanings occurred with the allocation of processing resources into information. Simpson and Burgess (1988) pointed out that the activation of homographs would involve two stages in the mental lexicon: initially, multiple meanings of ambiguous words would be activated, and then explicit attention to the primary meanings would be paid. They also argued that this two-stage processing would be observed only in the lexical processing of adults and older children whose word recognition skills had developed, and only the first stage of the processing would be detected in younger children whose word recognition skills have not yet fully developed. In their hypothesis, it is assumed that the processing of lexical ambiguity would become attributive with age and dominant meanings would be generated predominantly with the development of the word recognition. If the developmental changes can also be applied to L2 learners' lexical ambiguity processing, it could be argued that the result of the present study regarding advanced EFL learners shows the second of two stages of the developmental processing of lexical ambiguity.

In the intermediate EFL learners' group, there was no explicit significance among relatedness in the analysis,  $F(1,25) = 3.61$ ,  $p = .07$ ,  $\eta^2p = .13$ . The result is similar to that of 700 ms found in Ishida's study (2013). According to the study, the facilitation for less proficient learners at 300 ms was significant, yet no overt priming effect was detected at 700 ms. The findings support the research hypothesis that the activation of less proficient learners is transient and has a short time-span compared to that of native speakers and more proficient learners.

## Conclusion

The present study investigated the L2 activation of lexical ambiguity processing at a long SOA (900 ms) when an ambiguous word was encountered out of context. The findings suggested that the facilitation of an ambiguous word for advanced EFL learners was through the ordered access model, while the multiple access model was confirmed as successful among the native participants. With regard to the reaction time of the intermediate EFL learners, only a weak tendency of these accesses was observed in the analysis. Comparing the lexical processing of the native speakers with that

of the intermediate learners, the activation of homographs was transient and weak for the intermediate learners. The results proved that the processing of lexical ambiguity for intermediate EFL learners has a short time-span.

## References

- Lyle F. Bachman** (1982). The trait structure of cloze test scores. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 16, pp61-70.
- Carol Conrad** (1974). Context effects in sentence comprehension: A study of the subjective lexicon. In *Memory & Cognition*, vol 2, pp130-138.
- Kerrie E. Elston-Güttler & Angela D. Friederici** (2005). Native and L2 processing of homographs in sentential context. In *Journal of Memory and Language*, vol 52, pp256-283.
- Donald J. Foss & Charles M. Jenkins** (1973). Some effects of contexts on the comprehension of ambiguous sentences. In *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, vol 12, pp577-589.
- Cheryl Frenck-Mestre & P. Prince** (1997). Second language autonomy. In *Journal of Memory and Language*, vol 37, pp481-501.
- Thomas W. Hogaboam & Charles A. Perfetti** (1975). Lexical ambiguity and sentence comprehension. In *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, vol 14, pp265-274.
- Pamela Holley-Wilcox & Michelle A. Blank** (1980). Evidence for multiple access in the processing of isolated words. In *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, vol 6, pp75-84.
- Tomomi Ishida** (2013). Are multiple meanings of ambiguous words activated in L2 word recognition? Evidence from the priming paradigm. In *Book of abstracts, The European Second Language Association 23*, pp98-99.
- Douglas L. Nelson, Cathy L. McEvoy, John R. Walling & Joseph W. Wheeler, Jr.** (1980). The University of South Florida homograph norms. In *Behavior Research Methods and Instrumentation*, vol 12, pp16-37.
- William Onifer & David A. Swinney** (1981). Accessing lexical ambiguities during sentence comprehension: Effects of frequency of meaning and contextual bias. In *Memory & Cognition*, vol 9, pp225-236.
- Roger W. Schvaneveldt, David E. Meyer & Curtis A. Becker** (1976). Lexical ambiguity, semantic context, and visual word recognition. In *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, vol 2, pp243-256.
- Greg B. Simpson** (1981). Meaning dominance and semantic context in the processing of lexical ambiguity. In *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, vol 20, pp120-136.
- Greg B. Simpson & Curt Burgess** (1985). Activation and selection processes in the recognition of ambiguous words. In *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, vol 11, pp28-39.
- Greg B. Simpson & Curt Burgess** (1988). Implications of lexical ambiguity resolution for word recognition and comprehension. In Steven L. Small, Garrison W. Cottrell & Michael K. Tanenhaus (eds.), *Lexical Ambiguity Resolution*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers: San Mateo, CA, USA, pp271-288.

- Greg B. Simpson & Mollie Ramsey Foster** (1986). Lexical ambiguity and children's word recognition. In *Developmental Psychology*, vol 22, pp147-154.
- David A. Swinney** (1979). Lexical access during sentence comprehension: (Re)consideration of context effects. In *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, vol 18, pp645-659.
- Michael K. Tanenhaus, James M. Leiman & Mark S. Seidenberg** (1979). Evidence for multiple stages in the processing of ambiguous words in syntactic contexts. In *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, vol 18, pp427-440.
- Keith A. Wollen, Steven D. Cox, Margaret M. Coahran, Daniel S. Shea & Robert F. Kirby** (1980). Frequency of occurrence and concreteness ratings of homograph meanings. In *Behavior Methods and Instrumentation*, vol 12, pp8-15.



# **7 Promoting literature-focused cross-cultural communication and collaboration between Taiwanese and Japanese EFL university students through technology-enhanced literature circles**

Wan-lun Lee  
*Fu Jen Catholic University*  
leemary.tw@yahoo.com.tw

## **Introduction**

The rapid development of computer and internet technologies in the information era has made it easier for people from different parts of the world to interact and work with one another online and provided more opportunities for English learners living in an EFL environment to use the target language for real communication and collaboration purposes. It has thus become crucial for English teachers in the 21st century to explore all sorts of possibilities of integrating technology into the teaching of EFL students in order to motivate these students to learn and use English beyond the walls of their language classrooms and get more actively engaged in the global community in online settings.

As a full-time university English teacher in Taiwan, I often find my EFL students fluent and comfortable with web-based technologies though most of them admit that they seldom use these technologies to do any English-related activity, such as reading electronic texts on English websites, exchanging English messages or emails with friends, or posting English comments online. In order to make these technologies play a significant role not only in these students' daily lives but also in their English learning process, I have been searching for appropriate technology-enhanced approaches to create high-interest language learning activities in my English courses for English and non-English majors.

On the other hand, my personal interest in reading and discussing English short stories and novels has given me the eagerness to explore the linguistic, cultural and aesthetic benefits of using literature in ELT, and my search for a satisfying method of using literary texts with EFL learners has directed my attention to the literature circle approach. In its simplest definition, literature circles are small, student-led, and role-based discussion groups where members read and discuss the same story or book before they choose another text and move on to the next cycle (Daniels, 1994). Traditionally, literature circles are only conducted in face-to-face classrooms, but in recent years, there have been more and more successful cases of using literature circles in online environments. Only a few of these cases, however, have been done in EFL context or between EFL learners studying English in different places of the world.

This paper reports on the practice and effects of a cross-cultural technology-enhanced literature circle project designed to create opportunities for Taiwanese and Japanese EFL university students to work together in small groups to read and discuss short stories in English synchronously and asynchronously by means of online communication tools, including Skype, weblogs and e-mail.

## **The Design and Implementation of the Project**

Before the project started, thirty English short stories had been preselected and posted on a blog called “Literature Circle Blog.” Then I managed to find a Japanese teacher who was willing to let her Japanese students work with my Taiwanese students on this project, and we started discussing and deciding on the details about the implementation of this cross-cultural technology-enhanced literature circle project in our English courses. In the first semester, we let our students not majoring in English work together, and in the second semester, we had our English majors participate in this project.

In both semesters, in the first class gathering, the literature circle approach and the literature circle blog were introduced to the students in each class before they took a TOEIC-style reading comprehension test. In the second week, mixed-ability groups of four to six Japanese and Taiwanese members were formed using their reading test results, and each group had to start contacting members via email or Skype to decide on the date and time of each of the four online discussions as well as the way of rotating the six discussion roles, including Discussion Director, Summarizer & Recorder,



Web Researcher, Passage Master & Tracker, Connector and Word Wizard. The six different roles with different functions were used to help the students get a deeper understanding of the text (Miller et al., 2007), allow them to bring many levels of prior knowledge to the text (Devik-Fry & Lesage, 2010), and challenge them to do more in-depth preparation for the discussion instead of simply reading the story (Whittingham, 2013).

In each semester, each group had to complete four cycles of literature circle. Usually the students had one or two weeks to read a short story chosen by their own group and then leave their after-reading comments on the blog for their group members to read and exchange ideas in an asynchronous way. In the next one or two weeks, they had to prepare notes or materials to help them play their discussion roles well and then the whole group gathered together at the same time to discuss the story by exchanging text-based or voice messages on Skype. After each discussion was done, the Summarizer & Recorder of each group had to submit the discussion record. Besides, each of them needed to fill in an evaluation form to reflect on and assess their own performance and that of their group members'.

At the end of the project, the students took another TOEIC-style reading comprehension test, and their post-test results were compared with their pre-test ones to help them know whether their English reading ability had improved due to their participation in this project.

## **The Investigation into the Effects of the Project**

A mixed methods approach was employed to collect both qualitative and quantitative data in order to investigate more thoroughly the effects of this project from the Taiwanese and Japanese university students' perspectives. Qualitative data came from my one-on-one interviews with Taiwanese and Japanese students and their answers to the open-ended questions of the two questionnaire surveys, including the one called "Getting Started" administered at the beginning of each semester and the Exit Questionnaire the participants had to fill in at the end of each semester. Quantitative data collection instruments included the two questionnaire surveys and pre- and post-tests.

The majority of the Taiwanese and Japanese participants of both English major and non-English major thought positively of this English learning experience, and the major findings indicate that most of the Taiwanese and

Japanese EFL students felt that the project did improve their English reading ability and critical thinking skills, enhance their motivation to read, write and speak in English outside the classroom, and increase their confidence in using English to communicate with foreigners as well as their interest in learning English through short stories. Many of them also agreed that working with group members with different cultural backgrounds had added more fun to this learning activity and motivated them to work harder on it, and that the literature circle blog, Skype, and email were appropriate and useful online tools for this project that required cross-country collaboration and cross-cultural communication though some Taiwanese students strongly recommended using Facebook and Line as well. Particularly noteworthy is that most of the participants did not find it hard to understand their foreign group members' opinions and viewpoints. Moreover, they felt they had learned more interesting ideas from these foreigners than from their fellow students.

However, there were also complaints about this project, and most of them were about three things. First of all, on average, the Japanese students of English major had weaker English than the Taiwanese ones, so the former had difficulty understanding what was being discussed or expressing their ideas clearly and actively while the latter often felt disappointed because they could not know what their Japanese members really had in mind. Next, most of the Japanese participants had part-time jobs and some Taiwanese ones had to spend most of their free time on the other activities, so some students complained that it was very difficult for their groups to decide on the online discussion date and time, which was sometimes changed again and again for various reasons. Last, some students that preferred to exchange voice messages with their group members on Skype felt disappointed when they were forced to exchange text-based messages because one or two of their group members did not have the equipment needed to have a real chat online or because their Internet connection was not good enough for them to actually "talk" on Skype.

## **Conclusion**

Though there is still room for further improvement in the design and implementation of this cross-cultural technology-enhanced literature circle project, it is hoped that its positive outcomes and findings will encourage university English teachers who are interested in integrating technology into language education or using literature in ELT, or who have used traditional

face-to-face literature circles, to consider using this new literature circle approach with their EFL students and creating an authentic learning environment for them to shape, express and exchange their ideas in the target language.

## References

- Harvey Daniels** (1995). *Literature Circles: Voice and Choice in the Student-Centered Classroom*. Stenhouse Publishers: Portland, ME, USA.
- Jane Devick-Fry & Teresa LeSage** (2010). Science Literary Circles: Big Ideas about Science. In *Science Activities*, vol 47, pp35-41.
- Linda Miller, William Straits, Linda Kucan, Woodrow Trathen, & Max Dass** (2007). Literature Circle Roles for Science Vocabulary. In *The Science Teacher*, vol 74, pp52-56.
- Jeff Whittingham** (2013). Literature Circles: A Perfect Match for Online Instruction. In *TechTrends*, vol 57 July/August 2013, pp53-58.



# 8 Identifying the Functions of Communities of Practice in an EFL Classroom

Akiko Nagao  
*Kumamoto University, Japan*  
na00e328@gmail.com

## Introduction

In the classroom environment in Japan, for a long time it was believed that the learning which occurred within learners' brains was based on behaviorism (Nishiguchi, 1999), while learners' intellectual acts and learning distributed between the learners and tools and among learners and learning environments was an effect of socially distributed cognition (Takagi, 1999). Research in the field of applied linguistics is only now beginning to shift towards the idea that learning and knowledge transmission can be embedded in situations and is dependent on the environment, community, social semiotics, tools and people. Learning can mean sharing goals and information, working in groups to solve problems and/or networking through interactions with other members of a community (Lave & Wenger 1991).

Although research has been conducted into such Communities of Practice (CoPs) for two decades now, their functions and patterns are still little understood. In particular, only a limited amount of research has been conducted into CoP dynamics: how such communities and their patterns of activity are formed (Ribeiro 2011). As noted by Lave (1991), it is a challenge to identify CoPs, "because they exhibit organisational patterns that are not reflected in hierarchical organisation charts", which refers to the idea that CoPs evolve organically (Hara, 2008, p. 14). Therefore, to understand how CoPs are embedded within EFL language learning environments in Japan, this study examines the degrees of participation of language learners in sustained CoPs. It is hoped that this research will allow the successful development of CoPs for the enhancement of learning and classroom management.

## Literature Review

### *Background to Communities of Practice*

This section outlines the functions of CoPs, which have become an important focus in the development of organizations. The CoP is defined as a learning social network of participants with shared skills within a profession (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In a CoP, people gain knowledge and skills through participation in a variety of social practices with other CoP members (Lave 1991).

Members constantly seek to gain important information and to improve their abilities to be able to apply these skills to their social practices within the CoP framework (Wenger 1998; Mickan 2006). In the case of EFL classrooms, participants as class members may constantly seek to gain information about how to deal with the task efficiently and productively with other members, improving not only these learners' language proficiency but also their ability to cooperate in the classroom with others. Importantly, the acquisition of knowledge and skills proceeds from participation in the CoP. This participation is defined as a process of learning within the CoP context. Wenger (2002) identified three key features of CoPs: (1) participants engage in particular events, (2) participants have a common communication strategy in order to engage in particular entities and (3) participants share the same achievements, interests and values after their practice participation. In a CoP, learning is not simply knowledge transmission through intellectual performance and information processing, nor is it based on memorisation or repetition. On the contrary, CoP learning is a concrete practice activity actualised through members' cooperative reactions (Lave & Wenger 1991). In a CoP, novice members can be influenced by older and more experienced members (Lave & Wenger 1991).

### *Degree of Participation in the CoP*

Wenger (2002) suggested three possible levels of member involvement in CoPs: peripheral, active, and core. Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) theory is one of the learning theories that has influenced Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), Habitus theory, and Giddens and Dallmayr's (1982) Theory of Structuration. LPP defines how people gain knowledge and skills through interaction with other members of the CoP, which is the primal state of the learning process (Lave and Wenger 1991).

In this paper, learning is not defined simply as engagement in target language knowledge transmission; rather, learners participate in social practices in which are embedded important skills and knowledge, and these practices

eventually enhance their learning (Wenger 2002). In this way, participants gradually develop a sense of membership within the CoP (Wenger 2002). Also of importance within the LPP framework is that knowledge and skills are embedded in teachers, the learning environment, and learning contexts (Wenger 2002; Takao 2007). By comparing novice participants with established members, a large number of differences can be observed in, for example, interaction with other members, the quality of relationships with other community members, how they evaluate their own learning strategies, and the degree of identity transformation (Lave and Wenger 1991). In the LPP learning framework, when a new member joins the CoP, they may initially work on less challenging jobs. The new member then observes the actions and movement of more experienced members in order to become more experienced members themselves (Wenger 1998). The LPP learning framework allows novices to become aware of what they can do within the CoP, what they already know from their former experience, what new knowledge they have to gain in order to survive within the CoP, and what kinds of participation roles are expected (Wenger 2002). While there is a great deal of research into the features of peripheral members, fewer definitions

have been developed of core and active members. Active members are those whose regularity and intensity of participation is not at the same level as the core group, but who do participate in the social practices of the CoP (Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder 2002). Compared to other member types, there are relatively few core members within a CoP. These members have a higher level of discretion on projects, more experience in the CoP, and usually understand how they are expected to act within the CoP (Wenger 2002). Core members are mostly defined as taking a central role and contributing more than other members to the CoP function (DeSanctis, Fayard, Roach & Jiang, 2003). They provide intellectual and social leadership and show their expertise in order to coordinate the CoP network (Wenger and Snyder 2000; Wenger et al. 2002). Thus, while some definitions of participation roles have been developed, one of the challenges of this paper is to clarify certain features of core, active, and peripheral members in the EFL language learning context.

## **Context and Research Questions**

In this study, learners participated in three different types of social practices for writing: recounting, explanation and discussion. They learned to analyse

written texts critically, to research essay questions and to construct and develop logical arguments through a genre-based approach to language learning, following Feez's (1998) cycle of learning. The aim of the course was for learners to become able to analyse and produce discussion-genre essays through participation in a large number of tasks in peer groups.

In this paper, these EFL learners and those related to the learners will be examined as 'individual community members'. The EFL writing classroom environment, based in a Japanese university, will be defined as the CoP. The EFL learners will learn how to become aware of their participatory roles and how to maintain relationships with other members of the CoP in order to learn the target language. In order to understand how first-year Japanese university students become experienced learners through participation in genre-based writing classroom communities, this study will analyse the degree of participation of learners in a particular language-learning classroom. The research question is as follows: How do EFL learners define the roles of core and active members in the EFL classroom?

## **Methodology**

### ***Participants***

The participants comprised 27 first-year students (Class G) from the Faculty of Business Administration at a Japanese university, who participated in the research over the course of one semester. In total, the students participated in six English lessons per week in an intermediate-level English proficiency class (TOEIC scores ranging from 450–600) with the same class members. The author taught Class G twice a week for one semester. All the students produced free-writing and self-reflection texts (each writing more than 10 examples of the latter during the semester) on the topic of their engagement in learning social practices. The majority of students had never previously experienced a genre-based approach combined with Feez's (1998) learning cycle. Therefore, they were novices in this environment.

### ***Data Collection and Analysis***

This study examines the results of the text-mining analysis of learners' written self-reflections. One challenge for this research paper was identifying what degrees of participation in the CoP constituted core, active and peripheral participation. As discussed in the literature review, a large number of definitions for peripheral membership have been produced; however, the roles and functions of core and active members need further expansion.



Therefore, in order to clarify the criteria for each degree of participation, during week 10 of the research study, 25 out of 27 learners were asked to write free texts describing what they believed constituted core, active and peripheral membership.

By this stage, learners had completed three different genre-writing tasks: recounting, explanation and discussion. Lave & Wenger's (1991) model for Communities of Practice and the terms 'core member', 'active member' and 'peripheral member' had been explained to the participants during the first week. Text-mining analysis was then applied to the learners' free writing to examine how they had described the roles of core, active and peripheral members in their learning context. This was followed by an analysis of the learners' categorisation of the other members of the classroom into these roles.

Text analysis has been used widely in traditional qualitative methods (Michalski 2011) to uncover patterns and regularity in natural language (Zhang & Segall 2010). In this study, the analysis software KH Coder (Higuchi 2014) was used to extract and chart the essential elements of the CoP as identified from the learners' free writing. A self-organizing map (SOM) was used to depict the semantic relationships demonstrated within the free-writing sentences (Van Hulle 2012). In the first part of the text-mining analysis, the learners' degrees of participation were categorised. All learners' free-writing regarding defining roles as core, active, and peripheral members in their classroom was categorised as frequently used words and meanings: "higher English proficiency and knowledge" and "greater leadership skills". The same texts were also used to create the SOMs, providing visual diagrams that grouped similar words together from a large data set. In the SOM analysis, the same parameters were used to analyse the data, with a set of different variables. The network was created from a 2D lattice of nodes and the Ward method was applied to cluster these nodes.

## Results

### *New Definition of Core Members in the Language Learning CoP*

Learners in Class G produced a particular image and definition for core members. Their free-writing texts totalled 2,975 words. Table 1 shows the criteria for their definitions of core members. The majority of learners acknowledged that core members had superior language knowledge and abilities (n = 16). Another common criterion was the ability to lead other members during group discussion (n = 10). Core members also needed to have the ability to listen to other members' opinions (n = 10) and to express

their own opinions spontaneously and actively ( $n = 7$ ). These results indicate that a core member has a higher level of discretion on projects, has a great deal of experience in the CoP and usually understands how s/he is expected to act within the CoP (Wenger 2002). Core members are defined generally as taking a central role in their CoPs (DeSanctis, Fayard, Roach & Jiang, 2003). While many of the criteria identified mirror Wenger's definition (2002), the 'ability to listen' element can be considered a new feature of core members. Learners in Class G tended to mention abilities related to effective group work. Another characteristic identified for core members was confidence in terms of language proficiency ( $n = 3$ ). Moreover, learners noted certain personality features for core members, such as cheerfulness, trustworthiness and a higher sense of responsibility when completing tasks.

Criteria	n
Higher English proficiency and knowledge	18
Greater leadership skills	10
Able to listen to other members' opinions	10
Actively expresses his or her own opinions	7
Participates spontaneously in social practices in class	6
Always attends lessons	5
Has confidence in own English proficiency	3
Has a cheerful personality	2
Has a larger vocabulary	2
Has confidence in own opinion	2

**Table 1: Criteria for Core Members**

Nouns	n	Nominal nouns	n	Verbs	N
Members	33	To participate in class	18	To assume	20
English	19	To answer in front of other members/to make statements	11	To think	9
Activity	18	To express an opinion	8	To have	7
Group	17	To participate	5	To boost	4
Abilities	13	To attend	4	To add	3
Works	12	To have accurate answers	4	To give answers	3
Myself	11	To activate	3	To say	3
Class	8	To ask questions	3	To address	3
Confidence	6	To have initiative	3	To be outstanding	2
Centre	6	To feel relief	2	To enjoy	2

**Table 2: Core Members: Frequent words list**

Table 2 shows the frequent nouns, verbs and nominal verbs used by learners to describe core members. The results show that the nouns *Member* ( $n = 33$ ), *English* ( $n = 19$ ), *Activity* ( $n = 19$ ), *Group* ( $n = 17$ ), *Ability* ( $n = 13$ ) and *Work* ( $n = 12$ ) were used most frequently. The most commonly used nominal verbs

(formed by adding 'suru' to a Japanese noun) were *to participate in class* (n = 18), *to answer in front of other members/to make statements* (n = 11), *to express opinions* (n = 8), *to participate* (n = 5), *to attend* (n = 4), *to give accurate answers* (n = 4), *to activate* (n = 3) and *to ask questions* (n = 3). The most common verbs used were *to assume* (n = 20), *to think* (n = 9), *to have* (n = 7) and *to boost* (n = 4). These results indicate that core members are able to actively participate in group work, have strong opinions and can state their own opinions in front of other members.

Figure 1 shows the SOM of learners' written texts for their core member definitions. The map is divided into seven clusters. The cluster at the top left of the SOM is word group A: *leadership, high, to have, every time, group, work, confidence*. Word group B, which adjoins word group A, contains the terms *attend, actively, class* and *to answer*. Word group C consists of *ability, English, to address* and *to think*. Word group D is made up of *people, to add, initiative, to think* and *members*. The words in these clusters A, B, C, D, are similar to words and definitions of core members by Wenger, McDermott and Snyder (2002). According to these results, participants tend to have an ideal image of a core member. Wenger (2002) claimed that core members always attend meetings and have the power to express their opinions at these meetings. They tend to define core members as those who have the confidence to take initiative and lead discussions. All the labels from the SOM analysis for the core member definitions are summarised in Table 3.




Figure 1: Core Members: Self-Organizing Maps (Ward method)

Words groups	Label name	Words
A	Leadership	leadership, high, to have, every time, group, work, confidence
B	Attendance	attend, actively, class, to answer
C	English knowledge and abilities	ability, English, to address, to think
D	Relationship with other members	people, to think, members, to add, initiative
E	Authorities/ Power relations	to boost [ <i>to pull up</i> ], knowledge
F	Accurate answers	accurate answers, a lot, class, to say, questions
G	Participation	to participate, myself, centre

**Table 3: Core members: SOM Labels**

### ***New Definition of Active Members in the Language Learning CoP***

The learners' free-writing texts were also analysed for definitions of active members in the CoP. Table 4 shows some of the essential criteria for active members as defined by the learners in Class G. The majority of learners indicated that active members need to be able to express opinions during active participation in lessons ( $n = 23$ ). They also need to be able to summarise their discussions logically and smoothly ( $n = 8$ ). They have higher levels of assertiveness than peripheral members but not as high as those of core members ( $n = 6$ ). They have strong opinions and can convince others ( $n = 6$ ). They can support core members ( $n = 4$ ). These results indicate that active members are not expected to have as great a level of proficiency in the target language as core members; however, they do need to have significant knowledge in order to be able to summarise discussion content productively during group activities. Active members should have a higher degree of activity and effectiveness in terms of their participation than peripheral members.

Criteria	n
Able to participate actively	23
Able to summarise discussion content	8
Have higher assertiveness levels	6
Have own opinions and able to convince others	6
Able to support core members	4
Able to cooperate with other members	3
Have lower English proficiency than core members	3
Have a higher accuracy rate than peripheral members	1
Use nonverbal communication	1
Core members rely on them	1
Other	23

**Table 4: Criteria for Active Members in Class G**

Nouns	n	Nominal verbs	n	Verbs	n
Members	27	to have class	27	to suppose	15
Activity	26	to make remarks	22	to think	6
Abilities	16	to participate	12	to have	5
Group	15	to express opinion	6	to answer	4
Myself	14	to ask questions	5	to demand	3
Work	12	to have a relationship	4	to address	3
English	12	to discuss	4	to submit	3
Confidence	5	to act	3	to talk	3
Surrender	5	to cooperate	3	to feel	2
Answers	5	to have initiative	3	to make mistakes	2

**Table 5: Active members: common words list**

Table 5 shows the nouns, verbs and nominal verbs used most frequently by participants to describe active members. The most common nouns used were *members* (n = 27), *activity* (n = 26), *abilities* (n = 26) and *group* (n = 15). Common nominal verbs used were *to have classes* (n = 27), *to make remarks* (n = 22), *to participate* (n = 12), *to express opinion* (n = 6) and *to ask questions* (n = 5). Finally, common verbs used are *to suppose* (n = 15), *to think* (n = 6), *to have* (n = 5), *to answer* (n = 4) and *to demand* (n = 3).

Figure 2 shows the SOM of active member elements; the map is divided into nine clusters. Table 6 is a summary of the SOM labels for the active members of the class. Word group A comprises the words *cooperation*, *activity*, *centre* and *class*. Word group B, which adjoins word group A, contains the words *high*, *questions*, and *to address*. Word group C consists of *answer*, *surrenders*, *to have* and *to demand*. Word group F is made up of *English*, *ability*, *confidence* and *to think*. Word group G contains *actively*, *to participate*, *class* and *discussion*. The SOM map of active members allows us to understand the similarities between the features identified for active and core members: both need to be concerned about relationships with others, they need to have English knowledge and ability, they should participate actively and should exhibit a degree of leadership. Some features that differ between active and core members are: (1) their ability to respond to questions in reading comprehensions and group discussions related to English learning tasks and (2) their ability to provide opportunities for other members to give answers for these tasks and questions, with a view to building and maintaining CoP relationships. However, most of the criteria for active and core members are similar.



**Figure 2: Active Members: Self-Organizing Maps (Ward method)**

Word groups	Label name	Words
A	Cooperation with members	cooperation, activity, centre, class
B	Asking questions	high, questions, to address
C	Answering questions	answer, surrenders, to have, to demand
D	Relationship with members	members, to think
E	Providing an opportunity to maintain relationships	to provide, relationships
F	English knowledge and abilities	English, ability, confidence, to think
G	Participation	actively, to participate, class, discussion
H	Initiative (leadership)	works, initiative
I	Expressing opinions	people, utterance, myself, opinion

**Table 6: Active members: SOM labels**

### *Peripheral members*

Table 7 shows the categories for the essential criteria for peripheral members as identified by the learners in Class G. Peripheral members are defined as people who lack a positive attitude towards participation due to their personalities and levels of willingness to be involved ( $n = 16$ ). Usually, they are not strong language learners ( $n = 7$ ) and do not have sufficient confidence in their English proficiency, which influences their group work negatively ( $n = 9$ ). They do not participate in conversations during classroom and group discussions ( $n = 7$ ). They struggle with group work due to a lack of self-assertiveness and communication skills ( $n = 6$ ). They will not state their

answers in front of a large group of people because they are either unwilling or unable to do so (n = 5). They may be shy or less emotionally expressive than others (n = 5).

Criteria	N
Lack positive attitude towards participation due to personality and level of willingness	16
Lack confidence in their English proficiency, which influences their group work negatively	9
Are not usually strong learners in terms of English proficiency	7
Do not participate in classroom and group discussions	7
Struggle to participate in group work due to lack of self-assertiveness and communication skills	6
Do not state their answers in front of a large group because they are unwilling or unable to do so	5
Have particular personality traits, such as being shy and/or less emotionally expressive	5
Often late for, or absent from, class	4
Do not engage in tasks without scaffolding from others	4
Try to follow group discussion but give up easily because they cannot understand	1

**Table 7: Definition of Peripheral Members in Class G**

One interesting observation about peripheral members is that they are cooperative and participate actively in group work when encouraged to do so by core or active members; however, core and active members cannot expect spontaneous participation from them. These results indicate that peripheral members are not expected to have high proficiency in English; the low frequency of verbal participation during group tasks and the degree of (in)activeness causes members to evaluate such people as peripheral.


Table 8 shows the nouns, verbs and nominal verbs used most frequently to describe peripheral members. The nouns used most commonly are *members* (n = 25), *activity* (n = 16), *myself* (n = 15), *group* (n = 13) and *confidence* (n = 13). Common nominal verbs used are *to take classes* (n = 20), *to make remarks* (n = 14), *to express opinions* (n = 8), *to participate* (n = 7) and *to act* (n = 6). Common verbs used are *to assume* (n = 20), *to answer* (n = 8), *to think* (n = 5), *to have* (n = 5) and *to demand* (n = 3). The two elements ‘some degree of relationship with other members’ and ‘English proficiency level’ may mark participants out as peripheral members.



Nouns	N	Nominal nouns	N	Verbs	N
Members	25	to take classes	20	to assume	20
Activity	16	to make remarks	14	to answer	6
Myself	15	to express opinion	8	to think	5
Group	13	to participate	7	to have	5
Confidence	13	to act	6	to demand	3
Works	12	to transmit	3	to say	3
Abilities	11	to understand	3	to listen	3
Answers	9	to concern	2	to lack	2
English	7	to stay constant	2	to point	2
Personalities	6	to have a relationship	2	to move	2

**Table 8: Peripheral members: frequent words list**

Figure 3 shows the SOM of learners' definitions for peripheral members' elements; these are divided into eight clusters. Word group A comprises to listen, answers, to answer, self and to have. Word group D contains members, to think, to participate and personalities. Word group F is composed of group, work, people and ability. All the SOM data results are summarised in Table 9.



**Figure 3: Peripheral Members: Self-Organizing Maps (Ward method)**



Word groups	Labels	Words
A	Ability to listen to others	To listen, to answer, self, to have
B	Degree of understanding	Opinions, understanding
C	Confidence	Confidence, to remark
D	Relationship with other members (personality)	Members, to think, to participate, personalities
E	English knowledge and abilities	English, activities, high, activeness
F	Relationship with other members	Group, work, people, ability
G	Output	Output, a lot, to think

**Table 9: Peripheral members: SOM Labels**

## Discussion

### *The CoP Form and the Development of the English Language Learning Classroom: Core Members*

*English Proficiency and Abilities.* One of the essential characteristics of core members is English proficiency/language learning ability. These members have a better understanding of technical words related to genre writing. The features of community discourse are discussed in Wenger's (1998) CoP model. However, the results of this research indicate that core members need to have higher target language proficiency and knowledge than other members so that they can support and scaffold others in the classroom environment.

*Human Relationships.* According to Wenger et al. (2002), in order to become a core member of a language learning CoP, a learner not only needs highly developed target language knowledge but is also expected to have leadership skills and to listen to other members' opinions. In this study, it has further been shown that core members should encourage active members to become core members and should also serve as role models for peripheral members. Furthermore, they should gain the trust of other members of the community.

*Personality.* Learners in this study have strong biases regarding the ideal personality of a core member. A core member should be cheerful and confident, taking responsibility for completing tasks and participating in various social practices.

### ***The CoP Form and the Development of the English Language Learning Classroom: Active Members***

*English proficiency and abilities.* Active members are expected to have lower levels of English proficiency than core members and to have a smaller vocabulary. However, active members regularly practise and review their English skills and complete assignments. They maintain a motivation for language learning.

*Human relationships.* Although they may not have the highest level of English proficiency, active members are expected to participate actively in group tasks. The degree of activity can be understood as one of the key criteria that defines learners as active members or otherwise. Active members can take important roles in group activities and while they have less opportunities for answering questions or expressing their own opinion than core members, they still have strong opinions and can convince others. Active members can support core members and can also accept support from others in order to improve their own skills.

*Personality.* Learners in Class G visualise active members as those who have confidence in their language proficiency and who can state their opinions spontaneously in front of others. Active members do not worry unduly about the accuracy of their answers and they have the ability to convey their opinions.

### **Conclusion**

This study has analysed free-writing texts in order to understand how Japanese first-year students of English form a Community of Practice in the EFL classroom. The results show that learners negotiate, interact and work with one another towards the same goal, not only in general communities but also in language learning communities (Wenger et al. 2002). Participants can be categorised as being core, active or peripheral members; however, the definitions for these roles are more complex than Wenger et al. (2002) suggest.

Although scholars have conducted studies into CoPs, more research is needed into the following aspects: CoP dynamics, the process of CoP formation, activity patterns of the CoP and how CoPs come into existence (Ribeiro 2011). This research reveals the important elements required to form a successful CoP in an EFL classroom. Text analysis of learners' free

writing has allowed us to form a more detailed description of the roles of core and active members.

This study was limited by a small sample size and by confining the research to a particular classroom; therefore, in future studies, further data analysis of the EFL CoP is necessary in order to theorise how the CoP is formed in the classroom context. In particular, it would be useful to examine the connection between the genre-based writing approach and the results explicitly, in terms of learners' transformation from novices to experienced learners. In particular, further work could be conducted on whether demotivated peripheral students can become more active members as they move from being novices to being experienced learners.

## References

- Gerardine DeSanctis, Anne-Laure Fayard, Michael Roach & Lu Jiang** (2003). Learning in online forums. In *European Management Journal*, vol. 21 (5), pp565-577.
- Susan Feez** (1998). *Text-based Syllabus Design*. Macquarie University/AMES: Sydney, Australia.
- Anthony Giddens & Fred. R. Dallmayr** (1982). *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory*. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA, USA.
- Noriko Hara** (2008). *Communities of Practice: Fostering Peer-to-Peer Learning and Informal Knowledge Sharing in the Work Place (Information Science and Knowledge Management)*. Springer: Berlin, Germany.
- Koichi Higuchi** (2014). *Shyakai Cyosanotameno Keiryō Text Bunseki: Naiyoubunseki no shyōkei to hatten wo mezashite [Measurements for Text Analysis in Social Research with the Aim of Inheritance and Development of Content Analysis]*. Nakanishiya Press: Kyoto, Japan.
- Jean Lave & Étienne Wenger** (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. University of Cambridge Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Jean Lave** (1991). Situating Learning in Communities of Practice. In *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, vol 2, pp63-82.
- Greg V. Michalski** (2011). *Complementing the Numbers: A Text-mining Analysis of College Course Withdrawals*. Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research (NJ1) Annual Forum, Toronto, Canada, May 24, 2011, accessed 10 December 2014. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED531730.pdf>.
- Peter Mickan** (2006). Socialization, Social Practices, and Teaching. In P. Mickan, I. Petrescu & J. Timoney (eds), *Social Practices, Pedagogy, and Language Use: Studies in Socialization*. Lythrum Press: Adelaide, Australia, pp7-23.
- Koichi Nishiguchi** (1991). Japanese language education seen from the perspective of situated learning [in Japanese]. In *Bulletin of International Student Center Osaka University*, vol 3, pp1-15.

- Richard. D. Ribeiro** (2011). *Recurrent Communities of Practice (RCoPs) and Transient Core Members (TCMs): Temporal Behaviour of Co-located and On-line Communities of Practice*. PhD thesis, University of York, UK.
- Khotaro Takagi** (1999). Identity construction in legitimate peripheral participation theory [in Japanese]. In *Bulletin of the Center for Educations of Children Overseas Tokyo Gakugei University*, vol. 10, pp1-14.
- Misako Takao** (2007). The Learning Process of Workshop Staff: The development of legitimate peripheral participation [in Japanese]. *Rikkyo University Journal of Social Design Studies*, vol 6, pp109-116.
- Marc M. Van Hulle** (2012). Self-organizing Maps. In Grzegorz Rozenberg, T. Bäck & J. N. Kok (eds.), *Handbook of Natural Computing*. Springer: Berlin and Heidelberg, Germany, pp585-622.
- Étienne Wenger** (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Étienne Wenger** (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: a quick start up guide*. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/equal\\_consolidated/data/document/0709-cop-guide\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/equal_consolidated/data/document/0709-cop-guide_en.pdf)
- Étienne C. Wenger & William M. Snyder** (2000). Communities of Practice: The organizational frontier. In *Harvard Business Review*, vol 78 (1), pp139-146.
- Étienne Wenger, Richard McDermott & William Snyder** (2002). *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.
- Qingyu Zhang & Richard S. Segall** (2010). Review of Data, Text, and Web mining Software. In *Kybernetes*, vol 39 (4), pp625-655.

# 9 **Learning and working for meaningful communication in interviews: Making a transition from the teacher's questions to the student's questions and why it matters**

Ian Nakamura  
*Okayama University*  
iannaka@okayama-u.ac.jp

## **Introduction: The situation, problem, and proposed solution**

Interviews happen all around us in such well-known forms as broadcast news, job selection, and foreign language oral proficiency tests. When hearing that there will be an interview, most people have an idea of the procedure. We are familiar with the roles the interviewer and interviewee respectively play. The organization of turn taking is clear. The management of interviews is in the hands of the interviewer. This important constraint sequentially organizes the ensuing talk into a 'turn-type pre-allocation' of questions and answers according to the roles (Atkinson & Drew, 1979). The interviewer asks questions and the interviewee answers them. This controlled and seemingly predictable structure and manner of speaking makes interviews a popular method of discourse. In language learning and teaching contexts, the turn taking of this discourse practice is apparently straightforward, but a word of caution should be raised.

What is talked about is often 'limited' to the agenda set by the interviewer (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). While this constraint may not be a problem in many situations where the institutional purpose is well-defined, it could prove overly restrictive in allowing the interviewee to give full expression of his/her experience and thoughts. This paper explores one solution to this potential problem of only hearing and dealing with what the interviewer asks: Provide time for the interviewee to ask questions.

Discussions at two BAAL 2014 presentations on the IELTS interview test by Seedhouse, and Berry and O'Sullivan, respectively, considered the idea of giving interviewees (in the future) a chance to ask questions. This opportunity, for example, could encourage IELTS interview test candidates to express themselves more freely. In turn, examiners might see the candidates in a new light. One limitation of interviewing for institutional purposes is that inquirers only hear one side of the 'story', answers to questions that they (e.g., employer, teacher, doctor, etc.) ask.

Allowing the interviewee-candidate time (e.g., in the last few minutes) to ask questions may reveal new and important information that might not have been covered by the interviewer's questions. Acknowledging the co-accomplishment of the interview and that this kind of talk consists of more than an exchange of questions and answers makes assessment a complex undertaking. As for pedagogic implications and application, the key structural issue for co-participants is not simply following the interview procedure, but also being aware of how the talk is unfolding.

A socially oriented view of the interview structure is provided by taking a conversational analytic perspective. Interviews, as other forms of talk, are social interactions that are co-constructed. What co-participants do in interviews is more than asking and answering questions. In conversation analysis (CA), interviews have been examined for how their institutional orientation is displayed through turn taking and its sequential organization. For example, Heritage and Clayman (2010) illustrate an interview's characteristic constraint by contrasting it with the lack of such constraint in daily conversation. In ordinary talk, there is an unpredictability of what to say, how long to say it, and even who will say it and when. Such features are not predetermined, 'but remain to be determined by the participants themselves as the conversation unfolds' (p. 216).

The underlying organizational concept in interviews restricts the interviewer to asking questions and the interviewee to answering them. CA, however, would point out that there is an array of actions that speakers can take to get around limitations (e.g., strict turn taking roles). Participants can orient to the structure through 'marked' actions. According to Clayman and Heritage (2002), the boundaries can be stretched as to what is acceptable within the institutional purpose and plan. What Heritage and Clayman (2010) demonstrate through numerous excerpts of news interviews is how participants tend to follow the format of questions and answers even in heated disagreements. 'The unexplicated complexity of actual turn taking, in

contrast to the utter simplicity of the question-answer rule, becomes apparent when we think about what is required to follow this rule' (pp. 217-218).

Despite showing how strong orientation to the 'interview rule' can be, Heritage and Clayman (2010) also state that 'the turn-taking system is not a physical law of science; it is a normative organization that specifies proper forms of conduct' (p. 232). The point is that the format is not set in stone and participants can and do depart from it (and return to it). For example, speakers are found to speak out of turn or in my data even switch roles in terms of who asks the question. Awareness of the rule is displayed even when actions are marked as 'non-conforming' to the rule. Raymond (2003) uses this term to describe when respondents do *not* 'conform' to the grammatical expectation of answering a yes/no interrogative with a yes/no reply.

In my data, we will see that despite the student-interviewee asking the teacher-interviewer questions and even doing most of the talking, the teacher-interviewer still controls the talk. First, the interviewer marks the transition away from the usual practice by stating that in the remaining time that the floor is open for the student to ask questions (to be seen in Excerpt 2). This marked opportunity is in contrast to the normative operation of the rule when the interviewer is in charge of questions, topic, and development. If it were not so, there would be no need to announce the transition of who may ask questions. Second, the teacher-interviewer is the one who decides when the transition would take place. Finally, the interviewer determines how long the student can ask questions and elaborate on the topic raised before the session comes to a close. Thus, 'interview' as a spoken discourse practice continues to serve the purpose of seeking and gathering information. The potential difference from typical interviews is the two way flow of how the information is elicited, what information is given, and who supplies it.

What I have noticed through my data and analysis is that a different and arguably more personal and meaningful kind of information is expressed when both participants have a chance to ask questions and impart knowledge. Heritage (2012) talks about the negotiation and recognition of which speaker has the epistemic access to the current topic. There is a question of where to place our attention during the interaction in order to be open to emerging opportunities. Should we (interviewers, teachers) continue to focus on the answer given which is the usual place we look for information or should we also give close attention to the questions they (interviewees, students) ask? Not only answers, but questions shape the ensuing talk and the information shared.

Another way to look at this situation is to consider what might be lost by keeping strictly to the interview rule. Mishler (1986) mentions that 'unstructured' interviews have been used by survey interviewers. An issue raised when interview questions are standardized is 'the particularities of the individual and setting' may be ignored rather than 'acknowledged as essential components of meaning-expressing and meaning-understanding processes' (viii). This observation has pedagogic implications for language teachers. How much is lost by not giving students time and opportunity to ask their questions and say what they want?

My point thus far has been to show how previous studies explore interviews as (somewhat) flexible and open-ended while still retaining a basic grounding in pre-allocating turns. A deeper understanding of what participants do in an interview can come from collecting some data and analyzing it.

### **Account of what was done: Data and analysis**

The question-answer rule is more subtle and flexible within its confines than we may think. For example, in news interviews, Clayman and Heritage (2002) see 'the interviewer's control' of questions, topic agenda, and length of talk on one hand as being a useful 'restraint' on overly talkative interviewees. On the other hand, in the case of less experienced interviewees, a balance of the interviewer's flexibility and the interviewee's assertiveness can help to ensure that the talk is not dominated by the inquirer. This may 'limit' what is talked about to 'the imagination and ability' of the inquirer. The issue of what to talk about and who can nominate topics can become open to negotiation at particular moments as both speakers have their own interests and concerns that they may want included in the discussion. Through this cooperative combination of flexibility and assertiveness, co-participants in talk can work together to open up the inquiry beyond the interviewer's questions.

By 'adapting' CA to the study of this particular institutional discourse practice, I will discuss how the orderly taking of turns is sequentially organized. For those interested in more background information, Wong and Waring (2010) provide an introduction to CA for language teachers. Ten Have (2007) as pointed out by Richards (2010) explains the advantages of 'doing' CA with particular relevance to studying interviews. For example,



the use of recordings and transcripts allows analysts to stay closer to the actual interaction and how it is organized than some other methods. This leads the practitioner to see how interactions are co-accomplished through turn by turn procedures. According to Richards (2010), the 'discoursal dimension' of interview practice can be explored through the application of CA. It 'is not merely a matter of how questions or probes are constructed' (p. 110), but also how the interviewer's orientation, positioning, and actions shape the interaction. What becomes important is 'attending' to what the other participant says and does, not only the list of questions that need to be asked.

In the following sections, I will discuss the discourse from three different perspectives and mediums: (1) observing embodied actions through video recordings, (2) analyzing question-answer adjacency pairs, extended turns, and receipts through transcription, (3) highlighting expressions about learning in post-interview written reflective comments. This data comes from a larger project involving seven in-service English teachers who are studying in a TESOL graduate program in Japan.

### ***Embodied actions: Noticed features of talk and body***

In a CA-based data session where participants (teacher-researchers and postgraduates) viewed the same video recording (as the one presented at BAAL 2014) when the student asked a question, the teacher replied, and extended talk by the students ensued, three features of the current speaker's actions were mentioned. First, whoever had the floor, would establish eye contact or direct gaze with the recipient. Second, whoever was speaking would use hand gestures to bring out and emphasize the point being made verbally. Third, speakers appeared to 'mirror' each other's actions. Both of them would use sweeping hand gestures across the table top to accentuate particular parts of their speech. In addition, direct eye gaze at the other participant took place when taking his or her turn. The recipient of the talk would also maintain direct gaze. Related observations have been made by Carroll (2004) and Olsher (2004) of how gaze, gestures, and body posture are intertwined with speech in the project of interactional accomplishment of the talk. An additional feature to look for is head nods. Stiver (2008) discusses how they display shared orientation in progress.

### ***Transcript analysis***

In the presentation, I only showed the audience a single example (Excerpt 4) with a short video clip and transcribed extract where the student gave an extended explanation. One participant said that she was interested in how the

talk progressed *before* the transition to the student's question. In order to address this point, I provide an overview of how the talk unfolded through three brief excerpts from the talk before the student elaborated (in Excerpt 4).

**Teacher-interviewer (T), Student-interviewee (S).**

**Excerpt 1: The opening question and answer**

- 1 T: And ah: (.) how- how has it been going this semester. Ha- has  
2 anything changed from the past when you teach (.) in the second  
3 semester (2.1) reading or translation?  
4 S: Uhm:: (1.7) I think well that uh in in the same freshman class uhm  
5 students were more interested in:: reading literature than other years.

There are always several minutes when the participants first sit down when they have greetings and simple exchanges about how they have been. They have not seen each other for five months. Then the topic changes to her teaching with the question in line 1. There had been some mention earlier about teaching a literature class where reading and translation are studied.

T incorporates this information into how he shapes the opening question to the 'interview' proper. S picks up on this lead with a statement of comparison, a favorable one at that. The bulk of the talk is about what she has done differently such as giving more individual attention and making more effort to find out what their thinking process is in doing classroom tasks.

**Excerpt 2: Transition from the teacher's questions to the student's questions**

- 1 T: So let's switch a little bit and ah last few minutes um do you have  
2 any do you have some questions?  
3 S: Ah:: for my research

After 20 minutes of discussion (out of a scheduled 30 minutes of talk) about what she has been doing in class and especially how students seem more engaged than in previous years, T opens the talk to her questions. Along with the opening question, he always asks the same transitional question at about the same time. Interestingly, she nominates a different topic that is not about her teaching, but about her research. Not included in the excerpt, S goes on to explain the situation where she is considering changing supervisors in order to fit her particular class and interest, literature class (a content based class as opposed to a language skill class). The next example articulates her research concern: Giving students a class questionnaire on what they think of her class.

**Excerpt 3: The student's first question**

- 1 S: Oh- (0.2) Can I uh (wo wo) do you usually (0.6) let students  
2 write their names down?  
3 T: Um: (0.9) nowadays um (0.2) it seems questionnaires (.) um  
4 one type of questionnaire they do write their names down.

T does not give a simple and straight 'yes' or 'no'. In one type of questionnaire, it is done. There is the implication that it depends on the purpose of the questionnaire whether respondents are asked for their names and possibly other personal information. This question appears to set the stage for S to explain why knowing the name on the questionnaire is important to her.

One characteristic shared by the first three examples is the use of a yes/no interrogative to open the inquiry and the 'non-conforming' (Raymond, 2003) response which is not 'yes' or 'no'. The forms of the question and answer do not align grammatically. The recipients appear to take the question as an elicitation of an explanation rather than seeking confirmation.

**Excerpt 4: Her explanation of why she asked**

- 1 S: If I know the names so some students study very hard  
2 T: Right right  
3 S: I want to know what they tho[ught  
4 T: [Yeah]  
5 S: because they (0.4)  
6 T: Yeah  
7 S: made efforts in this cla[ss  
8 T: [Yeah]

Once S gets confirmation from T that it is possible to have students write their names, she explains her thinking. Here we see the teacher-interviewer is the listener. He gives minimal responses, continuer receipts ('Yeah'), in order to give S the floor to explain. Despite the very limited linguistic contribution by T, his responses seem precisely timed (in lines 2, 4, 6, and 8) to maximize S's opportunities to voice her idea. This fourth example shows the interviewer (T) minimizing his response to 'continuers' or token receipts to acknowledge and invite S to continue talking. Richards (2010) discusses 'continuers' as part of what interviewers do to display such things as acknowledgment and affiliation. Earlier, Gardner (1998) described these tokens as important connections between speaking and listening by serving as 'vocalized' displays of understanding of what is occurring.

My questions led the discussion in a certain direction about classroom teaching. What S's question demonstrates is her wanting the chance to elaborate on what she wants to do in her research. However, there is more involved than simply wanting to do a share and tell. The conversational work that she does in asking a question to nominate her topic and then explain her reason allows her to ultimately seek approval from T of her idea. This process is arguably a more meaningful and helpful dialogue than being limited to talk about only what she is asked. The topic of the questionnaire and how to present it to students might not have occurred if there was no transition from T's questions to S's.

In other types of institutional talk, the interviewee (e.g., student, patient, candidate, or client) is given the chance to ask questions. In fact, the questions asked by the student (and others in novice roles) can draw on the professional's expertise in ways that might not have been addressed by prior questions and answers. Clinical talk is one area where patients' questions and doctors' responses may lessen uncertainty and anxiety. In this way, the inherent asymmetric relationship benefits from some space for exchange, experiential and expertise. For example, Robinson (2001) looked for differences (grammatical form) in eliciting patients' questions at the end of consultations when the doctor says, 'Do you have *some* concerns?' instead of 'do you have *any* concerns?' Preliminary findings suggest the former form prompted more patient-initiated response. As for oral proficiency test interviews, Seedhouse (2013) discusses the 'variety' of interactional features and issues occurring in the question-answer sequence beyond interviewer protocol. In SLA studies on 'uptake', Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001) compared response in focus on form episodes (FFE) when initiated by the learner and by the teacher compared with 'notably higher and more successful' language production in student-initiated cases. Finally, in Grañena's (2003) study of appeals for assistance, she notes, 'the interviewers' response moves are understood as being triggered by learner self-initiation as opposed to interviewer-initiation' (p. 92). With relevance to my interest in how student-interviewee initiated questions introduce new topics, she goes on to say that it is the learner who first points out a problem which needs to be discussed.

Besides using CA to study embodied actions and talk, a third form of 'representation' of the interview experience was considered, reflection. Students had previously taken a course on reflective practice through journaling, so they had developed a habit to write their thoughts soon after the event.

### ***Reflective writing: What did you learn from today's talk?***

As is customary, T sends S an e-mail soon after the 'interview' and asks her to reflect on what she learned today. Here is what she wrote.

I had already made questions beforehand to ask for advice. I had to reconsider my thesis with a new supervisor. I wanted to know how to evaluate my teaching. I was not sure if I could write the thesis in a different way. Talking with you, I was encouraged to keep my study.

Here is evidence of what the student was thinking in advance of the talk. Even though the stated purpose of these bi-annual 'interviews' was to reflect and discover how the student-teacher changed the way or ways she taught during this semester, we see that she wanted to ask for advice. Being the third time they talked, the format of the discussion appears to have undergone some kind of evolution from the teacher-interview gathering information to giving information. Furthermore, she had specific questions though related to her teaching about how to do her thesis. Her situation has changed since they last met which shaped what was on her mind. At that time, she was still thinking about changing supervisors which could imply (in her understanding) that she would also have to change how to write the thesis. One key concern for her was how to evaluate her teaching (as we find out in the transcript) through asking students if she was meeting their needs. She concludes the reflection by deciding not to change the way she does her study.

In terms of structure and cyclical processes in a reflective and experiential perspective, the above writing about an 'experience' follows the steps or elements outlined and discussed by Moon (2004, p. 127) based on the 'Kolb cycle' (1984): Concrete experience ( 'reconsider thesis with a new supervisor' ) → Abstract conceptualization ( 'how to evaluate my teaching' ) → Reflection ( 'not sure if I could write the thesis in a different way' ) → Effective learning results ( 'I was encouraged keep my study the way it is' ).

### ***Summary of preliminary findings***

- When the students have a chance to ask questions, they end up giving more detailed and extensive accounts of their teaching than answering my questions.
- They also raise additional issues beyond teaching about how to conduct their own research for their graduation thesis. This talk becomes an occasion to check procedural details of collecting data such as giving class questionnaires.

- Embodied actions seem to become more animated and interconnected when the teacher is responding to a question and topic raised by the student. They appear more focused on clearer articulation of what they want to say.

More research is needed to explore reasons why there appears to be greater engagement when the talk revolves around a student nominated topic than teacher nominated ones. Another area in need of more study is to trace the source of the question and the topic nominated. Was it something that she has been thinking about and planned (in advance) to ask the teacher when she met him? Or did the question come during the unfolding conversation? Investigating such areas would lead to discussions on teaching and learning and trying to connect the two.

## **Conclusion: Pedagogic implications**

A preliminary look at the data revealed that once the teacher addressed the students' questions (e.g., asking for advice on what to do); they then produced detailed and extensive accounts of their own teaching through specific hands-on questions about how to do research. Re-examining such a routine action as asking questions and who asks them can help teachers and students re-consider how to make interviews a vehicle for extended talk (i.e., discussion) and a co-managed and mutually meaningful communicative discourse practice.

### ***Questions for further exploration***

Using an 'interview' format to structure teacher-student talk raises an important pedagogic issue: Can teachers be flexible in allowing space for students to be assertive in expressing themselves? In order to explore new ideas to address this issue, further study is needed in the following areas: continuer receipts (i.e., a type of back channeling), a re-definition of 'interviews' when used for discussion and exploration of ideas rather than institutional assessment, and an epistemological issue.

#### **(1) What can a teacher do instead of giving token receipts (i.e. minimal backchannels)?**

While data session participants noted the abundance of them, there was no mention of what could be done instead let alone whether they proved useful. I wondered what they do since all the participants are language teachers. Do they act differently? So the underlying pedagogic issue might not necessarily

be how to give responses to encourage the student to talk more, but rather are such opportunities exploited for their conversational potential. Is either party free to take the floor and ask what he/she wants to know? If we subscribe to current thought that both language learning and use occur in social interactions, possibly 'interview' is no longer the most appropriate description of the kind of talk that they are engaged in. 'Open-ended discussion' might be a truer description of these interactions in form and action.

**(2) How a teacher-researcher describes his/her practice may determine if other teachers will read such an account.**

Classroom teachers are thinking about their own local context and what will help address their immediate concerns. While terminology may determine a study's relevance and perceived usefulness, how the activity is carried out may be the chief appeal for teachers. Showing procedure is one way to seek credibility. In this case, is an 'interview' the most suitable way to organize and conduct this kind of teacher-student talk?

One reviewer of the conference proposal commented on the confusion raised by using 'interview' and 'teacher-student talk' interchangeably. Particularly with respect to how this discourse practice allows for the interviewee or student to ask questions. The reviewer argued that an 'interview' is a socially familiar institutional discourse practice with a clear constraint in turn taking specification: The interviewer asks questions and the interviewee answers them. The example mentioned was a job interview. Here the purpose of the talk is to determine the suitability of a candidate for the position. Granted in this context and other similar ones (e.g., court trial talk, oral language proficiency interview tests) the purpose is to find out what the interviewee knows. I would point out, however, in job interviews (that I have been involved in), the last few minutes are given to any questions that the candidates may have. Often, these questions bring to light for the first time some of the concerns and issues that the candidate has. To take this line of discussion one step further, in doctor-patient talk, much of the consultation follows an interview format where the doctor asks questions for the patient to answer. The answers play an important role in determining the problem and treatment.

**(3) Another issue raised by this study for other teachers is the idea of information flowing in either direction as well as how to access it.**

The teacher wants to know how the student is developing her teaching skills. The student who is at once learning about teaching and research in addition

to learning how to use the L2 to explain what is being accomplished. The student's questions represent the immediate need to know what has yet to come up through the teacher's questions (e.g., how to collect data). Having 30-40 minutes at the end of every semester to discuss such matters with a senior teacher-researcher (who is not her supervisor) may seem a luxury in terms of time and attention, but should it be? This study and the collection of 'interview' data from other research student-teachers suggest all program participants would benefit.

The issue brought into question is the very purpose of teacher-student talk. Is it purely for the delivery or transmission of knowledge or is it something more dialogic in experience? What complicates the teacher-student talk in my study is the seeking of information flows both ways. The teacher wants to find out what has changed in the postgraduate student's teaching since they last met especially from a reflective practice perspective. On the other hand, the student wants to know how to conduct her research (e.g., When giving a class questionnaire is it alright to have students write their names?).

### ***Final thought: The importance of students asking questions***

I now have a different conversational challenge in the classroom. Students seem to have questions, but hesitate to ask them in front of others (despite my assurance that their classmates most likely have the same question and asking would help them). As a result of doing this study, I try to provide more time and space for students' questions. I stay around longer after class and make myself available. Fortunately, a few students come up to me after class and ask questions. Unfortunately, most of the students have left by then. Through this study I have greater appreciation of how their questions are often insightful and draw attention to where there is a lack of clarity in my instructions and assignments. Often they are things that I overlooked. Without questions from students, I would have less of an idea of how to best serve and contribute to their learning through talk-in-interaction. Interviews represent one spoken discourse practice which is commonly used, but needs more understanding of its complexity. Interviews can provide students with new and fresh learning opportunities when they actively participate.



## Transcription Symbols (Wong and Waring, 2010)

.	(period) falling intonation
?	(question mark) rising intonation
(.)	micro-pause of less than 0.2 seconds
(1.5)	length of a silence (e.g. a pause of 1.5 seconds)
A::h	prolonging of sound
-	abrupt cut off
[	beginning of simultaneous or overlapping speech

## References

- John Maxwell Atkinson & Paul Drew** (1979). *Order in Court: Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. Macmillan: London, UK.
- Vivien Berry & Barry O'Sullivan** (2014). *Raising the bar: Setting language standards for medical practice in the UK*. Paper presented at the BAAL conference, Warwick University.
- Don Carroll** (2004). Restarts in novice turn beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In Rod Gardner & Johannes Wagner (eds.), *Second Language Conversations*. Continuum: London, UK, pp201-220.
- Steven Clayman & John Heritage** (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Rod Ellis, Helen Basturkmen, & Shawn Loewen** (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. In *Language Learning*, vol 51 2 June 2001, pp281-318.
- Rod Gardner** (1998). Between speaking and listening: The vocalization of understanding. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 19 2 June 1998, pp204-224.
- Gisela Grañena** (2003). Appeals for assistance and incorporation of feedback in foreign language interaction: The role of age and proficiency level. In *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies*, vol 27 2003, pp87-109.
- Paul ten Have** (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide. Second edition*. Sage: London, UK.
- John Heritage** (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. In *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, vol 45, 1 January-March 2012, pp1-29.
- John Heritage & Steven Clayman** (2010). *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford, UK.
- David Kolb** (1984). *Experiential Learning as the Science of Learning and Development*. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA.
- Jennifer Moon** (2004). *A Handbook of Reflective and Experiential Learning: Theory and Practice*. Routledge Falmer: London, UK.
- Elliot Mishler** (1986). *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.
- David Olsher** (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interactions. In R. Gardner and J. Wagner (eds.), *Second Language Conversations*. Continuum: London, UK, pp221-245.

- Geoffrey Raymond** (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. In *American Sociological Review*, vol 68, 6 December 2003, pp939-967.
- Keith Richards** (2010). Using micro-analysis in interviewer training: 'Continuers' and interviewer positioning. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 32 1 March 2010, pp95-112.
- Jeffrey Robinson** (2001). Closing medical encounters: two physician practices and their implications for the expression of patients' unstated concerns. In *Social Science & Medicine*, vol 53 2001, pp639-56.
- Paul Seedhouse** (2013). Oral proficiency interviews as varieties of interaction. In Kenneth Rose & Gabriele Kasper (eds.), *Assessing Second Language Pragmatics*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, UK, pp199-219.
- Paul Seedhouse** (2014). *The IELTS speaking test: Interactional design and practice in a global context*. Paper presented at the BAAL conference, Warwick University.
- Tanya Stiver** (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. In *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, vol 41 1 January-March 2008, pp31-57.
- Jean Wong & Hansun Zhang Waring** (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. Routledge: New York, USA.

# 10

## **Distributing a monolingual strategy through English language teaching policy: A critical analysis of discourse practice by Japanese government officials**

Mamiko Noda

*UCL Institute of Education, University College London*

[nodamamiko@outlook.com](mailto:nodamamiko@outlook.com)

### **Introduction**

Japan's Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) has attempted to force a shift in the foreign language teaching methodology employed in Japanese classrooms from the traditional *yakudoku* method to a communication-oriented approach by renewing the content of its Course of Study every ten years since 1989. *Yakudoku* involves using Japanese translation and has been constantly 'problematized' also by previous researchers (see e.g. Gorsuch, 2001, Kikuchi and Browne, 2009).

Following the latest 2009 Course of Study, now teachers of foreign languages at upper secondary level are supposed in principle to adopt a monolingual strategy in the classroom, instead of using *yakudoku*. In a social context where English has been dominantly taught as a foreign language in schools, I have suggested that a monolingual strategy is ideologically prescribed out of the discourse of mainstream SLA, and it has been established in the textual dimension of the policy documents (Noda, 2014).

This research goes beyond the written discourse, and it investigates the actual practice, especially *production* and *distribution* of the policy by government officials. By looking into different kinds of data from a perspective of *crystallization* (Lincoln, Lynham and Guda, 2011), I gained various insights into the aspects of their discourse practice (Fairclough, 1992). From the large amount of collected data, I will select and show some key findings about the discourse practice. I especially focus on how government officials use argumentation strategies in putting forward the monolingual ideology in the policy, and their plans to spread it among schools.

The research questions are:

- How do government officials produce and reinforce a monolingual strategy as discourse?
- How do they ‘work to ensure particular interpretations of text’?  
(adapted from Woodside-Jiron, 2011, p.164)

## Methodology

For the data collection, I employed the strategies of discourse-oriented ethnography for studying organisations (Oberhuber & Krzyżanowski, 2008). To investigate the discourse practice of government officials, I conducted hour-long semi-structured interviews with six officials working as policy makers, distributors, and teacher trainers in spring 2012. Half of them work at MEXT, and the other half work at a teacher training institution run by a local government. To complement the oral data, I utilised personal field notes.

For my data analysis, I have combined a Critical Discourse Analytical Approach (Fairclough, 1992, 2003) and Argumentation Theory within the field of Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001; Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1992, Van Eemeren, Grootendorst and Snoeck Henkemans, 2001) for analysing interview data. For further investigation on how the policy is actually distributed, I made use of ethnographic description.

## Results of data analysis

### *Setting up the context*

The government officials have given a number of reasons why they felt it was necessary to introduce a monolingual strategy into the latest Course of Study. One such reason is because ‘English language teaching in Japan is in crisis’. MEXT government officials produce a sense of impending crisis for the current situation of English language teaching in Japanese senior high schools, as shown in the following extract from the interview.

#### **Interview Extract 1 – A: Government Official A**

A: If English language teaching does not change with this Course of Study, I think, English language teaching in Japan will fall into a situation of crisis...We express our determination, send out our message to teachers:

teachers who cannot abandon *bumpo*[grammar]-*yakudoku* deprive students of fulfilling their potential completely. We showed this message specifically in the Course of Study.

I suggest that the Government Official A describes the current situation using argumentation strategy, *argumentum ad consequentiam* (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1992). That is, ‘unfavourable light is cast on a thesis by pointing out its possible consequences, without the rightness of the thesis itself being disputed’ (Van Eemeren, Grootendorst and Kruiger 1987:30, cited by Reisigl and Wodak, 2001:74). Here, he appears to threaten Japanese teachers of English by saying the teachers will cause a future ‘crisis’ of Japan if they stick to using *bumpo-yakudoku*. This scheme of cause and effect is not plausible; thus, this can be considered as a pragmatic fallacy (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001, p. 71).

### ***Normalising a monolingual strategy and marginalizing the explicit teaching of linguistic knowledge***

The dissemination of monolingual strategy seems to be closely connected with the marginalization of the explicit teaching of linguistic knowledge. In regard to this, I have examined how the government officials try to persuade teachers to change their practice by making use of argumentation strategies. One tactic is that government officials manipulatively re-categorise English as a subject in order to change teachers’ perceptions, by saying that English as a subject should be taught like physical education.

The principal argument of government officials in relation to how to teach English is that it should be taught in the same way that *jitsugi kamoku*, which means subjects of practical skills, are taught. *Jitsugi kamoku* are distinct from *shuyo kamoku*, which means principal subject in English. In Japanese schools, it is usually said that there are five principal subjects: Japanese, English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. These subjects may be seen as the subjects for students to learn knowledge rather than skills. They say that teachers have tended to see English as *shuyo kamoku* or subjects for university entrance examinations until now but that this attitude should be changed; they argue that teachers must see English more as *jitsugi kamoku*, such as music or physical education

The following excerpt shows Government Official B claims that English as a subject is more similar to *jitsugi kamoku* than to *shuyo kamoku*. His point is that English as a subject is about acquiring skills, not about learning knowledge.

### **Interview Extract 2 – B: Government official B**

B: Then, I feel that, I said this to first-year teachers yesterday, but English is *jitsugi*. Like physical education or music. It belongs to that kind of category, I guess. So, it is not like students sit, listen and take notes, and that's it. I think it is a subject for students to move their body, including using their voice. It is to let students do that a lot. Basically it is remembering words, so it is not logic. Like babies learn language, we should learn language by listening to it a lot, associating names with things, and learning how to speak in a specific context, through various experiences. So for myself, it is a subject of practical skills. It is said there are principal subjects, five principal subjects, but in this way, there are four principal subjects. That is the image, I guess.

I suggest that he uses *similarity argumentation* (argument from analogy). This is used when '[s]omeone attempts to persuade interlocutor by indicating that something is similar (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1992, p. 96-97, 160). I would argue that the argument strategy is not used correctly here, and thus it is *false analogy*.

It may be true that their re-categorisation of English as *jitsugi kamoku* is grounded in the academic discourse of mainstream SLA, and government officials refer to the academic reference correctly in a sense. They probably cite 'information processing' approaches, particularly the hypothesis that has been advanced by Robert DeKeyser (1998; 2001) and others. The researchers regard second language acquisition as learning skills, drawing on skill acquisition theory in the field of cognitive psychology. DeKeyser compares the process of automatization of language skills to the process of mastering 'making cigars' or 'programming computers' (1998, p.61), and the government officials similarly use metaphors of sports and music for language learning.

Even if they cite academic references correctly, however, I suggest that re-categorising English as a subject as one of *jitsugi kamoku* with the background of skill acquisition theory is problematic. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, the re-categorisation will lead to an overemphasis on one single aspect of language learning, the implicit acquisition of skill, and eventually will have the effect of excluding other important aspects involving explicit learning; and I believe this is not suitable and potentially very damaging for students in Japanese senior high schools. Secondly, government officials overlook the social context in Japan when citing skill acquisition theory. After all, the theory does not take into account various sociolinguistic contexts where English is used, and its presupposition is that English is taught for real life purposes (DeKeyser, 1998; 2001). Obviously

it is not fit for contexts in Japan, where the majority of people do not need to use English for professional purposes (Terasawa 2013), and English as a subject remains an important subject in the system of university entrance examination.

For these reasons, I suggest that their argumentation scheme to associate English as a subject with *jitsugi kamoku* is fallacious. More importantly, we will have to think about what kind of effect this ideology will have on the practice of Japanese English teachers.

### ***Government's plans for realizing the Course of Study***

Next, I will reveal how the government officials plan to disseminate the idea of the latest Course of Study. I suggest that one of the key movements on the side of MEXT is introducing the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) into senior high schools. CEFR was originally developed by EU in order to celebrate European multiculturalism and multilingualism and to facilitate interaction among professionals who were involved in the language teaching of different European languages (Council of Europe [COE], 2001). In general, the developments of CEFR and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) have been closely connected with each other since the 1960s (Imig and O'Dwyer, 2010, p3).

CEFR has influenced educational policies all around the world in different ways. Parmenter & Byram, (2010, p14) point out that East Asian countries, such as China, Taiwan, and Japan, have tended to pay attention only to the CEFR levels of competence, despite the fact that there has been increasing criticism of the overemphasis of these. They state that in the case of Japan, there is no obvious influence of the CEFR yet in the Course of Study; however, as a powerful group of academics advocate the CEFR in English language teaching, it is to be seen how the CEFR will be incorporated into the next policy reform, which will take place around 2016.

The following are what I have found regarding MEXT's intentions on CEFR through interviews with the MEXT government officials.

- They will not authorize it as an official national standard.
- They require teachers to write learning outcomes in each school curriculum in a form of can-do statement like in CEFR, i.e. action-oriented.
- They require teachers to set action-oriented goals that are closer to practical or real life purposes but they are aware that it would be difficult for teachers.

- They say actions should be based on what students will be able to do with textbooks.

Furthermore, I have also found out MEXT's intention on the application of policy; in sum, the solutions are all left in teachers' hands. When interviewed, government officials say that the first thing is teachers' self-training. And the stance of the government is just to support them by providing training. Also, universities have the responsibility to teach 'ESL'. Moreover, they also say it is local governments' responsibility to spread the idea of the Course of Study. On their side, there are two main national plans. MEXT was going to send thirty teachers to the UK and one hundred to the USA in 2012, yet this is out of about fifty to sixty thousand English teachers all over Japan. Another principal on-going project was to distribute DVDs to all the senior high schools.

In terms of the relationship between MEXT and local governments and between a local government and teachers, the findings from interviews give interesting insights. According to MEXT government officials, MEXT plays a role to do 'awareness campaign' to local governments as well as teachers; so they show only the important points in the policy. Spreading the idea of the Course of Study is the responsibility of local governments. They have to report back to MEXT how English language teaching in a prefecture as a whole has been improved. However, when I interviewed local government officials in a prefecture, they said that they only played a role in organising teacher training. They invite some experienced or 'advanced' teachers to train other teachers.

This cannot be generalised for all the other forty-six prefectures in Japan; however, for the teachers in the prefecture in which I have done research, they have to think and come up with new ways of teaching, which accommodate a monolingual strategy, an ideology of mainstream SLA theory, or what policy makers think are its principles, without any specific instruction or training from the government in how to do this.

## **Summary of this research**

The research has shown the rhetorical tactics employed by the government officials to make sure that teachers transform the classroom into a more communication-oriented environment by adopting a monolingual strategy. At the same time, however, it also reveals that, although the pressure on



teachers for change is becoming stronger, government officials have not offered any clear vision of the communicative language teaching they expect teachers to implement in the classroom. Therefore, I would argue that to change teaching practice government officials merely undertake 'awareness' campaigning, and in reality, that they require teachers to find solutions to accommodate the new ideologies created out of mainstream SLA by themselves.

## References

- Council of Europe [COE]** (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR)*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Robert M. DeKeyser** (1998). Beyond focus on form - Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Robert M. DeKeyser** (2001). Automaticity and automatization. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Norman Fairclough** (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Norman Fairclough** (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. Routledge: London, UK.
- Greta Gorsuch** (2001). Japanese EFL teachers' perceptions of communicative, audiolingual and yakudoku activities: the plan versus the reality. In *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9 (10).
- Alexander Imig & Fergus O'Dwyer** (2010). A brief overview of the use of can do statements in language education, the CEFR and ELP. In M. G. Schmidt, N. Naganuma, F. O'Dwyer, A. Imig and K. Sakai (eds.), *Can do statements in language education in Japan and beyond – Applications of the CEFR*. Asahi Press: Tokyo, Japan, pp2-8.
- Keita Kikuchi & Charles Browne** (2009). English Educational Policy for High Schools in Japan: Ideals vs. Reality. In *RELJ Journal*, 40 (2), pp172-191.
- Yvonna S. Lincoln, Susan, A. Lynham & Egon G. Guba** (2011). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences, Revisited. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (4th edition)*. Sage: London, UK, pp 97-128
- Mamiko Noda** (2014). Making Sense of Foreign Language Teaching Policy for Japanese Senior High Schools from a Discourse-Ethnographic Critical Perspective. In Bernadette O'Rourke, Nicola Bermingham & Sara Brennan (eds.), *Opening New Lines of Communication in Applied Linguistics: Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics*. Scitsiugnil Press: London, UK.
- Lynne Parmenter & Mike Byram** (2010). An overview of the international influences of the CEFR. In M. G. Schmidt, N. Naganuma, F. O'Dwyer, A. Imig & K. Sakai

- (eds.), *Can do statements in language education in Japan and beyond – Applications of the CEFR*. Asahi Press: Tokyo, Japan, pp9-17.
- Florian Oberhuber & Michal Krzyżanowski** (2008). Discourse Analysis and Ethnography. In R. Wodak & M. Krzyżanowski (eds.), *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, UK, pp182-203.
- Martin Reisigl & Ruth Wodak** (2001). The discourse-historical analysis of the rhetoric of racism and antisemitism. In *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. Routledge: London, UK, pp31-90.
- Takunori Terasawa** (2013). 「日本人の 9 割に英語はいらない」は本当か? 仕事における英語の必要性の計量分析 [Ninety Percent of Japanese do not need English? Statistical Analysis of Workers' Need to Use English]. In *KATE Journal*, 28, pp71-83.
- Frans Hendrik Van Eemeren & Robert Grootendorst** (1992). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies: A pragma-dialectical perspective*. L. Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ, USA.
- Frans Hendrik Van Eemeren, Robert Grootendorst & Francisca A. Snoeck Henkemans** (2001). *Argumentation: Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. L. Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, NJ, USA.
- Haley Woodside-Jiron** (2011). Language, Power and Participation: Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Make Sense of Public Policy. In Rogers, R. (ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Routledge: London, UK.

# 11

## **Corpus analysis technology and a new blended EFL e-learning: toward real-time classroom management strategies**

Takeshi Okada  
*Tohoku University*  
takeshi.okada.a8@tohoku.ac.jp

### **Introduction**

This paper describes an on-going project dedicated to the development of a blended e-learning package for Japanese university EFL (English as a foreign language) reading classes. An e-learning system built on the RDBMS (relational database management system) technology plays a crucial role in face-to-face classrooms, where optimal classroom management strategies are adopted dynamically on a real-time basis. The system is based on a corpus analyzing and building method, in particular an attribution assignment mechanism exploited in Garside et al. (1997), through which all the textual attributions such as document type, paragraph number, sentence number, and the sequential position of each word as well as its grammatical information such as part-of-speech, are managed in relational database tables adequately correlated with each other.

Special attention is paid to the advantage of this corpus management method that defines every constituent in terms of its positional property within a whole corpus database. The idea of handling every constituent that is assigned a distinct attribution in different relational tables in terms of its locational property in a given corpus can be applied to an e-learning system that ensures real-time interactions between the teacher and the learners. The teacher can instantaneously grasp specific parts of a target EFL reading material which students are having difficulty learning, and the students, on the other hand, can see the specific parts which their teacher wants to put stress on or attract their attention to. The more important thing for the teacher is to implement effective teaching strategies in response to the learners' needs that are transmitted on a real-time basis.

The first section explains the importance of setting a clear system user level, especially the learners' EFL fluency level assessed via TOEFL® ITP test. After describing the basic design of a new e-learning system based on the RDMBS technology in the next section, I will touch on some practical ideas for dynamic, real-time classroom management strategies in the third section. The fourth section discusses the way classroom activities and out-of-classroom activities are blended in the entire package. Particular attention is paid to the LMS (learning management system) which enables the learners to acquire practical EFL reading skills through autonomous, heuristic learning. The learners are prompted to read the materials actively by completing an online task such as making multiple-choice questions. The learners themselves are required to become question setters who can properly evaluate their peers' reading skill. In other words, the learners are required to comprehend the content of the material sufficiently in order to be good question setters. The questions can be distributed among learners working on the same material and encourage further collaborative, active e-learning, as mentioned in Momtaz & Garner (2010). The final section refers to the present status of the development and to the further potential of the new blended e-learning system.

### **The system users: their EFL level**

A number of commercial e-learning systems, including Smart Learning™ released by a Japanese educational publisher ALC, have been developed and used in EFL education in Japan (<https://alcsmartlearning.jp/>). Those large-scale and therefore expensive systems naturally presuppose an indefinite number of users with a wide range of needs. Some of the questions and comments given to the author's talk at the BAAL 2014 conference reflect the general attitude toward commercial multi-purpose e-learning systems (Okada et al. (2014)).

In a research project described in this paper, we presuppose very clearly the fluency level of the Japanese EFL learners and expertise of their teachers, both as system users. Our intention is not a vague vision of complete self-learning assisted only by the system not by a human teacher. We set the fluency level of the target EFL learners as follows: those Japanese university students who have good learning habits but fail to reach the world standard level in English fluency test, more precisely over 550 in TOEFL® ITP test score. At the same time we presuppose the EFL teachers who use the system should be those who are willing to share their knowledge and to work

collaboratively with peer teachers and TAs (teaching assistants). We also require the teachers to have clear teaching objectives supported by a given level of teaching expertise.

The system to be developed is designed specifically for the instruction of English reading comprehension, of which the internal processing properties are frequently said to be most difficult to observe and evaluate. Many studies on the relationship between reading ability and vocabulary have been done as in Richards (1976), Read (1993), Schmitt (2000) and Nation (2001). The present project is unprecedented since it has distinctive characteristics such as listed below.

- It sets a clear achievement goal of EFL fluency level which is observable in internationally-recognized tests such as TOEFL® ITP.
- It encourages the advancement of EFL skills especially in reading comprehension.
- It tries to achieve this goal by blending a traditional face-to-face mode of reading instruction, in which newly developed e-learning plays a central role, and a computer assisted autonomous learning mode outside the classroom.
- It is developing a new e-learning system based on a corpus building and analysis technology.
- It exclusively employs authentic teaching materials, such as genuine passages and concomitant multiple-choice questions actually used in TOEFL® ITP test.

## **RDMBS technology and the e-learning system**

The present paper does not touch technical details described in articles by other project members such as Hino & Sakamoto (2014). The basic idea for the multi-purpose corpus building and analysis technology that the author has been developing so far is as follows: every constituent of all documents is appropriately attributed in distinctive layers that are hierarchically related to each other; and every table reflecting attributions of constituents is successfully linked and managed as an integrated informational entity.




Figure 1: How highlighted parts are managed in a database table

The left half of Figure 1 shows a tablet screen on which particular parts of a given reading passage are highlighted by the system user. The right half of the figure is a simplified example of the table in the database showing how each constituent, i.e. word and punctuation mark, is managed. Every word and punctuation mark is described in separate tables reflecting distinctive attribution layers indicating properties as follows.

- whether it is highlighted or not
- its syntactic role
- its grammatical property such as part-of-speech
- its lemma
- its position in a sentence
- the position of the sentence in a paragraph
- the position of the paragraph in a document
- the source of the document itself, etc.

It is worth mentioning that these attribution properties are not a priori defined but the system is designed to allow its users to define their own attribution properties and describe them as attribution tag-sets. In this sense, the processing of the highlighted parts of a given passage is managed by adapting this attribution assigning technology.

The sequence of words assigned a flag indicating that it is highlighted can be successfully located and retrieved in the subsequent processing. This functionality of the system allows for interactive teaching/learning activities in face-to-face EFL classroom and collaborative work among teachers using the same instructional materials.

## Real-time classroom management strategies: examples

The present project is developing not just a new interactive e-learning system but comprehensive course/class management strategies including instructional programs that make good use of the system and the blending of face-to-face teaching modes with the computer assisted self-learning mode. Though there are characteristic difficulties in EFL classroom management as mentioned in Sakui (2007), in a face-to-face EFL classroom with a limited number of students who have high learning motivation, a teacher is required to have sufficient teaching expertise and play a very important role as a facilitator of the class.

### *Traditional, one-directional reading instruction*

Figure 2 shows typical, traditional EFL reading instruction process that lacks interaction between the teacher and the learners. In such one-directional instruction, heading linearly for a designated goal of the course, the teacher usually points out some important parts of a target reading passage or gives instructions for a better reading technique such as skimming, scanning, summarizing and so on.




Figure 2: How one-directional instruction goes

In a face-to-face mode class the teacher visually observes students' reaction to the materials and, as pointed out in Spratt (1999), relies on his/her intuition to detect particular parts or points over which his/her students are having trouble. Though the intuitive decisions made by teachers with enough experience are correct in many cases, they are not supported by informed assessment of the actual needs of every student (Davies (2006)). When a

teacher tries to confirm the depth of students' understanding by asking questions of a particular student, the rest of the class is not responding to the questions. Therefore the teacher tends to give out-of-classroom assignments or examinations in order to obtain objective feedback from the students. However, the out-of-classroom assignments are not necessarily effective measures for the overall course design and management, since student feedback via these methods usually comes to the teacher with an inevitable time lag of a week or at least a couple of days.

Figure 2 also shows the decrease in students' learning motivation as well as the reduction of the teacher's teaching motivation in a traditional one-directional EFL reading instruction class, which is potentially fraught with the risk of falling into a series of ineffective routine exercises. As it is not easy to obtain immediate learner feedback on a real-time basis, there can arise serious gaps between the teacher's expectations and learners' needs.


The resulting divergence of teacher and learner beliefs and expectations can spell trouble for language courses as the teacher-learner gap widens and becomes increasingly difficult to close as the course progresses. (*Davies 2006:3*)

### ***Dynamic instruction designing and sub-goal setting***

As pointed out earlier we do not assume a face-to-face EFL reading instruction class that completely relies on one particular e-learning system. On the contrary, we presuppose a multi-medium and multi-modal class in which an e-learning system functioning as a handy electronic textbook with communication facility is used to meet learners' needs in combination with other classroom equipment such as screen projector, clicker, or personal headset and other resources like web dictionaries. Therefore, in the actual classroom the students would leave their electronic textbooks all at once at their teacher's cue, turn to their ordinary pen and notebook and start group discussions or listen to their teacher's lecture-style instruction. It should be noted here that we do not have the illusion that an imaginary e-learning system has omnipotent power producing overwhelming pedagogical effect. Instead we are trying to develop an e-learning system to fill the gaps between teacher's intention and learners' need, as described in Huang (2013).

One of the most crucial features for an interactive EFL class where a new e-learning system plays a central role is, as illustrated in Figure 3, that the course is dynamically designed and managed by setting a series of sub-goals (goal 1, 2, ...n) which respond to learners' needs on a real-time basis in order to pursue the final goal.





**Figure 3: Dynamic class management through interaction**

In dynamic class management, the teacher can obtain real-time feedback for each sub-goal set in accordance with students' responses and needs, which results in a feedback loop which is helpful for the overall course design.

## Out-of-classroom activities and feedback loop: a blended model

Figure 4 shows a blended model of two distinctive learning modes, i.e. face-to-face classroom activities using the e-learning system and out-of-classroom activities encouraged by well-designed assignments or tasks. In out-of-classroom activities, learners are expected to work on assignments or tasks using ordinary PCs and send achievements and learning results back to the server. The teacher adds the incoming information from learners outside of the classroom to the feedback loop as feedback  $n+1$  illustrated in the bottom right corner of Figure 4, and eventually implements feedback responses that are reflected in the subsequent classes and the overall course design.

One of the out-of-class tasks developed in parallel with a new e-learning system is a task to set appropriate questions for the reading passages in TOEFL® ITP test. As the author has already made a copyright contract with ETS (Educational Testing Service) to use dozens of passages actually used in the previous TOEFL® ITP test, the majority of reading materials used in our e-learning package are authentic test passages.




Figure 4: Blending face-to-face mode and CALL mode

The basic idea for the question-setting task is a reverse conception that one should be a good question setter if he/she tries to be a good reader. It presupposes that a good reader with good comprehension of the content naturally can set good questions for passages given in the task. Before setting questions, learners are encouraged to examine carefully actual questions in TOEFL® ITP test that are well-designed (ETS (2013:3)). The task is expected to develop learners' reading skills during the process of setting appropriate questions that should be based upon deep and accurate reading. Figure 5 shows the flow from a slightly different perspective. After collecting learner-made questions through a web page dedicated to this question-setting task (out-of-class activity), the teacher would sort them out and bring them into the next class, where the questions are examined in interactive face-to-face mode (in-class activity 1). In the actual classroom, the questions are scrutinized by learner groups who are required afterward to make their presentations on the selection of appropriate questions (in-class activity 2).

Figure 5 also indicates that through collaborative learning and presentation of the learning achievements (in-class activity 2), learners' reading skill would steadily be strengthened (Momtaz & Garner 2010). The moment of heuristic learning, sometimes called the 'Aha!' moment (Kounios & Beeman 2009), may occur in this collaborative activity.




Figure 5: Blending of different activities

## Conclusion and further potential

We have discussed the overall picture of a blended e-learning package for Japanese university EFL reading instruction in which an interactive system plays a crucial role in order to bring about dynamic, real-time face-to-face class management. The new e-learning system that provides the EFL teacher with learner feedback on a real-time basis allows him/her to obtain pedagogical information that can be helpful for making better decisions on dynamic class management during each period in order to fill the gap between his/her intention and learners' needs.

For EFL teachers the system is expected to play an important role as a reliable and handy device to receive immediate learner feedback that enables them to discover in far more detail their learners' actual expectations and needs. In other words, EFL teachers should know much more about their learners in order to select appropriate materials, tasks and to choose more efficient course management strategies.

It is often pointed out that one-directional teaching has a lot of drawbacks.

Lecture-style teaching in large classes that preclude student participation is still prevalent in Japan, but may learners invariably express a dislike for the lecture-style class structure. (*Davies 2006:8*)

However, a project to develop a new e-learning system that is used in a face-to-face teaching mode proposes that we need more careful discussion of the teaching/learning style. Distinctive teaching/learning styles should be chosen in accordance with the contents to be taught and the sub-goals of a particular course. When a teacher wants to teach strategies required for skillful reading, for example, a teacher-centred (lecture-style) mode may be effective; when, on the contrary, a teacher tries to exchange ideas and information with learners on particular material, an interactive-style teaching/learning mode is fruitful; and when learners are required to work on tasks that require collaboration, group-style learning may be more suitable. As mentioned earlier, an electronic textbook with communication facility would function in a face-to-face classroom as an e-learning system. This means that a teacher can choose the teaching/learning style in order to achieve the optimal EFL reading instruction environment. In other words to use the e-learning system in a face-to-face classroom, in which a teacher can decide effective teaching/learning style, is the most significant advantage.

Along with the release of a prototype system in May 2015, there will be an automated corpus analysis system through which system users can measure properties of candidate English documents that can be processed into reading materials: their type/token ratio, lexical density, degree of reading ease, etc. Whereas some authors such as Greenfield (2004) claim that the classic formula devised in Flesch (1948) is valid for EFL use, the author has devised a new formula specifically designed for Japanese EFL learners. In a proposed formula, instead of counting syllables of each word as Flesch does in his formula, the word-level score of each word set by JACET (Japanese Association of College English Teachers) is incorporated. (For the further detail see Okada (2014).)

The immediate learner feedback obtained on a real-time basis through the e-learning system and the information obtained from the results of out-of-classroom tasks should be complementarily blended in the overall e-learning package in order to offer more effective EFL reading instruction.

## **Acknowledgement**

This research has been partially supported by the JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) (Research No. 26284075).

## References

- Alun Davies** (2006). What do Learners Really Want from Their EFL course? In *EFL Journal*, vol 60 1 2006, pp2-12.
- ETS** (2013). *TOELF® ITP Test Taker Handbook*. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, NJ, USA.
- Rudolph Flesch** (1948). A New Readability Yardstick. In *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol 32 3 1948, pp221-233.
- Roger Garside, Geoffrey Leech & Tony McEnery** (1997). *Corpus Annotation: Linguistic Information from Computer Text Corpora*. Longman: London, UK.
- Jerry Greenfield** (2004). Readability Formulas for EFL. In *JALT Journal*, vol 26 1 2004, pp5-24.
- Yuki Hino & Yasunobu Sakamoto** (2014). *A Design of English Collaborative Learning Management System for Tablet Devices*. Paper read at Forum on Information Technology 2014. N-007 pp277-278.
- Hsin-Chou Huang** (2013). Online Reading Strategies at Work: What Teachers Think and What Students Do. In *ReCALL*, vol 25 3 2013, pp340-358.
- John Kounios & Mark Beeman** (2009). The Aha! Moment: The Cognitive Neuroscience of Insight. In *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, vol 18 2009, pp210-216.
- Esmaeli Momtaz & Mark Garner** (2010). Does Collaborative Learning Improve EFL Students' Reading Comprehension? In *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, vol 1 1 2010, pp15-36.
- Paul Nation** (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Takeshi Okada** (2014). EFL Reading Instruction Based on Information Sharing among Multi-purpose Corpus System Users. In B. O'Rourke, N. Bermingham & S. Brennan (eds.), *Opening New Lines of Communication in Applied Linguistics: Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics*. Scitsiugnil Press: London, UK, pp368-380.
- Takeshi Okada, Yasunobu Sakamoto & Kensuke Sugiura** (2014). The LMS development for a blended EFL e-learning. In S. Jager, L. Bradley, E. J. Meima, & S. Thouësny (eds.), *CALL Design: Principles and Practice: Proceedings of the 2014 EUROCALL Conference, Groningen, The Netherlands*. Research-publishing net: Dublin, Ireland, pp273-277.
- John Read** (1993). The Development of a New Measure of L2 Vocabulary Knowledge. In *Language Testing*, vol 10 1993, pp355-371.
- Jack C. Richards** (1976). The Role of Vocabulary Teaching. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 10 1 1976, pp77-89.
- Keiko Sakui** (2007). Classroom management in Japanese EFL classrooms. In *JALT Journal*, vol 29 1 2007, pp41-58.
- Norbert Schmitt** (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Mary Spratt** (1999). How Good are We at Knowing What Learners Like? In *System*, vol 27 2 1999, pp141-155.



# 12 Authenticity in a Global Context: Learning, Working and Communicating with L2 teachers of English

Richard Pinner  
*Centre for Applied Linguistics, The University of  
Warwick*  
R.S.Pinner@warwick.ac.uk

## Outline

In order to continue teaching in Japanese schools, every ten years all teachers from primary to high school level are required to renew their teaching licence by taking professional development courses which provide them with credits for renewal. This paper outlines an in-service training workshop for high school teachers of English as a Foreign Language, accredited by the Japanese ministry of education (MEXT). The course which I taught, entitled *Using and Adapting Authentic Materials to Help Motivate Students*, is four 90 minute workshops and a one hour assessment. During the sessions I attempted to gauge the participants' existing ideas about authenticity in language teaching and examine how these fit with the way English is currently employed for international communication in the global context. I proposed during the workshop that authenticity be reconceptualised as a continuum; incorporating contextual and social dimensions. Participants were then asked to reflect on their concept of authenticity before and after the workshop to examine the impact of the proposed continuum. I collected data from participants in the form of a written reaction to the workshop and questionnaire, as well as teacher/researchers' observations and journal entries. From a total of 33 participants, 23 (almost 70 per cent) had culturally embedded definitions of authenticity, with 18 participants (over 50 per cent) specifically making reference to native speakers in their explanation of what they thought authentic language meant. Participants commented that the workshop had helped them to expand their ideas about authenticity, which for many was a motivating or empowering experience since it meant that they could include themselves as being able to provide an authentic model English speaker for their learners.

The first of the four workshop sessions overviews the definition of authenticity, drawing heavily on the eight inter-related definitions identified by Gilmore (2007). I also look at the 3Cs (Culture, Currency and Challenge) of authenticity proposed by Mishan (2005) before explaining the concept of the authenticity continuum, which basically attempts to view authenticity as possessing both social and contextual dimensions in order to incorporate the individual, target speech community, classroom and reality (see Pinner 2014a, Pinner 2014b). In the second session I looked at World Englishes as alternative model English speakers, showing videos and asking participants to evaluate how authentic each sample was. The third and fourth sessions were more hands-on, and provided participants with a chance to adapt their own lesson plans and learn about using multimedia resources.




Figure 1: The authenticity continuum

## Results

I conducted multiple close-readings of the written reactions and identified that the majority of participants had what I coded as *culturally embedded* views of authenticity. By this I mean that the participants made either direct or indirect mentions of the “native speaker” definition of authenticity. For these participants, authenticity was a product more or less solely the province of the native speaker varieties of English – despite the problems associated with such a narrow definition (see Pinner 2014b). One participant, who I will



refer to as Kyoko, provided a classic response which confirmed my fears that for many of the participants they (as non-native speakers of English) did not see themselves as being able to provide an authentic model of English.

Before I took this lesson, I thought that authenticity should be “native”. I mean that the material should be written by native speakers. (*Kyoko*)

This comment was typical of the participants on the course, and proved that although L2 speakers themselves, the participants held native-speakerist biases and prejudices which detrimentally affect their own self-image as teachers (Holliday 2005). Japan has been shown to be a context where such prejudices are strongly enforced by certain sociological factors (Houghton and Rivers 2013). Some of the participants, such as Momoko, held these views but rejected them after the workshop, perhaps because the more international definition of authenticity had empowered her somehow.

Before this workshop I just thought that ‘authentic’ means ‘native’; using a newspaper in English class is better than using a textbook. But now, at the end of the workshop, I can talk more about authenticity, giving my experiences today as an example.... I have felt negative about myself as a non-native English speaker who teaches English. Now, I don’t. Authenticity connects me not only to English but also learning. (*Momoko*)

In the above sample, Momoko makes it clear that she felt authentic language was the sole product of native speakers and that her understanding of authentic materials was something like a newspaper – which I identified as the “classic” definition of an authentic material during the workshop. This definition excludes Momoko from being an authentic model English speaker, although clearly after the workshop she has altered this definition and now takes a more positive view of her own identity as a non-native teacher of English. However, she does not go into great detail about this and her quick rejection of the old “native speaker” based definition may not yet rest on a robust and reconfigured new definition with herself at the centre. More follow-up work would be needed to know how deeply the course was able to shift this view.

My idea about authenticity has changed dramatically by participating in this workshop. Before I joined this workshop, my definition of authenticity was the language material source from native speakers. Now, I have learned what really makes material, lesson to be authentic is how we teacher use it. (*Aiko*)

During the workshops, the idea of authenticity having relevance to the learners seemed to be the take-home message, and one that was easily

adopted and imbibed by the participants. This is probably because trying to make the classes relevant is something that teachers intuitively feel will make their lessons more successful and more motivating. This is the main practical application of the proposed authenticity continuum, and when I asked the participants to comment on the idea, most of the reflections were positive:

The authenticity continuum tells me how to evaluate the authenticity of materials, and it's interesting. Before I participated in this workshop, I believed that authentic materials were the English statements use in the countries like UK or USA, English native countries. However, when we evaluated the authenticity of the Wall Street Journal according to the continuum, its authenticity was not high. Also, by comparing three examples of tasks, I realised that I chose A, the task using an English language newspaper, as the least authentic. I was surprised at the result myself, and it was interesting to know that most of the teachers here had the same choice. This experience made me think it is important to have several points of view, or factors, to assess the authenticity of materials, and of course how to use them. (Ai)

In the above quote, Ai mentions a task from the workshop in which participants are asked to rank examples of authentic materials being used in class, depending on which they felt was most authentic (see Figure 2). Interestingly, Example C was ranked as most authentic, followed by example B (despite the example clearly stating that it is based on an “inauthentic” text) whereas Example A, which uses the “classic” newspaper, was ranked lowest. Ai also makes reference to another task in which certain materials were mapped onto the authenticity continuum, in order to assess their level of authenticity (see Pinner 2014a for examples). For Ai, the value of the continuum is in its ability to help her assess the materials she intends to use with her class, particularly doing so from various perspectives.

<b>Example A:</b>	<i>The teacher brings an English language newspaper to class and has students read the text and underline every instance of the present perfect aspect or passive tense, and then asks them to copy each sentence out into their notebooks.</i>
<b>Example B:</b>	<i>The teacher uses an 'inauthentic' text from a published course book which was contrived specifically to practise reported speech and then discusses other ways in which the speakers from the text could have said the same thing in a different way.</i>
<b>Example C:</b>	<i>The teacher asks students to use the internet to research about their favourite celebrity or hero and then create a short presentation in English to the rest of the class about that person.</i>

**Figure 2: Authenticity of the task ranking activity**

## Conclusion

From conducting this research I was able to learn that for many of the participants, authenticity is still conceptualised from a native-speakerist and culturally embedded perspective. Although this may be true in other countries, I believe it would be especially the case for countries in which English does not have any official status, and contact with international speakers (be they native speakers or not) is rather limited. Japan is an example of such a context, where English is more likely to be experienced as a school subject than as a living and breathing form of international communication (despite the fact that it is often sold as such, see Seargeant 2009, Seargeant 2011). I was also able to connect issues of authenticity with teacher efficacy and identity and I noted that Japanese L2 teachers are vulnerable to efficacy issues around authenticity. Finally, I was pleased to note that many of the participants felt that the authenticity continuum might help to ‘shift the centre of gravity’ as Graddol (1997) predicted, and empower other linguistic varieties which should be seen as valuable models of authentic English even (and perhaps especially) if they are not from the domain of native speakers.

## References

- Alex Gilmore** (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. In *Language Teaching*, 40/02: 97-118.
- David Graddol** (1997). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. British Council: London, UK.
- Adrian Holliday** (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Stephanie Ann Houghton & Damian J. Rivers** (2013). *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK.
- Freda Mishan** (2005). *Designing authenticity into language learning materials*. Intellect Books: Bristol, UK.
- Richard S. Pinner** (2014a). The Authenticity Continuum: Empowering international voices. In *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 16/1: 9-17.
- Richard S. Pinner** (2014b). The authenticity continuum: Towards a definition incorporating international voices. In *English Today*, 30/04: 22-27.
- Philip Seargeant** (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK.
- Philip Seargeant** (2011). *English in Japan in the era of globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, UK.



# 13

## The use of oral narrative tasks in second language learning: does a familiar topic make a difference?

Xuyan Qiu

*The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR*

xyqiu@connect.hku.hk

### Introduction

As one of the four skills, speaking receives much emphasis in second language learning. Different types of activities have been designed for teaching speaking with the functions of reinforcing pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, or creating experiences of real life communication so as to satisfy learners' future academic, professional or personal development needs (Baker & Westrup, 2003). Oral tasks are adapted to develop L2 learners' speaking competence in classrooms. Based on various definitions of "task" in the field of task-based language learning, tasks refer to meaning-based language activities with some given information and the existence of gaps so that learners can achieve communicative purposes while reaching a task outcome (Bygate et al., 2001; Ellis, 2003).

According to Robinson's cognition hypothesis framework (2011), tasks can be designed with various structures which may impose different levels of cognitive complexity for L2 learners. Whether task performers obtain prior knowledge of a task topic is one of the resource-dispersing variables included in the framework. Positive effects of familiar task topics have been found on EFL learners' listening and reading comprehension from empirical studies (Hu, 2012; McVee et al., 2005; Schmidt-Rinehart, 1994; Tuan & Loan, 2010). However, the investigation of whether and how a familiar topic affects EFL learners' language output, in particular oral performance, is still limited. Bui (2014) pointed out that familiar topics may shift L2 learners' attention partly from the conceptual preparation of a speech to the formulation of both content and linguistic forms which encourages them to produce more fluent and accurate oral performance. More research is still needed to further explore the effects of topic familiarity on EFL learners' speech production so that more solid conclusions can be drawn. In order to fill the research gap, this study aims to examine whether and how far familiar

and unfamiliar task topics affect Chinese EFL learners' oral production in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency.

## **Process of L2 speaking**

In the late 1980s, Levelt (1989, 1999) proposed a speaking model which describes the process of speech production for L1 speakers. His model was later extended to illustrate the speech production of L2 speakers (de Bot, 2007; Kormos, 2011; Segalowitz, 2010). Levelt (1989, 1999) explained that the procedure of speech production contains four components: conceptual preparation, formulation, articulation and self-perception/monitoring. When receiving information from the outside world, a speaker begins to activate relevant concepts from his/her knowledge so as to prepare the preverbal message of the speech. This can be referred to as the conceptual preparation stage. The formulation stage describes the speaker developing the preverbal message into the linguistic form via formulating the grammatical, morpho-phonological and phonetic encodings. Then, the speaker articulates the speech to the external world. Meanwhile, the speaker also monitors his/her oral production and repairs when there is any mistake.

Levelt's speaking model is fundamental for understanding EFL learners' oral task performance (Bui, 2014; Skehan et al., 2012; Wang, 2014). The four stages elaborated in the model can be related to the influential factors proposed in Robinson's cognition hypothesis framework, such as prior knowledge. Bui (2014) pointed out that a familiar task topic facilitates ESL learners' conceptual preparation and formulation because speakers may find it easier to get access to relevant concepts from their memories or knowledge so that they can allocate more attention to formulate their oral output. The speaking model provides more insightful illustration of L2 learners' performance of different tasks with explanations for their development of oral production, but its relationship with tasks of different structures and learners' performance needs to be understood and supported with more empirical data. Therefore, more investigation is necessary to explore learners' task performance on the basis of the speaking model.

## **Topic familiarity and task-based language learning research**

In this study, L2 speakers' familiarity levels with task topics depend on whether they obtain prior knowledge or schema of the topics. Previous

studies have been conducted to examine the influence of topic familiarity on EFL learners' listening and reading comprehension and the findings showed the effectiveness of familiar topics in language development (Hu, 2012; McVee et al., 2005; Schmidt-Rinehart, 1994; Tuan & Loan, 2010). However, exploration on whether and how far familiar and unfamiliar topics affect EFL learners' oral performance is rarely found. As one of the four language skills, the speaking skill is regarded as important in the field of language learning in that it equips learners with the competence to achieve communicative purposes. Hence, the development of EFL learners' oral production needs to be attended to in the field of second language acquisition.

Tasks are a form of classroom activity which has been adopted in language classrooms to improve EFL learners' language skills, especially the speaking ability (Ellis, 2012). When performing a task, learners express their meaning to achieve communication based on their own linguistic and non-linguistic resources (Ellis, 2003, 2012). Tasks can be designed with familiar topics or unfamiliar ones. In Bui's framework of task readiness (2014), topic familiarity, the existence of prior knowledge, is included as an aspect of the implicit planning or preparation for task performance and he calls for investigation into the influence of topic familiarity on L2 speakers' oral production.

To date, studies examining the effects of topic familiarity on L2 speakers' oral performance are seldom found in the field of task-based language learning. There exists a research gap when exploring the role of topic familiarity in L2 language learning. Révész and Han (2006) examined the impact of task content familiarity and task types (video versus notes) on 36 adult EFL learners' oral performance. During their performance, participants were provided with recasts focusing on the past progressive form. The results suggested facilitative effects of familiar task topics on reception of recasts. Nonetheless, the study does not shed light on the direct influence of topic familiarity on learners' speech production.

Taking a further step with the purpose of exploring ESL learners' reaction to tasks with familiar and unfamiliar topics, Bui's recent research (2014) invited 40 computer science undergraduate students and 40 medicine majors to perform two narrative task topics: computer virus and medical virus. He concluded that participants produced more fluent, slightly more accurate and complex speech when talking about "a virus" within their own academic background, that is, under the familiar condition. Bui's study attempts to support the effectiveness of a familiar task topic on L2 speakers' language

production, but taking the prior subject knowledge to distinguish the familiar topic from the unfamiliar one may confound the effects of topic familiarity. Participants may find it difficult to activate the professional terms within or out of their academic background. To avoid the potential impact of lacking professional terms, topics, such as problem-solving experiences, can be selected with tasks.

To address the research gaps discussed above, this study examines the influence of topic familiarity on Chinese EFL learners' oral performance from three aspects: complexity, accuracy and fluency. The research question and a hypothesis are provided as follows:

- Q: What differences, if any, are evident in participants' complexity, accuracy and fluency when explaining a problem-solving event in a picture task and explaining a personal problem-solving experience?
- H: It is hypothesized that the familiar topic, a personal problem-solving experience, encourages participants to produce more fluent, accurate and complex speech.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants are 25 Chinese postgraduate students who are female majoring in arts or social science and had been in UK for more than nine months when the study was conducted. 36 postgraduate students were first recruited to fill in a questionnaire of background information which collects participants' basic information (e.g., age, major), IELTS test scores and self-assessed oral proficiency. LeBlanc and Painchaud (1985) advocated that self-assessing language proficiency is valuable and reliable, thus, self-assessment grids of oral proficiency are adapted from *Common European Framework* (2007) and included in the questionnaire as a reference for the selection of participants. 29 of the participants assessed their oral proficiency level to be at B2 level whilst the others were at B1 level. Then, 29 students, whose self-assessed oral proficiency level was at B2 level, were shortlisted for the DIALANG writing test. Since writing and speaking are productive skills, the writing test helps to assess participants' productive skill which further ensured that participants were at a similar L2 proficiency level. Finally, the list of participants was narrowed to 25 students who were at B2 level of both speaking and writing abilities. 23 of them were aged between 21-25 years



old and two were aged 26 to 30. Their speaking scores for the IELTS test ranged from 5.5 to 7.0.

### ***Task design***

The finalized 25 participants were invited to perform two oral narrative tasks. One is a picture task which requires them to explain an event based on six sequential pictures depicting a problem-solving experience of four boys. The picture prompts were chosen from Heaton's study (as cited in Tavakoli & Foster, 2008) as shown in Appendix one. The other task is a personal experience explanation task in which participants shared one of their recent problem-solving experiences. Participants' own problem-solving experience is considered as the familiar topic whilst the four boys' experience, the experience of other people, is the unfamiliar topic.

### ***Data collection procedure***

25 participants performed the two tasks individually in a meeting room. Each of them was first provided with the following instructions for two tasks which are identical so as to avoid the influence of instructions on their task performance.

**Picture task:** *“Look at these pictures. Tell me how the children solved the problem. You have three minutes to prepare. You may not write down anything while preparing.”*

**Personal experience explanation task:** *“Think about a problem you solved in the last month. Tell me how you solved the problem. You have three minutes to prepare. You may not write down anything while preparing.”*

13 of the participants performed the picture task first while the other 12 participants did the personal experience explanation task first in order to avoid the influence of task order on speech production. Three minutes, which was testified in the pilot study, were given for planning in each task to ensure that the participants had enough time for preparation. The author was the listener who produced responding words (e.g., hmm, okay) so as to create a more real life communication experience. Participants' task performance was audio-recorded by voice recorders.

### ***Data analysis methods***

Oral discourse of the participants was first transcribed into textual words via *Audacity* software, following Kormos and Dénes' (2004) convention including filled pauses, corrections, and repetitions. In order to decide the

cutoff point, the author separately marked all the pauses which are longer than 250ms, 400ms and 500ms in eight participants' responses of the two tasks to investigate whether pause marks were relevant to fluency. For most of the selected pieces of discourse, pauses longer than 400ms are more meaningful in the study of fluency, hence, 400ms is the margin point of pauses which is consistent with Derwing et al.'s (2009) decision as the cutoff point. Punctuation marks were then added to the transcriptions. Both transcriptions and audio files were sent back to the participants to ensure that transcriptions were correct and punctuation was consistent with their original ideas. Participants' feedback was collected and the transcriptions were revised accordingly.

Complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) have been regarded as three general aspects of oral output which are commonly agreed to be effective measurements for oral performance (Geng & Ferguson, 2013; Lambert & Kormos, 2014; Malicka & Levkina, 2012; Révész et al., 2014; Skehan, 1996). Therefore, CAF are three main analytical foci of this study. The complexity of language use was measured for syntactic complexity and lexical richness. T-unit, a main clause plus any subordinating clauses (Hunt, 1970), was the analytical unit because narrative oral discourse, which has no interruption from interlocutors, is similar to written discourse. The *average number of words per T-unit* and *number of clauses per T-unit*, which are adopted in TBL studies (Iwashita, 2010; Kuiken & Vedder, 2012), was chosen to measure syntactic complexity. The former measure was calculated by dividing the total number of words by the total number of T-units. *Number of clauses per T-unit* was calculated by dividing the total number of clauses by the total number of T-units.

Another ratio related to lexical richness is length of nominal phrase which measures average word length of nominal phrases. The ratio is developed on the basis of Ravid and Berman's study (2010) which proposed that nominal phrases appear more frequently in the discourse of higher-proficient learners. In the task performance, nominal phrases present key information of circumstances and characters which may also reflect participants' ability to explain the events. Therefore, the ratio was selected to explore the lexical richness of the oral discourse.

In terms of accuracy measurement, this study adopts two ratios to investigate the general accuracy from the lexical level and the clausal level (Ellis, 2012): *errors per 50 words* and *error-free ratio* (Bui, 2014; Muñoz, 2014). *Errors per 50 words*, the number of errors per 50 pruned words, focuses on the

lexical level. *Error-free ratio*, the percentage of error-free clauses to all clauses, emphasizes the analysis from the clausal level.

For the measurement of fluency, three ratios, speech rate, phonation-time ratio and mean length of runs, have been selected which are frequently used in empirical studies of TBL to measure breakdown fluency (Ahmadian et al., 2012; Bui, 2014; Iwashita, 2010; Mora & Valls-Ferrer, 2012). Speech rate (SR) is defined by Kormos and Dénes (2004) as “the number of syllables articulated per minute” (p. 148). Phonation-time ratio (PTR) “is calculated as the percentage of time spent speaking as a proportion of the total time taken to produce the speech sample” (De Jong & Perfetti, 2011, p. 538). Mean length of runs (MLR) refers to “the mean number of syllables produced between pauses” (De Jong & Perfetti, 2011, p. 538).

## Results and discussion

Compared with the narrative about four boys’ experience in the picture task, the personal experience explanation task is more familiar since it is explaining their own problem-solving experiences. The data group of each ratio was tested by one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to be normally distributed. A pair-samples t-test was conducted to compare the oral discourse of two tasks from the three aspects of CAF. The results are shown in Table 1.

From Table 1, the mean word length of T-unit for the picture task is significantly lower than that for the personal experience explanation task with a large effect size ( $t(24) = -5.35, p < .01, d = 1.26$ ). The number of clauses per T-unit for the picture task is significantly lower than that for the personal experience explanation task with a large effect size ( $t(24) = -5.28, p < .01, d = 1.44$ ). No significant differences were found in length of nominal phrase. These findings indicated that participants produced speech with higher syntactic complexity when explaining the familiar topic, their own experiences.

In terms of accuracy, from Table 1, error-free ratio for the picture task is significantly lower than that for the personal experience explanation task with a medium effect size ( $t(24) = -2.36, p < .05, d = 0.60$ ). No significant differences were spotted in errors per 50 words. The results showed that participants had higher percentage of error-free clauses under the familiar condition.

For the measurement of fluency, from Table 1, the speech rate for the picture task is significantly lower than that for the personal experience explanation task with a small effect size ( $t(24) = -2.99, p < .01, d = 0.40$ ). Phonation-time ratio for the picture task is significantly lower than that for the personal experience explanation task with a large effect size ( $t(24) = -5.34, p < .01, d = 0.81$ ). Mean length of runs for the picture task is significantly lower than that for the personal experience explanation task with a medium effect size ( $t(24) = -4.42, p < .01, d = 0.72$ ). These findings suggested that participants produced more fluent speech when performing the personal experience explanation task, that is, with the familiar topic.

Measures	Picture task Mean(SD)	Personal experience explanation task Mean(SD)	t	p	Effect size
<b>Complexity</b>					
Mean word length of T-unit	15.12(3.16)	20.10(4.59)	-5.35	.00**	1.26
Number of clauses per T-unit	1.87(0.40)	2.53(0.51)	-5.28	.00**	1.44
Length of nominal phrase	3.67(0.77)	4.04(0.66)	-1.76	ns	-
<b>Accuracy</b>					
Errors per 50 words	2.32(1.28)	1.80(1.42)	1.58	ns	-
Error-free ratio	61.04%(0.21)	73.04%(0.19)	-2.36	.03*	0.60
<b>Fluency</b>					
Speech rate	138.72(30.34)	150.86(30.15)	-2.99	.01*	0.40
Phonation-time ratio	67.75%(0.09)	74.63%(0.08)	-5.34	.00**	0.81
Mean length of runs	6.60(2.59)	9.66(5.39)	-4.41	.00**	0.72

**Table 1: Results of CAF**

**Notes:**

SD means standard deviation.

\* means there is a significant difference with  $p < .05$ .

\*\* means there is a significant difference with  $p < .01$ .

Effect size refers to Cohen's  $d$ .

***Familiar topic and unfamiliar topic***

From the findings shown in Table 1, the familiar task topic, a personal problem-solving experience, facilitates participants' ability to produce more syntactically complex oral speech with large effects in both predictors. It encourages oral output with a higher error-free ratio and greater fluency. The results are consistent with the Cognition hypothesis (Robinson, 2001) which advocates that capability is not limited but with multiple resources, thus, all

the three aspects of CAF can be simultaneously attended to during participants' task performance under the familiar condition.

The allocation of attention to CAF can also be elaborated with Levelt's speaking model (1999) which describes the cognitive procedure of speech production. Similar to the findings of Bui's study (2014), more fluent and accurate oral production is spotted in the oral discourse of familiar task topics which may show that a familiar topic facilitates participants' conceptualization of speech content and formulation of linguistic forms. Preparing speech content is related to the conceptualization stage in that the participants activated concepts relevant to the task topics from their knowledge or memories. When narrating their own problem-solving experiences, they could get access to those concepts (e.g., people, place) more quickly because of their familiarity with the events. Therefore, more attention can be allocated to the formulation procedure so that participants could spend more time thinking how to formulate their linguistic output and more accurate and fluent speech was produced.

Furthermore, there is a medium effect size of the measure, error-free ratio, and no significant differences were spotted in terms of errors per 50 words. The possible reason is that all the participants are at a higher-intermediate level (B2 level) and their accuracy of speech production is generally high under both the familiar and the unfamiliar conditions. Hence, the effects of the familiar topic on oral performance are not very obvious and the effect size is not so large as the ones for fluency and complexity.

In contrast to Bui's results indicating the ineffectiveness of a familiar topic on syntactic complexity, the statistics of this study suggested more complex syntactic structures when narrating a personal experience. The findings further confirm the Cognition hypothesis which claims that with multiple resources, the participants can balance CAF during speech production, hence, their spoken performance could be improved under the familiar condition. When being familiar with their own experiences, the participants are more likely to use different conjunctions to link the details of the events and select more sophisticated vocabulary and expressions to enrich their narratives. Therefore, more complex speech production was found. However, when facing an unfamiliar topic, the participants may not be certain about the relations of all the details, so they may not be confident enough to use conjunctions to form the details into paragraphs. For example, a participant mentioned that "(and) there was a snake looking at them". The participant could not decide whether the existence of snake was relevant to the boys'

experience, so she intended to cover the information with a single sentence which may lower the number of clauses per T-unit.

The participants' higher-intermediate proficiency level could be the reason to explain why no significant differences were spotted between the oral utterances of the two tasks in terms of length of nominal phrase. Ravid and Berman (2010) claimed that nominal phrases are a developmental signal of language learning and are more likely to appear in the later stages of language development. Higher-intermediate students may be more able to use nominal phrases in their explanations when compared with beginners or lower-intermediate learners. It is possible that the length of nominal phrase for the personal experience explanation task does not vary much from the one for the picture task. What is more, both task topics are relevant to everyday life and the participants' discourse is colloquial, so the nominal phrases used to explain the experiences may not be very long and complicated. The length of nominal phrase, therefore, may not be affected by the familiarity levels of the task topics.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the familiar topic, personal problem-solving experience, enables EFL learners to produce more complex speech in that higher syntactic complexity was spotted with large effects sizes in two ratios, mean word length of T-unit and number of clauses per T-unit. No influence was spotted with regard to lexical richness. More accurate speech was also found under the familiar condition with a medium effect size in error-free ratio. In addition, positive effects of the familiar topic were noticed on participants' oral production in that more fluent speech was produced with a small effect size in speech rate (SR) and medium effect sizes in phonation-time ratio (PTR) and mean length of runs (MLR). In general, under the familiar condition, participants had better oral performance.

This study yields both theoretical and pedagogical implications. From the theoretical perspective, this study raises the consideration that topic familiarity affects oral performance of EFL learners. The comparison between oral production of the picture task and that of the personal experience explanation task may provide empirical data on the effectiveness of familiar topics on speaking and develop deeper understanding on EFL learners' reaction to oral tasks with familiar and unfamiliar topics. Furthermore, exploring the influence of topic familiarity on EFL learners'

oral performance further elaborates the conceptualization and the formulation stages in Levelt's speaking model. From the pedagogical aspect, a familiar topic, such as a personal problem-solving experience, can be used to engage learners in the language learning process. It may facilitate them to produce speech with higher quality so that they may be more confident and willing to participate in task performance.

Nonetheless, this study still bears three limitations which can be paid attention to in future research. First, besides the difference of topic familiarity levels for the picture task and the personal experience explanation task, the provision of picture prompts is another difference between these two tasks which has not been taken into consideration in this study. Picture prompts may also affect EFL learners' oral production (Kawauchi, 1999), hence, further exploration on the effects of picture prompts on EFL learners' oral production is encouraged. Second, a larger number of participants can be recruited to solidify the results. Third, besides postgraduate students in UK, learners with different proficiency levels, such as lower-intermediate learners, can be included to investigate lower- and higher-proficient learners' performance of tasks with familiar and unfamiliar topics so that language teachers may obtain more insights into the use of different task topics for students with different L2 proficiency levels in their actual teaching.

## References


- Mohammad J. Ahmadian, Mansoor Tavakoli & Hossein V. Dastjerdi** (2012). The combined effects of online planning and task structure on complexity, accuracy and fluency of L2 speech. In *The Language Learning Journal*, January 2012, pp1-16.
- Joanna Baker & Heather Westrup** (2003). *Essential speaking skills*. Continuum: London, UK.
- Hui Yuet G. Bui** (2014). Task readiness: theoretical framework and empirical evidence from topic familiarity, strategic planning, and proficiency levels. In Peter Skehan (ed.), *Processing perspectives on task performance*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Netherlands, pp63-94.
- Martin Bygate, Peter Skehan & Micheal Swain** (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: second language learning, teaching and testing*. Pearson Education Limited: Essex, UK.
- Council of Europe** (2007). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Retrieved from [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework\\_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_en.pdf)
- Kees de Bot** (2007). A bilingual production model: Levelt's "speaking" model adapted. In Li Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader*. Routledge: New York, NY, USA, pp384-404.

- Nel de Jong & Charles A. Perfetti** (2011). Fluency training in the ESL classroom: an experimental study of fluency development and proceduralization. In *Language Learning*, vol 61 2 June 2011, pp533-568.
- Tracey M. Derwing, Murray J. Munro, Ronald I. Thomson & Marian J. Rossiter** (2009). The relationship between L1 fluency and L2 fluency development. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol 31 04 December 2009, pp533-557.
- Rod Ellis** (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- Rod Ellis** (2012). *Language teaching research & language pedagogy*. Wiley-Blackwell: Malden, MA, USA.
- Xu Geng & Gibson Ferguson** (2013). Strategic planning in task-based language teaching: the effects of participatory structure and task type. In *System*, vol 41 4 December 2013, pp982-993.
- Xiaoli Hu** (2012). The application of schema theory in college English listening teaching. In *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol 2 2 February 2012, pp282-288.
- Kellogg W. Hunt** (1970). Syntactic maturity in school children and adults. In *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, vol 35 1 February 1970, pp1-67.
- Noriko Iwashita** (2010). Features of oral proficiency in task performance by EFL and JFL learners. In Matthew T. Prior, Yukiko Watanabe & Sang-Ki Lee (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 2008 Second Language Research Forum*. Cascadilla Proceedings Project: Somerville, MA, USA, pp32-47.
- Judit Kormos** (2011). Speech production and the Cognition Hypothesis. In Peter Robinson (ed.), *Second language task complexity: researching the cognition hypothesis of language learning and performance*. Benjamins: Amsterdam, Netherlands, pp39-60.
- Judit Kormos & Mariann Dénes** (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. In *System*, vol 32 2 June 2004, pp145-164.
- Folkert Kuiken & Ineke Vedder** (2012). Syntactic complexity, lexical variation and accuracy as a function of task complexity and proficiency level in L2 writing and speaking. In Alex Housen, Folkert Kuiken & Ineke Vedder (eds.), *Dimensions of L2 performance and proficiency: complexity, accuracy and fluency in SLA*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Netherlands, pp143-170.
- Craig Lambert & Judit Kormos** (2014). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in task-based L2 research: toward more developmentally based measures of second language acquisition. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 35 5 August 2014, pp607-614.
- Raymond LeBlanc & Gisèle Painchaud** (1985). Self-assessment as a second language placement instrument. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 19 4 December 1985, pp673-687.
- Willem J. M. Levelt** (1989). *Speaking: from intention to articulation*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.
- Willem J. M. Levelt** (1999). Producing spoken language: a blueprint of the speaker. In Colin M. Brown & Peter Hagoort (eds.), *The neurocognition of language*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, pp83-122.
- Aleksandra Malicka & Mayya Levkina** (2012). Measuring task complexity: does EFL proficiency matter. In Ali Shehadeh & Christine A. Coombe (eds.), *Task-based language teaching in foreign language context: research and implementation*. John Benjamins Amsterdam, Netherlands, pp43-66.



- Mary B. McVee, Kailonnie Dunsmore & James R. Gavelek** (2005). Schema theory revisited. In *Review of Educational Research* vol 75 4 Winter 2005, pp531-566.
- Joan C. Mora & Margalida Valls-Ferrer** (2012). Oral fluency, accuracy, and complexity in formal instruction and study abroad learning contexts. In *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 46 4 December 2012, pp610-641.
- Carmen Muñoz** (2014). Contrasting effects of starting age and input on the oral performance of foreign language learners. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 35 4 September 2014, pp463-482.
- Dorit Ravid & Ruth A. Berman** (2010). Developing noun phrase complexity at school age: a text-embedded cross-linguistic analysis. In *First Language*, vol 30 1 February 2010, pp3-26.
- Andrea Révész, Monika Ekiert & Eivind Nessa Torgersen** (in press). The effects of complexity, accuracy, and fluency on communicative adequacy in oral task performance. In *Applied Linguistics*.
- Andrea Révész & Zhaohong Han** (2006). Task content familiarity, task type and efficacy of recasts. In *Language Awareness*, vol 15 3 2006, pp160-179.
- Peter Robinson** (2011). *Second language task complexity: researching the Cognition Hypothesis of language learning and performance*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Barbara C. Schmidt-Rinehart** (1994). The effects of topic familiarity on second language listening comprehension. In *The Modern Language Journal*, vol 78 2 Summer 1994, pp179-189.
- Norman Segalowitz** (2010). *Cognitive bases of second language fluency*. Routledge: New York, NY, USA.
- Peter Skehan** (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 17 1 March 1996, pp38-62.
- Peter Skehan, Bei Xiaoyue, Li Qian, Zhan Wang** (2012). The task is not enough: processing approaches to task-based performance. In *Language Teaching Research*, vol 16 2 April 2012, pp170-187.
- Parvaneh Tavakoli & Pauline Foster** (2008). Task design and second language performance: the effect of narrative type on learner output. In *Language Learning*, vol 61 1 June 2008, 439-473.
- Luu Trong Tuan & Bui Thi Kim Loan** (2010). Schema-building and listening. In *Studies in Literature and Language*, vol 1 5 2010, pp53-65.
- Zhan Wang** (2014). On-line time pressure manipulations. In Peter Skehan (ed.), *Processing perspectives on task performance*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Netherlands, pp27-62.

## Appendix One: The football task



Football task (as cited in Tavakoli & Foster, 2008)

# 14

## **Do short-term study abroad experiences help L2 learners to become pragmatically more appropriate?**

Yoko Sato  
*Hosei University*  
yoko@hosei.ac.jp

### **Introduction**

It has long been recognised that pragmatically inappropriate features in L2 speakers' communicative behaviour could lead to negative consequences in social, academic and professional contexts by causing negative affective reactions in the interlocutors (e.g. Gumperz, 1982, 1995, 1996; Sato, 2008, 2013; Thomas, 1983; Wolfson, 1983). (For a fuller discussion see Sato, 2013.) However, the effect of study abroad (SA) experiences on the pragmatic aspect of communication has not been researched adequately. In particular, hardly any studies have included the paralinguistic and non-verbal facets, despite the fact that these have been reported as having a grave impact on communication (e.g. Sato, 2013).

This paper reports on one of a series of studies<sup>1</sup> investigating the impact of an SA programme on the communicative competence of Japanese university students, including the aforementioned under-researched areas. More specifically, it focuses on findings related to the pragmatic aspect of communication as perceived by the interlocutors. The following research question is addressed:

Do Japanese university students perform pragmatically more appropriately in English after short-term ESL SA experiences as perceived by the interlocutors?

---

<sup>1</sup> See Sato (in press) for some other findings of the present study.

## Method

The participants were 26 second-year Business students between the ages of 19 and 21. The students were at a pre-intermediate to intermediate level of English proficiency as assessed by TOEFL ITP (413-517 [ $M = 463.1$ ,  $SD = 25.79$ ]). They joined the Faculty's optional, credit-bearing SA programme and enrolled on ESL courses offered at two universities. At University M in Australia, the course lasted for 11 weeks and the students lived with local host families. The second option was a course that lasted for 16 weeks at University R in the United States, where each student lived in an on-campus dormitory for both international and local students. While abroad, the students submitted online monthly reports about their SA experiences. (See Table 1 for the profile of the participants.)

Placement	M	F	Total	TOEFL ITP
University M (Australia)	7	6	13	$M = 463.1$ ( $SD = 29.52$ )
University R (US)	7	6	13	$M = 463.1$ ( $SD = 23.28$ )
Total	14	12	26	$M = 463.1$ ( $SD = 25.79$ )

**Table 1: Profile of the participants**

Before and after the programme, one-to-one, face-to-face oral proficiency interviews were conducted by two experienced native speaker (NS) assessors. Each student was interviewed once by each examiner. The interview format was based on the IELTS Speaking test, with some modifications drawing on the author's previous study (Sato, 2008). Each interview lasted approximately 12 to 14 minutes. The interviewers assessed the students' performances using the IELTS Speaking band descriptors (public version). The descriptors had nine bands and consisted of the four criteria of Fluency & Coherence, Lexical Resource, Grammatical Range & Accuracy, and Pronunciation. (It should be noted that the setting and content of the interviews were somewhat different from those of the official IELTS test. Therefore, this study does not claim the same degrees of reliability and validity as the original IELTS test.)

After each interview, a questionnaire was administered in order to explore pragmatic problems perceived by the interlocutors. It asked the interviewers to rate the negative affective impact that the students' performances had on them, such as irritation or unpleasantness, on a 5-point scale ranging from "1: very serious" to "5: none". The interviewers then answered an open-ended question regarding the causes of such an impact. This subjective questionnaire aimed to collect data on pragmatically inappropriate features in the students' performances.

The students independently rated the difficulty they felt during the interviews and answered relevant questions. In the post-test, they also answered a questionnaire about their SA experiences and resulting changes in L2 learning and intercultural communication and understanding.

## Results

The interviewer ratings indicate that, as a group, the students' performances improved significantly after SA ( $p < .001$ ). The mean score improved from 2.90 (SD = 0.86) in the pre-test to 4.42 (SD = 0.42) in the post-test. (See Figure 1.) Neither gender- nor university-related difference was observed.






Figure 1: Negative affective impact rating: Group data

However, there were great differences among individuals in the pre/post score changes ( $M = 1.52$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ ). One student received a lower score in the post-test, and the scores of two students stayed the same. (See Figure 2.)



**Figure 2: Negative affective impact rating: Pre/Post changes: Individual data**

Spearman's correlation analysis showed a very strong, significant, negative correlation between the pre-test scores and the pre/post changes ( $r = -.898$ ,  $p = .000$ ). This means that those students who received lower scores in the pretest made greater improvement. This in turn led to the much smaller individual differences in the posttest scores; all students reached Score 4 (see Figures 1 and 3).



**Figure 3: Negative affective impact rating: Individual data**

As to the interlocutor comments on the causes of the negative affective impact, the total number increased from 53 in the pre-test to 87 in the post-test (multiple comments allowed). Comments related to abandoned communication decreased to less than one-third after SA. Conversely,

comments on insufficient linguistic resources and inappropriate use of body language and prosody increased greatly. In fact, prosody was commented on only in the post-test. No or little change was observed for dysfluency and under-elaboration (see Figure 4).




Figure 4: Causes of negative affective impact (Frequency)

However, somewhat different results emerged for the proportions of comments on different causes (Figure 5). The percentages of comments related to dysfluency and under-elaboration, as well as abandoned communication, greatly decreased after SA. Those of comments about inappropriate body language and linguistic deficit increased but to a smaller degree than were found with frequency. For prosody, the result was similar to that of frequency.




Figure 5: Causes of negative affective impact (Percentage)

## Case studies

Case studies were conducted with two students who did not follow the pattern of pre/post changes found in the group analysis presented above. Both of these students received Score 4 in the pretest but showed very different changes; Student 2 received a lower score after SA, while the score of Student 21 reached the highest score (Score 5) in the posttest. In the proficiency rating they received the same score in the posttest. In fact, Student 2's score improved whereas that of Student 21 did not change. (See Figure 3 above and Table 2 below.)

Student (Sex)	Place- ment	Affective Impact Rating (1: very serious – 5: none)			Proficiency Rating (Average 4 analytical scores)		
		pre	post	change	pre	post	change
2 (M)	Uni M	4.5	4.0	-0.5	5.0	5.75	+0.75
21 (M)	Uni R	4.5	5.0	+0.5	5.75	5.75	+/-0

**Table 2: Profiles of Student 2 and Student 21**

The interlocutors' comments on the causes of negative affective impact showed that, in the pre-test, both students had difficulty answering the questions adequately; abandonment of communication and under-elaboration were mentioned. In the post-test, however, only Student 2 received comments on features that caused problems, such as incoherent utterances and inappropriate body language and prosody. (See Table 3.)

	Pre	Post
Student 2	sometimes couldn't answer questions and gave up	raises eyes up a lot, looks over glasses (like it's secret or being told off), repetition of baseball etc. too much, sometimes too intense, stress too strong sometimes and on odd places, very animate with his hands - difficult to concentrate
Student 21	not quite able to develop answers fully enough with prompting	extra use of articles (e.g. I go to the Disneyland): clear but strange

**Table 3: Interlocutor comments on the causes of the negative affective impact**

In order to explore possible factors that contributed to the differences, these students' monthly reports and questionnaire responses were examined. Their monthly reports showed some distinct characteristics. Student 2, although describing some positive experiences of L2 learning and intercultural communication, had a lot of criticisms of the host mother, some of his classmates and the administrative aspect of the programme. Some of these comments were rather subjective and emotional. (Note: The following



excerpts were originally written in Japanese and translated into English by the author.)

...I've realised even my body language and self-talk are unintelligible to foreigners (sic), and feel motivated in attending lessons in such a severe environment. ... I often talk to my Greek friend. ... I learn a lot from him; he corrects my spoken English and tells me alternative expressions. We ... sometimes read aloud free newspapers together on the train. (October)

As for the homestay, I seem to be allocated to a typical middle-aged Aussie woman (sic), and at first I was daunted by her loud voice and couldn't cope with her "learn independently" style. I asked her to talk to me more during evening meals, but she said it was selfish of me to ask her to talk only for the specific period of time. I raised my voice while arguing with her for 50 minutes, asking her why she couldn't be considerate. (October)

On the other hand, Student 21's reports showed his positive attitudes throughout. He had very high motivation to study and learn, and actively participated in class.

The content of the Low Advanced class is all very useful, ... and I'm full of expectations for my future progress. I'm also taking an elective course which ... involves listening to fast daily conversation in a TV drama series. I've been trying my best to practise listening to English conversation after class, by, for example, watching American movies I brought from Japan. I'll keep trying my best without changing this attitude. (August)

He also analysed his own problems, and acknowledged and appreciated help by others. He made positive observations on other students and the local community, and sought opportunities for L2/intercultural communication out of class.

... for the first few days in the States I felt homesick and a very strong culture shock. .... I think this was due to the lack of my listening ability in English. I'd had some confidence in English, but couldn't cope with the speed of conversation of local people and had a hard time. But these were resolved after a few days, thanks to the local people full of the spirit of volunteerism, and now I'm actively participating in such activities as football and barbecues with other students. I'd like to keep it up. (August)

I went to a Thanksgiving party free for international students.... The party, guided by the spirit of volunteerism, offered an opportunity for cultural exchange, and I realised again that Reno is a town with an open-minded attitude towards foreign students and suitable for the first study abroad experience. (November)

Their post-test questionnaire responses also showed some differences. Student 2 indicated that his attitudes towards L2 learning changed through spending time with other international students who shared the same level of English ability and motivation. He came to be interested in learning about his own country and wanted to improve his grammar. Student 21, on the other hand, stated that through the SA experiences he realised that the ability to use contextually appropriate register was necessary, and wanted to improve this ability together with vocabulary.

### **Provisional Conclusion, Limitations & Future Directions**

The results suggest that the short-term SA experiences helped most of the Japanese university students who participated in the present study to develop pragmatic appropriacy, as measured by the affective impact their performances had on the NS interlocutor. There was a very strong, significant, negative correlation between the pre-SA scores and the pre/post changes. This means that those students who received lower scores before SA made greater improvement. After SA, much smaller differences were observed amongst individuals and all students reached Score 4 out of 5. It may be that the SA experiences facilitated the development of pragmatic competence to an extent which was minimally required in the particular setting.

As for the causes of pragmatic problems perceived by the interlocutor, dysfluency, under-elaboration and abandoned communication greatly decreased after SA. Conversely, problems caused by linguistic deficit and inappropriate use of body language and prosody increased to a large extent. One interpretation of these findings would be that the communicative pressure and social context in the target-language environment have facilitated the development of fluency and raised the awareness of the importance of elaboration and keeping conversation going. This in turn might have resulted in more prompt and extended but less accurate messages and in less attention being paid to body language and prosody.

However, large individual differences were observed in the pre-test/post-test changes, and some students did not follow the pattern mentioned above. The brief case studies suggest that it was not the linguistic proficiency that led to these differences. Rather, the attitudes of the students towards the SA experiences, such as the living and learning environment, and the awareness

of the importance of pragmatic competence which may be the factors that resulted in the difference in changes. Further investigation incorporating qualitative analysis of attitudinal factors is needed.

There are some methodological shortcomings, which may limit the generalisability of the findings. The small sample size calls for further studies and accumulation of data. Also, the fact that only one interlocutor-examiner was used for each test could have amplified the impact of idiosyncratic tendencies and subjectivity in the rating and comments, although an effort was made to enhance the reliability of the ratings by selecting experienced interviewer-examiners. Despite the improved rating scores in the post-test, the total number of comments regarding the causes of the negative affective impact increased. This suggests that the post-test examiner was simply more willing to provide comments than the pre-test counterpart. In addition, highly significant correlations were found between the proficiency ratings and the negative affective impact ratings only with the pre-test examiner. This may indicate the presence of the halo effect in the pre-test ratings. Using a panel of video raters may enhance the generalizability of the rating. Further studies with these modifications will provide a clearer picture of the pragmatic impact of SA experiences.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (#23520759, #26370710).

## References

- John J. Gumperz** (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- John J. Gumperz** (1995). *Mutual inferencing in conversation*. In I. Markova, C. F. Graumann & K. Foppa (eds.), *Mutualities in dialogue*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, pp101-123.
- John J. Gumperz** (1996). The linguistic and cultural relativity of inference. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, pp374-406.
- IELTS** (undated). *IELTS Speaking band descriptors (public version)*. Retrieved from [http://www.ielts.org/PDF/UOBDS\\_SpeakingFinal.pdf](http://www.ielts.org/PDF/UOBDS_SpeakingFinal.pdf)
- Yoko Sato** (2008). *Japanese University Students' Problems and Communication Strategies in EFL Speaking: a descriptive study using retrospective verbal reports*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Reading, Reading, UK.

- Yoko Sato** (2013). Retrospective verbal reports as a way to investigate cross-cultural pragmatic problems in oral interaction. In Bert Peeters, Kerry Mullan & Christine Béal (eds.), *Cross-culturally Speaking, Speaking Cross-culturally*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, pp11-45.
- Yoko Sato** (in press). Short-term ESL study abroad experiences: Do they reduce Japanese students' difficulty in oral communication in English? In *Conference of the International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 7(2).
- Jenny Thomas** (1983). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure. In *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.
- Nessa Wolfson** (1983). Rules of Speaking. In Jack. C. Richards & Richard W. Schmidt (eds.), *Language and communication*. Longman: London, UK, pp61-87.

# 15 English in Bangladesh: Is There a Bangladeshi English Creeping In?

Shaila Shams

*Independent University, Bangladesh*

shailashams1@gmail.com

## Introduction

With globalization and advancement in technology; the English language spreading more than ever all over the world has truly become the ‘lingua franca’ of today’s world. It is not only the language of international communication but also has given birth to its varieties which we call world Englishes/ New Englishes. These varieties of English, which are spoken not by the native speakers of English but the people who have learned the language as a second or foreign language, are becoming popular with the growing number of their speakers. Bangladesh, a south Asian country, long colonized by the British has given a considerable role to English in society and has nurtured its growth in the education of the country. As the current situation of English language usage/ English used by the young generation in urban Bangladesh matches with what the scholars call a possibility of a new English or a new variety of English, this has inspired the paper to investigate the current trends in the spoken and written English of tertiary level students in Bangladesh. The paper will also illustrate the history of English in Bangladesh in order to better analyze the use of English at present in the country.

## History of English in Bangladesh

The English language has had a deep rooted history in Bangladesh since 1600 (Kirkpatrick, 2007). Bangla, being the mother tongue of the majority of the population is the official language of Bangladesh. However, English has always received tremendous importance in the country as in any other post British settlement and enjoys the status of second language. English, though not the official language in Bangladesh, is very important in the education system of the country. It is introduced in grade 1 in schools. Depending on the amount of English to be taught in schools three kinds of schooling systems have developed in Bangladesh namely; English medium,

Bangla medium and Islamic/ Madrasa education. Recent results of public examinations after 10th and 12th grade and university admission tests where students are disqualified mainly because of their failure in English and maths only prove the necessity and importance of English in Bangladeshi society. Moreover, English is viewed as the language of the upper class and is seen as a tool of development in financial and social hierarchy (Hossain & Tollefson, 2007). Interestingly, the primary language of legal instruction in Bangladesh has been English until recent times. Ironically, the Bangla Academy, the proponent institution of the national language in the country obtained its ordinance drafted in the Bangla language for the first time in 2010 (Chowdhury, 2013). Therefore, the conditions stated above clearly place Bangladesh in the outer circle of Kachru's model (1985).

## **The scope of a Bangladeshi variety of English and Research Rationale**

Before discussing the Bangladeshi variety or the possibility of a Bangladeshi variety of English, it is important to define what constitutes a new variety of English. According to Ferguson (2006:152) "The term "New Englishes" is usually understood to denote varieties of English from post colonial societies whose formal properties – phonological, lexical, grammatical, discoursal – show a measure of divergence from British or American standard English." These new varieties develop in regions where the majority of people speak a language other than English. They grow through the education system and also have varieties of functions within the society and these varieties become localised or nativised (Platt & Weber, 1980). Kachru (1992b) characterizes the new Englishes as the ones which have long standing use in a society, have varied functions and a large number of users. The users have "emotional attachment" with the variety, these new Englishes also have "functional importance" and "sociolinguistic status". From the definitions above it can be said that the present condition of English language in Bangladesh as discussed before, matches with most of the aspects of new Englishes as outlined by scholars and thus provides a favourable platform for a new variety of English to grow.

One fascinating reason for the expansion of English language users in Bangladesh is technology. The Internet, online social networks and mobile phones have made this upper class language accessible to all sections of society with the young generation specially benefitting from it. English language, which was a subject only to be taught in schools for most of the

students, has suddenly become a medium of their expression. Therefore from the formal territory of educational purposes, English is now being used in the daily lives of young Bangladeshis.

This shift of English, becoming a part of everyday language use of a significant number of people, is a step toward localizing the language. This phenomenon initially triggered this research to conduct a methodical observation of the possibility of a Bangladeshi English.

This research was conducted among students of a private university in Bangladesh. The yearly intake of this university is more than 2500 and almost 90% of these students have to do compulsory foundation level English courses. These foundation courses emphasize students' listening, speaking and reading skills. These are the last English courses for them before they start their working career unless they opt for other language courses at a later time. These students come to university after 12 years of study of English as English is a compulsory subject from grade 1-12. Consequently, it has been observed that the students make the same repetitive mistakes in English in their exams and during class tasks. It is imperative to mention here that this study does not state the existence of a Bangladeshi variety of English, rather it is looking into the possibilities of discovering a new variety of World English. The purpose of this study is to look into the frequency of mistakes made by the students and to determine whether these are mistakes or deviations. Whilst adjudging on the classification of mistakes and deviations, the frequency of the respective individual events has been given the most importance as the classification factor. The research also aims to explain the possible underlying reasons for the mistakes or deviations.

Conversely, a past study conducted by Hamid & Baldauf Jr. (2013) has already shown that the practising English language teachers of Bangladesh do not have a favourable attitude towards the features that deviate from a standard variety of English. This would mean that even though the current students might show a trend of deviations in the language, the current English language teachers would always be trying to correct these deviations. Thus an advent of an indigenized form of L2 English would be strictly suppressed. The counter argument here is that, the current tertiary level students naturally are the future English language teachers of the country. Thus with almost no obstacle from using the same form of deviations in the future, these students will definitively engrave such deviations into a new form of English.

## Research Methodology

This research was conducted with a group of 18-21 year old university students doing foundation level English language courses in a private university. There were a total of 325 respondents to this study. This study was conducted for almost 1 year which included three semesters. For one year, the exam and class work copies of the participants were collected. For exams and class tasks, students were asked to write on different topics at different times. Since the language courses involve classroom discussion, students were asked to speak on various topics during class hours. For this activity as well, students were either given specific topics or were asked to propose their own. The students' discussions were recorded. Therefore, there are two types of data for this research- written and verbal. Both these modes have been examined for particular types of deviations or mistakes. The language components that were taken into consideration for this study were 'tense' and 'words and phrases'.

The 'tense' component included all forms of English language tenses in present, past and future, for example- past tense included: past simple tense, past continuous tense, past perfect tense, past perfect continuous tense. The students were free to choose the type of tense in their sentences. During the analysis, specific focus was given on the mood, aspect and setting of each of the sentences to identify which tense the sentence should have been in. The individual students' respective response sentences were then analyzed to ascertain the deviations made from the standard form such as wrong use, drop in verb use etc. These deviations were then recorded and analyzed for trends. Another analysis was to identify simple mistakes of tense in a sentence, for example- I was eaten/ I am ate. Both auxiliary verb use and main verb use were taken into consideration and analyzed separately for the study. The results were then grouped and tabulated together according to the broad classifications of past, present and future tense. Also analysis were carried out to find the persistent misuse of a specific 'broad class tense', for example- past tense, by specific students. This was done to ascertain the respective students' understanding or level of confusion of a specific tense.

'Words and phrases' included a single word or a collection of similarly organized words that were used repetitively by students. For this study a maximum of 2-word phrases were analyzed. These words and phrases were identified as deviations from the standard form by analyzing each sentence from the students' responses and comparing them with what should have been used, had the student meant the same thing. To understand whether the student was trying to express a similar meaning to what was determined, the



setting of the sentence and overall paragraph was taken into consideration. The sentence was also translated into Bangla in the determined meaning to find out the equivalent Bangla word or phrase used for the deviated English word or phrase. Reference was then made to the official English to Bengali and Bengali to English dictionary to ascertain the justification behind the deviations. The deviations were also recorded and investigated in each student's overall work to ascertain that the deviation was made multiple times when encountered by the need to use the same meaning. If the use of the 'deviation' was reversed with a correct or unrelated incorrect use of another word in the same written or verbal work, then the deviation was recorded as a 'mistake' for the said respondent.

## **Findings**

The corpus collected provides quite a number of significant findings. The data is divided into two sections for convenience of analysis and discussion. First, the use of 'Tense' in students writing will be analyzed.

### ***Tense***

When analyzing the use of 'Tense' in students' responses, all three types of tenses- Past tense, Present tense and Future tense have been taken into consideration.

### ***Present Tense***

The corpus of 325 copies of the students' responses shows that the majority of the students (80%) were able to use all four types of present tense- present simple tense, present continuous tense, present perfect tense and present perfect continuous tense.

A small number of participants (20%) used only the form of simple present tense. Also a low percentage which is 23% of random mistakes could be found in the work. These random mistakes included but were not limited to the use of 'is' instead of 'are' or vice versa. Only 9.85% of the respondents persistently made mistakes in the use of present tense. Overall, all the respondents seemed to have grasped the understanding of this form of tense.




Figure 1: Use of Present Tense among the respondents

### ***Future Tense***

The results revealed that most of the students (91.7%) for the study circumvented the need to use complex forms of future tense. These students adhered to using simple future tense to express any event in the future such as “she will go there, I will go there”. Of the use of simple future tenses, every single respondent was able to use such simple forms correctly with very rare cases of mistakes. Conversely, only 8.3% of the students attempted to use complex forms of future tense such as future perfect or future continuous tense. Of the users 80.2% were able to use the forms correctly. This translated to only 6.7% of the respondents being able to use all forms of future tenses correctly.




Figure 2: Use of Future Tense among the respondents



Figure 3: (pronounced *hobay*) will, will be, will be going to, will have been going to

### ***Past Tense***

Further analysis showed that students made the most mistakes in the use of past tense. The first mistake noted is that almost half of the respondents (44.9%) misused the auxiliary verbs to turn a sentence into past tense without transforming the main verb into a past tense. This was persistent in all forms of past tense. An example of such misuse of auxiliary verb is –‘I was go home.’

The second type of mistake that occurred mostly in students’ written or spoken English was the misuse of main verbs. The respondents here misused the main verb to transform a sentence to past tense while they simultaneously dropped the auxiliary verb or used a totally wrong tense of the auxiliary verbs. This was noted in the majority (64.9%) of the respondents. Examples of this sort of mistakes are –‘I gone home’, ‘I am went’, ‘We journeyed together’.

It has also been noticed that both the auxiliary verb and main verb were used wrongly or misused by a considerable number of the respondents (24.9%). This mistake was made mainly (79.3%) when a respondent used a past perfect or past perfect continuous tense. Ex: I was gone Malaysia before university start.





Figure 4: Use of Past Tense among the respondents

A small number of respondents used the “past future tense” (15%) and almost all of them (13.2% of the population or 88% of the users) transformed such tenses into present tense. An example of this type of mistake found from the corpus is ‘Suddenly I heard that after a few days my elder sister is going to married’. However random tense mistakes were quite low (6.8%) and completely correct users were also quite low in number (8.3%).

### ***Words and Phrases***

After analysis, the most commonly misused words observed in the study were – For, By, Repeat, Tell, Say, Every, Do, Make, So, Too Much, Too, Really and Like as. These words and phrases were however used with differing frequencies with some words and phrases used more pervasively than others.



**Figure 5: Frequencies of the most commonly used deviated words**




**Figure 6: (Pronounced *aunek baeshee*) – English word used so, too much, too, really**

The most commonly used words or phrases were a group which consisted of the words – ‘so’, ‘too much’, ‘too’ and ‘really’. All these words were used interchangeably by the majority of the students (65%). When using such words or phrases, the students primarily needed to express a large quantity, very big size or high quality such as ‘much more’ or ‘huge’ or ‘very good’. As there is no such similar expression in Bangla, the expression that is most

commonly used is to add a prefix of ‘aunek’ with a translation ‘many’ before ‘baeshee’ meaning ‘much’. Thus the Bangla phrase is used in the language to mean the following equivalents in English:

- **Adjective** – too much, numerous, Very Much, Most.
- **Adverb** – a lot, greatly, numerously, considerably, extremely.
- **Noun** – too many, too full, umpteen
- **Prefix** – multi-

The most commonly used translation thus becomes ‘too much’ with the other words and phrases (so, too and really) used just as frequently when expressing such meaning in English. Examples of such use are – ‘The lake is so beautiful’ or ‘I love my mother too much’.



**Figure 7: (Pronounced *Karā*) – English word used do**

The word ‘Karā’ in Bangla is a very versatile verb which is used to mean the Bengali equivalent of the English verbs – make, create, commit, practice, do, undertake, repeat etc. The Bangla word is also used as an action verb. When translating the word to English, students however tend to use only the word ‘do’. Thus by using the word ‘do’, students were mostly observed to transform nouns into verbs without the use of any other verbs. For example, ‘we do fun together all the time’; ‘we did songs all night’.

করা, বালান, গড়া, পঠন করা, প্রস্তুত করা, নির্মাণ করা, রচনা করা, ঘটান, সৃজন করা, সৃষ্টি করা, তৈয়ারি করা, উদ্ভাবন করা, উৎপাদন করা, প্রবর্তন করা, স্থাপন করা, সিদ্ধান্ত করা, সম্পাদন করা, বাধ্য করান, পরিণত করান, নিযুক্ত করা, গণনা করিয়া পাঠয়া, পাঠয়া করা, অর্জন করা, লাভ করা, পূর্ণ করা, আচরণ করা, পমন করা, বাতয়া, যাত্রা করা, অগ্রসর হওয়া, সম্পাদনা করা, নির্বাহ করা, উৎপন্ন করা, আকার, পঠন, শ্রেণী, প্রকার, নির্মাণ, তৈয়ারি - MAKE

**Figure 8: The Bengali words which use the same the equivalent English translated word “Make”**

Perhaps the most widely known phrase in the new generation Bangladeshi populace is the phrase ‘will you make friendship with me?’ Even though some might blame the birth of this phrase on the advent of computer aided messaging devices and social networking websites, the reason has been observed as otherwise. After ‘do’, the word ‘make’ was the most frequently used deviated word (35%) used by the students. The word ‘make’ has 39

recorded Bengali equivalents, both words and phrases, being used in Bangladesh. Of these equivalents quite a few also overlap with the Bengali equivalents of the word do. Thus the students were observed to be using both the words do and make interchangeably in the overlapping meanings. On the other hand the word ‘make’ was used quite frequently without any interchange when the expressing terms did not have any overlapping equivalents to the Bengali equivalent of do. Examples include, ‘I made good results in SSC’. To clarify, the English equivalents of the above figure 8 are given below:

- **Verb** – make, commit, practice, repeat, quicken, whiffle, create, invent, build, manufacture, produce, construct, shape, found, form, constitute, prepare, ready, equip, ready up, rear, found, forge, weave, write, provoke, cause, bring about, give rise to, effect, originate, raise, hatch, generate, originate, fashion, work, think, cut out, think out, grow, send out, introduce, inaugurate, institute, initiate, establish, set, put, place, put in, conclude, infer, educe, elicit, derive, edit, perform, put through, go through, drive, enforce, necessitate, employ, nominate, assign, ascertain, get, achieve, earn, acquire, attain, obtain, gain, obtain, carry, reach, fulfill, complete, occupy, make good, fill, treat, behave, act, use, conduct oneself, go, leave, lead up, toddle, cover, move, depart, transit, ride, set out, take the road, get off, journey, peregrinate, move forward, go forward, be promoted, get a move on, execute, redact, manage, turn out, beget.
- **Noun** – shape, form, appearance, build, character, make, structure, formation, construction, build, class, group, category, range, series, kind, style, method, species, sort, construction, building, making, working.



**Figure 9: (pronounced *Balā*) English word used reply, tell, say**

The next frequently used group of words and phrases were ‘reply’, ‘tell’ and ‘say’. With approximately 33% of the respondents, these words were noticeably used interchangeably. The word ‘Balā’ in Bengali actually has several English meanings which include the words - say, tell, speak, talk, utter, announce, pronounce, mention, inform, anticipate, vent, permit, ask, invite, rebuke, ring the changes, relate and shout. However, the students

seemed to pick up the three words- reply, tell and say, when trying to express a meaning of the Bengali word ‘Balā’. It was also noticed that the three words were interchanged randomly providing a notion that the students were yet unable to home into one single word for each expression.



Figure 10: (pronounced *Jan'ya*) English word used For

With 28% of the respondents showing to have developed the use of the English word ‘for’ as a translation of the Bengali word ‘Jan'ya’, this word was also observed as a deviation. The word ‘Jan'ya’ in Bangla has the following equivalents:

- **Conjunction** – for, because
- **Preposition** – because of, on account of, owing to, for the sake of, in favor of, with regard to, toward, against.

This word was, therefore, mostly misused when expressing possession of or causal due to the first person. For example, ‘the weather was very good for me’; ‘the cup was broken for me’.

প্রত্যেক, প্রতি, সব, সকল, সমস্ত, প্রত্যেকে, সকলে

Figure 11: (pronounced *prottek, proti, shob, shokol, shomosto, protteke, shokole*)  
English words used every, every people

For this one word in English, there are seven Bangla equivalents which are ‘prottek, proti, shob, shokol, shomosto, protteke, shokole’. The meanings of these Bangla words are:

- **Adjective** – each, every, all, whole, entire
- **Pronoun** – everyone, every, everybody

Because of so many meanings existing in Bangla and only one English equivalent, it was found from the corpus that students were inclined to mistranslate and use the English word ‘every’. Examples are: ‘Every people’. The number of respondents making this deviation was also quite high at 28%.

দ্বারা, কর্তক, দিয়ে

Figure 12: (pronounce *dara, kotrik, diye*) English word used 'By'

Two low frequency deviations were 'by' and 'like, like as' with respectively 18% and 13% of the respondents consistently using the expressions. The word 'by' was used for Bengali expressions with English meanings of:

- **Preposition** – by, through, with, per
- **Phrase** – by dint of

সত, একইভাবে, সমভাবে, সমত, তথা, পরা, পছন্দ, একই আকারে বস, একই আকারে প্রাপ্ত, সদৃশ আকারে বস, অনুবর্ত, স্বকল্প, সমান, প্রায় সমান, উপর, প্রতিম, প্রায়, ছেদ, একত্র, অভিন্ন, উপস্থিত, সদৃশ, মর্যাদাপূর্ণ - LIKE, LIKE AS

Figure 13: The Bengali words which use the same the equivalent English translated word "Like", "Like as"

On the other hand because of the lack of English expressions for so many Bangla expressions, students showed tendency to use the two words 'like' and 'like as' for all the expressions. However, the lowest number of students made mistakes using these two expressions. An example of the deviation is – 'She was looking as like beautiful'.

Other than the mistakes or deviations made in 'Tense' and 'Words and Phrases' there were also some other sparingly made deviations found in the corpus. Students very often used the following words: 'proudy', 'crowdy', 'shoutedly', 'sleepily', 'charming'. While they added an extra suffix after some words, students also kept the form of other words correct as in the word 'charming' but used them wrongly. Examples found from the corpus are: 'My native village is very charming', 'I was charmed to see the lake'.

## Discussion and Conclusion

The findings above suggest that the current students studying at universities in Bangladesh, even after having received 12 years of institutionalized teaching of English make mistakes in the very basic forms of English. The thought provoking factor here is that, these mistakes were not random rather were consistently made by several students. This fact also indicates that though not fully established, yet quite a traceable trend is being formed in the English used by the tertiary students of Bangladesh. What is fascinating



under this occurrence, if we could say so, is that this phenomenon might be suggesting the advent of a Bangladeshi English. What today's teachers conceive as mistakes because of the deviation from the standard varieties of English, may not be considered mistakes in the future. Some of the students who are making these mistakes in English today are going to be future English language teachers in Bangladesh, and may conceive 'mistakes' as perfectly fine.

The aim of this study was to investigate the usage of English by current university students of Bangladesh to locate any possible trend in English that deviates from the standard varieties. It has been found that a number of students were consistently making similar types of mistake in their use of English. The result also suggests that if the present situation continues with the students repeatedly making similar mistakes, there is a possibility of a Bangladeshi variety of English developing. The question is, if this is the dawn of a Bangladeshi English, whether the English language teachers and the policy makers should let it flourish. As the study by Hamid & Baldauf Jr. (2013) confirmed, present English language teachers are disapproving of such non-standardised practices, such studies can also help them remedy the situation of the observed deviations.

Though this study indicates the advent of a Bangladeshi English, there were some limitations to this study. Firstly, the participants were the students of only one university in Bangladesh therefore the data collected provides a very partial image. A geographical variety can be undertaken in further studies to analyze any variations of the hypotheses. Secondly, only two language components 'tense' and 'words and phrases' were taken into consideration in this study. Further study can be done in all the other aspects of world English respective to Bangladesh. This will enable us to form a clearer picture of the 'Bangladeshi English'. Also, to ascertain the hypothesis of this study the respondents can be provided with a set of sentences with specific "Bangladeshi English" sentences and let them decide on the "correctness" of the sentences.

## References

- Kamran R. Chowdhury** (2013). Bangla Academy gets its first law in Bangla. In *Dhaka Tribune*, [internet] 16 September 2013. Available at <http://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/2013/sep/16/bangla-academy-gets-its-first-law-bangla>, [accessed 15 August, 2014].

- Gibson Ferguson** (2006). *Language Planning and Education*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.
- Obaidullah M. Hamid & Richard B. Baldauf Jr.** (2013). Second language errors and features of world Englishes. In *World Englishes*, vol 32 4, pp476-494.
- Braj Kachru** (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk & Henry Widdowson (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and the Literatures*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, pp11-30.
- Braj Kachru** (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In *The Other Tongue; English across cultures (2nd edition)*. University of Illinois Press: Urbana, IL, USA, pp48-74.
- Andy Kirkpatrick** (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- John Platt & Heidi Weber** (1980). *English in Singapore and Malaysia: status, features and functions*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- James W.Tollefson & Tania Hossain** (2007). Language Policy in Education in Bangladesh. In Amy Bik, May Tsui & James.W.Tollefson (eds.), *Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian Contexts*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.: Mahwah, NJ, USA, pp241-257.

# 16

## Constructing and contesting the 'ideal learner': multilingual children in the UK school system

Robert Sharples  
*University of Leeds*  
ed12rs@leeds.ac.uk

### Introduction

There are over a million young people in England and Wales whose first language is not English. The label usually applied to them, pupils with 'English as an Additional Language' (or 'EAL'), is misleadingly simple. They are an enormously diverse cohort: some born and brought up in the UK in bilingual homes; others recent arrivals, perhaps passing through on a longer migration journey<sup>2</sup>. Some are confident multilinguals, literate in a broad repertoire of domains and language codes; others may be monolingual, perhaps taking their first steps into literacy and into formal education. Some have secure access to economic resources and established social networks; others are here illegally and their position in this country may be tenuous or under threat.

Grouping such pupils together on the basis of their presumed proficiency in English is both simplistic and highly contested (Baker 2011: 207, García 2011: 140-142). It conflates major differences in the cohort and obscures teachers' views of their pupils in ways that can isolate young learners at crucial points in their school careers. The problem is compounded by a lack of consensus over who counts as 'EAL': different definitions are used at different levels of local and national government, by researchers, practitioners and by the pupils themselves.

This paper looks at the challenge of defining 'EAL'. It offers three perspectives, seeing how multilingual pupils are defined in current policy, in educational data, and by the pupils themselves.

---

<sup>2</sup> In this paper, 'bilingual' and 'multilingual' are used interchangeably to denote speakers of more than one language, with no comment on their proficiency in each.

## Methodology

This paper is drawn from my broader doctoral study, a linguistic ethnography of multilingual pupils in the 'EAL' department of a South London secondary school. The data in this larger study consist of extensive field notes from classroom observations, audio recordings of classroom talk and interviews with the pupils and their teachers. This is supplemented by a review of current policy on 'EAL' and interviews with a range of other education professionals at school, local authority and national level.

This paper, based on a short conference presentation, offers extracts from this data set: three quotations from policy documents, a model of educational-data management drawn from interviews with staff at the school and at the Department for Education (DfE), and three micro-extracts from my classroom data. Together they illustrate the key contention of this paper: that the label 'EAL' obscures the reality of multilingual pupils' experiences of schooling, and enacts an understanding of multilingualism as other to a narrow monolingual norm.

## Findings

### *In policy*

Three quotations from policy documents will illustrate the dominant approach to multilingualism in the English education system<sup>3</sup>. The first is a definition of 'EAL' from the official guidance for school inspectors:

English as an additional language (EAL) refers to learners whose first language is not English [...] Pupils learning EAL are not a homogeneous group.

*(Ofsted 2009: 4)*

This is an authoritative definition: it is used during school inspections, the results of which can have a major impact on a school's future. It is significant for two reasons: first, it offers an unusually clear definition of 'EAL', a policy term that is elsewhere contested. Second, it recognizes heterogeneity within the cohort; that is, it makes an explicit reference to 'EAL' as non-homogenous, as a composite label encompassing pupils from different

---

<sup>3</sup> Although they are broadly comparable, there are significant differences between the education systems in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. This paper refers specifically to the English context.

linguistic backgrounds, with different migration trajectories and differential access to social and economic resources.

The second quotation offers a more policy-oriented definition. In estimating the likely impact of changes to the GCSE exams, Ofqual (the examinations regulator) notes:

We are using English as an additional language as a proxy for national origin, which is protected under the characteristic of race.

*(Ofqual 2013: 10)*

This presents 'EAL' as roughly synonymous ('a proxy') for national origin, and further equates it with a pupil's race. It makes a connection between these three characteristics ('EAL', national origin and race) and the Equalities Act 2010 – legislation that protects against discrimination according to certain 'protected characteristics', such as race, sexual orientation and religious belief.

The final quotation defines the limits of 'EAL'. Current rules allow schools to 'discount' pupils from the league table calculations if the pupil has recently arrived from a non-English speaking country. Here, the Department for Education clarifies how this applies to officially multilingual countries, in which English is one of the national languages:

While we appreciate that some children may speak a tribal language, these countries have reported that their official language is English, so requests [to discount pupils] will be automatically rejected in these cases.

*(DfE 2013: 3)*

Nation, language and person are tightly bound here: English is the prestige variety (in contrast to 'tribal languages') and there is a clear assumption that a language used in an official, national domain will therefore be used by all the citizens of that country.


Together, these three quotations sketch out a policy approach to multilingualism based on a clear definition, with clearly bounded limits, that sits within a broader policy and statutory context.

### ***In educational data***

Educational data plays an extremely powerful role in school management (and is likely to play a greater role in the future, see e.g. Exley 2015). A great deal of information about pupils is collected, quantified and submitted to

central government to form the basis for school inspections and local accountability. It is important to ask how multilingual pupils are represented in this data, as it forms the basis on which resources are allocated and the quality of education judged.

The primary locus for this data collection is the school. Information is collected by the school administrators and processed by the school data manager before being submitted to the RAISEonline system – a web-based service run jointly by the Department for Education and Ofsted that allows schools to access reports on pupil performance based on the data they submit. The National Pupil Database (NPD), a management system, draws data from both the school returns and the RAISEonline system (figure 1, below, shows this in schematic form).



**Figure 1: schematic representation of educational data flows.**

Several key points can be noted about this procedure. At school level it is very dependent on the data-management system purchased by the school: different systems have different options for recording language, ethnicity and nationality (which can be seen as three major components of ‘EAL’ – as in the extract from Ofqual 2013, above). This leads to some variation in how RAISEonline requests are understood and processed at school level. Interviews with data managers and analysts (at the Department for Education and in the school) reported wide variation between schools in the frequency and accuracy of this data collection.

The RAISEonline system is authoritative, but problematic. One interviewee (who works for the RAISEonline team at the Department for Education) described it as 'clunky' and 'not user intuitive'. It is difficult to produce fine-grained reports that include multiple variables (such as gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status – which would be needed to examine the performance of, say, Pakistani boys with limited access to economic resources) and it does not include much of the data that would give insight into the differential experiences of pupils with EAL (such as their literacy practices, prior education or family networks).

It is worth noting that the data reported by RAISEonline is always out of date: it depends on 'validated' data which are not released until the following year. Pupils whose personal or educational circumstances are most in flux (such as young migrants or those at the early stages of learning English) are those most likely to be misrepresented in these data. Young people who join the school mid-year (again, young migrants make up the majority of such movement) are unlikely to be visible in the official data for some time, especially if they arrive after pupil data are collected for the year. Despite these systematic weaknesses, RAISEonline is the main source of data for those who hold schools to account: Ofsted inspectors, governors and the school leaders themselves.

### ***In their own words***

Three micro-extracts of classroom talk will stand as a final illustration of the diversity of 'EAL'. The context for all three is a 'withdrawal' classroom, where pupils at the earlier stages of learning English are withdrawn from their subject classes to study basic vocabulary and grammar. These extracts are taken from a single class, and all the names are pseudonyms.

#### **Extract 1:**

Teacher: Marco, do you know 'relatives'?  
Maria: relativo  
Marco: yes

#### **Extract 2:**

Duda: ... and then a second warning, after which you will be ...

#### **Extract 3:**

Aman: I so miss my mum.

In the first extract, we see the teacher asking a simple vocabulary question to Marco. Before he can reply, Maria steps in to translate for him. Her intervention answers the teacher's question, and removes the need for Marco to respond fully; he simply replies 'yes', he does know the word. In the second extract, Duda is being told off by his teacher. Following the school behaviour policy, she tells him that he is being given a first warning, and he picks up the rest of the routine without missing a beat, using words he has heard her say many times before. In the third extract, we are studying family vocabulary. As the teacher explains the meaning of 'aunt' and 'uncle', Aman turns to me and whispers, 'I so miss my mum'.

## Discussion

This short paper has offered data from three different sources: from an analysis of policy documents on EAL, from interviews with data managers at the Department for Education and in the school, and micro-extracts of classroom talk. They all contribute to a broader picture.

In policy, we see a narrow definition of multilingualism produced in opposition to a homogeneous monolingual norm. The use of 'EAL' as a proxy for 'national origin' conflates nationality and language: knowing the language a person speaks does not tell you (certainly not reliably) what nationality they are, and vice versa. Linking this to equalities legislation suggests a further elision of language and national identity: the legal definition of 'race' does include nationality and ethnicity, but not language (Equalities and Human Rights Commission 2015, GOV.UK 2015).

The relationship between nationality and language is further strengthened in the 'discounting' policy. There, countries are assumed to be substantially monolingual and the use of a language at national level is seen as a reliable indicator that it is used by all citizens. This is in contrast to the multilingual reality of most of the world. Take Uganda as an example: it is one of the countries listed in the DfE (2013) document as having English as an 'official' language. Pupils from Uganda are therefore ineligible for 'discounting', suggesting that they are expected to have a sufficient command of English to follow the English school curriculum. Leaving aside any differences between the countries' curricula and learning cultures, Uganda uses two 'official' languages: English is the statutory national language and Swahili is the statutory national working language. English is the dominant language of wider communication, a second language for many people, with



Ganda/Luganda also widely used. Chiga and Nyanore are used as the medium of education in some areas. In total, 41 different languages are spoken in the territorial area of Uganda, with three languages (English, Swahili and Ganda/Luganda) widely used at national level (Crystal 2003, Ethnologue 2015). The status of 'official' language is here not synonymous with 'L1' in the manner assumed by the DfE.

The use of 'first language' in the guidance for inspectors equally assumes a monolingual home environment. There is little scope, for example, for bilingual homes in which each parent speaks a different language; or for homes in which young people use a different language with their immediate and extended families. It also makes no mention of differential access to literacy, or the simultaneous maintenance of regional varieties and languages of wider communication. While the guidance notes that 'pupils learning EAL' are not a homogenous group, it is rooted in an assumption of monolingualism, tightly bounded to ethno-national identity. The 'inclusive rhetoric of government policy towards linguistic difference', Creese (2005: 42) argued, 'is held at the level of a celebratory discourse without any real bite'. Similarly, here we see superficial acknowledgement of diversity while 'EAL' is powerfully positioned in opposition to an implicit monolingual norm.

This monolingualising (Heller 1995: 274) policy discourse is enacted in the collection and processing of educational data. At school level, data relevant to a full understanding of 'EAL' (such as the pupil's language background, their prior schooling and their literacy practices) are often collected through questionnaires to parents on enrolment. This can be problematic: many families, for example, will report a regional *lingua franca* as the child's first language, assuming that the school lacks the specific knowledge of minority or regional varieties. Variation in the frequency of (re-)collecting data means that changes in ethnic identification, developing linguistic repertoires and the acquisition (or loss) of legal status are not kept up to date. García (1996: vii), writing about the New York of twenty years ago, argued that:

the ethnolinguistic identity of children is itself undergoing rapid change [...]  
The greatest failure of contemporary education has been precisely its inability  
to help teachers understand the ethnolinguistic complexity of children [...].

García was right not to lay the blame at the feet of practitioners. If schools do not collect accurate and timely data on the pupils, it is difficult to see how a rounded picture of their ethnolinguistic complexity can emerge.

Even when such data are collected, there are structural barriers to using it to support multilingualism in schools. At school-level, for example, the data management systems used are often able to record quite detailed information on language and ethnicity (though none, to my knowledge, allows information on literacy practices to be encoded). There is an expectation that schools will use this data to plan their provision, but in practice it is often lost. The RAISEonline system generates reports for Ofsted inspectors, governors and school leadership teams based on a much restricted set of variables. These reduce ethno-linguistic complexity to a small number of dominant nationalities and language varieties, intended to stand for much broader and more diverse areas. This can be seen, for example, in reports of attainment by (e.g.) ‘Chinese girls’ or ‘Pakistani boys’ – the latter, as one participant noted, making no distinction between children from rural backgrounds with little prior access to literacy and those from literate urban families, and therefore obscuring wide variation in educational achievement. It can be difficult, he argued, to justify time and resources spent on these children when the governors have a report saying that the cohort’s performance is broadly on target. At the national level, the NPD database reduces ethnolinguistic complexity still further, using a binary distinction between English-L1 and non-English-L1 as the main indicator of ‘EAL’.

Educational data, at least in the current collection and analysis procedures, requires and reinforces an understanding of ethnically and linguistically homogeneous national identities. Bhabha (1994: 66) identified a conception of ‘fixity’ as an important underpinning of colonial discourse, something Leung *et al.* (1997: 547) pick up as the ‘reification’ of migrants: an important assumption in the discourses of ‘otherness’, discursively separating migrants from those playing a ‘permanent and integral part’ in the nation state. In the data-collection and -analysis routines used in the English education system, we see such fixity being enforced as important details (such as languages and ethnic identifications) are conflated, reified and reduced to over-simplified categories and blunt ‘EAL’ tick-boxes.

In the classroom data, a more nuanced picture emerges. The first extract reveals a young person using her knowledge of two languages to interrupt an ‘initiation-response-feedback’ routine between the teacher and another pupil (see also Creese and Blackledge 2010: 111). Despite being positioned by the school as someone with deficient linguistic proficiency who is in need of special ‘withdrawal’ classes, she is able to mediate the English-language lesson and help her classmate (whether he wanted help or not). In doing so she creates a more powerful subject position for herself (Le Page and

Tabouret-Keller 1985: 4) and indexes a more successful learner identity than was otherwise available to her.

In the second extract, we see a young multilingual adopting the words of his teacher. He was being told off, but by appropriating her voice he is able to give implicit recognition to her authority without losing face – a ‘sharply ironic’ move that demonstrates his ability to engage in a ‘double-voiced discourse that is “internally dialogized” (Bakhtin 1981: 324)’, (Blackledge and Creese 2009b: 472). As in the first extract, the speakers demonstrate a nuanced command of different registers and codes, and deploy them appropriately.

The final extract highlights the tragedy and absurdity of defining pupils only in terms of their ethnicity and linguistic proficiency (as the category of ‘EAL’ does, resting on restrictive and homogenising assumptions about language, ethnicity and nationality). The young person in the extract was nominally studying vocabulary about the family, but at that moment was entirely focused on his actual family, thousands of miles away in Afghanistan. His traumatic experience of unaccompanied migration and tentative settlement has been very different from that of some other ‘EAL’ pupils, such as those born and raised in bilingual homes in the UK, or those who have migrated with their families, secure in their legal status and with access to the economic and social resources that he lacks. In the terminology of the English education system, though, they are indistinguishable: ‘pupils with EAL’, whose first task is to learn English.

## Conclusions

This short paper has sketched out some of the inconsistencies in the current definition of ‘English as an Additional Language’, and has shown how they are embedded in both policy and in official data about young multilinguals. There is a great deal left to be said; space has permitted only illustrative examples. Three points, though, can be made:

- First, the well-attested assumption of monolingualism in education policy can also be seen in the management of educational data. Broad linguistic repertoires (Blommaert and Backus 2011, Busch 2012, Pennycook and Otsuji 2014) are reduced to ethno-linguistic/national labels, which in turn become a binary distinction between a putative monolingual norm and an

‘other’ (as in the binary between English-L1 and non-English-L1).

- Second, policy and data management reinforce each other, systematically excluding ‘EAL’ pupils from the league tables and data-driven reports that are used to hold schools to account. The ethnolinguistic complexity that García noted is obscured (though has been better recognised in the past, see Department for Education 2006: 3-4, 10-13).
- Third, young people are not constrained by this; they negotiate and contest the ways that the education system positions them as deficient, showing great linguistic creativity (see, *inter alia*, Blackledge and Creese 2009a, 2010).

Young multilinguals, then, find and create spaces to express the full complexity of their ethnolinguistic identities despite systemic barriers are placed in the way of that complexity being recognised. This paper has sought to show how those barriers are embedded in current policy and data management. How the young people respond to them is the focus of my on-going research.

## References

- Colin Baker** (ed.) (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, UK.
- Homi K. Bhabha** (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge: London, UK.
- Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese** (2009a). Meaning-Making as Dialogic Process: Official and Carnival Lives in the Language Classroom. In *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, 8 (4), 236-253.
- Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese** (2009b). ‘Because tumi Bangali’. In *Ethnicities*, 9 (4), 451-476.
- Adrian Blackledge & Angela Creese** (2010). *Multilingualism*. Continuum: London, UK.
- Jan Blommaert & Ad Backus** (2011). Repertoires revisited: ‘Knowing language’ in superdiversity. In *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*. Available online at: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/67.pdf> [last accessed: 23 May 2013].
- Brigitta Busch** (2012). The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited. In *Applied Linguistics*, 33 (5), 503-523.
- Angela Creese** (2005). *Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classrooms*. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, UK.

- Angela Creese & Adrian Blackledge** (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? In *Modern Language Journal*, 94 (1), 103-115.
- David Crystal** (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Department for Education** (2006). *New Arrivals Excellence Programme*. Available online at: [http://www.leics.gov.uk/new\\_arrivals\\_excellence\\_programme\\_guidance\\_booklet.pdf](http://www.leics.gov.uk/new_arrivals_excellence_programme_guidance_booklet.pdf) [last accessed 13 June 2014].
- Department for Education** (2013). *2013 Secondary School Performance Tables: KS4 June Exercise Troubleshooting and Additional Information*. Available online at: [http://www.medway.gov.uk/pdf/DfE\\_2013\\_KS4\\_June\\_Checking\\_Exercise\\_Troubleshooting\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.medway.gov.uk/pdf/DfE_2013_KS4_June_Checking_Exercise_Troubleshooting_Guide.pdf) [last accessed 13 May 2014].
- Government Equalities Office** (2010). *Equalities Act 2010 (c. 15)*. TSO: London, UK.
- Equalities and Human Rights Commission** (2015). *Protected Characteristics*. Available online at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/guidance-all/protected-characteristics> [last accessed 18 January 2015].
- Ethnologue: Languages of the World** (2015). *Uganda*. Available online at: <http://www.ethnologue.com/country/UG/status> [last accessed 18 January 2015].
- Stephen Exley** (2015). We've not done enough to ensure reliability. In *Times Educational Supplement*, London, 9 January 2015. Available online at: <https://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6455235> [last accessed: 15 January 2015].
- Ofelia García** (1996). Foreword. In: Colin Baker (ed.), *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, UK, pp. vii-ix.
- Ofelia García** (2011). Educating New York's bilingual children: constructing a future from the past. In *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14 (2), 133-153.
- GOV.UK** (2015). *Discrimination: your rights*. Available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/discrimination-your-rights/types-of-discrimination> [last accessed 18 January 2015].
- Monica Heller** (1995). Language Choice, Social Institutions, and Symbolic Domination. In *Language in Society*, 24 (3), 373-405.
- R. B. Le Page & Andrée Tabouret-Keller** (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Constant Leung, Roxy Harris & Ben Rampton** (1997). The Idealised Native Speaker, Reified Ethnicities, and Classroom Realities. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (3), 543-560.
- Ofqual** (2013). GCSE Reform: Equality Analysis Report (Ofqual/13/5336). Available online at: <http://ofqual.gov.uk/documents/equality-analysis-report-on-reforms-to-gcses-from-2015/> [last accessed 13 November 2013].
- Ofsted** (2009). English as an additional language: A briefing paper for section 5 inspectors (Reference no: 090164). Ofsted: Manchester, UK.
- Alastair Pennycook & Emi Otsuji** (2014). Metrolingual multitasking and spatial repertoires: 'Pizza mo two minutes coming'. In *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18 (2), 161-184.



# 17

## **The impact of teacher questions and task design on L2 performance –complexity, accuracy and fluency- in EFL classrooms**

Natsuyo Suzuki

*Graduate School of Education, Waseda University*

natsuyo-suzuki@fuji.waseda.jp

### **Introduction**

The study investigated the impact of teacher question strategies and task design factors on the performance of English as a foreign language (EFL) adolescent learners in a Japanese secondary school. The major contribution that teachers make to second language (L2) discourse is in the typical form of initiation, response, follow-up (IRF) exchange as well as in the form of giving instructions and feedback; however, questions are also often used to check students' L2 knowledge (display questions) rather than ask personal and creative responses (referential questions). This suggests form is emphasized over meaning and accuracy over communication (Long & Sato, 1984; White & Lightbown, 1984), which is different from the way people interact in real life communication.

On the other hand, tasks are in popular use in L2 classroom settings for facilitating natural interactional modifications and language development (Mackey, 2012). The current study hypothesized that teacher questions might affect students' task performance depending on the quality of questions given. However how to select appropriate tasks and how to validate or match tasks for the target English learners are significant questions (Samuda & Bygate, 2008) and has been a growing focus (Philip, Adams, & Iwashita, 2014). Thus, there is clearly a need for more classroom-based studies which examine the effects of various design variables (e.g., manipulation, topic) on learner-learner interaction (Ellis, 2012).

In addition, the issue of the appropriateness of the measures for identifying success of learners' L2 task performance is still an open question (Mackey, 2012). As for an approach to researching tasks, Skehan (2009) argued that

task performance and the processing influences on it could be the major concerns. These are more frequently measured in studies exploring task characteristics and task conditions (Skehan, 1998; Ellis, 2003, Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000). The notion of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) has been used both as performance descriptors for the oral and written assessment of language learners as well as for an indication of learners' proficiency when measuring progress in language learning (Housen & Kuiken, 2009).

'Complexity' is defined as the extent to which learners produce elaborated language and the variations in their willingness to use more challenging and difficult language at the upper limit of their interlanguage systems (Skehan, 2001). 'Accuracy' refers to how well the target language is produced (Skehan, 1996). 'Fluency' is defined as the production of language in real time without undue pausing, repetition or hesitation (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Understandably, there has been a consensus that learners' L2 proficiency and L2 performance are multi-dimensional in nature. They cannot be measured only by the proficiency underlying their performance, though CAF whose three dimensions are distinct from one another could be a good reflection of performance. The purpose of this paper is to: 1) explore the role of teacher questions given in the first part of EFL communicative lessons, and 2) examine their impact and task design factors on students' L2 development by observing the complexity, accuracy and fluency in their performance in the group.

### ***The role of teacher questions***

Teachers utilize different types of questions. They are classified based on: 1) the depth of cognitive processing, some operating at the surface level (e.g., calling for the reproduction of content) and some at a deeper level (Koivukari, 1987); 2) form (e.g., yes/no or WH questions); 3) communicative value (e.g., referential or display); 4) orientation (e.g., language focused or real-life content) (Hakansson & Lindberg, 1988) and so forth. Among these types, referential and display questions are most frequently used (Long & Sato, 1984) in classrooms in which communication is valued. Referential questions intend to get students to use their imagination and creativity by providing contextual information about situations, events, actions and they often focus on content (e.g., 'Have you ever...? What do you think about...?'), whereas display questions ask knowledge of the learners to check comprehension and often focus on the form and meaning of grammar (e.g., 'What does ...mean? What is the opposite of...?'). Studies found display questions were frequently used and generally preferred by English as a



second language (ESL) teachers because they are quick (Long & Sato, 1981; White & Lightbown, 1984). However referential questions surpassed display questions in terms of eliciting varying lengths and complexity of responses (Brock, 1986; Long & Crookes, 1992; Nunan, 1990; White, 1992). On the other hand, it was found that secondary students in Hong Kong produced longer and more complex utterances in response to display questions (Wu, 1993). Yang (2010) also found referential question did not make students produce longer responses, finding that students in Chinese language classes tended to economize on words in priority to meaning for instant communication. In a recent study of English as a foreign (EFL) classroom in Brunei, Ho (2005) suggested that display questions could be purposeful and effective in terms of institutional goals, yet disagreed with the categorization of the types of questions. Much of the literature on teacher questions pays particular attention to students' responses as discourse, however the current study is more concerned with how types of questions worked in the students' group performance while engaging in tasks, since it seemed to be more natural to portray dynamic classroom interactions for L2 learning.

### ***Tasks and L2 production-complexity, accuracy and fluency***

Tasks used for pedagogical purposes in the classroom are considered to be beneficial for L2 development in terms of providing opportunities for comprehensible input, negotiation for meaning and form, production of output, and directing one's attention to points of discrepancy between the interlanguage and the target language in a particular setting (Mackey, 2012). In researching tasks, one important topic is the role of tasks played by individual learner factors (e.g., working memory, language classroom anxiety and the learning that take place). This study, however, focuses on more specific variables as to how learners perform tasks in relation with how tasks are designed and manipulated.

Types of task (e.g., one-way vs. two-way, open vs. cloze) have been most extensively studied in the research literature (Samuda & Bygate, 2008), along with the impact of various task design variables (e.g., topic familiarity, discourse mode) and implementation variables on learner-learner interaction. However, very few of them were investigated in a classroom (Ellis, 2003). Among various task design variables, the current study particularly focused on personal topic (familiarity) and a game element that makes learners compete for task completion (manipulation). Given that the topic enables learners to get personalized messages in the interactions, it may help learners to produce more spontaneous and natural language. Similarly, given that the task has a game element, with learners tending to compete to get winning

results, the task may encourage adolescent learners to engage in tasks more seriously and may create an authentic atmosphere for L2 production. These factors seem to be very important particularly for EFL learners. However, to date there has been little focus on task design factors which motivate active task engagement.

This study followed a cognitive approach to measure L2 performance and focused on complexity (lexis), accuracy and fluency (Skehan, 2009; Housen & Kuiken, 2009, Skehan, 2014). Complexity focuses on the extent to which learners vary in their willingness to use more challenging and difficult language (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Housen & Kuiken, 2009), and to restructure more complex subsystems of language (Foster & Skehan, 1996). Lexical richness which is generally measured by calculating type-token ratio (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005), is also considered to be a measure of complexity. Type-token ratio is defined as the total number of different words used (types) divided by the total number of words in the text (tokens) (Robinson, 1995). For the low-level English learner who can only produce a limited range of grammatical structures but might be able to employ a variety of words, lexical complexity is perhaps a good measurement. Accuracy is measured in terms of how accurately a learner uses the L2 (Ellis & Barkhuizen 2005), and it is clearly distinguished from complexity. Fluency has two distinct dimensions; the speed of speaking and breakdown fluency (number and length of pauses in speech). It is seen in the rate and density of delivery (Skehan, 1998; Tavakoli & Skehan, 2005) and hesitation phenomena including repair fluency such as the number of false starts and repetitions (Ellis & Barkhuizen 2005). Foster and Skehan (1996) and Skehan and Foster (1999) investigated the impact of a certain task type (e.g. narrative, personal, argumentation) on task performance examining fluency, accuracy and complexity of the ESL university level students' language. They found that fluency and accuracy improved on personal tasks, since these were already sufficiently familiar to the students; students performed more fluently regardless of pre-planning time. Personal tasks also gave rise to less complex use of language. They suggested that the learners' affective characteristics and task familiarity would relate with the learners' willingness to engage with L2 and could be measurable factors. So far, however, there has been little discussion about the relationship between topic familiarity and L2 performance on CAF. The study thus proposes the examination of the impact of topic familiarity and task design factors on CAF in EFL classrooms in a Japanese secondary school.

## Method

### *Research questions*

The study was conducted in classrooms in which a teacher-learner interaction phase took place prior to the task activities and the students' task performance phase. The study seeks to address the following questions:

- Which type of teacher question (referential or display) is more successful to elicit a grammatical structure and a longer response from the students?
- Which task (picture difference or personal information exchange) is used more effectively in terms of eliciting complexity, accuracy and fluency between the groups who received referential questions and display questions?

### *Participants*

In this study there were thirty-eight junior high school students (8 male, 30 female) aged 12-16. They have studied English for less than three years in 3.3 hours of classes (including a 50 minute class by a native speaker of English) per week at their college of music junior high school alongside everyday music lessons and practices. Many of the students were beginners and had not learned English grammar before the age of 13 when the junior-high school curriculum started. The study was divided into two groups: a referential group (n=12) which included one bilingual student (Chinese and Japanese), and a display group (n=11), including a bilingual (English and Japanese) student. The referential group and the display group were counterbalanced by the effect of operational order. There was no significant difference between the groups in terms of the scores collected from written pre-tests of question formations. As a control group, fifteen students receiving no treatment also participated in the experiment.

### *Materials*

The teacher used referential questions to ask mostly about a student's personal life in order to elicit extensive and creative responses from the students (e.g., 'Where are you going for your holiday this vacation?' 'How was the concert last weekend?'), whereas display questions were used to elicit mainly recall for the reproduction of content and description of the story (e.g., 'What is apple bobbing at Halloween?' 'How many landmines are still buried in over 70 countries today?') from the textbook the students were studying.

As for tasks, picture difference and personal information exchange tasks were made different in terms of a game element and the personal topic (Table

1). A game element which will make learners race for task completion and a personal topic which will enable learners to personalize the task were examined to see whether they were effective enough for the adolescent students to give rise to complexity, accuracy and fluency. Other factors related to task implementation variables such as repetition and pre-planning were controlled and made identical on a like for like basis in this study. Table 1 highlights the distinctions between the tasks.

Distinction:	Game element	Personal topic
Task		
Picture Differences	Yes	No
Personal Information Exchange	No	Yes

**Table 1: Task differences**

The picture difference activity was used to promote students' ability to identify differences between similar pictures by using question formations to gather the information they needed. Studies of learner performance on a series of tasks have shown that various question forms could be effectively targeted. The performance on these tasks was helpful to learners to improve their production of questions as measured in pre-/post-tests. (Mackey, 1999; McDonough & Mackey, 2000). Participants were divided into two groups to compete on the speed of task completion, which was on a first-come-first-served basis. To avoid participants spotting the difference and only uttering one word, participants in each group were allowed to rehearse what and how to ask for differences in the pictures they had.

The Personal Information Exchange task required participants to exchange personal information by asking questions (e.g., 'what do you hate most' 'what will it be when you are in your twenties?'). The participants were given planning time in which they were allowed to make notes in English on a piece of paper before doing the task. Participants were divided into small groups and exchanged their information one by one.

### ***Procedure***

The experiment was undertaken in school classes in which a non-native EFL teacher interacted with the participants three days a week. Participants were informed beforehand about the purpose of the procedure for language learning including tests, task treatment and voice recordings, which were distinct from their regular textbook-based lessons. Participants in both groups (Referential group and Display group) took a pretest a day before the treatment as a part of an in-class activity. One lesson consisted of three phases: a teacher-led interaction phase (whole class) in which students were

provided teacher questions (referential group/ display group) one by one; a text-based lesson phase including explicit instruction of grammar points and translation in the learners' L1 (Japanese); and the students task performance in the group phase of the lesson. The teacher question phase took approximately 7 minutes of the 50 minutes of each lesson; about 10-15 minutes were allocated to text-based instruction and the task treatment lasted approximately 20-30 minutes including student planning time.

In the teacher's phase of the lesson, Class A received referential questions (referential group) and Class B received display question (display group) in the first term (Term 1). The two groups were counterbalanced between Term 1 and Term 2 by the effects of task order. The groups were statistically homogeneous in terms of their English proficiency in using question formations ( $t(20) = 1.14, p > .27$ ).

In the students' task performance phase of the lesson, three different contents in the same task design were employed three times in a row per week. The task treatment lasted for about 3 to 4 weeks in each term.

### ***Analyses and coding***

Audio-recordings of teacher questions and students' responses were transcribed and complexity, accuracy and fluency were identified and the number was calculated.

As for the measure of complexity, this research examined the grammatical aspect in terms of the number of different words used in the speech. Lexical richness was calculated by type-token ratio (Robinson, 1995). The measure seemed to be suitable to indicate lexical complexity of low-level learners who were not able to produce long texts.

Accuracy was measured by identifying error free clauses and was calculated by dividing the total number of independent clause units multiplied by 100 (Foster & Skehan, 1996). To indicate the extent to which the learner is oriented towards accuracy, the study included the number of self-corrections.

Fluency in terms of repair or modification was measured, for which Skehan (1998) used hesitation phenomena rather than breakdown fluency which measures pause length and speech rate. Although it would not be normal not to combine the measurement of two aspects of spoken production (speed and hesitation phenomena), there seemed to be little point identifying pauses and breakdowns as a sign of dysfluency when considering the nature of

interactional conversations for the task completion where students tended to pause to think about what and how to say something. Thus, this study examined repair fluency including reformulations, repetitions, and false starts which were identified only for clauses. Repetition of words used as fillers (e.g., 'yes', 'no', 'okay') were not identified for one or two words.

## Results

### *Research question 1*

The first research question asked: Which type of teacher question is more successful to elicit a grammatical structure and a longer response from the students who received referential questions or display questions? To identify any grammatical structure from students' audio-recorded transcription, the number of turns which produced a sentence structure (subject + verb, subject + verb + object / complement) was calculated for each group, which is shown in Table 2. Display group (18) produced more than twice as much as those of the referential group (8), though the number produced was extremely low. The total number of words in students' responses and the total duration of teacher questions (referential group: 518 words in 86.8 minutes; display group: 448 words in 81.9 minutes) over 6 weeks revealed that there was not much difference between the groups. The data appear to suggest that the ratio of grammatical structures produced in response to display question was much larger than those in response to referential questions which tended to elicit a single word or short phrase not to break down their natural communication. On the other hand, students in the display question group appear to use a grammatical structure showing their reproduction of what they have learnt or what they knew from the textbook.

	Referential group	Display group
The number of turns produced per sentence	8	18
Total number of words produced in response	518 words	448 words
Total time of the teacher question and response	86.8 minutes	81.9 minutes

**Table 2: Comparison of number of grammatical structures, words and total duration of teacher questions**

### *Research question 2*

The second question asked: Which task is used more effectively in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency, the group which received referential questions or display questions? Table 3 shows the number of different words in the two tasks to indicate complexity in participants' task performance. The right column shows the ratio of the total number of different words used

(types) divided by the total number of words in the text (tokens) shown. Lexical richness is generally measured by calculating type-token ratio and the closer the type-token ratio is to one, the greater the lexical richness (Ellis, 2012). Table 3 shows the referential group in the picture difference task indicated .16 and that of display group indicated .17 in the same task. While in the personal information exchange, the type-token ratio of the referential group showed .11 and similarly that of the display group showed .10. Surprisingly, lexical complexity in each column was extremely low, while there was no distinct difference between the groups (referential and display groups), and only a slight difference between the two tasks.

<b>Lexical Complexity</b>	<b>Type-token ratio</b>
(different words used / the total number of words)	
<b>Picture Differences</b>	
Referential	.16 (160/ 1014)
Display	.17 (168 / 989)
<b>Personal Information Exchange</b>	
Referential	.11 (234 / 2082)
Display	.10 (168 / 1665)

**Table 3: Complexity of two groups in each task design**

Next, accuracy of participants' performance was measured by counting the number of error-free clauses including error-free morphosyntax and error-free vocabulary. Error-free clauses were shown per total number of independent clauses which were identified only in independent clauses since no sub-clausal units were found in the participants' performance in this study. Table 4 figures the referential group's ratio of error-free clauses at .84 and that of the display group at .79 in picture differences, whereas in personal information exchange, the referential group indicated .71 and the display group indicated .76. In contrast to the result for lexical complexity, there was not much difference either between groups or tasks, however accuracy occurred with greater frequency (the referential group in the picture difference task showed .84, whereas complexity showed .16).

<b>Accuracy</b>	<b>Ratio of error-free clauses</b>
(errors-free clauses / the total number of clauses)	
<b>Picture Differences Task</b>	
Referential	.84 (141/167)
Display	.79 (112/142)
<b>Personal Information Exchange</b>	
Referential	.71 (175/247)
Display	.76 (168/222)

**Table 4: Accuracy of two groups in each task design**

Lastly, Table 5 shows the fluency that was indicated by showing the number of clauses in which any repair fluency such as reformulation, false starts, and repetitions did not appear. The number of such clauses is shown with the total number of clauses to indicate the ratio. The referential group figure is .41 whereas the display group figure is .42 in picture differences. On the other hand, the referential group in the personal information exchange task figure is .73 and the display group shows .73. Despite both the referential group and the display group performing similarly in fluency, a distinct difference was not made between the participants in the referential and display groups but there was a difference between the two tasks. The personal information exchange task could successfully elicit a more fluent performance than the picture difference task, although complexity and accuracy were not markedly different.

<b>Fluency</b>	<b>Ratio of fluent clauses</b>
(the number of clauses with no reformulation, false starts, repetitions / the total number of clauses)	
<b>Picture Differences Task</b>	
Referential	.41 (69 /167)
Display	.42 (60 /142)
<b>Personal Information Exchange</b>	
Referential	.73 (180 / 247)
Display	.71 (159/ 222)

**Table 5: Fluency of two groups in each task design**

## Discussion

Contrary to the results from some published studies which found referential questions elicited varying lengths and complexity (Brock, 1986; Long & Crookes, 1992; Nunan, 1990; White, 1992), findings observed in this study were not consistent. The study found that the display group produced twice as many grammatical structures than those in the referential group. Findings also revealed that a number of students in the referential group tended to economize on words in their communication by using only one word, in spite of producing almost the same number of words. This was consistent with Yang's study (2010) in Chinese language classes and Wu's study (1993) which revealed students in Hong Kong produced longer and more complex utterances in response to display questions. This might be explained in that students who received display questions tended to simply produce grammatical structures, recalling the texts in the textbook, paying more attention to form, and being aware of the purpose of teacher's questions



which was to ask knowledge rather than to communicate. Consequently, it is questionable whether there is a relationship between the longer responses towards display conversations at the surface level of cognitive process and L2 development. Also, it might be argued that the impact of teacher questions might vary depending on learners' L2 proficiency level. However a question remains unanswered at the moment. What role does classroom discourse play for pedagogical purposes on the one hand and meaningful communication on the other? A further study with more focus on classroom conversation and L2 acquisition is therefore suggested.

Next, findings observed for research question two showed that both display questions and referential questions did not seem to have any impact on lexical complexity, however they revealed a slight difference between the two tasks. The picture differences task is distinct from the personal information exchange one in that the former had a game element and the latter was more personal. It might be argued that tasks with a game element might successfully push learners to produce a wider variety of words compared to personal tasks. However, it should be noted that the type-token ratio indicating lexical diversity was extremely low, regardless of the type of teacher questions or task design variables. This may be explained due to the task design itself. Unlike opinion-gap tasks, both information-gap tasks resulted in eliciting a very limited number of possible outcomes. For instance, the participants in the picture difference and personal information exchange tasks were required to use a certain pattern of forms repeatedly in the conversation (e.g., 'Is there...?', 'What do you like....'), which might inevitably limit the variety of expressions to be produced. Clearly, this may suggest that complexity is controlled by task design variables.

By contrast, accuracy was fairly consistent between groups and between tasks. Since learners' English proficiency level was almost identical at the pre-test stage, no difference in accuracy might have been made. Instead, one question that might need to be asked is why the accuracy figure was much higher than that for complexity. A possible explanation for this might be that the more words are produced, the more the errors take place, and this is understandable in situations where the lexical complexity was quite low. In addition, the results are likely to be related to the classroom atmosphere where learners had opportunities to listen to their peers' utterances carefully, imitate and use them in turn for their task completion with other peers. This would not happen easily in laboratory-based research. To develop a full picture of the dynamic interactions for L2 learning in the classroom, additional studies will be needed.

Finally, the results for fluency appear to suggest that task types generated different L2 performance, which was in line with studies by Foster & Skehan (1996) and Skehan & Foster (1999). This may be explained by the fact that personal tasks were already sufficiently familiar to the students (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1999). This study also confirms their findings that personal tasks generate less complex use of language. Another possible explanation for this is that a personal topic fits best to the adolescent learners who were at a sensitive age in the process of establishing their own identities, which could be attributed to more fluent language production. It can thus be suggested that a personal topic is likely to generate more fluent language production, however more research on the issue for different ages needs to be undertaken. Fluency in the current study measured the number of repetitions, false starts and reformulations, but the data are not sufficient to draw conclusions. To maximize learners' motivation for active engagement in the task, we could infer that teachers need to organize and utilize a mixture of pedagogical tasks taking value from the topics and interests of the target learners. Furthermore, there is some controversy regarding the standard measures of CAF (Housen & Kuiken, 2009); more robust and varied measures should be applied in classroom-based research in which the dynamic processes of learning are taking place.

## Conclusion

The current study revealed that referential questions and display questions did not have any impact on L2 performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency, though there was a distinction between tasks. In addition, the findings observed during teacher questions revealed that display questions elicited more grammatical structures than referential group in which students tended to produce one word answers to keep up a meaningful conversation. Accuracy also did not show a distinct difference between the picture difference and personal information exchange tasks, yet accuracy showed a high percentage in both tasks compared to lexical complexity. Fluency was generated much more in the personal task than the other one which involved a game element. The combination of task utility for pedagogical purposes and learners' interests is therefore recommended and further research on the issue is called for.

## References

- Colin Brock** (1986). The Effects of Referential Questions on ESL Classroom Discourse. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 20:pp47-8.
- Rod R. Ellis** (2012). *Language teaching research & language pedagogy*. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford, UK.
- Rod R. Ellis** (2003). *Task-based Language and Teaching*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- Rod R. Ellis & Gary Barkhuizen** (2005). *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- Pauline Foster, Alan Tonkyn & Gillian Wigglesworth** (2000). Measuring Spoken Language; A Unit for All Reasons. In *Applied Linguistics*, 21: pp354-75.
- Pauline Foster & Peter Skehan** (1996). The Influence of Planning on Performance in Task-Based Learning. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18:3, pp299-324.
- Gisela Hakansson & Inger Lindberg** (1998). What's the question? Investigating questions in second language classrooms. In *AILA Review*, 5, pp73-88.
- Alex Housen & Folkert Kuiken** (2009). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. In *Applied Linguistics*, 30, pp461-473.
- Debbie Guan Eng Ho** (2005). Why Do Teachers Ask the Questions They Ask? In *REL C Journal*, 36.3: pp297-310.
- Mirjami Koivukar** (1987). Question level and cognitive processing: Psycholinguistic dimensions of questions and answers. In *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, pp101-120.
- Michael, H. Long & Christine Sato** (1984). Methodological Issues in Interlanguage Studies: An Interactionist Perspective. In Alan Davies, Clive Cripser & Anthony Howatt (eds.), *Interlanguage*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Michael, H. Long & Graham Crookes** (1992). Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 26: pp27-56.
- Alison Mackey** (1999). Input, Interactions, and Second Language Development. In *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, 21, pp557-587.
- Alison, Mackey** (2012). *Input, Interactions, and Corrective Feedback in L2 Learning*. Oxford Applied Linguistics: Oxford, UK.
- Kim McDonough & Alison Mackey** (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22, pp471-97.
- David Nunan** (1990). The Questions Teachers Ask. In *JALT Journal*, 12: pp187-202.
- Jenefer Philp, Rebecca Adams, & Noriko Iwashita** (2014). *Peer interaction and second language learning*. Routledge: London, UK.
- Peter Robinson** (2005). Aptitude and Second Language Acquisition. In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25: pp46-73.
- Virginia Samuda & Martin Bygate** (2008) *Tasks in Second Language Learning*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York, NY, USA.
- Peter Skehan & Pauline Foster** (1999). The Influence of Task Structure and Processing Conditions on Narrative Retellings. In *Language Learning*, 49.1, pp93-118.
- Peter Skehan** (1998). *A cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- Peter Skehan** (2001). Tasks and language performance. In Martin Bygate, Peter Skehan & Michel Swain (eds.), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second language learning, teaching, and testing*. Longman: London, UK, pp167-185.

- Peter Skehan** (2014). The context for researching a processing perspective on task performance. In Peter Skehan (ed.), *Processing Perspectives on Task Performance*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp1-26.
- Joanna White & Patsy M. Lightbown** (1984). Asking and answering in ESL Classes. In *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 40: pp288-344.
- Chi Cheung Ruby Yang** (2008). *Second Language Classroom Interaction Patterns: An Investigation of Three Case Studies of Pre-service Teachers*. University of Hong Kong: China.
- Kelvin K. Wu** (1993). Classroom Interaction and Teacher Questions Revisited. In *RELJ Journal*, 24: pp49-68.

# 18

## **Competence in building intercultural relations: Case study insights into the development process**

Jiayi Wang & Helen Spencer-Oatey  
*University of Central Lancashire & University of Warwick*  
JWang11@uclan.ac.uk

### **Introduction**

The effective building of relationships across cultures is of central importance in today's globalising world. However, although it is identified (either explicitly or implicitly) as a key element of intercultural competence (e.g. Griffith and Harvey, 2001; Gudykunst, 2004; Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009) in a number of models, and various process steps for developing it have been proposed, there have been few qualitative studies that have examined its development at a detailed level. This paper addresses this lacuna of research by reporting an in-depth empirical study of a group of Chinese government officials who visited the USA for three weeks, with the explicit aim of 'building relations'. It explores the Chinese participants' experiences from a 'developing competence' perspective.

The paper starts by briefly outlining the key elements of some well-known intercultural competence models (Bennett, 2009; Byram, Nichols, & Stevens, 2001; Deardorff, 2006; Gudykunst, 2004): motivation/attitudes, knowledge and skills, as well as desired internal and external outcomes associated with the development of competence.

Next it describes and analyses the case study data that were collected. The participants' reflection data formed the starting point for our analyses. We focus particularly on how their understanding, attitudes and behaviour developed during the course of the visit, i.e. how, and to what extent, growth in competence in managing relations occurred.

Finally, the paper relates the findings to the competence models discussed earlier in the paper, considering how adequate they are for accounting for the

data. We argue that while the models offer useful generalized insights, they do not account very well for the goal-oriented nature of professional intercultural interaction, such as occurred in this case study. Some brief suggestions are made for adjustments to the models.

## Models of intercultural competence

Before looking at the models of intercultural competence, it is worth defining the term the “competence in building intercultural relations”. We use it to refer to the ability to develop, through interaction, ‘good’ relations with people from other cultural groups and to “handle the psychological demands and dynamic outcomes that result from such interchanges” (Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009, p. 51). ‘Good’ here can be interpreted as smooth, appropriate, effective, and so on, i.e. it can be personally defined, underscoring the subjective nature of the evaluation of relationship quality.

It has been broadly agreed that intercultural competence comprises three important components: motivation/attitudes, knowledge and skills (Byram, Nichols, & Stevens, 2001; Deardorff, 2006). *Motivation* is what inspires people to engage in intercultural interaction. Gudykunst (2004) defines it as certain basic needs that motivate us, including the need for a sense of security, the need for self-confirmation and the need to avoid anxiety. For example, in order to sustain our self-conceptions, we are attracted to those who support our self-concept, and this influences our choices of the people with whom we form relationships.

However, a growing number of researchers have focused their attention on attitudes rather than basic needs as the central motivating factor. Deardorff (2006) lists respect (valuing other cultures), openness (being open to cultural learning, to people from other cultures and withholding judgment), and curiosity and discovery (tolerating ambiguity) as the requisite attitudes in her pyramid model of intercultural competence. They are also the place where her process model (2006) starts. Similarly, Bennett (2009) suggests that, in order to develop our intercultural competence, first and foremost we need to foster attitudes that motivate us. For example, it is critical to keep an open mind, i.e. “suspending assumptions and judgments, leaving our minds open to multiple perspectives” (Bennett, 2009, p. 128).

The *knowledge* component of intercultural competence refers to the cognitive information we need in order to communicate effectively and appropriately. It includes both culture-specific information and more general cultural awareness such as knowledge of stylistic differences (e.g. degree of

openness or explicitness) and alternative interpretations (Gudykunst, 2004; Deardorff, 2006).

In comparison, the *skill* component has been studied from numerous perspectives. Drawing on her research with leading intercultural experts, Deardorff (2006) proposes the ability to listen, observe, interpret, analyse, evaluate, and relate in her widely-cited process model.

So, according to these models, a person with the right motivation/attitudes, combined with increased knowledge and skills, may experience an informed shift in frame of reference (e.g. in adaptability, flexibility, and empathy) and develop an ethnorelative view. This desired internal outcome, through interaction, can then facilitate the achievement of a desired external outcome, viz. behaving effectively and appropriately in an intercultural situation. This may then feed back into attitudes. In Deardorff's (2006) terms, intercultural competence should thus be understood as a process that emerges through interaction.

## Case study data

Having reviewed relevant theoretical models, we now focus on the case study data that we collected. In this section, we describe the background to the case, a Chinese delegation visit to the USA, and explain the focus of our analyses.

The delegation comprised twenty senior officials from the Chinese Ministry of X, which has had a long-term relationship with its American counterpart, the US Department of X (American Government Department, abbreviated as AGD). Both sides had agreed on the schedule for the delegation visit in advance. The group visited six major American cities during their three-week visit, and had twenty-six meetings with twenty-three American organisations, both governmental and non-governmental. The overall host was the AGD. Among these exchanges, seventeen meetings were video recorded completely, four meetings and one banquet were video recorded in part with supplementary audio recordings, and at five meetings recordings were not allowed due to the nature of the American government organisations. All the names of the organisations, people, cities and states have been anonymised.

Typically, members of high-level official delegations, usually leaders from various departments, do not have much contact with each other before their trips. After returning home, they frequently only hold one formal internal meeting to summarize and reflect on their intercultural experiences, though during their trip they might discuss informally some matters that arise.

This delegation differed from most others in this regard. The head of the delegation (henceforth, HOD) was already a leader of the other delegates in their daily work and, perhaps because of this, he formally dedicated a considerable amount of time during the trip to an internal meeting in the evening of every working day, after and/or before special events. These evening reflection and planning meetings, (henceforth, EMs), aimed to report, share and understand in a timely and efficient manner any issues arising from their intercultural contact with their American counterparts. Therefore, the Chinese officials' spontaneous comments at the EMs formed the starting point for our analyses. We examined how their competence in managing relations, i.e., their understanding, attitudes and behaviour, developed over the course of the visit.

## Developing competence in building intercultural relations

It is noteworthy that the primary goal of the trip for the Chinese officials was to build intercultural relations. This was highlighted at the pre-departure meeting and reiterated during the visit. At the very first evening meeting, for example, the HOD explicitly identified it as a central goal:

...throughout our stay in the US, we must constantly enhance our image. Second, as we've said at the dinner, keep off the politically sensitive topics, properly handling the *relations* with the American side. This trip is hosted by the US Department of X (AGD) as our counterpart... We will visit different American X organisations, and some are at the grass-roots level. This is more likely to deepen our understanding of the administration of the American X system. Therefore, we must develop a good *relationship* with every organisation in order to further promote the development of *relations* between the Chinese Ministry of X and the United States Department of X. From the day we arrived in the US till the day we leave, we must *put the relations* with AGD *first* and every exchange and every visit are opportunities to boost our *relations*... They are the two most important points that I want to make [*italics added*].

*Data extract 1: EM comment*

[.....在美期间，大家要一直不断提升我们的形象。第二，我们在吃晚饭的时候也说了这点，不要涉及政治敏感话题，要处理好和美方的关系。这次等于是美国 X 部



作为我们的对口单位接待我们.....我们也会去拜访不同的美国 X 机构, 拜访一些基层单位, 这更能加深我们对美国 X 系统管理模式的了解, 所以跟每个单位要搞好关系, 进一步推动中美 X 部关系的发展。从我们踏入美国第一天起, 到我们离开美国, 都要把和美方 X 部的关系放在首位, 每一次交流和访问都是增进关系的契机.....这是我要提到的最重要的两点。]

As can be seen, the group had a clear focus on building intercultural relations, and this was a key motivation for the delegation. Gifts emerged as a central theme in the Chinese delegation's relational planning and reflection and so we examine below how their competence in managing intercultural relations through gift-giving developed (or failed to develop) during the course of the visit.

The group dedicated a considerable amount of time during their EMs to discussing the giving of gifts. Of course, they talked about the specific gifts they had prepared for the Americans as well as the gifts they had received. Yet to understand the developmental process that they went through, it is helpful to explore the following questions that the group raised, either explicitly or implicitly:

- Do Americans open gifts upon receipt, in line with what they had been told?
- Is gift-giving important to Americans?
- Do they still need to give gifts to individual professionals in addition to organisational gifts?

As with most Chinese governmental organisations, the department of foreign affairs (or international department) of the Chinese ministry held a pre-departure meeting for the outbound delegation. This meeting included a cultural briefing. The officials were also given a cultural handbook with so-called 'cultural facts' and lists of dos and don'ts. Both the briefing and the handbook aimed at preparing the Chinese officials for the upcoming visit.

At the pre-departure training, they were told in a stereotypical manner that unlike Chinese who generally preferred not to open gifts immediately after receiving them, Americans always opened their gifts on the spot. Interestingly, on the very first day, the delegates encountered two contradictory experiences.

At the end of the morning meeting on Day 1, the American speaker did not open the gift upon receipt, nor did the speaker at the afternoon meeting.

According to the EM data, the Americans' behaviour was surprising to the Chinese group. However, the delegates were quick to notice the breach of the expected norms and to accept their occurrence in real-life interaction. They neither revealed their surprise nor queried it with the Americans during the daytime meetings. The video recordings show that they all kept silent and displayed blank faces. In the evening, they reported they were glad that they had not said anything.

I noticed that there might be unexpected things or situations we could not understand. We'd better note them down and bring them to the evening discussions rather than raising them with the Americans in public. For example, today the American professors did not open their gifts on the spot even though we were told that Americans would like to open the gifts immediately in front of the donors. We'd better keep silent rather than asking them why they did not do that, so I think we should keep this attitude. When it comes to problematic situations, we should not speak or behave rashly. We'd better show that nothing is going wrong; otherwise it may embarrass both sides. We may discuss the reasons and solutions as much as possible in our internal meetings afterwards. Let's accomplish the mission of the visit successfully.

*Data extract 2: EM comment by the DHOD*

[……我注意到可能会有一些出乎我们意料的事情或者是情况，我们不一定当下能明白。最好是大家都记下来，晚上开会的时候讨论，不要当着其他人的面直接跟美国人提出来。比如说，虽然我们都以为美国人会当着我们的面打开礼物，但是今天美方教授都没有当下打开礼物。我们最好就像今天一样当下就不要吭声，不要问对方问什么不打开。我认为我们应该保持这种态度。如果出现情况，我们最好不要仓促说话或者是行事。我们要表现一切正常，要不双方都会尴尬。大家可以在内部会议中讨论分析，解决问题，圆满完成这次出行任务。]

Clearly, the American professors' behaviour violated the group's expectations which were based on the information they had been told in their pre-departure training. However, through their experiences and observations, they easily and successfully overcame their stereotypical expectations and realised that the cultural knowledge they had been told clearly did not always apply.

Additionally, they managed to withhold their surprise as they did not want their intercultural interactants to recognize that they thought something was going wrong or that something unexpected had happened. This reflected their desire to regulate their emotions. As also can be seen in the EM comment above (Data extract 2), the delegation affirmed the strategy of emotional concealment and verbal closedness in the presence of their intercultural interactants, especially in meetings. They believed this would

help them achieve the primary goal of the trip: to build and develop good relations with the Americans.

With respect to the second question “Is gift-giving important to Americans?”, it took them longer to discover the answer. For the Chinese officials, the importance of gift-giving was self-evident. That is why they focused their relational efforts before the trip on gift-giving, i.e. they planned carefully what kinds of gifts to bring to the United States. At each of the intercultural events, they gave gifts to the American organisations and individual professionals, and mindfully observed the recipients’ reactions.

During the EMs, they always reflected on how their gift-giving had worked out during the day and then planned for the next day. In this way, they used their learning about gift-giving to feed into their relational planning for the subsequent intercultural activities. Gradually, the group discovered that gift-giving was not that important to Americans. After receiving a gift at the welcome banquet on Day 1, the group did not receive any further gift from the Americans until Day 7 when they visited a non-governmental organisation. While appreciating the Americans’ warm response to the Chinese gifts, they found it more difficult to understand why the Americans did not give them any gifts.

To be frank, originally I thought the Americans did not care about us by not preparing any gifts for us when we visited some organisations. Many of us thought the same. For example, this week it was like this when we went to X government bodies. Whenever we host a foreign delegation, we will at least prepare one gift. That’s the normal situation. I used to visit some organisations (in my overseas trips), so usually they would give gifts when we left. We probably have misunderstood the American organisations. As the DHOD summarized at the (evening) meetings, they may not have the habit of giving gifts.

*Data extract 3: EM comment by D5 on Day 5*

[……坦白说，我原来以为美方根本就不在乎我们，我们拜访一些单位，根本就没给我们准备礼物，大家好多人都是这么觉得，比如说这个礼拜，我们去拜访 X 政府机构的时候。我们如果接待外国代表团，最起码都会准备一份礼物，这才是正常的情况。我原来出访，去拜访的机构少得多，所以一般离开那些单位，也都会给我们送礼物。大家可能误解美方单位了，就像副团长会上总结的那样，他们可能没有送礼物的习惯。]

Clearly, they seem to have subtly modified their perceptions during the course of the first week. The cumulative experiences of intercultural interaction and ongoing reflections helped them raise their cultural

awareness in this regard, i.e., realise that perceptions of the importance of gift-giving might differ, and begin to adjust their frame of reference with regard to gift-giving.

With respect to the third question “Do they still need to give gifts to individual professionals in addition to organisational gifts?”, it is similarly interesting to note the process of the development over time of the group’s understanding. On several occasions the American professionals, officials and non-officials alike, were surprised by the fact that even though the Chinese delegation gave a gift to their organisation, they also gave a personal gift. On one occasion, an American professional, P1, even mistook the personal gift for an office gift.

- 1 HOD: 使我们对……的大体状况有了一个了解，非常  
2 感谢。  
3 Interpreter: Thank you. We have a small gift for you.  
4 ((P1 takes the gift and looks at it  
5 attentively.))  
6 HOD: 给你个小礼物。对你表示感谢。  
7 P1: We have an office gift, but I think P3  
8 (Director-General) was going to give it to  
9 you either this afternoon or tomorrow. ((P1  
10 lifts her head and says it to the room.))  
11 Interpreter: 对，他们办公室也有礼物，但是下午，他们的  
12 总管 P3 会-  
13 HOD: 这是给你的。((HOD pats her shoulder.))  
14 Interpreter: This is just for YOU.  
15 P1: Oh! ((P1 is surprised.))  
16 ((All the delegates laugh at her reaction.))  
17 P1: THANK YOU! ((She smiles happily.))  
18 This is BEAUTIFUL!

**Data extract 4: Video recording**

In this extract, P1’s verbal and non-verbal expression of delightful surprise from lines 15 to 18 pleased the group, who laughed appreciatively at her reaction. In this way, the meeting came to a happy end. At the EM that day, D15 drew attention to P1’s surprise and wondered if the delegation needed to alter the gift-giving practice or not.

D15: ...P1 in the morning was very surprised to see the present. She was not expecting a gift for her and thought it was for their organisation. Since we have prepared a gift for her organisation, do we still need to give a gift to her?

HOD: We'd better give one. We have already prepared it, and we usually give (individuals gifts) in overseas trips. They represent (inter)personal relations which is not contradictory to (inter)organisational relations.

**Data extract 5: EM comment**

Throughout the trip, several delegates raised the issue of 'duplicated' gift-giving a number of times, but as the HOD explained above, the two kinds of gifts embodied different relational dimensions. Therefore, while the group had discovered a subtle difference in expectations, they did not adapt their strategy because of the relational goals they were pursuing.

## Discussion

It is interesting to note how, under the influence of interactional goals, the delegates' intercultural relational competence, including attitudes and knowledge, developed over the course of the visit. The overall motivation of the delegates was to build good relations. This both facilitated and constrained the growth in intercultural relational competence.

Let us look at the development of competence first. Clearly, this was an ongoing process that took place over time. In other words, it did not occur after a single incident or even several incidents (Deardorff, 2006, p. 259). With respect to knowledge, although the Chinese officials received unhelpful information about the American gift-opening behaviour in their pre-departure training, they easily and successfully refined that knowledge through careful observation of their experiences. It also showed that they were open to cultural learning (Bennett, 2009; Deardorff, 2006), willing to adjust their understanding.

As reviewed earlier in the paper, Deardorff (2006) emphasises the skills of observing, listening, analysing, interpreting, evaluating, and relating. It seems that the Chinese officials did all of them in the trip. The evening reflection and planning meetings served as an ideal platform. The delegates not only listened to the Americans' gift-receiving comments, observed their reactions, and analysed their gift-giving and gift-receiving behaviours, but also evaluated their own gift-giving strategy and related it to what they had

learned from the other. For instance, let us take the development of the skill of relating as an example. It was a gradual process that evolved over time. Initially, the Chinese delegates viewed the Americans' gift-giving behaviour in isolation. The absence of gifts from the American side was taken as indicating that the Americans did not care about them. However, as they began to link similar gift-giving behaviours of the American hosting agencies together and relate them to the Americans' reactions over the Chinese group's gift-giving, they discovered that gift-giving was not that important to the Americans. Their interpretive frame then changed. They no longer perceived the Americans' gift behaviour solely through their own perspectives. In other words, this marked the achievement of a desired internal outcome (Deardorff, 2006).

Nevertheless, it did not lead to a desired external outcome. They did not adapt their own gift-giving behaviour. Why not? The motivation to build good relations actually also constrained their development of relational competence. On the one hand, from the Chinese delegates' perspectives, the importance of goals seemed to override the need to change behaviour. On the other hand, they were unable to overcome their belief that gifts were of key importance for relationship-building.

Given the crucial role that goals played in this lack of change in behaviour, they need to be captured by models of intercultural competence. As can be seen from the literature review, while the existing models (e.g. Bennett, 2009; Deardorff, 2006; Gudykunst, 2004) offer useful insights, they do not account very well for the goal-oriented nature of professional intercultural interaction. Strategic goals are not included in any of the frameworks. We therefore argue that it would be useful for them to draw on work in social pragmatics on politeness and relations. For example, Spencer-Oatey's (2008) rapport management model identifies goals as a key element in relational management. Goals can actually become a dominant motivating factor in addition to the oft-cited attitudes such as openness (e.g. Bennett, 2009; Deardorff, 2006), and they can have a huge impact on the development of intercultural relational competence.

Additionally, while intercultural competence is an ensemble of attitudes, knowledge and skills and the different facets are interconnected (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009), they may develop dynamically yet not simultaneously. The findings suggest that while the delegates adjusted their knowledge over time, this might not necessarily feed into the development of skills.

## Conclusion

As Deardorff (2006, p. 259) argues: “[t]he development of intercultural competence needs to be recognized as an ongoing process and not a result of solely one experience”. Yet there is little qualitative research that has examined the development at a detailed level and this case study helps address this lacuna of research. More studies like this are needed.

In today’s globalising world, organisations and companies are developing globalisation strategies, and governments are promoting international development policies. Yet despite an increase in intercultural contact, problems and misunderstandings remain. Against this backdrop, the development of intercultural competence has become an objective that people from a variety of backgrounds now aim for. How can we help them to develop it? Clearly, this question cannot be answered without empirical investigations into real life experiences of the actual development process. Researchers need to analyse such empirical data in the light of theoretical models and thereby help answer the emerging call to engage in intercultural dialogue and promote understanding across cultures.

## References

- Janet M. Bennett** (2009). Cultivating Intercultural Competence: A process perspective. In Darla K. Deardorff (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, pp121-140.
- Michael Byram, Adam Nichols & David Stevens (eds.)** (2001). *Developing Intercultural Competence in Practice*. Multilingual Matters: London, UK.
- Darla K. Deardorff** (2006). Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization. In *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol 10 iss 3, pp241-266.
- David A. Griffith & Michael G. Harvey** (2001). Executive Insights: An intercultural communication model for use in global interorganizational networks. In *Journal of International Marketing*, vol 9 iss 3, pp87-103.
- William B. Gudykunst** (2004). *Bridging Differences: Effective intergroup communication*. Sage: London, UK.
- Helen Spencer-Oatey** (2008). Face, (Im)politeness and Rapport. In Helen Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally Speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory (2nd edition)*. Continuum: London, UK, pp11-47.
- Helen Spencer-Oatey & Peter Franklin** (2009). *Intercultural Interaction: A multidisciplinary approach to intercultural communication*. Palgrave MacMillan: London, UK.
- Brian H. Spitzberg & Gabrielle Changnon** (2009). Conceptualizing Intercultural Competence. In Darla K. Deardorff (ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, pp2-52.





# 19 Predicting Chinese Students' Academic Achievement in the UK

Wang Yixin & Michael Daller  
*Swansea University*  
wangyixin@hotmail.co.uk

## Introduction

In the past few decades, the number of Chinese students pursuing higher education abroad has increased rapidly and steadily. According to the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS, 2013) nearly a fifth of all international mobile students in the UK were Chinese in 2010. Compared to studying at home universities in China, it is rather challenging for these students to study abroad. Apart from the high tuition fees for international students, the living expenses in the UK are about 50% higher on average than in China (NUMBEO, 2014). Besides these significant costs, Chinese international students are also facing other challenges such as a language barrier, homesickness and possible culture shock.

Study failure is a major concern for these international students. An early and accurate detection of international students at risk of study failure will be beneficial to both students themselves and the host universities. Many factors other than language ability, such as appropriate learning strategies in the new learning environment, motivation, general acculturation ability and intelligence, are important to international students' academic achievement. However, there is a consensus among researchers that English language ability is the most important factor for academic achievement (Graham, 1987; Bellingham, 1993; Johnson & Ngor, 1996; Reid, Kirkpatrick & Mulligan, 1996; Volet & Renshaw, 1996; Briguglio, 2000; Brooks & Adams, 2002; Lee & Greene, 2007). We therefore focus on English language ability in the present study.

## Literature review

### *IELTS and TOEFL predictors of academic achievement*

Previous researchers have generally used standardised tests, IELTS (International English Language Testing System) and TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) for the prediction of academic achievement.

Some studies found significant correlations between IELTS/ TOEFL and academic achievement scores (Elder, 1993; Bellingham, 1993; Ferguson & White, 1993; Hill, Storch & Lynch, 1999; Feast, 2002; Yen & Kuzma, 2009). Some studies however did not find a significant correlation (Yule & Hoffman, 1990; Gibson & Rusek, 1992; Cotton & Conrow, 1998; Dooley & Oliver, 2002; Cho & Bridgeman, 2012). A meta-analysis was carried out by Wongtrirat (2011) on studies that were published between 1987 and 2009 on the relationship between TOEFL, GPA and course completion. This analysis shows that the predictive value of TOEFL on GPA for course completion of international students at both undergraduate and post-graduate level was generally very low. This meta-analysis also came to the conclusion that the predictive validity of IELTS for academic achievement is inconclusive. More recent studies came to similar conclusions (Ferguson & White, 1993; Moore & Morton, 2005; Daller & Phelan, 2013; Yu, 2014).

There are at least three potential explanations for the low predictive validity of these standardised tests. The first explanation is a purely mathematical problem with truncated samples. The reason that there is not much variability in the test scores for those students who are admitted to university (and are the potential sample for further studies) is that most universities will not admit students when their English levels are below the benchmark, and that the students themselves will not delay the start of their courses once they pass the cut-off score. Therefore from a purely mathematical point of view, high correlations between the test scores and the achievement scores (e.g. GPA) are very unlikely. Ferguson and White (1993) point out that with truncated samples, where the range of scores is curtailed, the magnitude of any correlation coefficient is likely to be depressed. Daller and Phelan (2013) make a similar point when they explain that if the IELTS scores are all the same at entry, 'the correlation between these scores and any measure of academic achievement will automatically be zero' (2013: 177).

The second explanation might be a mismatch between the test tasks and the requirement in real university tasks. Moore and Morton (2005) compare the standard IELTS task 2 with a corpus of 155 university assignment tasks in terms of genre, information source, rhetorical function and object of enquiry. They found that there seems to be important differences between university assignment writing and the writing task required to pass IELTS. This threatens the construct validity of the IELTS task. The third explanation might be the fact that world-wide many students attend courses that train specifically for the IELTS exam before they apply to a UK university. According to Yu (2014), with a large number of Chinese students eager to

achieve the required IELTS scores, many test preparation centres focus on a 'short cut' to improve candidates' scores. Therefore, IELTS has been turned from an assessment of English ability to an effective test to measure learners' test skills; it has turned "into a game of skills and strategies" (Yu, 2014: 25).

### ***Vocabulary knowledge as predictor of academic achievement***

Vocabulary knowledge has been suggested to be closely related to English language ability and academic achievement (Saville-Troike, 1984; Daller & Xue, 2009; Daller & Phelan, 2013; Roche & Harrington, 2013; Harrington & Roche, 2014a, 2014b). Morris and Cobb (2004) examined the correlation between vocabulary profiles based on writing samples and the academic achievement of 122 students. They found that students' vocabulary profiles correlated significantly with grades and that therefore, vocabulary profiles are a useful predictor of academic achievement. Harrington and Roche conducted a series of studies between 2013 and 2014 focusing on timed Yes/No vocabulary recognition tests to detect academically at-risk students in an undergraduate English-as-a-Lingua-Franca (ELF) university programme in Oman. Vocabulary size was identified as the best predictor of GPA in their studies. Daller and Xue (2009) predicted academic achievement of international students with several measures of lexical richness, such as Guiraud, Guiraud Advanced, and D (see Methodology Procedures section for more details). They also used a C-test at the beginning of the academic year, which could predict almost 40% of the number of failed modules at the end of that year.

The C-test is a further development of the Cloze test (Taylor, 1953) by Klein-Braley (1981). Whereas the Cloze test is based on whole word deletions, the C-test format deletes every second half of every second word. According to Eckes and Grotjahn (2006: 291), the C-test is a test format that generally yields high reliability. What a C-test actually measures has been an issue of debate for many years. Some studies (Little and Singleton, 1992; Stemmer, 1992) indicate that the C-test has a clear lexical focus; whilst some researchers (Sigott, 2004; Eckes and Grotjahn, 2006) state that it is a measurement of general language proficiency. However, it can be argued that these are related aspects of language proficiency. Eckes and Grotjahn, (2006) found that C-test scores correlate highly with scores in all aspects of language ability including reading, writing, listening and speaking. With its appealing feature, easy to administer, objective scoring and high reliability, the C-test has been favoured in many studies and is also used in the present study.

## Hypotheses

In the present study we investigate the following hypotheses:

- Vocabulary knowledge as measured by indices of lexical richness is a significant predictor of international students' academic achievement.
- C-test scores are significant predictors of academic achievement.
- IELTS scores are less powerful predictors than measures of lexical richness or the C-test scores.

## Methodology

### *Participants*

The participants in the present study were international Chinese students at Swansea University from across different disciplines at both undergraduate and MA level. The students at undergraduate level were mainly from international 3+1 programmes (3 years at their home university and 1 year in the UK). Thus, for most students, even if they were in the final undergraduate year, it was their first year abroad. In total 60 students took our set of tests in Sep. 2013, when they just started their 1st semester. For 57 students IELTS scores were available at the beginning of the academic year. Twenty six out of the 60 students also took the tests in May 2014.

### *Measures*

We used a C-test and a written task in September 2013 and in May 2014. The C-test was piloted and a final version with five sub-texts was used. In each sub-text every second half of every second word was deleted according to the classical C-test principle (see Klein-Braley, 1997). Specialised vocabulary was reduced or replaced by simple words with similar meaning. Based on the pilot study we arranged the sub-texts of the C-test according to difficulty (starting with the easiest sub-text). In total there were 100 gaps which gave a maximum score of 100. We used exact scoring with only entirely correct answers accepted. The writing task was adapted from practice IELTS materials (Milton, Bell & Neville, 2001). Given a topic of 'tourism', students were asked to produce a written text in the allotted time (30 minutes) but with no lower or upper word limitation, unlike IELTS where normally a minimum of 300 words is required. Students were also told that scores would be given in consideration of both quality and quantity of the written material they produced. Academic performance was measured by the participants' overall GPA collected at the end of the second semester of

their one-year study and with the students' permission. For master students, their GPA was calculated from their taught sessions only, excluding the dissertation.

### ***Procedures***

The tests were administered in a pen-and-paper format. Students were given 25 minutes on the C-test and 30 minutes on the writing task. The tests in both testing rounds (Sep. 2013 and May 2014) were exactly the same. The writing task was transcribed to allow for a computerised analysis with the different measures of lexical richness (see below). Spelling mistakes were corrected, abbreviations were extended and proper nouns were deleted to avoid counting them as "infrequent words" by some of the programmes. The programme "Vocabprofiler" (Cobb, 2002) was used to calculate types and tokens for the writing task. Three measures of lexical richness were then calculated:

- Guiraud's index =  $\text{Types} / \sqrt{\text{Tokens}}$  (Guiraud, 1954)
- Guiraud Advanced (GA) =  $\text{Advanced Types} / \sqrt{\text{Tokens}}$  (Daller, van Hout & Treffers-Daller, 2003)
- and "D" (Malvern and Richards, 1997)

For GA we defined all types that are beyond the 2K level as advanced (based on the British National Corpus and Nation's Range Programme, (Nation, 2015). "D" is a measure that indicates the lexical richness of a text through a parameter ("D") that models the distribution of types and tokens in a text. We computed it with the appropriate CLAN command from the CHILDES project (MacWhinney, 2000).

In total there were therefore five predictor variables for each testing round: Guiraud, Guiraud Advanced, "D", C-test and IELTS scores.

## **Results**

### ***The reliability of the C-tests***

In order to establish the reliability of the C-tests we computed Cronbach's alpha as a measure of internal consistency. Both C-tests were sufficiently reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha = .82 for the C-test in Sep. 2013 and .803 for the C-test in May 2014. We also carried out a factor analysis for both C-tests to investigate the dimensionality of the tests. In both cases we obtained only one factor which is a clear indication that the C-test has only one

dimension. This is in line with the previous research which supports the view that the C-test measures general language ability (Sigott, 2004; Eckes and Grotjahn, 2006). In order to get a view on the concurrent validity of the C-test we correlated it with the IELTS scores. The correlation between C-test Sep. 2013 and IELTS was 0.542 ( $p < 0.01$ ). The correlation coefficient of C-test May 2014 and IELTS was 0.636 ( $p < 0.01$ ).

### ***The predictive validity of the five individual measures***

In order to assess the predictive validity of the five measures included in our study we carried out correlations between GPA and the scores of our measures for September 2013 (Table 1) and May 2014 (Table 2).

	IELTS	C-test Sep. 2013	Guiraud Sep. 2013	GA Sep. 2013	D Sep. 2013	GPA
IELTS	-	.542**	.329**	.276*	0.122	.300*
C-test Sep. 2013			.464**	.376**	0.18	.317*
Guiraud Sep. 2013				.700**	.666**	.526**
GA Sep. 2013					.425**	.291*
D Sep. 2013						.302*

**Table 1 Correlation between IELTS, Predictor variable obtained in Sep. 2013 (C-test, Guiraud, GA, D) and GPA**

- Notes: 1. \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).  
2. \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).  
3. GA refers to Guiraud Advanced  
4. D refers to D measure

	IELTS	C-test May 2014	Guiraud May 2014	GA May 2014	D May 2014	GPA
IELTS	-	.636**	.607**	0.316	.435*	.300*
C-test May 2014			.567**	0.283	.667**	.404*
Guiraud May 2014				.600**	.661**	.493*
GA May 2014					0.195	0.296
D May 2014						0.385

**Table 2 Correlation between IELTS, Predictor variable obtained in May 2014 (C-test, Guiraud, GA, D) and GPA**

- Notes: 1. \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).  
2. \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).  
3. GA refers to Guiraud Advanced  
4. D refers to D measure

For both measurement points, Guiraud yielded the highest correlation with GPA, followed by the C-test scores and then IELTS. This confirms hypothesis 1 and supports hypothesis 3. All correlations are significant. “D”

yielded a significant correlation in September 2013 but no significant correlation in May 2014. Guiraud Advanced yielded the lowest correlation in both testing rounds. Almost 28% of the variance of GPA can be predicted by Guiraud in September 2013 and 24% by Guiraud in May 2014. This means that part of the variance of GPA at the end of the academic year can be predicted already 9 months before the students sat the exam. The C-test was on both occasions the second largest predictor which predicted around 10% in September 2013 and 16% in May 2014, which confirms hypothesis 2 and again hypothesis 3.

From Table 1 and 2 it is clear that both C-tests (Sep 2013 and May 2014) correlated highly with IELTS, with a correlation coefficient of 0.542 ( $p < .01$ ) and 0.636 ( $p < .01$ ) respectively. Furthermore, the C-test correlated significantly with most of the vocabulary richness measures. This supports the view that the C-test format measures vocabulary knowledge and therefore, also general language ability (see also Little and Singleton, 1992; Stemmer, 1992; Sigott, 2004; Eckes and Grotjahn, 2006).

### ***Multiple regression analysis***

The bivariate correlations only quantify the relationship between individual variables. Multiple regression can combine the predictive power of the individual variables in an overall model. In order to avoid the problem of multicollinearity we decided to include only the measure of lexical richness with the highest correlation with GPA, Guiraud's index. Again for reasons of multicollinearity we did include IELTS and C-test scores only in two different multiple regression analyses. The summary of the two analyses is shown in Table 3. All measures are taken from the September 2013 testing round as we are mainly interested in predicting academic achievement at the start of the academic year.

Model	Variables entered	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Standardized Coefficients Beta	Sig.
1	C-test	.533	.284	.259	.093	.465
	Guiraud				.483	.000
2	IELTS	.548	.301	.275	.140	.250
	Guiraud				.486	.000

**Table 3 Multiple Regression of two models (C-test and Guiraud, IELTS and Guiraud)**

The predicted variance of GPA is slightly higher than with Guiraud as a single predictor (see Table 1) but the second variable (C-test or IELTS) in

each model is not significant. The multiple regression model can therefore not be used to increase our predictive power in the present study. However, the fact that Guiraud is significant in each model confirms hypothesis 1 that vocabulary knowledge is an important predictor of academic achievement, and in the current study Guiraud's index of lexical richness is the best predictor.

## Discussion

The present study shows that it is possible to predict academic achievement 9 months before Chinese students sit their exam across disciplines. Twenty eight percent of their achievement can be predicted with a measure of lexical richness, Guiraud's index. The C-test used in the present study explains more of the variance of academic achievement than the IELTS scores and moreover, its administration takes only 30 minutes and it is very cost effective. All three hypotheses are supported by our findings: Vocabulary knowledge is an important predictor of international students' academic achievement; C-test scores are a significant predictor of academic achievement, and IELTS scores have the lowest predictive power. The low predictive power of IELTS can be explained by the mathematical problem of truncated samples and through the fact that students might have taken IELTS-specific test training.

In contrast with the study by Daller and Xue (2009), where almost 40% of the variance in the number of failed modules can be predicted with a C-test, the result in the present study looks a little disappointing. However, in the study by Daller and Xue (2009) the tests were conducted under strict inspection and students were told that their test scores would influence their admission to university. While in the current study, participants took the test after they had already secured a place in university and the tests were completely voluntary. This could have influenced their test performance and decreased the predictive value of the C-test in the present study. However, this argument does not hold true for the IELTS scores that were obtained in a high stake test as part of the admission process to the university. Further studies need to be carried out to assess the predictive power of the C-test in comparison with IELTS. These studies need to include measures of lexical richness, especially Guiraud's index.



## References

- L. Bellingham (1993). The relationship of Language Proficiency to Academic Success for International Students. In *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 30(2), 229-232.
- BIS (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills)** (2013). *International Education – Global Growth and Prosperity: An Accompanying Analytical Narrative*. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and Department for Education. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/international-education-strategy-global-growth-and-prosperity> (Accessed: 18 December 2014).
- C. Briguglio** (2000). *Generic skills: attending to the communication skills needs of international students*. Paper presented at the inaugural Lifelong Learning Conference, Yepoon, Australia.
- G. Brooks & M. Adams** (2002). Spoken English proficiency and academic performance: Is there a relationship and if so, how do we teach? In A. Reid, S. Fraser & M. Gosper (eds.), *Celebrating Teaching at Macquarie: 28-29 November 2002*. Macquarie University: Sydney, Australia.
- Y. Cho & B. Bridgeman** (2012). Relationship of TOEFL iBT scores to academic performance: Some evidence from American universities. In *Language Testing*, 29(3), 421-442.
- T. Cobb** (2002). *Compleat LexTutor V8, Vocabprofilers, English*. Available at: <http://www.lextutor.ca/vp/eng/> (Accessed: 22 January 2015).
- F. Cotton & F. Conrow** (1998). An investigation of the predictive validity of IELTS amongst a group of international students studying at the University of Tasmania. In *IELTS Research Reports*, 1, 72-115.
- H. Daller, R. van Hout & J. Treffers-Daller** (2003). Lexical Richness in the Spontaneous Speech of Bilinguals. In *Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), 197-222.
- H. Daller & J. Xue** (2009). English proficiency and academic success: a study of Chinese students in UK higher education. In R. Brian, H. Daller, D. Malvern, P. Meara, J. Milton & J. Treffers-Daller (eds.), *Vocabulary studies in first and second language acquisition: The Interface between Theory and Application*. Palgrave: Basingstoke, Hants, UK, pp79-193.
- M. H. Daller & D. Phelan** (2013). Predicting international student study success. In *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 173-193.
- P. Dooley & R. Oliver** (2002). An investigation into the predictive validity of the IELTS Test as an indicator of future academic success. In *PROSPECT-ADELAIDE-*, 17(1), 36-54.
- T. Eckes & R. Grotjahn** (2006). A closer look at the construct validity of C-tests. In *Language Testing*, 23(3), 290-325.
- C. Elder** (1993). Language proficiency as a predictor of performance in teacher education. In *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing*, 2(1), 72-95.
- V. Feast** (2002). The impact of IELTS scores on performance at university. In *International Education Journal*, 3(4), 70-85.
- G. Ferguson & E. White** (1993). A small-scale study of predictive validity. In *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing*, 15-63.
- C. Gibson & W. Rusek** (1992). *The validity of an overall band score of 6.0 on the IELTS test as a predictor of adequate English language level appropriate for successful academic study*. Unpublished Masters of Arts thesis: Macquarie University, New South Wales, Australia.

- J. G. Graham** (1987). English language proficiency and the prediction of academic success. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(3), 505-521.
- P. Guiraud** (1954). Les caractères statistiques du vocabulaire: In *Presses universitaires de France*.
- M. Harrington & T. Roche** (2014a). Identifying academically at-risk students in an English-as-a-Lingua-Franca university setting. In *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 15, 37-47.
- M. Harrington & T. Roche** (2014b). Word recognition skill and academic success across disciplines in an ELF university setting. In *Association for Language Testing and Assessment of Australia and New Zealand (ALTAANZ): Papers in Language Testing*, 3(2), 76-99.
- K. Hill, N. Storch & B. Lynch** (1999). A comparison of IELTS and TOEFL as predictors of academic success. In *IELTS Research Reports*, 2, 52-63.
- R. K. Johnson & A. Y. S. Ngor** (1996). Coping with second language texts: The development of lexically-based reading strategies. In D. W. A. J. Biggs (ed.), *The Chinese Learner, Cultural, Psychological and Contextual Influences*. Comparative Education Research Centre: Hong Kong, China.
- C. Klein-Braley** (1981). *Empirical investigations of cloze tests: An examination of the validity of cloze tests as tests of general language proficiency in English for German university students*. Universitat Duisburg: Duisberg, Germany.
- C. Klein-Braley** (1997). C-Tests in the context of reduced redundancy testing: an appraisal. In *Language Testing*, 14 (1), 47 - 84.
- Y.-J. Lee & J. Greene** (2007). The Predictive Validity of an ESL Placement Test A Mixed Methods Approach. In *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(4), 366-389.
- D. Little & D. Singleton** (1992). The C-test as an elicitation instrument in second language research. In R. Grotjahn (ed.), *Der C-test. Theoretische Grundlagen und praktische Anwendungen*. AKS Verlag: Bochum, Germany, pp173-192.
- B. MacWhinney** (2000). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk, Vol. 1: Transcription format and programs (3rd edition)*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, NJ, USA.
- D. D. Malvern & B. J. Richards** (1997). A new measure of lexical diversity. In A. Ryan and A. Wray (eds.), *Evolving Models of Language. Paper from the Annual Meeting of the BAAL held at the University of Wales, Swansea, September 1996*. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, UK, 58-71.
- J. Milton, H. Bell & P. Neville** (2001). *IELTS Practice Tests*. IELTS: Newbury, UK.
- T. Moore & J. Morton** (2005). Dimensions of difference: a comparison of university writing and IELTS writing. In *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 43-66.
- L. Morris & T. Cobb** (2004). Vocabulary profiles as predictors of the academic performance of Teaching English as a Second Language trainees. In *System*, 32(1), 75-87.
- P. Nation** (2015). *Range Programme*. Available at: <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation> (Accessed: 8 January 2015)
- NUMBEO** (2014). *Cost of Living Comparison between United Kingdom and China*. Available at: [http://www.numbeo.com/cost-of-living/compare\\_countries\\_result.jsp?country1=United+Kingdom&country2=China](http://www.numbeo.com/cost-of-living/compare_countries_result.jsp?country1=United+Kingdom&country2=China) (Accessed: 8 January 2015).

- I. Reid, A. Kirkpatrick & D. Mulligan** (1996). *Framing reading*. Centre for Literacy, Culture and Language Pedagogy, Curtin University: Perth, Australia.
- T. Roche & M. Harrington** (2013). Recognition vocabulary skill as a predictor of academic English performance and academic achievement in English. In *Language Testing in Asia*, 3(12), 133.
- M. Saville-Troike** (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? In *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(2), 199-219.
- G. Sigott** (2004). *Towards identifying the C-Test construct*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt, Germany.
- B. Stemmer** (1992). An alternative approach to C-test validation. In R. Grotjahn (ed.), *Der C-test. Theoretische Grundlagen und praktische Anwendungen*. AKS Verlag: Bochum, Germany, pp97-144.
- W. L. Taylor** (1953). "Cloze procedure": a new tool for measuring readability. In *Journalism Quarterly*, 30, 415-433.
- S. Volet & P. Renshaw** (1996). Chinese students at an Australian university: Adaptability and continuity. In D. W. A. J. Biggs (ed.), *The Chinese learners: cultural, psychological and contextual influences*. Comparative Education Research Centre: Hong Kong, China.
- R. Wongtrirat** (2011). English Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement of International Students: A Meta-Analysis. In *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 71 (08), 2785.
- D. Yen & J. Kuzma** (2009). Higher IELTS score, higher academic performance? The validity of IELTS in predicting the academic performance of Chinese students. In *Worcester Journal of Learning and Teaching*, (3), 1-7.
- Q. Yu** (2014). Various Items Causing IELTS Test-Taker's Low Performance in Mainland China: an International Joint Education Program Solution. In *2014 International Conference on Global Economy, Finance and Humanities Research (GEFHR 2014)*. Atlantis Press: Paris, France.
- G. Yule & P. Hoffman** (1990). Predicting success for international teaching assistants in a US university. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 227-243.



# 20 A critical thematic analysis of York's Hidden Stories

Rachel Wicaksono & Darya Zhurauskaya  
*York St John University*  
r.wicaksono@yorks.ac.uk  
d.zhurauskaya@yorks.ac.uk

## Introduction

The study reported here aimed to explore a partnership between two applied linguists (the authors of this paper) and a non-profit, community organisation, hereafter referred to as 'the client'. The client had conducted semi-structured interviews with 15 black and minority ethnic (BME) residents of York as part of the YHS community project and was seeking an analysis of those interviews. The project was a response to an earlier study of York's BME community, which had emphasised the need for York to strengthen its commitment to racial equality and diversity (Craig *et al.*, 2010).

In order to achieve the aim of the study, two research questions were asked, as follows:

- What themes occur in the interviews with York's BME residents on the topics identified by the client?
- How do the interviewers' contributions shape the interaction with the interviewees?

In addressing the first research question, a thematic analysis of the 15 interviews was conducted in order to identify and feed back data on the topics identified by the client. These topics included project participants' reasons for immigrating to the UK, their values and their barriers in life.

The second research question aimed to explore the effects of the interviewers' contributions on the interaction between the project leaders and the BME participants. A conversation analysis-informed methodology was used to explore research question two. It was not the intention to suggest to the project leaders that co-construction of the interview content can be avoided. It was the intention, however, to provide evidence to the project leaders of how stories told in an interview get constructed in context-specific ways. In raising awareness of the interactional consequences of their talk, it was

hoped that the interviewers might be able to increase their repertoire of questioning strategies for use in future projects.

The data used in the study reported here is one of a total of 15 audio recordings of semi-structured interviews collected by the client as part of the YHS project. Each of the 15 interviews is a conversation between one interviewee and two project leaders, lasting approximately one hour. Each participant was asked the same set of questions (see the methodology section below for more information about the questions), covering general information about the participant, their values, their life in their home country and the changes they may have experienced since coming to York. The interviews provide a unique insight into people's memories of their home countries, and their experience of moving to, and living in, York. For the purposes of this paper, one interview was selected for analysis, in order to be able to begin to answer the two research questions stated above and begin to fulfil the aim of the project.

The paper begins with a brief review of the literature on the topic of interviews as a method of data collection and as a methodology. Next the methodology of the study is described, followed by a discussion of the findings. The paper concludes with some recommendations for interviewers on similar, community-based, projects.

### ***Theorising qualitative interviews***

Interviews are a common feature of much qualitative research, as well as of everyday life. Atkinson and Silverman (1997:304) suggest that we live in an "interview society". Qualitative interviews are also a *topic* of research, both as a method of data collection and a methodology (Cicourel, 1964; Kvale, 2007; Talmy, 2011; Roulston, 2010; Talmy and Richards, 2010). There continue to be calls for the further study of interviews in qualitative research (Fina and Perrino, 2011) based on the charge that a critical approach to the conduct and analysis of interviews is regularly lacking, and that this is an issue ideally suited to exploration by applied linguists (Mann, 2011; Talmy and Richards, 2010).

The use of interviews to elicit responses from research participants presents a complex set of analytical problems for the researcher, related to the preparation of questions, the conduct of the interview and the interpreting of interview data. A range of theoretical frameworks which aim to classify the various solutions to these problems have been suggested in the literature. For example, Talmy (2011:26) suggests a two-part framework for the

classification of qualitative research interviews as follows: *the interview as a research instrument* and *the research interview as social practice*. The former is theorised as a neutral technology “used to mine the attitudes, beliefs, and experiences of self-disclosing respondents” (Talmy and Richards, 2010:2). The latter adopts a ‘discursive perspective’ on interviews, seeing interviews as a situated social practice, where both interviewer and interviewee co-construct the content and make meanings together.

Another, more detailed, conceptualisation of interviews is offered by Roulston (2010). She outlines a six-part framework for the classification of qualitative interviews, reflecting researchers’ epistemological and theoretical assumptions. The six categories are: ‘neo-positivist’, ‘romantic’, ‘constructionist’, ‘postmodern’, ‘transformative’ and ‘decolonizing’ (Roulston, 2010a:51).

Roulston’s first two categories, ‘neo-positivist’ and ‘romantic’ seem to fit inside the first of Talmy’s (2011) two-part framework: the interview as a research instrument. This is a common conceptualisation of interviews, in which interviewees are treated as bearers of knowledge and interviews are used to access their experiences and beliefs, or as Briggs puts it, “elicit [their] inner worlds with minimal intervention” (Brigg, 2007:555). This approach to interviewing is one which seeks to “mine the attitudes, beliefs and experiences of self-disclosing respondents” (Talmy and Richards, 2010). Similarly, Silverman (2013) describes this category of interviewing as one which treats interview responses as direct representations of peoples’ thoughts and experiences. Hollway (2005:312, cited in Talmy, 2011) sums up this ‘interview as research instrument’ approach as, ‘you ask they answer, and then you know’.

The second part of Talmy’s (2011) framework is one in which interviews are conceptualised as ‘social practice’, or, in other words, actively constructed narratives (see also Holstein and Gubrium, 1995; Pavlenko, 2007; Roulston, 2010; De Fina and Perrino, 2011; Talmy, 2011). Roulston’s (2010a) ‘constructionist’, ‘postmodern’ approaches can be fitted within a social practice category. Talmy and Richards (2010:2) define a constructionist approach as one on which, “the interview is conceptualised explicitly as a socially-situated ‘speech event’, in which interviewer(s) and interviewee(s) make meaning, co-construct knowledge, and participate in social practices”.

An alternative label for the social practice category is offered by Holstein and Gubrium (2004:157), who suggest that all interviews should be seen as

‘active interviews’. In an active interview, despite the efforts of an interviewer to plan and structure the interaction, it is not possible to separate out the interviewer’s input and the participant’s interpretations. The interaction between the interviewee and interviewer, and the spontaneous elements of talk that will inevitably occur, are inextricably intertwined.

Mann (2011:6) takes a more fully constructionist position, arguing that, "all interviews are already sites of social interaction, where ideas, facts, views, details, and stories are collaboratively produced by interviewee and interviewer". His position is an ethnomethodological one, in common with earlier work on interviews as entirely unique communicative encounters (see Cicourel, 1964 and Briggs, 1986). Observing how the roles of the interviewer and participants are different each time an interview is performed, Cicourel (1964:87) questions the notion of comparability of data across interviews.

In the first part of Talmy’s (2011) framework, interviews are conceptualised as a way of discovering the pre-existing attitudes, beliefs and experiences of the participants. In the second part, interviews are conceptualised as social practice; at the very least, they are imperfect instruments which inevitably obscure the participants’ truths. More radically, the participants’ truths are brought into being through the interview itself and might appear differently when told to a different interviewer at a different time. Hollway (2005:312, cited in Talmy, 2011) sums up the former ‘interview as research instrument’ approach as, ‘you ask they answer, and then you know’. The latter ‘interview as social practice’ approach can be summed up as, ‘you ask, they respond to you(r question), and that’s all you know’.

Applying these frameworks to the interviews conducted by the YHS project leaders, the client, is challenging. The project website states that, “stories and personal treasures were recorded and conserved to become a physical resource bank for present and future generations” (Centre for Global Education York, 2014). This description of what happened during the interview process and the aims of the process implies more than one of the categories reviewed above. There appear to be elements of both the ‘romantic’ and ‘neo-positivist’ categories (interviews as a research instrument); giving a voice to an underrepresented social group, or what Roulston (2010) calls ‘true confessions’.

The project website also describes how a series of playback theatre events took place. Having told their stories to the project leaders, the participants were encouraged by the leaders to re-tell certain elements of their story in



front of an audience and a small cast of actors. The actors listened to the selected element and re-enacted the 'mini' story in front of the participant, and the audience. The participant was then invited to comment on the re-enactment, in front of the actors and the audience. This use of interviews suggests elements of the 'postmodern' category (interviews as social practice); transforming interviews into performance texts, what Roulston (2010) calls 'situated performances'.

## Methodology

### *Thematic analysis*

Thematic analysis was adopted in response to research question one, *what themes identified by the client occur in the interviews with York's BME residents?* This type of analysis is a common way of analysing qualitative data in order to report important or recurring ideas occurring within the data (Gibbs, 2007). Thematic analysis assumes that data collection (in this case, the interview) is way of discovering the pre-existing attitudes, beliefs and experiences of the participants. In negotiation with the client, it was decided that this type of analysis was best suited to the client's needs. Therefore, a deductive thematic analysis was conducted with the following three themes in mind:

- what people say about reasons for migrating to York,
- values and treasures in their lives and how those change as a consequence of coming to York,
- the barriers people had to overcome when they came to York.

### *Conversation analysis*

The approach to the second research question, *how do the interviewers' questions shape the interaction with the interviewees?*, is conversation-analytic, drawing on the following typical points of interest in conversation analysis (CA): turn-taking, turn design and sequential organisation of talk (Sacks *et al.*, 1974).

A CA-informed methodology was adopted in order to be able to study the ways in which specific interactional features have an effect on talk. Psathas (1995:45) describes CA-informed methodology as "unmotivated looking". This means that the analysis is data-driven, meaning that the researcher looks at the data with an open mind rather than looking for evidence to support a

hypothesis. As Sacks points out, conversation analysts use “observation as a basis for theorizing”.

In the case of this study, the conversation analysis was conducted in an inductive way. This is because there was not a pre-given question defined from the literature. However, patterns were identified from engaging with the data.

## **Analysis and Discussion**

### ***Thematic analysis***

Based on the requirements of the client, the thematic analysis looked for the occurrence of three main ideas in the data: reasons for coming to live in York, ‘values’/‘treasures’ and ‘barriers’. A summary of the findings is presented below.

#### **Where do you get your values from?**

The majority of participants stated that they get their values from their parents. Other answers included spouses, friends, social and political groups, and values that are grounded in native culture, religion and education.

#### **What do you treasure the most in life?**

When talking about their treasures, participants said that they treasure their family the most, including children, siblings, parents, spouses and friends. Abstract values included the capacity to smile, being happy, cooking for friends and family, faith, religion, origin and differences between people.

#### **Has coming to York changed your values and what you treasure?**

This question was a problematic one for a number of people, as reflected their noncommittal answers. Many of the participants in fact answered negatively, meaning that coming to York had not changed their values and treasures. Those who agreed with this question, made statements such as: “It allows me to be who I am”.

#### **What do you treasure the most about your home country?**

The answers to this question varied enormously and included: my grandmother, all my life there, the weather, food and music.

#### **What do you treasure about York?**



- IR: I mean is there anything else that you treasure about the UK then  
(.)  
IE: (lip-smack).hh Erm (2.0) (lip-smack) what do I treasure about the UK?=  
IR: =or even York perhaps (.) is there something about living in York=  
IE: =Yes (.) I actually (.) really love (.) living in York now (.) again when I first  
came to York I thou:ght it was one of the most bo:ring cities  
((laughter))  
IE: a:nd=  
IR: =so what age where you when you came to York then  
IE: I wa:s (.) round about (.) thirteen fourteen  
IR: ok  
IE: (.) yes a:nd (.) one of the first things that you notice of somebody of colour  
erm (.) is (.) of cause=  
IR: =rarity  
IE: yeah (.) [and]  
IR: [yeah]  
IE: there wasn't much hehe  
IR: okay  
IE: e:m (.) so: it was another (.) moment of (1.0) ((sigh)) hh just (.) being kind of  
(.) on your own again (.) you know (.) e:rm (.) a::nd (.) >it was a struggle< but  
((lip- smack)) I think those experiences sort of made me (1.0) e:rm (1.0) what's  
the word (1.0) stronger in a lot of ways  
IR: so they give you character  
IE: erm (0.5) it did

**Extract 1: Rarity**

IR = Interviewer, IE = Interviewee (Gabriela)

The talk prior to this extract consisted of an extended exchange of short questions and answers by the IR and IE. The extract above begins with the IR launching a new topic, which is indicated by a discourse marker *so*. Bolden (2009:988) argues that “speakers draw on this discourse marker’s capacity to mark upcoming matters having been incipient to propose a particular interpretation on the action they are about to launch”. After a small pause and a hesitation sound, the IR begins to summarise the prior talk in lines 1-4 and 6-8.

In line 5 the IE produces the minimal response token *yeah* indicating that she is listening and in line 9 the IE agrees with the IR’s formulation. The IR pauses in line 10 at a possible transition relevance place, creating a moment in which either speaker can self-select to talk. It is possible that the IR was expecting the IE to expand the turn in line 9 and produce a response to IR’s invitation in lines 6 and 8: “when you think of this country I am getting an inkling that you treasure the opportunities?”. What actually happens is that, in lines 11-12, the IR self-selects a turn with the utterance “I mean is there anything else that you treasure about the UK then?”. Fox Tree and Schrock

(2002) suggest that one of the meanings of the discourse marker *I mean* is to indicate an upcoming adjustment. Therefore, it is possible to argue that in lines 11-12 the IR is reformulating the request for clarification that was produced earlier in lines 6-8.

In line 14, the IE is taking time to think, producing a hesitation marker *Erm*, followed by a two second pause and a restatement of the question. Further to the IE's hesitation, the IR offers an alternative in line 16 "or even York perhaps?" and after a micro pause the IR rephrases to "is there something about living in York?". What is interesting to note here is that the IR changes *anything else* in the original question to *something* in the second version. It might be that the IR redesigned the polarity of the question in order to achieve an aligning response. Heritage and Robinson (2011) suggest that questions that use *anything else* are more likely to get a grammatically-preferred negative response, whereas questions that use *something* are more likely to result in a positive response.

A positive response comes immediately in line 18, followed by a further elaboration in lines 19-20. In line 22, the IE is holding the floor by producing an elongated *a:nd*, however the IR takes over with a new question in line 23. The IE responds in line 24. It is interesting to note that what happens in lines 26-28 may be a continuation of line 22, where the IE was not given the opportunity to carry on talking. The interruption happens again in line 29, however this time with a suggested word by the IR *rarity*, with which the IE agrees and carries on talking about this new topic in lines 32 and 34-39. The extract ends with the IR providing a closing statement, with which the IE agrees in line 41.

The fact that the IR breaks the IE's turn by suggesting the word *rarity* is most likely not accidental. It may be that the IR is projecting the kind of information they want to hear more about. In this case, it is also possible that the IR is confirming that it is acceptable to talk about what some might see as a sensitive topic.

Two different types of contributions made by the IR can be observed in the extracts above. Firstly, dropping an unsuccessful question and rephrasing, choosing a narrower topic. This means that the question in line 9 remains unanswered and the only possible answer that contributes to the thematic analysis is the interaction in lines 6-9, where the IE confirms the IR's assumption that opportunities are what the IE treasures. Secondly, what

might be seen as helping the IE to find the right word in line 29, is actually constraining of the IE's subsequent talk.

Based on the analysis above, a possible recommendation for interviewers is that, if they notice that they have made a specific contribution, such as offering a word that narrowed the range of choices that the interviewee was presented with, they could follow up with a more general contribution such as 'is there something else you want to say?' or 'do you have some more comments about this topic?'. In the next section of this paper, more recommendations, also based on an inductive, conversation analytic-type analysis of the interviews, are made.

## Recommendations

The conversation analysis conducted as part of the study reported here demonstrated that the interviewers' contributions do have an interactional effect on the interviewees' talk. Examples of interviewers' contributions included: offering words as examples of possible answers, abandoning questions, closing topics by producing formulations that are hard to disagree with, repetition to elicit answers and restating previously mentioned topics.

One possible recommendation has already been made, above. In addition, the data analysis suggested the following recommendations for the interviewers to consider when conducting interviews.

Where an interviewer:

- notices that an interviewee problematises their question, an interviewer can consider replying with 'yes' or 'anything' followed by a pause. This way an interviewer can avoid adding more information to the original question and only confirm that the interviewee has understood the question as was intended.
- notices that their contribution was judgmental or changed the direction of the answer, they can repeat the original question. This, of course, can result in the interviewee repeating their answer or adding more detail to it. However, it will provide an opportunity for the interviewee to clarify their answer. An additional hint here could be for an interviewer to consider asking the interviewee to summarise their answer.
- notices that the interviewee has not responded within five seconds of the question, let the silence be. Longer pauses allow

time for the interviewee to think of answers. This can potentially lead to more detailed and interesting answers.

- feels an answer from the interviewee is insufficient, consider asking them if they want to add more by saying '*is there something else you want to say about this topic?*' and accept the possibility of no further response.

It is important to acknowledge that the suggested recommendations are not prescriptions for all interviews. Instead, they are suggestions for (1) the management of interviews that are based on observations of the interactional effects of contributions and (2) possible ways of following up when such effects are identified.

The conversation analysis of the interviews conducted by the YHS project leaders demonstrates how answers get co-constructed at a 'discourse' level (Gee, 2005; Roberts *et al.*, 1992). The findings of the study reported here suggest that how people make sense of their past is influenced by their current experience; that what the past means, depends on the present.

## Conclusion

The work of applied linguists is based on solving real-world, language-related problems, as identified by clients. The client for this study had already collected their interview data and it was through engaging in dialogue with the client that the focus for the initial research question was chosen. Following Mann's (2011:29) guidance for applied linguists, "we still need to focus on the 'what' is said [interview as research instrument]; we just need more attention on 'how' this is constructed and how interaction is managed [interview as social practice]", the question was answered from a 'romantic' perspective, while a second research question was answered from a constructivist point of view (Roulston, 2010).

The nature and scope of the real-world problem turned out to be somewhat different than that initially identified by the client. For that reason, some of the solutions offered by this study were to the problem that they had identified, and others were solutions to a 'problem' that they had not realised existed. This was a sensitive issue and careful communication with the client was needed. Based on this experience of working on a community project, it is suggested that applied linguists engage in dialogue with clients with caution, but without abandoning their own theoretical beliefs. This is a

position which differs from the experience of linguists Mazeland and ten Have (1996), who describe how they had to, reluctantly, leave their position of ‘ethnomethodological indifference’, in order to engage in debate with practitioners of qualitative interviews.

The testing and evaluation of the solutions proposed by applied linguists is something that also requires dialogue; given that it is the clients who are the ones with access to the site of the problem initially identified. Testing the recommendations for interviewers made by this study is the next stage of the project.

## References

- Paul Atkinson & David Silverman** (1997). Kundera's Immortality: The interview society and the invention of the self. In *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol 3, pp304-325.
- Charles L. Briggs** (2007). Anthropology, Interviewing, and Communicability in Contemporary Society. In *Current Anthropology*, vol 48(4) August 2007, pp551-580.
- Charles L. Briggs** (1986). *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Galina G. Bolden** (2009). Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker “so” in English conversation. In *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol 41(5), pp974-998.
- Centre for Global Education York** (2014). *Education for a Just Future*. Available at: [www.centreforglobaleducation.org](http://www.centreforglobaleducation.org) [Accessed: 2nd July 2014].
- Aaron V. Cicourel** (1964). *Method and Measurement in Sociology*. Free Press: New York, NY, USA, 87.
- Gary Craig, Sue Adamson, Nazreen Ali & Fasil Demsash** (2010). *Mapping rapidly changing minority ethnic populations: A case study of York*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York, UK.
- Anna De Fina & Sabina Perrino** (2011). Introduction: Interviews vs. “natural” contexts: A false dilemma. In *Language in Society*, vol 40(1), pp1-11.
- Jean E. Fox Tree & Josef Schrock** (2002). Basic meanings of you know and I mean. In *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol 34(6), pp727-747.
- James Paul Gee** (2005). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge: Abingdon, UK.
- Graham R. Gibbs** (2007). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. Sage: London, UK.
- John Heritage & Jeffrey D. Robinson** (2011). Some versus Any Medical Issues: Encouraging Patients to Reveal Their Unmet Concerns. In Charles Antaki (ed.), *Applied Conversation Analysis: Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk*. Palgrave: Basingstoke, UK.
- James A. Holstein & Jaber F. Gubrium** (1995). *The active interview*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, California.



- James A. Holstein & Jaber F. Gubrium** (2004). The Active Interview. In David Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 2nd edition. Sage: London, UK, pp140-161.
- Steinar Kvale** (2007). *Doing Interviews*. Sage: London, UK.
- Steve Mann** (2008). A reflective approach to qualitative interviewing. Paper delivered at *Advances in Ethnography, Language and Communication*, Aston University, UK.
- Steve Mann** (2011). A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 32 (1), pp6 - 24.
- Harrie Mazeland & Paul ten Have** (1996). Essential tensions in (semi-) open research interviews. In Ilja Maso and Fred Wester (eds.), **The deliberate dialogue: Qualitative Perspective on the Interview**. VUB University Press: Brussels, Belgium, pp87-115.
- Aneta Pavlenko** (2007). Autobiographic Narratives as Data in Applied Linguistics. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 28(2), pp163–188.
- George Psathas** (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, p45.
- Celia Roberts, Evelyn Davies & Tom Jupp** (1992). *Language and Discrimination: A Study of Communication in Multi-ethnic Workplaces*. Longman: Harlow, Essex, UK, p7.
- Kathryn Roulston** (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. Sage: London, UK, p52, p57, p62, p64, p66.
- Kathryn Roulston** (2010a). Interview ‘Problems’ as Topics for Analysis. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 32(1), pp77-94.
- Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson** (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In *Language*, vol 50, pp696-735.
- David Silverman** (2013). *Doing qualitative research: a practical handbook*, Fourth edition. Sage: London, UK.
- Steven Talmy** (2011). The Interview as Collaborative Achievement: Interaction, Identity and Ideology in a Speech Event, In *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1): 25-42.
- Steven Talmy & Keith Richards** (2010). Theorizing Qualitative Research Interviews in Applied Linguistics. In *Applied Linguistics*, vol 32(1), pp1-5.



# 21 The Value of Teacher Portfolios for Professional Development in TESOL

Daniel Xerri  
*University of Malta*  
daniel.xerri@um.edu.mt

## Introduction

Teacher portfolios can play a significant role in professional development. This is because besides being “an organized collection of evidence about a teacher’s best work that is selective, reflective, and collaborative” (Xu, 2004, p. 199), the portfolio is an intrinsic part of their professional identity. In fact, Haniford (2010) affirms that the discourse employed in a portfolio may be indicative of how practitioners construct their identity.

Perhaps the most important means by which a portfolio allows teachers to negotiate their identity is by enabling them to examine their beliefs and practices as professionals. This is because “When presenting a (personal) professional portfolio, the professional presents material that characterizes themselves and distinguishes their practices, values and beliefs from those of another professional in the same field” (Goodfellow, 2004, p. 72). Berrill and Whalen (2007) found that the portfolio acted as a way for teachers “to make their beliefs visible, to demonstrate how their practice reflected those beliefs, and to demonstrate how they could teach in ways that had integrity for them and still satisfy external expectations” (p. 882). Speaking about pre-service education, Berrill and Addison (2010) maintain that through the portfolio “teacher candidates might more deeply understand and articulate their beliefs and competencies regarding the expected repertoires of practice in the teaching profession and therefore, their teaching identities” (p. 1184). The portfolio’s contribution to teachers’ professional identity makes it a significant artifact of practice.

In compiling a portfolio teachers usually rely on self-reflection as a tool for evaluating beliefs and practices. Self-reflection is included in the portfolio because teachers see “it as a way to articulate their tacit knowledge of teaching... Teaching contains a great deal of knowledge that is not theoretical in nature and is, therefore, difficult to describe. Reflection

requires articulation of this type of knowledge” (van der Westhuizen & Smith, 2000, p. 347). Montgomery (2003) claims that “the insights of self-reflection enable practitioners to examine ways that their own beliefs and actions impact students” (p. 181). Through self-reflection, “practitioners can scaffold their own ethical and professional development” (Montgomery, 2003, p. 181). This is related to the fact that “teachers have to think about their goals and priorities for future development or improvement when compiling their portfolio” (Darasawang, 2006, p. 308). According to Jones (2010a), “Selection and annotation of evidence and the writing of reflective statements in relation to the three foci (technical, contextual and critical) encourage meta-cognition and reflection” (p. 309). Nonetheless, besides reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, portfolios can also promote a form of reflection which “is not bound to and by specific events but rather becomes a means of looking programmatically at one’s practice over time” (Berrill & Whalen, 2007, p. 882). The potential to foster self-reflection seems to be one of the most significant benefits of compiling a portfolio.

In addition to self-reflection, a teacher portfolio leads to a number of related outcomes. Antonek, McCormick and Donato (1997) indicate that using a portfolio leads to the consolidation of teachers’ confidence through self-reflection. Gelfer and Filler (1997) claim that “A portfolio can serve as a potentially effective method to encourage teachers to evaluate their own abilities and to enhance their skills” (p. 117). As teachers “reflect, refine and clarify personal professional growth and performance they impose organization upon what can appear, at first, to be little more than a mass of unrelated events” (Gelfer & Filler, 1997, p. 117). Partly for this reason, a portfolio is “a highly useful means of demonstrating a teacher’s level of professionalism” (Murdoch, 2000, p. 58). Smith and Tillema (2001) maintain that a portfolio’s “Sustained use results in a gradual increase in benefits, starting with documentation of accomplishments and moving to a learning-oriented use or acceptance of mistake through the stages of collegial discussion and systematic reflection” (p. 201). This is why a portfolio can act as a “mirror of competence” (Smith & Tillema, 2001, p. 201) for teachers. Linked to this is “the opportunity to describe the teaching process from their own perspectives” (Xu, 2004, p. 201). According to Goodfellow (2004), “Documentation of professional practice not only enables a developing professional to reflect on their practices but also provides a testament to those practices in ways that are enriching and empowering” (p. 72). The process of compiling a portfolio leads to evidence of professional growth as well as the organization and articulation of teachers’ thoughts (McIntyre & Dangel, 2009). Moreover, it “encourages the integration of theory and practice and

the articulation of a theory of practice” (Jones, 2010a, p. 309). The above outcomes make the portfolio an invaluable tool for cultivating teachers’ professional development.

## **The Study**

This article explores teachers’ perspectives in relation to the value of portfolios for professional development in the TESOL sector in Malta. It reports part of the results of a study conducted at a private language school.

### ***Context***

There are currently more than 45 private language schools in Malta. In 2013 alone, these schools catered for the English language needs of nearly 75,000 students coming from more than 40 countries. The teaching population in Malta’s TESOL industry amounts to more than 1,400 professionals, the majority of whom are employed on a part-time basis. Every teacher is required to have a permit issued by the EFL Monitoring Board, a regulatory body within the Ministry for Education. This permit is granted on the basis of a set of qualifications in methodology and language awareness at a minimum level 5 on the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).

The EFL Monitoring Board devises policies that serve to promote high standards in the industry, and it conducts regular quality assurance visits to schools. By means of such visits the EFL Monitoring Board ensures that there exists an effective mechanism to maintain teaching standards, advises schools on how to support teachers in their CPD, and assists schools in developing a strong CPD culture. As shown above, research has established “just how powerful a professional development and personal affirmation process the portfolio can be” (Dingham & Scott, 2003, p. 243). Jones (2010b) asserts that “a mandatory portfolio may...be the prompt needed for the reflection required to promote professional development” (p. 603). For these reasons, the EFL Monitoring Board introduced teacher portfolios as part of a quality assurance policy governing academic school visits. This policy was developed in collaboration with the leading stakeholders in the industry, including teachers, trainers, Directors of Studies, and school owners.

### ***Study Participants***

The teachers that took part in this study were all employed at Easy School of Languages in Valletta, Malta’s capital city. In 2014, the school employed 36 teachers, 12 of them all year round. It had a population of circa 1,200 learners

originating from a variety of countries and speaking a wide array of first languages. Table 1 shows that the majority of the study participants were experienced teachers that had been at Easy School of Languages for more than a year. Most of them had an EQF level 5 qualification in TESOL, which is equivalent to a Cambridge ESOL CELTA or Trinity Cert. TESOL. The other two teachers held a TEFL Cert., which is an EQF level 4 qualification in TESOL methodology devised by the EFL Monitoring Board and delivered and assessed by those language schools accredited to run the course.

Teacher	Gender	Teaching experience in years/months	Years/months at Easy School of Languages	TESOL qualification EQF level
T1	F	13	3	5
T2	M	7	7	5
T3	F	10 months	10 months	4
T4	F	4	6 months	5
T5	F	7	2	5
T6	F	14	1	5
T7	F	7	7	5
T8	F	12	10	5
T9	F	7	7	4

**Table 1: Study participant information**

### ***Methodology***

The study used a mixed methods approach and it acted as a case study by focusing on a sample of teachers at one particular school. This sample consisted of teachers who taught at the school all year round. A self-completed questionnaire comprised of a series of open-ended questions was first distributed amongst the participants. This was followed by a face-to-face semi-structured interview with every participant. Each interview was audio recorded and subsequently transcribed. One of the purposes of the questionnaire and interviews was to examine the participants' perspectives in relation to the value of teacher portfolios for professional development. The questionnaire and interview responses were coded and subsequently analysed.

### **Contribution to Development and Change**

With one exception, all the teachers agreed that the portfolio contributed to their professional development by providing them with a record of professional growth and a log of attendance at CPD events. One teacher

maintained that “The importance of having a portfolio is that you can use it to look back at the way you were in the past, to reflect on where you are now, and to think about where you would like to be in the future” (T5). A questionnaire respondent stated that the portfolio “imposes a certain discipline and commitment to take part in educational seminars.” T1 disagreed with this idea because she felt she had always possessed a positive orientation towards professional development and because “sharing with other teachers and exchanging ideas is more beneficial and useful”. Unlike her colleagues, she seemed unable to see the portfolio as an extension of the CPD activities the teachers already practised and as a complement to their staffroom sharing of ideas.

For these teachers, professional change ensued as a result of using the portfolio. They indicated that with the implementation of the portfolios they started giving more importance to self-reflection, classroom observation, and attendance at CPD events. One interviewee affirmed, “It helps you to respect yourself as a teacher...because when I look at it I think of it as a journey I’m doing and these are my milestones” (T7). Another teacher explained,

Doing something like a portfolio hasn’t been a big change to the way I teach because it’s always been part of my personality to be like that. What it has done though is that it’s given me a record...which is quite important because it’s good to have something concrete that you can go through again. (T5)

Seven teachers indicated that the introduction of the portfolios had led to a change in their attitudes to teaching and CPD. A questionnaire respondent asserted, “I feel I’m valued more as a teacher and my efforts are appreciated.” A colleague pointed out, “Being able to see remarks on your teaching...helps you to reflect and examine the possibilities for improvement.” Confirming the idea that “Portfolios tend to be reflective” (Thaine, 2004, p. 336), the teachers seemed convinced that one of the portfolio’s main benefits was the opportunity it provided them for self-reflection. One interviewee explained,

I really believe that as teachers we are constantly learning and we learn mainly from experience not books. You have to be humble enough sometimes to admit your mistakes. So a portfolio helps you in your development by making you reflect on experience. (T7)

T1 underscored the portfolio’s role in enhancing the value given to self-reflection amongst her colleagues. However, she dismissed its contribution to professional change by saying, “I don’t want to overemphasize its importance and say that this is some guiding light for me because it isn’t. I’d

be lying” (T1). It seems clear that the implementation of the portfolios seemed to have consolidated these teachers’ beliefs in relation to the merits of professional growth via self-reflection, observation, and participation in CPD events.

Furthermore, the teachers pointed out that the portfolios had brought about change in the school’s CPD culture. They felt that there was now a collective sense of accountability, with one teacher maintaining that “It’s a great way to force people to organize their training... When you’re putting things in here physically...visually seeing it...it’s a kind of accountability” (T1). For some teachers this was linked to a sense of pride in professional development: “We are proud of our development and it’s nice to have everything in one portfolio” (T3). Despite the fact that these teachers had always been active in CPD, the portfolio spurred them to become more self-reflective. An interviewee asserted, “In this school the attitude of going to seminars and different events has always existed so I think the difference it may have made here is in the way people reflect on their teaching particularly because of the observations” (T5). Some of the teachers felt that the portfolios were a testament to their professionalism. As one interviewee declared,

The direction is more professional now. It no longer feels as if you’re just a housewife who comes in to teach for a couple of hours to fill in your time... Your development as a teacher is acknowledged. It’s more concrete. (T7)

These teachers confirmed that the implementation of the portfolios had succeeded in fostering the school’s CPD culture by underscoring their role as professionals following a path of constant development.

## Conclusion

The perspectives of the participants in this study seem to corroborate the idea that teacher portfolios can act as an ideal means of cultivating professional development. In order for this tool’s potential to be maximized it is important that teachers are consulted during the implementation process, given training in its use, provided with the time and support needed for them to use it effectively, and guaranteed ownership. If these conditions are met teachers will see the portfolio as a validation of their professionalism, an incentive to engage in reflective practices, and a manifestation of their professional identity. Teacher portfolios do not only lead to positive outcomes with respect to the practitioners themselves but also instigate change in a school’s



CPD culture by helping to promote a shared sense of appreciation for professional development.

## References

- Janis L. Antonek, Dawn E. McCormick & Richard Donato** (1997). The student teacher portfolio as autobiography: Developing a professional identity. In *The Modern Language Journal*, vol 81, pp15-27.
- Deborah P. Berrill & Emily Addison** (2010). Repertoires of practice: Re-framing teaching portfolios. In *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol 26, pp1178-1185.
- Deborah P. Berrill & Catherine Whalen** (2007). "Where are the children?" Personal integrity and reflective teaching portfolios. In *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol 23, pp868-884.
- Pornapit Darasawang** (2006). Professional development for language teachers. In *ELT Journal*, vol 60, pp308-309.
- Steve Dingham & Catherine Scott** (2003). Benefits to teachers of the professional learning portfolio: A case study. In *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development*, vol 7, pp229-244.
- Jeffrey I. Gelfer & John Filler** (1997). Developing teacher portfolios. In *Early Child Development and Care*, vol 139, pp107-118.
- Joy Goodfellow** (2004). Documenting professional practice through the use of a professional portfolio. In *Early Years: An International Research Journal*, vol 24, pp63-74.
- Laura C. Haniford** (2010). Tracing one teacher candidate's discursive identity work. In *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol 26, pp987-996.
- Elizabeth Jones** (2010a). A professional practice portfolio for quality learning. In *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol 64, pp292-312.
- Elizabeth Jones** (2010b). Enhancing professionalism through a professional practice portfolio. In *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, vol 11, pp593-605.
- Christie McIntyre & Julie Rainer Dangel** (2009). Teacher candidate portfolios: Routine or reflective action? In *Action in Teacher Education*, vol 31, pp74-85.
- Lee A. Montgomery** (2003). Digital portfolios in teacher education. In *Computers in the Schools*, vol 20, pp171-186.
- Kari Smith & Harm Tillema** (2001). Long-term influences of portfolios on professional development. In *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, vol 45, pp183-203.
- Craig Thaine** (2004). The assessment of second language teaching. In *ELT Journal*, vol 58, pp336-345.
- Gert J. van der Westhuizen & Kari Smith** (2000). Teachers' portfolio reflections: A comparative analysis. In *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development*, vol 4, pp339-352.
- Yaoying Xu** (2004). Teacher portfolios: An effective way to assess teacher performance and enhance learning. In *Childhood Education*, vol 80, pp198-201.



# 22

## When Do You Use Pronouns? An Entity Coherence Approach

Mitsuko Yamura-Takei & Etsuko Yoshida  
*Hiroshima Shudo University & Mie University*  
takeim@shudo-u.ac.jp  
tatan@human.mie-u.ac.jp

### Introduction

Coherence is often regarded as an abstract and elusive concept. Also, it is not as straightforward as it seems to answer the question, “When do you use pronouns?” This study attempts to explicate the entity coherence of discourse and its effect on pronominalization in the framework of Centering Theory (Grosz *et al.*, 1995).

Centering Theory intends to model entity coherence, i.e., the coherence that arises from certain patterns of entity transitions. The theory predicts that pronominalization is affected by a perceived degree of coherence and inferential cost created by a center (focused entity) transition. If a center is continued between utterances, the degree of coherence is high, and therefore, it does not cost much to infer the referent. Thus, pronouns are likely to be used. If a center is changed abruptly, the degree of coherence is low and the inferential cost is high. In this case, pronouns are unlikely to be used.

We conducted a survey with native speakers (NS) of English and Japanese and non-native speakers (NNS) of English and examined (1) how centering prediction is reflected in human intuitive judgments on pronominalization, (2) how NNS judgments differ from those of NS (in English), and (3) how NS judgments differ across the two languages (English/Japanese).

### Background

Centering Theory, on which our theoretical framework is based, was originally developed within computational linguistics and has been applied to other linguistic sub-disciplines, including psycholinguistics (Gordon *et al.*, 1995) and language pedagogy (Mitsakaki *et al.*, 2004). In this study, we use the centering framework as an explanatory tool to show the contrast, if any,

between NS and NNS and between the two languages with regard to speakers' choice regarding pronominal reference.

The fundamental assumption of centering is that people continuously update their local attentional focus (called center) as they incrementally process a discourse. Center is defined as the highest ranked entity in the previous utterance that is realized in the current one. Subjects are ranked higher than objects. Different ways of updating center are formulated as the types of transition from one utterance to the next. Each utterance in discourse is labeled CONTINUE when the same entity continues to be center, RETAIN when a new entity is introduced while retaining an old center, SHIFT when center is shifted from the old entity to a new one, and NULL when no entities from the previous utterance are included. The combination of these four types creates eleven transition sequence patterns, which then can be classified into three inferential cost groups: LOW, MEDIUM, and HIGH, as summarized in Table 1.

LOW cost group	MEDIUM cost group	HIGH cost group
CONTINUE-CONTINUE RETAIN-SHIFT SHIFT-CONTINUE	CONTINUE-RETAIN RETAIN-RETAIN NULL-CONTINUE	SHIFT-SHIFT SHIFT-RETAIN NULL-RETAIN RETAIN-CONTINUE CONTINUE-SHIFT

**Table 1: Inference cost-based classifications of transition sequence patterns**

LOW cost groups are assumed to impose the least inference cost in terms of pronoun interpretation. HIGH cost environments, on the other hand, require the most inference making, and MEDIUM is placed between the two. This grouping is based on the theoretical formalization described in Grosz *et al.* (1995) and statistical verification in the corpus analysis of Yamura-Takei (2005). Our assumption is that pronouns are more likely to be used in LOW cost environments than in MEDIUM cost ones and are least likely in HIGH cost environments.

Pronouns are a typical linguistic form referring to common entities in English, while in Japanese, lexical pronouns are rarely used, as ellipses serve the same function instead; therefore, pronouns (in English) and zero pronouns (subject/object ellipses in Japanese) are treated analogously in this study.

## Methodology

The participants were 23 NS of English (EFL teachers in Japan), 108 NNS of English (Japanese university students), and 116 NS of Japanese (Japanese university students). Three sets of discourse segments were constructed for the survey. The participants were presented with English/Japanese discourse segments containing discourse entities, all realized as explicit noun forms, and asked to identify any discourse entities that they judged could be replaced with pronouns (zero pronouns in the case of Japanese) if the change would make the segments sound more natural but still remain unambiguous.


The discourse samples (in both languages) consisted of a series of simple events (propositions) and included three discourse entities: TOM, JERRY, and SPIKE, all realized as names. They displayed various transition sequence patterns in three cost-based groups. Any other cohesive devices (e.g., connectives) were deliberately excluded from the discourse to minimize their effects on the perception of coherence. Below is a sample discourse, with discourse entities underlined and centers indicated in bold. Each utterance (except a discourse-initial one) is labeled with a cost-based group in brackets.

In this house lives <u>Jerry</u> with <u>Tom</u> and <u>Spike</u> .	
<b><u>Jerry</u></b> loves the house.	[MEDIUM]
<b><u>Jerry</u></b> is a smart mouse.	[LOW]
<u>Tom</u> is mean to <b><u>Jerry</u></b> .	[MEDIUM]
<b><u>Tom</u></b> teases <u>Jerry</u> .	[MEDIUM]
<b><u>Tom</u></b> chases <u>Jerry</u> around the house.	[LOW]
<u>Jerry</u> hates <b><u>Tom</u></b> .	[MEDIUM]
<u>Spike</u> is a house dog.	[NULL]

The three sets of discourse segments included a total of 35 entities, 18 of which were centers.

## Results and Discussion

Let us first look at the average number of entities that the three participant groups chose to pronominalize, shown in Figure 1.




**Figure 1: Average number of entities to pronominalize**

The English NS participants chose to pronominalize an average of 7.04 entities out of a total of 35 entities, with a range of 1 to 16. The English NNS (Japanese EFL learners) chose 10.44 entities on average, with a range of 4 to 21. The Japanese NS chose to use zero pronouns for an average of 8.41 entities, with a range of 3 to 18. The English NNS chose to use more pronouns than the NS, and the Japanese NS chose to pronominalize more frequently than the English NS. The average numbers are compared here, although there are wide individual differences within each of the three groups.

### ***English NS/NNS Comparison***

Next, we compared the English NS/NNS results. Figure 2 shows that centers are more likely to be pronominalized than non-centers by both NS and NNS and that NNS tend to use more pronouns than NS for both centers and non-centers.



**Figure 2: Pronominalization ratios for centers/non-centers**

Let us turn to the center pronominalization ratio in the three inference cost-based groups in Figure 3 below. As the theory predicts, LOW cost environments allow more pronouns for centers than MEDIUM and HIGH in both NS and NNS decisions. The NNS tendency to use more pronouns than NS is observed in each cost group environment.




Figure 3: Center pronominalization ratios in the three cost groups

### *English/Japanese NS Comparison*

Next, let us compare the two languages. Figure 4 shows that the Japanese NS chose to use zero pronouns for centers more frequently than the English NS chose to use pronouns. The English NS used a slightly higher percentage of pronouns for non-centers than Japanese NS.





Figure 4: Pronominalization ratios for centers/non-centers

Centering prediction is also supported here for Japanese, as shown in Figure 5, where the center pronominalization ratio is the highest in LOW cost, followed by MEDIUM and then HIGH cost. The comparison showed that the Japanese NS chose to use more (zero) pronouns than English NS in LOW and HIGH cost environments.



**Figure 5: Center pronominalization ratios in the three cost groups**

## Conclusions

The survey results showed that, for all three participant groups (English NS/NNS and Japanese NS), human intuitive decisions on pronominalization were reasonably compatible with centering predictions; centers were more likely to be pronominalized than non-centers; and less costly transition sequences allowed more pronouns. This proves that centering cost-based predictions can serve as a basis for the pronoun production principle and as an answer to the question, “When do you use pronouns?” The data also include instances that raise the following questions: (1) What allows pronouns for non-centers and centers in HIGH cost environments, and (2) what restrains pronouns for centers in LOW cost contexts? Potential answers to these questions seem to include the effects of world/contextual knowledge, parallelism, and semantic information that might override centering principles.

The study results showed the difference between NS and NNS, and between English and Japanese. English NNS’ tendency to use more pronouns than NS is an interesting issue to explore from a pedagogical view point. A



possibility of L1 influence can be seen in the Japanese NS, whose pronominalization ratio was as high as that of English NNS. Japanese is often described as an elliptic language in which subjects and objects are often left unsaid when they are guessable from the context. Moreover, unlike English pronouns, zero pronouns do not convey any information about gender or number. Are Japanese speakers more tolerant of ambiguity? Are they excellent guessers? Can the tendency be explained as a pragmatic feature prevalent in a high context culture (Ide, 2002)? These topics await further investigation.

## Note

This research was supported in part by the Hiroshima Shudo University Research Grant for the year 2014.

## References

- Peter C. Gordon & Kimberly A. Searce** (1995). Pronominalization and discourse coherence, discourse structure and pronoun interpretation. In *Memory & Cognition*, Volume 23, Issue 3, pp313-323.
- Barbara J. Grosz, Aravind K. Joshi & Scott Weinstein** (1995). Centering: A framework for modeling the local coherence of discourse. In *Computational Linguistics*, Volume 12, Issue 3, pp175-204.
- Sachiko Ide** (2002). The speaker's viewpoint and indexicality in a high context culture. In Kuniyoshi Kataoka & Sachiko Ide (eds.), *Bunka, Intaakushon, Gengo [Culture, Interaction, and Language]*. Hituzi Syobo: Tokyo, Japan, pp3-20.
- Eleni Miltsakaki & Karen Kukich** (2004). Evaluation of text coherence for electronic essay scoring systems. In *Natural Language Engineering*, Volume 10, Issue 1, pp25-55.
- Mitsuko Yamura-Takei** (2005). *Theoretical, Technological and Pedagogical Approaches to Zero Arguments in Japanese Discourse: Making the Invisible Visible*. Doctoral thesis, Graduate School of Information Sciences, Hiroshima City University, Japan.



# 23

## **Translanguaging as a language contact phenomenon in the classroom in Ghana: Pedagogic relevance and perceptions**

Elvis Yevudey  
*Aston University, Birmingham*  
yevudeye@aston.ac.uk

### **Introduction**

Switching between two or more languages within the classroom has attracted the attention of linguists, language educators and sociologists. A wide range of terminologies are used in the literature to describe bilingualism and education, which has led to several terms and approaches such as bilingual education, polylinguaging, polylingual languaging, flexible bilingualism, multilinguaging, heteroglossia, codemeshing, translingual practice, codeswitching and translanguaging. This paper adopts the term translanguaging to describe the linguistic choices in the classrooms observed for this study.

Two types of classrooms are observed. The first type of classroom, which will be referred to in this paper as Type 1 classrooms adopts a bilingual medium of instruction. These classrooms adopt the National Acceleration Literacy Program (NALAP), which is the bilingual literacy program of Ghana. This program since its inception in 2009 is still run on pilot bases in the country as it is not being implemented in all schools. Within the framework of this language program, Ewe and English lessons are joined into one teaching period called Language and Literacy. The Language and Literacy lesson is structured such that a given topic is taught in Ewe first half of the lesson and same topic is taught in English in the remaining half hour.

The other type of classroom observed, which would be referred to as Type 2 classrooms adopts a monolingual medium of instruction. In the Type 2 schools, Ewe and English, in this case study, are taught exclusively. With reference to theoretical terminologies, the Type 1 schools could be referred to as translanguaging whereas the Type 2 schools are non-translanguaging classrooms. The non-translanguaging classrooms, however, exhibit some

bilingual practices in their classroom interactions. These two types of classroom are chosen in order to explore the language use patterns and to ascertain the sociolinguistic situations in the schools. Subsequently, choosing these two types of classroom provides comparative data to explore the perception of teachers and pupils in these two contexts and how these perceptions impact on code choices in the classroom. This comparison further would provide us with the optimisation strategies of translanguageing and how it may contribute to both language acquisition and content comprehension.

Translanguageing is a relatively recent term in describing bilingual language use phenomena and originates as a pedagogic theory that conceives language mixing in the classroom to have cognitive benefits for the learner and produces important educational outcomes. As García and Wei (2014:2) describe it: "...translanguageing is an approach to the use of language, bilingualism and the education of bilinguals that considers the language practices of bilinguals not as two autonomous language systems as has been traditionally the case, but as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been societally constructed as belonging to two separate languages." Translanguageing in the classroom provides a 'fertile' platform to harness learners' linguistic repertoires flexibly to achieve and maximize learning and teaching goals. Thus, both languages are used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organise and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and not least, learning (Lewis et al. 2012:655).

This paper presents part of a study on translanguageing and bilingual practices in Ghanaian classrooms by exploring the various linguistic choices both teachers and pupils make in the classroom regardless of the proposed language policy of the school. The research questions addressed in the paper are: 1) What is the pedagogic relevance of translanguageing in the classroom? 2) What are the perceptions of teachers and pupils towards translanguageing the classroom?

These research questions aim to provide an overview of the pedagogic relevance of translanguageing in the classroom in Ghana, especially in Type 1 classrooms, and any bilingual practices in Type 2 classrooms. Furthermore, the findings would unravel the significance of pupils' first language (L1) in learning a second language (L2) and content comprehension. Equally, the paper advocates that the formation and implementation of language policies

should take into account the linguistic background of the pupils as well as the linguistic needs of the country.

## **Language and Education in Ghana: Policy and linguistic practices**

Ghana has about 79 indigenous languages and English as the official language. Among these indigenous languages, nine of them are government-sponsored and are used in the school curriculum. Ewe, which is the indigenous language in this case study, is one of the sponsored languages and used at pre-school to tertiary level. Ewe is one of the Westernmost languages of the Gbe/Kwa language subgroup of African languages and is spoken mainly in the Volta Region of Ghana. Other places where Ewe is spoken include Togo, Benin and some parts of Nigeria.

The linguistic multiplicity in Ghana presents insights into the reasoning behind diverse language policies within the country especially regarding language of education. The current language policy NALAP is under pilot study and is being implemented in public/government schools. The policy stipulates the use of Ghanaian indigenous languages from pre-school to grade 3 as medium of instruction and English is taught as a subject. From grade 4 onwards the Ghanaian indigenous language is taught as a subject and English becomes the medium of instruction. Aside this policy, private schools and a few public schools in urban centers adopt monolingual use of the indigenous languages and English.

In Ghana, as mentioned above, two types of classrooms can be observed based on the type of school. The Type 1 classrooms adopt a bilingual or multilingual medium of instruction, which involves the use of both Ewe and English in the same teaching period. These schools are mainly public schools. Type 2 classrooms adopt monolingual use of Ewe and English and are privately owned schools. As presented on Table 1 below, Type 2 schools have separate teaching periods for Ewe and English and it is expected that these languages be used exclusively during lessons.

Multilingualism is the norm in Ghana due to the linguistic diversity of the country. Bilingual practices such as codeswitching permeate both formal and informal contexts. Codeswitching generally refers to the concurrent use of two or more languages within the same interactive event. Interactions on radio and television are characterised by pervasive use of codeswitching.

Other media of communication such as television and radio advertisements are couched in English and at least one indigenous language (Chachu 2013). Chachu (2013:94) demonstrates that advertisements on television and on radio involve purposeful and skillful use of English and indigenous languages in order to uncover examples of 'unity in diversity since the various languages use make them authentically Ghanaian in nature'. Authenticity here refers to codeswitching on television and radio advertisements being a reflection of daily language use in Ghana, which is full of codeswitching.

Codeswitching is not only restricted to communication among Ghanaians within Ghana but also among Ghanaians in the diaspora. As recounted in Guerini (2014), Ghanaian immigrants in Bergamo, Northern Italy use codeswitching pervasively in their day-to-day interactions. The study explores the language mixing patterns, which involves Akan, English and Italy among the immigrants. Guerini (2014) argues that due to the pervasive switching between these languages their code choices seem to be on a transition from codeswitching to a mixed code.

There has been no research so far that addresses bilingual or multilingual language use in the classroom in Ghana via the concept of translanguaging. Studies into bilingualism in the classroom are addressed mainly via the concept of codeswitching, which is related to translanguaging in many respects. Park (2013:50) points out that translanguaging mirrors codeswitching in many respects as 'it refers to multilingual speakers shuttling between languages in a natural manner'. The use of indigenous languages and English as medium of instruction has led to extensive contact between the languages. In the classroom, codeswitching is used to perform certain pedagogic functions such as explanation of texts, definition of terminologies, elaboration of a point and to increase the participation of pupils (Yevudey 2013, Probyn 2009).

Studies of bilingual language use in the classroom have recommend that it should be considered as a teachable pedagogic resource and should be included in teacher training syllabi (Arthur 1996, Brew-Daniels 2011). The use of two or more languages in the classroom by teachers especially requires the awareness of the pedagogic implications and how to use the languages to achieve learning outcomes. In this regard, the teachers' guide produced as part of the National Acceleration Literacy Program (NALAP) spells out how Ghanaian indigenous languages and English could be use concurrently or exclusively in the class. The introduction of the NALAP program is an

attempt to incorporate the Ghanaian languages in the school curriculum following other related education programs such as *Breakthrough to Literacy* (BTL). The NALAP program can be described as a learner-centered approach to literacy where the linguistic resources of the pupils, in many cases Ghanaian indigenous languages, are harnessed to enable them to learn a second language, English. As a head of school described in an interview, the principle of literacy is from the known to the unknown (Yevudey 2012). In other words, the provision of education especially in multilingual contexts should take into account the linguistic competence of the pupils and aim to develop what they already know and build on it.

Studies into the perceptions and attitudes towards codeswitching in classroom have shown that there are more positive responses than there used to be. Teachers, parents and pupils express more positive attitudes towards the incorporation of indigenous languages and English as medium of instruction. Probing into the perception of teachers towards Ewe-English codeswitching in Ghana, Yevudey (2013) indicates that teachers' attitudes towards codeswitching range from agreement, conditional agreement to outright rejection. The overall attitudes of teachers based on a quantitative analysis of a questionnaire survey show that the majority of teachers are positive towards codeswitching. The study further shows that there is a parallel between the perception of teachers and their linguistic choices in the classroom. Thus teachers who are positive towards codeswitching in the classroom adopt it as a medium of instruction whereas teachers who express negative attitudes avoid it to some extent.

Perceptual differences towards learning and teaching indigenous languages could be associated with linguistic needs. Communicating in this era of globalisation requires competences in a 'global' language or languages: a global language in the sense of a language of wider communication, a language of business and employment and a language that 'crosses borders'. To this end, some speakers have little or no motivation to acquire indigenous languages or even to study them in schools as most of these languages are mainly used within their community.

For instance, although in recent times there is promotion of Ghanaian indigenous languages within the curriculum we cannot overlook the realities on the ground. The educational system in Ghana is heavily English-based and one's 'scholastic performance' and progression within the academic system is dependent on English (Andoh-Kumi 1998:119). The Ghanaian indigenous languages usually play little or no role when a student goes higher

on the academic ladder. Furthermore, the subjects of studies such as science, business and even humanities courses are taught in English. The aforementioned notwithstanding, the indigenous languages play a crucial role in language studies such as Linguistics and Cultural Studies such as dance, music, drama and theatre, which are core to the culture and heritage of the country.

In sum, the use of both indigenous languages and English in the classroom has been promoted as an ideal medium of instruction especially in classrooms where pupils have little or no exposure to English. The perception of teachers, parents and pupils towards codeswitching or translanguaging in the classroom has not been exclusively negative or positive. Most studies have, however, shown that there is high acceptance. As the world is globalising, attempts to promote indigenous languages within the school curriculum should take into account the promotion of these language outside the classroom. Thus there should be more job opportunities that require the use of the indigenous languages as a tool and only then can these indigenous languages become globalised.

## **Data and Research Methods**

Four schools were observed, which include two bilingual medium schools (Type 1 classrooms) and two monolingual medium schools (Type 2 classrooms). Data were collected using:

- Classroom observation via audio recordings and ethnographic notes
- Interviews with heads of schools and teacher participants
- Questionnaire surveys conducted with teachers
- Focus groups with fifteen pupils from each school. In order to elicit the opinions of pupils towards language use in the classroom, the teachers have selected five pupils each from grades 1-3 and they participated in the focus group. The medium of communication during the focus group was Ewe, English and any repertoire of the pupils some of whom spoke Akan.



Classroom type		Linguistic choices
Bilingual/ Translanguaging classrooms	Type 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ghanaian indigenous language + European language (e.g. Ewe + English)</li> <li>• Ghanaian indigenous language+ Ghanaian indigenous language (e.g. Ewe+ Akan or Ewe + Likpe)</li> <li>• European language +European language (e.g. English +French)</li> </ul>
Monolingual classrooms	Type 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monolingual Ghanaian indigenous language (e.g. Ewe only)</li> <li>• Monolingual European language (e.g. English only)</li> </ul>

**Table 1: Classroom type and linguistic choices (mainly at the lower classes grade 1-3)**

## Linguistic choices in the classroom and perceptions

### *Pedagogic relevance of translanguaging in the classroom*

Translanguaging in the classrooms observed is used to achieve various pedagogic goals in the classroom. In Type 1 schools, translanguaging is used pervasively partly due to the nature of the teaching period, Language and Literacy, where both Ewe and English are used. In Type 2 schools, it is observed that there is maximally monolingual language use during Ewe and English lessons. In these classrooms, however, although they conform to the monolingual policies of the schools there were occasional bilingual practices in which teachers and pupils switched to Ewe during English lesson and vice versa. Some pedagogic relevance of translanguaging include:

- Repeating of the same concept in Ewe and English in order to reiterate a point.
- Switching to either Ewe or English in order to explain a concept or (new) terminology used during a lesson.
- Pupils providing answers in another language other than the medium of instruction of the lesson.
- Teachers switching to either of the languages to explain an answer provided by a student.

Functionally, teachers usually serve as a mediator in the classroom and they provide linguistic support for students who find it difficult to speak either of the languages. For instance, during an English lesson one of the pupils attempted to provide answers in English but found it challenging to express

the idea. The teacher encouraged the pupil to provide the answer in the language comfortable to him and the pupil answered in Ewe. The teacher therefore explained the answer in English to the whole class.

### ***The perception of teachers***

Exploring the perception of teachers towards translanguageing in classroom was done via questionnaire surveys. The surveys were carried out in the four schools. Different numbers of teachers responded to the questionnaire and for comparative purposes the responses are normalised using percentages as presented in Tables 2 and 3. All the teacher participants are at least bilingual in Ewe and English and some speak other indigenous languages such as Akan, Likpe, Ga, and European languages such as French.

<i>Question 1: Which ONE of the language or combination of languages would you recommend to be used in teaching and learning in lower primary school classrooms in Ghana?</i>				
<b>Response</b>	<b>School A (Public)</b>	<b>School B (Private)</b>	<b>School C (Public)</b>	<b>School D (Private)</b>
English only	0 : (0%)	1 : (5.6%)	0 : (0%)	1 : (5.9%)
Ewe only (any Gh Lg)	3 : (8.6%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)
A combination of Ewe & English	32 : (91.4%)	17 : (94.4%)	15 : (100%)	16 : (94.1%)
Others	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)
No opinion	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)
Total	35 : (100%)	18 : (100%)	15 : (100%)	17 : (100%)

**Table 2: Responses from teachers on the language or combination of languages preferred for teaching in lower primary school level (Questionnaire)**

In response to which language or combination of languages should be used for teaching in the lower grade classes, teachers predominantly chose a combination of Ewe and English. In Schools A and C which are public schools, 91.4% and 100% respectively chose a combination of Ewe and English as ideal medium of instruction. The responses from Schools B and D, which are private schools, were in favour of a combination of Ewe and English in the classroom thus constituting 94.4% and 94.1% respectively. Some responses in School A were for Ewe only instruction 8.6%, School B one teacher (5.6%) chose English only and in School D one teacher constituting 5.9% also chose English only. However, there are some differences as the few teachers who would like ‘Ewe only’ to be used are from public schools whereas teachers who responded ‘English only’ teach in private schools. Overall, teachers from both public and private schools are advocating for bilingual language use in the classroom.

The questionnaire survey was used to explore the perceptions of teachers towards translanguaging in the classroom. As shown in Table 3 below, teachers in the four schools expressed either ‘very positive’ or ‘positive’ attitude towards translanguaging in the classroom. In School A, however, one teacher expressed uncertainty. Schools B and D have one teacher each (1 (5.5%) and 1 (5.9%) respectively) expressing negative attitudes. An overview of the responses shows that teachers in both public and private schools are predominately positive towards translanguaging in the classroom.

<i>Question 2: How would you describe your feeling or attitude towards translanguaging in the classroom?</i>				
<b>Response</b>	<b>School A (Public)</b>	<b>School B (Private)</b>	<b>School C (Public)</b>	<b>School D (Private)</b>
Very positive	10 : (28.6%)	10 : (55.6%)	7 : (46.7%)	6 : (35.3%)
Positive	24 : (68.6%)	7 : (38.9%)	8 : (53.3%)	10 : (58.8%)
Uncertain	1 : (2.8%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)
Negative	0 : (0%)	1 : (5.5%)	0 : (0%)	1 : (5.9%)
Very negative	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)	0 : (0%)
Total	35 : (100%)	18 : (100%)	15 : (100%)	17 : (100%)

**Table 3: Responses from teachers on their perceptions towards translanguaging in the classroom (Questionnaire)**

Comparatively there is a symmetry between the responses of teachers’ choice of the language or combination of languages and their perceptions. With reference to the responses bolded in Tables 2 and 3, the teachers who chose English only as their preferred medium of instruction equally expressed negative attitudes towards translanguaging in the classroom. Additionally, these teachers are from the two private schools observed.

### ***The perception of pupils***

Focus groups were run to explore the perception of pupils towards translanguaging in the classroom. The focus groups were to give pupils the opportunity to express themselves more free and informally. Prior to the start of the focus groups, the aim of the research was introduced and the pupils were informed they could use any language they felt comfortable and fluent in. The languages used were English, Ewe and some pupils used Akan.

Tables 4 and 5 present some extracts from the focus groups. In School A, Pupil 1 said he would like the teacher to use both Ewe and English in the classroom, whereas Pupil 2 from the same school said she wanted the teacher to speak English in class as when English is used she understands better. In School D, as in Table 5, Pupil 4 was asked the same question in Ewe and he

responded he would like the teacher to use Ewe because he will like all of them (the pupils) to be able to speak Ewe.

Pupil 2 reiterated that she would like teachers to use English in class because when they use Ewe she finds it difficult to understand. In an informal interaction, the class teacher mentioned to me that Pupil 2's opinion is based on the fact that although her parents are Ewe they only speak English to her at home, which explains the pupil's attitude towards the use of Ewe. The teacher said that Pupil 2 doesn't speak Ewe in class or even in her out-of-classroom interactions with peers.

IW(Interviewee):	Which languages do you like to speak?
Pupil 1:	"I like to speak Ewe and English"
IW:	Which languages do you like to speak?
Pupil 2:	I like to speak English.
IW:	Why?
Pupil 2:	Because English is very easy for me to speak. I prefer English because if they speak English I understand it more than Ewe.

**Table 4: Extract from the focus group with pupils from a public school (School A)**

IW:	Egbe-ka e-dzi be nufiala na-zã le suku?
	language-which 2SG-want that teacher 3SG-FUT-use be.at school
	'Which language would you like the teacher to use in school?'
Pupil 4:	Ne-zã Ue-gbe
	3SG-use Ewe-language
	'S/he should use Ewe language.'
IW:	Nukata fe?
	Why before
	'Why?'
Pupil 4:	Me-dzi bena mía-fete mía-se Eve-gbe
	1SG-want that 1PL-all 1PL-understand Ewe-language
	'I will like us to understand Ewe language.'
IW:	okay

**Table 5: Extract from the focus group with pupils from a private school (School D)**

## Conclusion

This paper sets out to explore the pedagogic functions of translanguaging in the classroom and its impact on teaching and learning. Based on classroom interactions, it is observed that translanguaging in the classroom is used to achieve pedagogic goals such as reiterating a concept, explaining new terminologies and encouraging participation of pupils.

Secondly, the perception of teachers and pupils towards translanguaging is predominantly positive. Teachers in both public and private schools advocate that a combination of Ewe and English should be adopted as medium of instruction at the lower grade classes. There are few teachers who would like Ewe only or English only to be the medium of instruction. Comparing the perception of teachers in public and private schools towards translanguaging, the data show that teachers from both classroom contexts are positive towards translanguaging in the classroom. A few of the teachers in the private schools expressed a negative attitude and a teacher from a public school expressed uncertainty. The responses of the teachers who chose English only as the ideal medium of instruction also showed negative attitudes towards translanguaging. In other words, there is a parallel between the code preference of teachers and their perceptions towards translanguaging.

The perception of pupils towards translanguaging and code preference for medium of instruction exhibits some variations. Some pupils would like Ewe to be used as a medium of instruction whereas some of them would like English to be used. These differences in opinion may not be associated with whether the pupil is studying in Type 1 classroom or Type 2 classroom. Variations in opinion could be associated with the linguistic background of the pupils. Pupils who have out of school exposure to Ewe would like Ewe to be used whereas those who have exposure to English want that to be used. Furthermore, pupils who are exposed to both Ewe and English said both languages should be used in the classroom. Finally, as the perception towards bilingual education is becoming more positive and as language policies are presenting the relevance of indigenous languages in both second language acquisition and content comprehension, government policies should factor in ways through which indigenous languages can have a place in business and employment.

## References

- Jo Arthur** (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. In *Linguistics and Education*, vol.8 pp 17-33.
- Kingley Andoh-Kumi** (1998). Medium of instruction at the basic education level: Does it matter? In *Legon Journal of the Humanities*, vol 11 pp119-146.
- Josephine Brew Daniels** (2011). *Twí-English Code Switching in the Classroom: a Case Study of some Selected Colleges of Education in the Ashanti Region*. MPhil Thesis. Department of English, University of Ghana, Legon.

- Sewoenam Chachu** (2013). Ghana television and radio advertisements: Codeswitching as a type of language use in the context of unity in diversity. In Helen Lauer, A.A. Nana Amfo & Joanna Boampong (eds.) *The One in the Many: Nation Building Through Cultural Diversity*. Sub-Saharan Publishers: Accra: Ghana, pp80-96.
- Ofelia García & Li Wei** (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, Hants, UK.
- Federica Guerini** (2014). Language contact, language mixing and identity: The Akan spoken by Ghanaian immigrants in northern Italy. In *International Journal of Bilingualism*, vol 18(4) pp 363 –383.
- Mi Sun Park** (2013). Code-switching and Translanguaging: Potential Functions in Multilingual Classrooms. In *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, vol 13( 2) pp. 50-52.
- Margie Probyn** (2009). Smuggling the vernacular into the classroom’: conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching in township/rural schools in South Africa. In *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol 12 (2) pp 123-136.
- Gwyn Lewis, Bryn Jones & Colin Baker** (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. In *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, vol 18(7), pp 641-654.
- Elvis Yevudey** (2013). The pedagogic relevance of codeswitching in the classroom: Insights from Ewe-English codeswitching in Ghana. In *Ghana Journal of Linguistics*, vol 2(2) pp 1-22.
- Elvis Yevudey** (2012). *Codeswitching in the Classroom: A Case of Ewe-English Code-switching in Ghana*. MA Dissertation, Aston University, Birmingham.

# 24 Personal Identity and Global Engagement: Chinese University Teachers' Use of the L1

Dr Xiaozhou Zhou  
*Shanghai International Studies University, China*  
xiaozhou711@gmail.com

## Introduction

For decades, the issue of first language use in second language classrooms has been the subject of heated academic discussion. At the centre of the debate exist two opposing opinions. The natural approach proposed by Krashen and Terrell (1983) states that classroom language use should be “based on the use of the language in communicative situations without recourse to the use of the native language” (Krashen and Terrell, 1983:9). This claim is opposed by some scholars on the grounds that it creates “a classroom dynamic in which the use of L1 is at best discouraged, and at worst stigmatised” (Levine, 2003:344) and they suggest a sanctioned role for L1 use in foreign language classrooms (Cook, 2001; Castellotti, 2001). Though it has been widely acknowledged that exclusivity of L2 use leads to unfavourable outcomes, there is little consensus as to how much L1 is optimal in the classroom, due to the vastly different levels and needs of second language learners.

In order to confirm and validate the theories noted above in different contexts, over the years empirical explorations have been conducted with a view to discovering the amount and functions of L1 use in foreign language classrooms as well as the motivations and possible factors affecting teachers' switching of languages (Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Carless, 2007; Copland and Neokleous, 2010; Gao, 2005; Guo, 2007; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2005; Liu et al, 2004; Macaro 2001, 2005; Macaro and Lee, 2013; Moodley, 2007; Tian and Macaro, 2012). Findings in various contexts fail to reveal a consensus on the amount of L1 used. However, the research has revealed several similarities and patterns, especially in terms of teachers' reasons for L1 use, the situations in which it tends to be used and factors affecting L1 use. Researchers are working towards gaining a deeper understanding of the relationship between teachers' language use and students' learning outcomes. Nonetheless, the majority of studies target teachers of foreign language

classes in a communicative setting, the focus of which is on foreign language skills and students' communicative competence. Little attention has been paid to university students majoring in foreign languages as well as content-based classes in which the target language serves as a medium to convey the subject matter, particularly in the Chinese context.

To this end, it is helpful to conduct a research study into L1 use in content-based classes for English majors in a Chinese university. This paper examines the results regarding the patterns of teachers' L1 (Chinese) use, the actual amount of L1 used, the change or development of L1 use over a term, if any, and the factors affecting their choice of languages, particularly in comparison with the results found in communicative skill-based foreign language classes. It is hoped that the study will contribute to this research area from the Chinese perspective and help practitioners become aware of L1 use in content-based courses, since teachers' L1 use is considered to be a crucial factor in L2 classroom learning and has a direct impact on students' L2 acquisition.

## **Context**

English language education in China has been undergoing drastic development since the 1950s. English is taught as a foreign language in China at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. It is a compulsory course for all university students. However for non-English majors, the emphasis of English courses is placed on the attainment of language skills and the ability to communicate freely in English, whereas the focus of the curriculum for English majors has been experiencing constant change due to the needs of social and economic development in China, shifting from a humanistic approach in the 1920s – 1930s to pure language skills training in the 1950s – 1990s, then to a so-called interdisciplinary model during the first few years of the 21st century.

The most recent trend among the leading English departments in Chinese universities features a return to the humanities-oriented approach, since it is considered that humanities subjects are most helpful in developing English majors' competitiveness in the 21st century. Apart from training students to become fluent English users, teachers are required to teach literature, history, philosophy, culture and so on in content-based courses via English as a medium of instruction. This process develops competitive graduates with humanistic awareness and critical thinking acumen – so-called “whole



people”, who can play an important role in the social, economic and diplomatic development of China, especially with culture as a soft power gaining more prominence recently (Hu and Sun, 2006; Wen et al, 2010).

Under these circumstances, communicating knowledge of the subject is prioritized at the expense of teaching of the language. Hence “meaning” outweighs “form”. It is thus likely that teachers tend to employ more L1 to explain complicated subject knowledge, which is detrimental to the students’ English learning process since L2 exposure is eliminated and that less input leads to less intake. Therefore it is necessary to undertake an empirical study to investigate teachers’ L1 use in those content-based courses and students’ attitudes towards it, as teachers’ language use in such courses could have a direct and profound impact on students’ acquisition of the foreign language and relevant subject knowledge.

## Research Questions

In the current study, the research questions focus on the core issue of teachers’ L1 use in content-based English courses. The three sub-questions are as follows:

- In what circumstances is L1 employed?
- What is the exact amount of L1 used?
- Is there any evidence of change or development in the amount of L1 use throughout the term?
- What are the factors affecting teachers’ switching of languages?

## Participants and Procedures

This research takes the form of a case study so as to explore the research questions in-depth. The participants are two male teachers from a Chinese university (Teachers A and B) in a city where English Language Teaching enjoys the most prosperity in this country. They comprise a typical group of competent and qualified cases in terms of researching English language education at tertiary level in China. Both received their Bachelor, Master and PhD education in prestigious universities in China and both of them have had experience of being visiting scholars in English-speaking-countries, which reflects the fact that their English language proficiency should be at a high level compared with other English teachers in Chinese universities as a

whole. Secondly, they are working for a university which has a strong reputation for foreign language teaching, which to some extent confirms their L2 proficiency and teaching ability. Thirdly, they have been teaching for more than ten years. In addition, they are all mid-career, which implies that they are expected to be of a status where their understanding of their jobs, students and curricula have reached a stabilized and consolidated stage (Huberman, 1989).

Three data collection methods were used: classroom observation, interview and stimulated recall. Classroom observation ran from Week 1 to Week 11 of the summer term which lasts from September to January. Two content-based courses were observed: American Literature and Western Philosophy. A total of 22 lessons were observed and recorded. Interviews were held with the two participants at the beginning and at the end of the research study. Therefore, there were a total of four interviews, varying in length from 30 to 60 minutes. Interviews were undertaken in Chinese in accordance with the preference of the participants. Stimulated recalls were held in the middle of the term with two participants respectively when extracts from video recorded lessons were shown to them and questions were asked to understand the decision-making processes of their codeswitching behaviours. All recordings were transcribed and interviewing data were subject to thematic analysis.

## Data Analysis and Results

In order to answer the first Research Question, a categorisation system was firstly designed to illustrate teachers' L1 use patterns. Ten major functions of teachers' L1 use behaviours were categorised in Table 1.

Patterns of L1 Use	Examples
Translating long, difficult and illustrative sentences	The psychological principle is this: anyone can do any amount of work, provided it isn't the work he is supposed to be doing at that moment. 这个心理学的原则就是说谁都能完成任何工作, 只要他做的工作, 不是那个当下应该做的。
Explaining/paraphrasing/interpreting new vocabulary or difficult phrases	Arty, 中文叫附庸风雅。(In Chinese it is called...)
Giving procedural instructions	今天就到这里。下次我们讲 Roman Fever, 大家看一下, 好吧。(That's all for today. Next time we will talk about the Roman Fever. Please read it beforehand.)

Patterns of L1 Use	Examples
Explaining grammar	In verb tense, we can judge the attitudes of the author. 英语里 (In English), in English, 我们使用一些 (we use some) verb tense. 英文里, 一个作家可以用动词时态来表达, 在中文里就很难。 (In English, it is easy for an author to express the intentions of the hero/heroine through using verb tenses, which in Chinese is really difficult.)
Providing background information	几乎所有的选本里都会选择这篇文章。这是一篇革命性的文章。 (Almost all the text books or essay collections would include this article. This is a revolutionary article.)
Lecturing on text-related culture/literature/philosophy	没有一个人对英美诗歌的影响有艾略特那么大。他的诗歌主要受 17 世纪的玄学主义, 和法国诗歌的影响。写的都是 the plight of modern men, 现代人的困境。 (No-one has ever had a greater influence on the English and American poem history than Eliot did. He was largely influenced by the transcendence poets in the 17th century as well as some French poets who wrote mainly the plight of modern men.)
Asides/anecdotes/ personal opinions embedded in interpretation/lecturing on the text	将来有机会, 同学们学习文化研究也好, 文学也好, 我觉得你们主要的责任是如何将我们现代的文化介绍给西方人。也许他们看到某些内容也会有似曾相识的喜悦感。 (If you have the opportunity in the future, whether you study culture or literature, I think your main responsibility will be working on how to introduce our modern culture to the westerners. Perhaps they will feel equally excited when by accident finding something similar to their culture/literature.)
Raising questions	我要请教你们一下, 三文鱼的英文叫什么? 是不是 salmon? 这是不是香港的翻译? 因为大陆是翻成鲑鱼的。 (I would like to ask you, what is the English name for ...? Is it called salmon? Is it a translation from Hong Kong? Since in mainland China, it is called...)
Meta-textual comments concerned with interpretation, evaluation of the text, etc.	这篇文章重点讲的就是 (The focus of this article is to describe) the relationship between style and the author's purpose. 他用什么样的语言风格, 就是为了表达怎样的目的。 (He uses different styles to express different purposes.)
Emphasizing pronunciation	Photography 这个词的重音很多同学读错, 大家要注意。 (A lot of students pronounce the stress of the word "photography" wrong. Please pay attention.)

**Table 1: Patterns of Teachers' L1 Use**

*The words in brackets are translations of the Chinese texts they follow.*

The times when participants switched from English to Chinese were noted and categorised. It was discovered that Teacher A tended to use more L1 when explaining vocabulary, making asides etc., translating sentences, making meta-textual comments and lecturing in literature, culture and

philosophy. As for Teacher B, it was clear from the results that the most dominant category was “making asides etc.” Additionally, “meta-textual comments” and “lecturing in literature, culture and philosophy” were major categories.

Secondly, time coding was conducted so as to distinguish the amount of time for which L1 and L2 were spoken and thus to answer Research Questions 2 and 3. Results from time coding are presented in Table 2. On average, both Teachers A and B spent a significant amount of time talking in L1, much greater than the researcher’s expectation. Taking the amount of their L1 use across the term into consideration, the overall trends showed an increase in the participants’ L1 use over time, although slight falls and rises could be seen at different stages.

	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	W11	Ave
Teacher A	8.4	24.4	35.2	31.9	35.9	43.5	44.8	46.1	35.6	46.5	45.4	<b>36.2</b>
Teacher B	40.1	53.7	49.4	48.6	38.8	61.5	63.2	61.5	63.0	58.3	62.7	<b>54.6</b>

**Table 2: Amount of L1 Use in Each Week’s Class % – a Results of Time Coding**

Thirdly, analysis of interview data revealed the participants’ statements as to which factors they believed were affecting their language choice in class. The list of factors were: lesson contents and objectives, teachers’ L2 proficiency, students’ L2 proficiency, language contrast, students’ reaction, teachers’ ability to comprehend and appreciate the teaching content, and teachers’ professional identity. Among all the factors, “teachers’ professional identity” stood out as a novel factor not identified in previous studies, and closely linked with the salient category of teachers’ L1 use “Lecturing on text-related culture/literature/ philosophy”, based on the findings from interviews and stimulated recalls. Thus, the following section is devoted to discussing the implications of the results.

## Discussion

Compared with the patterns of L1 use noted in previous studies, the categories generated from the current research are to a large extent similar, except for three novel categories: *lecturing on text-related literature/culture/philosophy*, *meta-textual comments concerned with interpretation, evaluation of the text etc.* and *emphasizing pronunciation*. Switching to Chinese to emphasize the pronunciation of certain words is used to ensuring that students’ attention is drawn to the correct pronunciation.

It is not treated as a salient category as it does not occur frequently. The appearance of the “meta-textual comments” can be attributed to the nature of content-based courses in which the subject knowledge, instead of the language, is the focus. Teachers’ L1 use in this situation could also be due to their own limited L2 proficiency or their concern for the weaker students in class.

However the category “*lecturing on text-related literature/culture/philosophy*” has proved to be prominent in both protocol analysis of patterns of L1 use and time coding for each category. It is understandable for teachers to spend time lecturing on American literature and western philosophy in those two content-based courses. Nonetheless, the fact that they spend a significant amount of time lecturing on **Chinese** literature, philosophy and culture and constantly endeavour to compare the western perspective with the Chinese perspective, (and more importantly conduct all this in Chinese) reveals a more profound purpose behind their language choice. Relating to their statements in the interviews, L1 is deliberately chosen with a view to giving students more information relating to Chinese literature, philosophy and culture and helping students build a comparative framework in their minds. It also reflects a hint of teachers’ own cultural identity embedded in their use of L1 – they expect English majors to be proud of their own national literature, culture and philosophy and be equipped with such knowledge, even though the current curriculum generally requires the attainment of this type of knowledge from the western perspective. This point of view is reflected in their interview responses:

“When we are in the process of learning western literature, culture or philosophy, we won’t be able to comprehend it thoroughly if we do not understand our literature and culture first. It is only through comparison that we comprehend ourselves better. ... The ultimate goal of researching American and British culture is not to understand American and British culture only. Rather, it represents a search for ways to make other cultures useful for the Chinese culture.”

With that aim in mind, and the practical limitation that teachers’ L2 proficiency is sometimes not sufficiently high to explain complicated issues in comparative literature/culture, it becomes natural for them to switch to their L1 whenever they feel it necessary, which results in a seemingly unhealthy and self-indulgent L1 use.

The results of time coding show that on average, Teacher A spends 36.2% of class time speaking in Chinese and Teacher B 54.6%. The figures are

substantially higher than the 19.4% from Guo (2007), a previous study set in a Chinese university but focusing on skilled-based English courses in non-English departments. Even though the national curriculum for English majors does not specify exactly how much English teachers should use in class, an average L1 use of over 30% across 11 weeks is already excessive, let alone over 50%. However, the participants are both aware of such significant amount of L1 use and during interviews they state that it is a deliberate pedagogical strategy due to the impact of their professional identity.

Professional identity is often regarded as “an ongoing process of integration of the ‘personal’ and the ‘professional’ sides of becoming and being a teacher” (Beijaard et al, 2004:113). Its formation concerns not only the question “Who am I at this moment?” but also the question “Who do I want to become?” It is not a stable entity but rather a complex and dynamic equilibrium where professional self-image is balanced with various roles teachers feel they have to play (Volkmann and Anderson, 1998). In addition, professional identity is considered as multifaceted in the way that historical, sociological, psychological and cultural aspects may affect the teacher’s sense of self as a teacher (Cooper and Olson, 1996).

Beijaard et al (2000) investigated experienced secondary school teachers’ perceptions of professional identity. Teachers’ knowledge of their professional identity, put in simple words, is how they perceive themselves as teachers and what factors contribute to these perceptions. He discovered that teachers in the study were very capable of expressing how they currently view themselves professionally and most of them saw themselves as a combination of subject matter experts, didactical experts and pedagogical experts. It is contended that “teachers’ perceptions of their own professional identity affect their efficacy and professional development as well as their ability and willingness to cope with educational change and to implement innovations in their own teaching practice” (Beijaard et al, 2000:750).

As far as the current research is concerned, the participants express that the reason they employ a large amount of Chinese in classes where English is expected to be the dominant language, while providing students with knowledge about Chinese literature and culture, which is not even part of the lesson contents, is that they do not view themselves as merely English language teachers, though the national curriculum and academics from other disciplines do. Rather they prefer to be seen as subject experts who teach content-based courses comparatively. In the interviews when asked what

type of teacher they see themselves as, Teacher A says that since he has been teaching American Literature for years, he sees himself as more of a literature teacher, although he understands that he also teaches English skill courses. However Teacher B does not believe he is purely a philosophy teacher. Compared with the teachers in the philosophy department, he considers himself as “something in-between”:

“I can’t be too philosophical in class. It is not entirely like teaching philosophy in English. I have to consider students’ L2 level when selecting texts for reading. At the same time I will keep in mind if the texts I select can provide them with some philosophical thoughts and inspire them to think actively”.

It seems that there is a dilemma with regard to the professional identity of Teacher B. On the one hand, the outside world tends to view him as an English language teacher, which he refuses to accept: “*I am definitely not an English language teacher. I am a teacher who uses English to spread humanities knowledge but I refuse to be viewed as an English teacher*”. On the other hand, he is not completely a philosophy teacher either. As for Teacher A, although he is likely to see himself as a literature teacher, he cannot deny the fact that he still teaches English language skills in some courses. It can be argued that these teachers are struggling to avoid being perceived as English language skills teachers because English language teaching is not a discipline but more of a “service” provided for other professions. They prefer to be acknowledged as part of the humanities academy, where they are recognised as experts in certain subjects.

As discussed earlier, professional identity is an ongoing process and its formation concerns not only the question of who the teachers are at a particular moment but also who they want to become in the future. In the present study, since they are not officially recognised as subject experts, they strive to include the knowledge from the perspective of liberal arts, thus establishing a basis for being accepted as humanities teachers in the future.

The current study also reflects the point Beijaard et al (2000) make about teachers’ perceptions of their professional identity affecting their willingness to cope with educational change and to implement innovations in their teaching practice. Teachers A and B in the present research tend to view themselves as literature/philosophy teachers more than English language teachers; therefore they choose to respond to the national curriculum in their own particular way through reducing the English language teaching while increasing teaching subject knowledge in their classes. In addition, their perceptions of professional identity as humanities teachers provoke them to

take the initiative to create freedom within the national curriculum and to employ a comparative (cross-cultural) teaching method to accommodate their innovative ideas towards the lesson contents, simply because the current curriculum is forcing them to become the type of teacher they do not want to be.

## Conclusion

The results of this study have identified a predominant category of L1 use: “lecturing text-related literature, culture, philosophy etc.” The prominence of this category, particularly the significant reference to Chinese literature and culture, could be viewed as indicative of the fact that teachers’ professional identity is one of the salient factors affecting their language choice. It is mainly because the participants do not want to become English language teachers in the way that the curriculum forces them to. Instead they prefer to see themselves as humanities teachers, which is also why they actively promote the inclusion of literary and cultural contents in the courses. The active involvement of Chinese literature, culture and philosophy etc. also to a certain extent reflects their implementation of the national strategy of “Chinese Culture Going Abroad” which is integrated in the bigger “Chinese Dream”.

It is also to be noted that the time spent on the use of Chinese in content-based English courses was remarkably high for both participants. Although this significant use of L1 can be partially explained by the nature and objective of the content-based courses observed, it is definitely a cause for concern that so much L1 is used in these classes. Even though it is impractical to regulate English teachers’ L1 use on a national level, given the vast differences and uneven ELT development across China, it is suggested that a university or an English department make their own policy regarding this issue. Universities should conduct their own research upon which they can base a relevant policy, so that the expectations of students are met and teachers have clear guidelines to follow. Particularly leading English departments should have the awareness to differentiate between the requirements of L2 input in skill-based and content-based courses respectively. As teachers it is necessary to help cultivate students’ cross-cultural awareness and critical thinking acumen through teaching comparatively. However this should not lead to L2 input being eliminated, which could be detrimental to students’ L2 learning process.



## References

- Marta Antón & Frederick DiCamilla** (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interactions in the L2 classroom. In *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, pp314-342.
- Douwe Beijaard, Paulien C. Meijer & Nico Verloop** (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. In *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2), pp107-128.
- Douwe Beijaard, Nico Verloop & Jan, D. Vermunt** (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: an exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. In *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(7), pp749-764.
- Alejandro Brice** (2000). Code switching and code mixing in the ESL classroom: A study of pragmatic and syntactic features. In *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 2(1), pp19-28.
- Kimberley Anne Brooks-Lewis** (2009). Adult Learners' Perceptions of the Incorporation of their L1 in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. In *Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), pp216-235.
- David Carless** (2007). The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong. In *System*, 35(4), pp595-608.
- Véronique Castellotti** (2001). *La langue maternelle en classe de langue étrangère [The native language in a foreign language classroom]*. CLE International: Paris, France.
- Vivian Cook** (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. In *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), pp402-423.
- Karyn Cooper & Margaret R. Olson** (1996). The multiple 'T's' of teacher identity. In M. Kompf, W. R. Bond, D. Dworet, & R. T. Boak (eds.), *Changing Research and Practice: Teachers' professionalism, identities and knowledge*. The Falmer Press: Washington, DC, USA, pp78-89.
- Fiona Copland & Georgios Neokleous** (2010). L1 to teach L2: complexities and contradictions. In *ELT journal*, 65 (3), pp270-280.
- Wen-Cheng Gao** (2005). An Empirical Study on Codeswitching of Chinese English Teachers on Tertiary Level. In *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2(9), pp1-10.
- Tao Guo** (2007). *A case study of teachers' codeswitching behaviours in mainland China's university EFL classrooms and students' reactions to the codeswitching*. Unpublished DPhil thesis. University of Oxford: Oxford, UK.
- Wenzhong Hu & Youzhong Sun** (2006). On Strengthening Humanistic Education in the English Language Curriculum. In *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 38(5), pp243-247.
- Michael Huberman** (1989). On teachers' careers: Once over lightly, with a broad brush. In *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(4), pp347-362.
- Stephen Krashen & Tracy Terrell** (1983). *The Natural Approach*. Pergamon: Oxford, UK.
- Glenn Levine** (2003). Student and Instructor Beliefs and Attitudes about Target Language Use, First Language Use, and Anxiety: Report of a Questionnaire Study. In *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(3), pp343-364.
- Grit Liebscher & Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain** (2005). Learner Code-Switching in the Content-Based Foreign Language Classroom. In *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), pp234-247.
- Dilin Liu, Gil-Soon, Ahn, Kyung-Suk Baek & Nan-Ok Han** (2004). South Korean High School English Teacher' Code Switching: Questions and Challenges in the

- Drive for Maximal Use of English in Teaching. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), pp605-638.
- Ernesto Macaro** (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. In *Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), pp531-548.
- Ernesto Macaro** (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (ed.), *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession*. Springer: Boston, MA, USA, pp63-84.
- Ernesto Macaro & Jang Ho Lee** (2013). Teacher Language Background, Codeswitching, and English-Only Instruction: Does Age Make a Difference to Learners' Attitudes? In *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(4), pp717-742.
- Visvaganthie Moodley** (2007). Codeswitching in the Multilingual English First Language Classroom. In *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(6), pp707-722.
- Lili Tian & Ernesto Macaro** (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A Lexical Focus-on-Form study. In *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), pp367-391.
- Mark J Volkmann & Maria A Anderson** (1998). Creating professional identity: Dilemmas and metaphors of a first-year chemistry teacher. In *Science Education*, 82(3), pp293-310.
- Qiufang Wen, Wang Haimei, Wang Jianqing, Cairan Zhao & Liu Yanping** (2010). Comparison on the Critical Thinking Skills between English Majors and Undergraduate from Other Disciplines in Arts and Humanities. In *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 42(5), pp350-355.



# Learning, Working and Communicating in a Global Context

Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting  
of the British Association for Applied Linguistics

*4-6 September 2014*

*University of Warwick, Coventry*

Edited by

Jo Angouri, Tilly Harrison,

Stephanie Schnurr and Sue Wharton



ISBN: 978-0-9559533-7-8