Bringing Purpose to Learning English: Theme-based Learning Experience for EFL College Students in a Content-based ESP Classroom
By Yi-chen Chen

English teachers in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) country commonly observe situations in which a lack of authentic language environment leads to no immediate language need, resulting in a lack of perception of the importance and objective of the lessons, and thus the students’ low motivation to learn. This problem is especially prevalent in colleges, where students have chosen their majors according to their interests and have considered English courses targeting general English as no more than an obligation. To raise EFL college students’ motivation, content-based instruction (CBI), which places students into English classes according to their majors so that teachers teach English for specific academic disciplines, has become popular in EFL contexts.

However, when implementing CBI in an English for Specific Purpose (ESP) classroom, EFL teachers need to seek ways in which content can promote language learning and facilitate acquisition of course outcomes (Freiermuth, 2001). Thus, a CBI curriculum has been suggested to accompany a theme-based project. In a theme-based project, language instruction is arranged around thematic modules or units; it not only enables teachers to link different disciplines meaningfully, it also strengthens the language aspect in an ongoing manner (Zhao, 2014).

Task-based activities should also be planned to guide students step by step in completing the projects while using language for authentic communicative purposes with their peers or instructors. So to speak, group collaboration with individual participation is crucial for students in this type of classroom. An individual’s personal goal would cause him/her to perform an activity differently in the group to which he/she belonged.

According to the Activity Theory of Learning (Engestrom, 1999), different subject participants, due to integral factors like object (learning goals), meditational means (language or knowledge engaged), community (groups), rules (guidelines) and division of labors (peer interactions), may have different learning outcomes, even if the physical project’s outcome is the same. That is to say, how EFL students experience this curriculum, as well as their learning outcomes, could vary; their experience can reveal crucial motivational factors which should be taken into consideration by EFL teachers.

The following reported case study is a classroom in a business college in...
Taiwan, an EFL country in Asia. Forty-four students majoring in Business Management took the College English course to fulfill requirements for graduation. They represent typical EFL college students in that they had a hard time connecting the English language to their daily lives and professions, and they lacked the motivation to learn the language because they did not find it to be of significance. Their English proficiency was at intermediate level. A theme-based learning project integrating business-related content and English language learning was implemented, and their experiences of learning this way were under investigation.

The project in this study, which was six weeks long, intended to provide opportunities for the participants to put the language they learned to real use. The theme was to use English in creating a business project. The final outcome was a business proposal for a selected company; the content should include product information, advertising strategies, promotional plans, and potential risk assessments. The class was divided into five groups of six people and two groups of seven people. Each week the instructor of the class, who has a Master’s Degree in TESOL and a certificate of Teaching English for Business Communication, led the students in doing activities by applying content knowledge and by incorporating the four language skills and critical thinking skills in the process. Reading materials adopted from ESP textbooks and media, including TV series, were used. (For detailed course designs and procedures, please refer to Chen, 2010.)

Two questionnaires were given to the students: 1) before the project began, the first questionnaire was given to understand the students’ opinions and feelings toward the community (class) they were in and the object (sensed objectiveness) they possessed; 2) after the project was complete, the second questionnaire was given to determine the experiences that participants had during these six weeks, to see if the participants changed their objects or attitudes, and to determine the factors that caused such changes. (For the complete versions of both questionnaires, please link to the webpage: http://goo.gl/pxdbJM, http://goo.gl/TzhBqA)

Three fourths of the students considered the projects successfully done; the reasons the students pointed out can be summarized into two: “appropriately assigned workload” and “smoothly-going group collaboration.” For the one fourth who considered the projects unsuccessful, they attributed their dissatisfaction to two major reasons: “insufficient time” and “unhappy experience of group work.” Experience of group collaboration seems to influence the students’ perception of the success of the project, though practically all the students turned in their learning outcome (i.e., written business proposals) and completed their projects. The factor “community” in the Activity Theory thus plays an important role in learning; learning is not independent but relate to a social network; within the network the division of labor that each participant perceives affect their interactions with others.

When asked about what they thought they had learned in the project, half of the students indicated that their “social skills” improved, while the other half specified improved content knowledge. They agreed that they “learned things in business,” three students pointed out that they “learned to use computer software.” Surprisingly, none of the students thought about improvement of their English. The ignorance of linguistic elements in the project may be related to the different “object” each student owns. Though one primary tenet of CBI is that students can use language that is meaningful beyond language classroom, students may not possess or recognize the same learning goals. Thus, professional language instruction should be a vital element of the coursework (Freiermuth, 2001);

Table 1. Six-week schedule of the theme-based project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Schedule of Activities</th>
<th>Content knowledge learning</th>
<th>Skill training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>To choose a company as the target</td>
<td>(orientation)</td>
<td>S, L, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>To conduct a SWOT analysis</td>
<td>SWOT analysis</td>
<td>R, S, W, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>To propose a promotion plan</td>
<td>4Ps strategies</td>
<td>R, S, W, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-5th</td>
<td>To wrote a business plan</td>
<td>Formal presentation skills</td>
<td>S, W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>To presented formally in class</td>
<td>(evaluation)</td>
<td>S, L, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results of the analysis of the college students’ learning experience of a theme-based project in a CBI classroom can be summarized as follows:

- They gained the significance of learning English.
- Some strengthened their positive attitudes to learning English, and gained both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to continue.
- Some, even though they held negative attitudes towards group project and thought they had not benefited from it, still admitted the importance of learning.

Moreover, from the students’ perspectives, the factors that influence their perceptions of learning English are mainly community and object. Whether they gain peer support and collaboration within their groups affect their self-perception of successful learning. Objects that the students set for themselves or that they were cognizant of influence the learning outcomes. Factors such as rules and division of labor are not particularly emphasized, yet they are interwoven as a web: it would be great if the students have guides (rules) from the instructors and peers to assist them in finding their roles in the groups (division of labor) so that they can support and communicate with each other, expressing and constructing ideas through mediation tools.

The case study suggests the importance as well as claims the beneficial effects of adopting theme-based projects in a CBI/ESP classroom. More importantly, from the students’ perspectives, the case study analyzes and reports how students perceive their learning experience throughout the process. Converting such findings to EFL teachers’ perspective, in a CBI/ESP classroom, it is not only the elements of content and language that matter but the learner (subject) is the major element that determines the effect of teaching. Students should be given more freedom and larger proportions of the task to participate in during the process, such as grouping options. Ultimately, EFL college students can benefit from the theme-based project by finding reasons or even excuses to continue learning English.
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How to Incorporate Critical Language Pedagogy in a Grammar Class in Seven Days

By Changho Kwon

Grammar classes as compared to other language skills classes in English as a Second Language / Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) context offer less flexibility for the teachers. With the students’ expectations to learn prescriptive grammar rules with ‘definite’ answers, it is not a simple task for a teacher to deviate from their expected standard. Given this expectation, therefore, critical language learning and teaching, which involves components like negotiated syllabus or discussing ‘controversial’ topics, does not have any room in such a context. Nevertheless, based on my experiences as a language teacher, I believe it is possible to incorporate some of the components of critical pedagogy, which means “teaching for social justice” (for a quick introduction, see Crookes, 2013, p.8), in grammar classes.

I want to share the critical components I added, and am still trying to add, to my Grammar for Writing classes I am currently teaching in an intensive language program for international students. As Crookes (2013, p.46) suggested, “baby steps are needed” for a language class to include components of critical language pedagogy and I, as a novice critical-pedagogue, am taking a couple of baby steps to raise my students’ awareness about social justice.

Let me first start with the (negotiated) syllabus, one of the essential components of critical language pedagogy (Crookes, 2013) I am using in my classes. Although I had pre-made syllabi that complied with the institutional requirements and student learning outcomes, the students and I discussed what we wanted to study in our grammar class on the first day of instruction. As the students are placed in high intermediate to low advanced levels, the grammatical items presented in the course textbook are not highly challenging for some of them. This, however, does not mean that learning the use of articles or verb tenses is not meaningful for them, as they continually repeat non-target-like errors in the speech and texts they produce. We talked about the basic grammar errors they make and the necessity of such basic grammar items to be included in our class.

With this discussed, we were able to be a little selective in terms of choosing what grammatical items to include in our 8-week-long program. It was not only I, the teacher, but the students who took part in deciding what they wanted to learn. The students talked about their strengths and weaknesses in class and also completed a short written survey. This helped me to critically analyze their needs and wants, which were then reflected in my lesson plans and schedule. This is an ongoing negotiation as we still talk about what is difficult, what is not, and what is to be included or excluded in the following weeks.

The content of the course is another area where I am applying critical language pedagogy. Although our focus in this class is to learn and review some grammatical items and apply what we learned in our own writing (journal writing in this case), I introduced some controversial topics about social justice for the students to discuss. As the textbook provides us with some explanations of grammatical rules and related exercises, I bring in some short newspaper articles to add authentic language as realia to practice what they have learned.

With the selected articles, I first adapt the texts with an adequate number of errors on the target grammar so the students have another chance to review and practice their grammatical knowledge.

The first task is to identify the grammatical errors in pairs or small groups and to correct them. Then, we discuss what the article is about and what we think about the social issues discussed in the articles. Next, we share our responses and thoughts in class. The students then are assigned to think about their own lived experiences (or others’ experiences) regarding the issue.

In the subsequent class, we first share in groups and then as a whole class to learn about what our peers have experienced and what we can do to make a fairer world. Finally, the students write a few-paragraph journal about their experiences with special focus on the target grammar. With the submitted papers, I identify one or two sentences with errors in the target grammar from everyone’s journal, and work on them with the students to see what kinds of errors they constantly produce and how they fix them. Then, the students get to work on peer editing tasks. The journals from the first class are peer edited by the students from the second class and vice versa. Using this method, the students get to share their experiences and ideas with more students as well as give and receive peer feedback.

Peer feedback is another way of empowering the students and letting them know that it is not only the teacher who can help them with improving their English. With one of the topics I like to discuss with the students (power dynamics in classrooms), peer feedback serves as a consequent action we take after discussing such a topic. By being an active member of the class and tak-
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ing over the conventional teacher role, the students learn that the teacher does not have to be an authoritative figure merely disseminating his or her knowledge.

In order to make the feedback process a little more efficient, I usually provide the students with some guidelines they can follow. This sounds like a little more traditional teaching method with the teacher controlling the student-oriented task, but in fact, this aid from the teacher in the initial stage serves as a scaffolding opportunity and can help the students with the necessary tools for the following peer feedback sessions, which they can run more autonomously.

Many of the components of critical language pedagogy, such as codes, dialogue, action orientation, etc. (for a short description, see Crookes, 2013), are missing in my class. However, as I highlighted in the beginning, I am only taking a few “baby steps” towards becoming a more critical language teacher. Many language teachers believe it is challenging to discuss social justice in a grammar class. I agree with them to some extent as the students’ needs and the institutional requirements have to be addressed sometimes creating a feeling that there are limited opportunities to discuss other topics. Nevertheless, I believe there still is room for teachers to discuss social (in)justice in their grammar classes.

Not every single component of critical pedagogy has to be integrated, although the more, the better. With a good balance of the institutional needs, the students’ needs, and the social values that the teacher and the students hold, a grammar (for writing) class can be a site to both improve the students linguistic accuracy as well as raise their critical awareness on social justice.

If you thought a grammar class is just mundane and boring, and you were looking for something else to make your grammar class livelier, why don’t you start to share and discuss your own social values and teaching values with the students? It will offer a great chance for the students to share their values and experiences with a focus on grammar.

Acknowledgement: My appreciation goes to Dr. Betsy Gilliland for her time and valuable feedback.
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How to Incorporate Critical Language Pedagogy in a Grammar Class in Seven Days

| Day 1          | • (Partly) negotiate the syllabus  |
|               | • Needs analysis                   |
|               | • Talk about the teacher, students, and their strengths and weaknesses |
|               | • Conduct survey                   |

| Day 2          | • Students identify and correct student-generated linguistic errors from the survey |
|               | • First grammar item: lesson and exercises |

| Day 3          | • Continue first grammar item: lesson and exercises |

| Day 4          | • Continue first grammar item: lesson and exercises |
|               | • A current social issue article (e.g. racism) with grammar errors |
|               | • Students identify and correct the errors |
|               | • Students discuss the article |

| Day 5          | • Students share their experiences regarding the social issue |
|               | • Grammar quizzes |
|               | • Homework: Writing a journal about their experiences regarding the social issue |

| Day 6          | • Students identify and correct student-generated linguistic errors from their journals |
|               | • Start second grammar item: lesson and exercises |

| Day 7          | • Peer feedback (give the journals from class 1 to class 2 and vice versa) |
|               | • Continue second grammar item: lesson and exercises |
This was not what I had initially hoped to hear on my first day of teaching. Nevertheless, I feel blessed to have encountered such a challenge. After all, good teaching requires being able to “go with the flow.” I had no choice but to plunge into my first day of class the same way I had plunged into a communal bath for the first time overseas: confident, but without enough material to really cover anything.

I had other material – I had icebreakers, grammar activities, handouts containing information about Hawai‘i, and (most thankfully) another textbook intended for university students – with which, I was told, I would be able to supplement the original textbook lessons. Having this back-up material was naturally not the same as having a back-up plan.

The students were indeed truly gifted – it seemed as if there was nothing they had not already learned back in their home country. The director of studies provided me with the rest of what was needed in order to cater to the class of 15 incredibly bright high school students before me – but could I be creative enough to take what I had been given and adapt it into something truly worth their participation?

The students were indeed truly gifted – it seemed as if there was nothing they had not already learned back in their home country. The director of studies provided me with the rest of what was needed in order to cater to the class of 15 incredibly bright high school students before me – but could I be creative enough to take what I had been given and adapt it into something truly worth their participation?

Since there exists no golden formula nor test which can give an instructor a one hundred percent accurate estimate of true learner’s abilities and needs, what is left – his or her intuition – is an immensely powerful tool; one which cannot be more valuable in a field requiring rapid and unexpected alterations to set plans.

Over the course of two weeks, I was able to observe, listen to, and bond with my students – all very crucial in helping me to assess their learning needs. The lessons which resulted were something seemingly magical – it was all very much like tossing a bunch of different ingredients into a pot and then casting a spell on it and seeing what came forth from its waters blossom into a beautiful and extraordinary mystical creature of sorts (not that I have experience in that sort of thing).

The students’ favorite activity turned out to be speech and debate. Initially I selected a number of topics related to issues affecting Hawai‘i’s environment – and from there we covered more – everything we could think of that was relevant and/or interesting from rail transit to hotel management to shark attacks and to beauty standards (the lattermost which produced some very exciting and interesting arguments).

By the end of the second week, I could not believe how much we had covered in just one short program. It was also especially pleasing and wonderful to have had been able to see a large number of students begin the program shy and reluctant to speak individually in front of all of their peers and to then end the program with their shoulders back and a look of pride in their accomplishments – to have been able to confidently and objectively speak about matters which were personally interesting to them, and to have been able to confront and discuss real issues relevant to the state of Hawai‘i.

All in all, the textbook is but a supplement to the true lesson plan which takes form and is refined over time. The textbook provides but a canvas upon which to sketch out what could turn out to be a real gem of a course – but the students remain our subjects.
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Addressing the Language-Literature Gap in ESL Classrooms
Jennifer Monje

Many ESL teachers must have grappled with the question of how to integrate language and literature into their classes. Because language learning and literature learning are so structured, Bernhardt (2002) coined the termed “lang-lit split” (p. 418). Others call this a “gap,” or “divide,” and Kramsch and Nolden (1994, as cited in Paran, 2002, p. 466) were prompted to use “institutionalized dichotomy” as the separation of teaching literary content from language learning. The abstract concept of a “divide” feels sufficiently concrete for me when I find myself putting on my language teacher hat in subjects such as Grammar and Composition, and a different hat for a course in Literature. This is also familiar when, as a graduate student, I went to a different college because I was a “Lit person,” while others were simply labeled “language teachers.”

There had not been deliberate attempts to integrate the learning and teaching of language and literature in ESL and EFL classrooms prior to the publication of the landmark 2007 report of the Modern Language Association (MLA) Ad hoc Commission on Foreign Languages. This report entitled “Foreign Language and Higher Education: Structures for a Changed World” recommended creating an articulated language-literature curricula that teaches language, culture, and literature as a continuous whole (Paesani, 2011, p. 164). While many researches have responded to the call and have made changes inside the ESL classroom since then, the divide persists because of underlying assumptions teachers make about their students. Among these assumptions are 1) that language study in lower-level courses will prepare students for literature in upper-level courses, and 2) that a student’s two-year language training is adequate preparation for literary analysis.

The ideal process of integrating language and literature in the curriculum, assuming teachers on either side of the divide buy into the idea, is to make the integration explicit at the university level of curriculum planning. University is where teachers recognize that an artificial separation exists, and proceed to structure courses to show the deliberate integration of language, literature, and culture from the beginning level of a student’s study. Failing that, any given course within a term may also deliberately implement a plan to provide language learning and literary study. Kraemer (2008) persuasively argued for a hybridized course that offered language and literature on-and offline. Finally, specific lessons may be carefully designed to reflect the closing of the gap, such as in an excellent lesson by Paesani (2006) using the text Zazie dans le metro for an EFL class. There are many ways teachers can integrate language and literature together, but not if the system keeps socializing graduate students, who eventually become teachers, as either language or literature teachers (Bernhardt, 2002).

Acknowledging that such separation exists in my own teaching, I refuse now to use a literary text as a “spring board” for language activities, and actually use the texts that my students read for language learning and as sources of learning about literature, too. Deliberately closing the gap between language and literature, I take my students along this exciting path to learning through strategy instruction and structured lessons via pre-reading activities that activate students’ background knowledge. I also included reading activities that focus on textual content, features of the text, and its organization; and, post-reading activities that bring the text out of its strictly textual environment to encourage students’ creative language production (Paesani, 2006, pp. 166-67), by, for example, extending the story or providing alternative endings. The nature of this approach incorporates a variety of learning activities that require students to use graphic organizers, write an extension of the story, listen to a dramatic reading, and essentially be creative while using English at all levels of the activities.

One literary text where language and literature lessons may be integrated successfully is Albalucía Angel’s “The Guerrillero,” a text sufficiently short that dramatic reading of it may be done early in the lesson to engage learners. Students are naturally drawn to literature when it is enacted.

Employing the stream-of-consciousness technique, this “prose-poem,” originally written in Spanish and translated by Alberto Manguel into English, is the story of Felicidad Mosquera, initially a passive observer in a civil war that had been raging on around her. Upon helping a guerrillero, she became an unwitting participant in the struggle for which she now had to face a bleak and uncertain future. That uncertain future plays out in her head: women who had helped the guerrilleros are killed in the most horrible ways imaginable by the henchmen of the oppressive government. Thus, the stream-of-thought is an inward “struggle” too, with different personas battling it out in her head. The use of flashback and foreshadowing techniques are literary concepts that are crucial to understanding literature as a content course, but
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may also be employed to teach features of language, such as tenses. This may be achieved through the use of a timeline that determines the various time frames in the protagonist's stream-of-thought. By establishing a chronology of events via a timeline, students are forced to attend to the specific tense or aspect of the text to establish organization. The way the tenses alternate—and the remote past first, followed by the recent past, and then again the remote past—will help students understand the uses of the past tense and past perfect tenses in the text. Understanding its utility in the text will provide adequate grounding for the uses of tenses in their own writing.

Another graphic organizer, an action line, plots the emotional “phases” of the speaker to make meaningful sense of the stream-of-thought. An action line imposes an organic “plot” on her stream of thought that determines the “phases” of her attitude/emotions to the terror she is anticipating. By first making sense of a text placed in a meaningful context, and learning literary concepts to make that learning stick, students can expand on their idea, invite thoughtful interpretations, and transfer learned skills in other areas of reading.

Writing activities may easily be integrated into this literary session when students are encouraged to write a speculative end or a twist to the short story, in answer to the question, “What happens when she opens the door?” Not only do the students’ creative sides come to the fore, but also the skill of writing in a register that blends with the actual text. Alternatively, they may be asked to compose a letter of goodbye to the guerrillero that Felicidad Mosquera anticipates she will leave behind, when she is taken away. Parts of the short story may also be dramatized, ensuring that the speaking and listening skills are paid attention to as well. Students may be free to choose a particular passage that they can turn into a dramatic choral piece, a skit, or even a news report. Being able to shift between registers is an excellent way for students to attend to style.

Finally, students may be asked to assess whether certain portions of the text may be considered “pornographic,” in the sense of catering merely to the prurient interests of the readers, or not. Contextualizing the passage may yield a surprising twist in the reading, especially if one sees the “pornographic” passage as central to understanding the text. The question, “Is the ‘pornographic’ passage crucial to moving the story along?” allows the students to entertain the possibility of her being pregnant. If so, is it a liberating reading, in the sense that a birth bodes well for the guerrilla struggle because they can continue the fight? Or will she, like all the other women in the story, suffer the same fate, and die with her belly open, exposing the unborn to the elements? If so, occasions of similar violence to the other women may signal as a foreshadowing technique to help readers frame alternative endings. Paying close attention to these aspects of the text develops students’ sensitivity to literary language, and the symbolic world of imaginative texts.

By integrating the teaching of language, literature, and culture, not only do teachers help their students build on one aspect of their learning a language, but they also become competent readers of literature and culture.
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Outsider or Insider: Foreign Language Identity

By Merve Demiralp

“Language is not only an instrument of communication or even of knowledge, but also an instrument of power. A person speaks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished.” (Bourdieu, 1977, p.648)

This quotation by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu goes some way to illuminating the role of a foreign language learner’s silence during the language learning process. Silence occurs when the foreign language learner is not valued for her/his act of using the target language.

To exemplify this, we can consider a foreign language classroom in which students learn a set of structures, rules and vocabulary to acquire knowledge about the language only. We ask: Is this a good way to acquire an additional language? Does it help students express their ideas in a foreign language and become “insiders” or “owners” of the language? Absolutely not. The achievement of effective acquisition of an additional language requires more than simply knowledge of linguistic structures, rules, and vocabulary. It requires “investment” in the language; that is, the learner must construct a social and historical relationship with the language (Norton, 1995). This then influences the learners’ understanding of their relationship with the social world through language (Norton, 2000). Therefore, the question we should ask is: How free are learners to invest in a language and construct a language identity in this way?

When exploring social reality from the perspective of a foreign language learning environment, learners’ access to a second language identity may be restricted by sociocultural factors, power relations, the atmosphere in a classroom community, or their own prejudiced ideas concerning the culture of the target language, which may result in assumptions of themselves as language “outsiders.” Sociocultural factors may relate to the differences between a learner’s own culture and that of the target language. For example, saying to a random person on the street: “Hi, how are you?” and then passing by not waiting for an answer is quite common in American culture. If a learner thinks “I do not greet people I do not know,” or “I will always wait for an answer if I ask after somebody,” based on her/his own culture, then this interferes with the acquisition of the second language identity. Regarding power relations, if students are not equally valued in their production of the target language, such that they are made to feel inferior to their peers because of the teacher’s attitude, they might feel unable to express their second language identities openly.

Thus, to avoid restricting learners, language teachers should create a classroom community in which students feel comfortable expressing multiple identities. This observation reflects current research on second language identity, which describes identity as “dynamic, contradictory, and constantly changing across time and place” (Norton, 2006, p.503). We need to examine the ways in which language teachers can utilize the dynamic nature of language identity to help learners construct their identity in the target language, and thereby invest in it. For example, in Atay and Ece’s (2009) research into multiple identities. Therefore, teachers should utilize these imagined communities when helping learners acquire identities. Certainly, each learner has a different imagined community. The examples of two different learners’ diverse approaches towards imagined language communities as reported in Atay and Ece’s research are given below:

My English teachers made me a self-confident person. I learned how to express myself without being afraid. When you have a Western identity, it is easier to criticize each other in a very democratic way. (p 29)

From what I have learned in the course books, I can say that people in Western countries do not know what “hospitality” is. They look “reserved”. (p 30)
While the first language learner prioritizes the culture of the target language over that of her/his own culture, the second language learner is prejudiced against the Western culture. Both of these are examples of the identity-struggle that second language learners experience because of their different investments in the target language. To avoid, or minimize ambivalence towards the target language, a language teacher should be careful when introducing the culture associated with the new language.

Language teachers should also create a classroom community in which students can move beyond utterance of formulaic sentences, to become engaged “emotionally, cognitively and physically” (Jonhson, 2011, p. 13). In this way, learners can construct their second language identity. Conducting target language-mediated projects may help learners in this sense. When they are valued and respected for their investment in the target language through these projects, they feel they are target language insiders and observe that they can use it to attain their imagined identity. For example, “grass-roots feminist English classes,” which McMahill (1997, 2001) mentioned in her research, can be very effective in learners’ construction of a second language identity. These are “feminist second language pedagogy” classes, in which English is used as a medium for the study of feminism in Japan. Japanese women then gain a target language-mediated subject position, sharing their gendered experiences with their peers in English. Some of the women explained that they felt like a different person when they spoke in English, since they can express their feelings more directly and assertively. This kind of class could be considered idealized by language schools, which seek to help learners acquire a second language identity through a similar process.

It is not easy to attain multiple identities when learning a language. Learners may feel that they are outsiders because of the factors mentioned above, which include sociocultural beliefs, power relations, the atmosphere of classroom communities, and possible prejudice against the target language culture. These factors should be examined in detail to ensure improved and appropriate classroom techniques.
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Is Google Classroom Ready for ELL?
By Alex Kasula

It often feels overwhelming for teachers to keep up with the continual growth of technological resources available in education, and how these resources can be beneficial for an English Language-Learning (ELL) classroom. However, when one of the largest Internet and technology-based companies in the world structures a web-based learning environment, we should take a second look.

Google Classroom was released in August of 2014. According to Google Classroom’s website, this new application for teachers will enable them to “save time, keep classes organized and improve communication with students” all through its ability to directly connect with Gmail, Google Drive, and other Google Apps. The question is, “Can this be beneficial for learners of English?”

I have the opportunity not only to use Google Classroom in my own English as a Second Language (ESL) class, but also to conduct a pilot, action research study looking at its ability to act as an interface for task-based learning, which I will reflect upon throughout this article as a source of insight. I will also draw upon small-scale interviews I have conducted with colleagues about their own perspectives of using Google Classroom in an ESL environment. For clarity and efficiency, I have broken down the uses and my analysis of Google Classroom into two categories, class management and class activities.

Class Management
One of the greatest strengths of Google Classroom is its ability to manage and keep the class organized, especially if students are already familiar with Google Classroom’s functions such as Gmail and Google Docs. When speaking of class management and organization, I am referring to the teacher’s ability to display class objectives, activities, and assignments in an orderly, focused, productive and transparent manner for students, teachers and administrators. Class management in this sense is teacher dependent as it relies heavily on the teacher’s own skills and abilities.

Since Google Classroom is technology focused, it is fundamental that students have the opportunity to become accustomed to Google Classroom’s functions, which are quite simplistic, especially for the younger learners who are acquainted with digital environments. Although many teachers are quite tech-savvy themselves, I would highly recommend that teachers go through the Google Classroom tutorial to familiarize themselves with its capabilities.

Google Classroom’s functions enable the teacher to display material, assignments, and grades clearly for the students, while also acting as an organizational resource for the teacher. Firstly, if you have multiple classes, you can have multiple Google Classrooms. The classes are clearly divided on the teacher’s homepage and can be navigated through a small icon that remains in the upper-left hand corner of the teacher’s Google Classroom window. Students are invited to join specific classrooms through the use of an email invitation and code, and once the students join the classroom their names and emails are logged into the teacher’s homepage.

Teachers can use an announcement box on each of their Google Classroom’s homepage to alert students of upcoming assignments, updates, or other related information helping to provide another avenue for students to see what is currently happening in class. On the same announcement function, teachers can post assignments, share a link, provide a YouTube clip, or share a file from the class’s very own Google Drive, which is created and assigned to the Google Classroom once the Google Classroom is made. Access to a class Google Drive allows for a place where students can find readings, assignments, PowerPoints, templates, videos and recordings, all of which do not need the Microsoft Office software which can be costly or incompatible with other software. However, Google Classroom still allows the teacher and students to upload Microsoft files. Lastly, Google Classroom enables teachers to grade assignments and post grades, a function that is found in most digital classrooms. From what I have presented, there seems to be a lot to manage on Google Classroom, but of course it is up to the teacher which elements to take advantage of.

Class Activities
There is plenty a teacher can do in terms of managing a class on Google Classroom, although Google Classroom still has to make improvements to become the ideal environment for student activities. Whereas the management of a classroom is teacher dependent, the activities are both teacher and student dependent. There is an abundant number of activities that can be done through Google Classroom, and this article attempts to be as inclusive as possible of how different language learning activities can be done through the Google Classroom environment.

Firstly, as mentioned earlier, each Google Classroom is connected to a Google Drive. Therefore, any activities done through Google Drive such as individual, collaborative or group activities can be accessed and turned in via Google Classroom. Examples of these would be a collaborative storytelling activity on Google Docs or a group presentation on Google Slides. Also, students have the ability to access the assignments folder within Google Classroom, download an assignment and then later upload it back to Google Classroom to be graded.

The announcement function that allows teachers to post assignments,
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web links, YouTube videos, etc., also allows students to comment on the teacher’s announcement or even make their own announcement and comment on other students’ postings. However, once many students begin to post announcements the classroom’s homepage quickly becomes cluttered and appears disorganized. This is one of the disadvantages I have recognized through my own use of Google Classroom in an ESL course. There is no distinct discussion board on Google Classroom, meaning that announcements are displayed by the date they are posted, rapidly becoming confusing for students and teachers alike. With only one page for announcements and the lack of distinct discussion forums, teachers have little ability to make Google Classroom a place for online discussion, something we often look for within digital environments.

Through my own use, I also recognized that students had little difficulty uploading written files but when they were required to upload videos or pictures, they immediately ran into technical complications. Where students may be able to view and access the teacher’s posting of various digital files, it is often much more difficult when students are required to do so.

Final Thoughts

Google Classroom clearly has several advantages in terms of class management; however, when it comes to teachers and students using the environment as a place for class activities some difficulties do arise. Can Google Classroom be beneficial for English language learners? I believe so. Through Google Classroom’s wide-range of functions and ability to adequately connect and make use of multiple digital resources there are nearly endless opportunities for teachers to take advantage of. Also, I do see Google Classroom becoming a dominant digit classroom environment in the near future. Its ability to connect with all other Google Apps such as Gmail and Google Drive expands its capabilities beyond many of the online interfaces currently used in education. Knowing the adaptive tendencies of Google Inc., positive changes will occur to address some of the limitations mentioned in this article, allowing for an even more convenient and easily operated resource for teachers to apply to their ELL classrooms.

Link to Google Classroom website: https://www.google.com/edu/products/productivity-tools/classroom/
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Although we may nod our heads at this collection of concepts, such knowledge is not particularly applicable to writing instruction. This is because these definitions are of a theoretical construct of thinking. As educators, we need a working definition of critical thinking that is context-bound and not over generalized. In other words, we want to know what critical thinking means in terms of our students’ essays, and thus, in terms of what and how we should be teaching. It is important to note that each geographical location, each educational institution, and even, perhaps, each classroom will have its own specific needs regarding critical thinking instruction. However, we can sketch out some rough guidelines for how to foster critical thinking within the broader context of academic writing in second language education.

Critical Thinking? Why?

First and foremost, we should start with the “Why.” Why is critical thinking required in academic writing? The primary goal of academic work is to move knowledge forward. When scholars contribute to pools of knowledge, they should write carefully, with a sense of responsibility because they are participating in a community effort to improve upon what the world knows. Teachers should continuously communicate with students, and clarify that the underlying purpose of writing an academic essay is to increase the knowledge and intelligence of themselves and others in a responsible manner. This means that scholars should apply significant time and effort to, and carefully consider what they read and write.

How do we facilitate Critical Thinking?

Obviously, there is more to critical thinking than just using a lot of time and energy to think. But how exactly do teachers foster the activity of critical thinking in the classroom?

“Consideration” implies that, in some form, you are thinking about what you currently do not notice or know. In other words, you are expanding your thinking, and you are exploring. Teachers can encourage students to think about things that they have not yet thought about by using such questions as:

- In what particular situations is this true? / When is it not true? Why?
- Who thinks this is true? / Who doesn’t think this is true? Why?
- If this happened in a different country, what would be different?
- If I were a different person, how might my opinion about this be different?

As demonstrated in the first two questions above, exploring opposites can be useful to “break out of the box.” Also, as demonstrated in the last two questions, adding a culture identity or a personal identity to the equation might start some new trains of thought.

For a more detailed example of how such questions might work in context, please see a previous issue of The Word (Tanaka, 2014). Teachers can facilitate critical thinking in the classroom by constantly encouraging exploratory and expansive thinking, and by conversely discouraging reductive thinking that seeks to conclude, and halt exploration. This does not mean that we aggressively stamp out all attempts to conclude things. It means that when we prepare to write, and while we are writing, we should prioritize our desire to ask questions and to know more. Popova (2012) provided an eloquent justification: “We know that it isn’t the clinging to answers, but the embracing of ignorance that drives science” (para. 1).

What do we expect from students?

For students writing an essay, the process of education and the learning which takes place during that process, are far more important than the end product of the essay. However, we can think of the essay as a necessary vehicle or structure that facilitates learning in the classroom. The essay allows teachers to explicitly evaluate the degree to which critical thinking successfully occurred during the course, and gives teachers an opportunity to give feedback. The most obvious way to evaluate critical thinking is to create a rubric, a scale for measuring the quality of critical thinking observed throughout the essay. While there have been attempts to create such scales, I feel that they are limited in terms of accuracy, generalizability, and potential to facilitate learning. Instead, a series of student-teacher communications (verbal or written) across several drafts and revisions, can provide the teacher with a richer understanding of students’ thinking processes, which leads to more accurate assessment and useful feedback. The focus of written comments or student-teacher conferences should be the evidence of exploration and expansion in the essay. Ideally, the teacher and student would cooperatively engage in the following steps:

- Highlight the various possibilities and perspectives explored in the essay.
- Discuss the extent to which the essay deeply explores these possibilities and perspectives, and decide if this is sufficient or not.
- Discuss what was learned from this exploration (what knowledge was created).

Conclusion

Fostering critical thinking in the writing classroom is a process, and the teacher must communicate with students the entire way. I have attempted to define critical thinking within the contexts of academic writing instruction as the exploration of possibilities and perspectives. I concede that the larger concept of critical thinking necessarily entails much more than this such as deductive reasoning. However, for our purposes, a focus on exploratory and expansive thought provides us with practical teaching points, and
clearly distinguishes critical thinking from non-critical, reductive thinking. This clear distinction and explanation is of the utmost importance when teaching L2 speakers of English because they are often from distinct cultural backgrounds, that have vastly different conceptions of critical thinking. As teachers, we need to explicitly communicate our expectations regarding critical thinking and our reasons for teaching it.
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Mission Impossible (Our Job)
By Juan Escalante and Mark James

At the core of all learning, according to Information-Processing Theory, is something like the following:

Input + Noticing → Intake + Internalizing + Output + Feedback = Learning (SLA)

This cognitive process does not occur in a vacuum however. One of the reasons not all second language learners are equally successful is that cognition is affected (positively and/or negatively) by many individual differences.

When reading research about second language acquisition, it is clear that teaching and learning a foreign language is very complex. The acquisition process for each individual is affected by his or her previous experiences, motivations, attitudes, strategies, age, L1 background, personality, and so on. Fortunately, what is also clear is that some factors are more important than others are, and we, as teachers, can have an influence on many of them.

One of the most important variables is metacognition. Anderson (2005) explained that once language learners develop metacognitive strategies and discover how to regulate their learning, the language acquisition process usually accelerates because they have become more conscious and strategic in their efforts. As teachers, we must help our students to think, reflect, and be critical of their language learning strategies.

Another factor is motivation. Traditionally, our field has focused on two different motivational orientations: Instrumental (language as a tool for work, or vehicle toward school admission, or job promotion), and Integrative (language for personal development and change). Whether integrative or instrumental, both types have proven successful in language learning (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). The important point is that high levels of motivation maintain the desire to learn, and as teachers, we must examine our motivational behaviors.

Age is perhaps beyond our influence. Some have hypothesized that there is a critical period for language acquisition and that changes in the brain have a debilitating effect on the acquisition of language over time. However, recent research indicated that older learners have several advantages. Grosjean (2013) argued that although older learners may have difficulties acquiring native-like pronunciation, many of them become very competent language users because of their ability to organize, focus, strategize, analyze, and so forth. As teachers, we must be aware of our students’ ages and tailor our instruction to meet their strengths and weaknesses.

Personality needs another look. Many have thought that extroverts are better at learning languages. A closer look at this variable revealed that different personalities are better at different competencies (e.g., literacy, pronunciation, vocabulary development). Again, it is our job is to help learners identify and maximize their best qualities, while developing others.

If this complexity were not already enough to make our professional lives seem more complicated than they already are, there is more bad news. This multitude of internal variables (or “individual differences” as they were traditionally called) are interconnected in a myriad of ways, best imagined by—a hairball. Gross, you say. Well . . . all other metaphors fail. A traffic jam results in no movement. A Gordian knot is something to be undone.
Mission Impossible (Our Job) . . . (continued)

Nevertheless, it does not stop there. The relatively recent “sociocultural turn” in our profession has led to the understanding that we cannot focus only on what is happening inside the learner. In reality, learners are constantly being affected by external variables: peers, resources, external exams, socio-politics, the economy, and so forth.

The learner’s family and peers is one of the most important external factors in second language acquisition. Learners are supported, pressured, and influenced by those around them. Close family and friends can bring great support or much stress. As teachers, we may not always have the opportunity to get our students’ family and peers involved in the learning process, but we should remain mindful and seek opportunities for positive involvement.

The place or location where our students are learning English is also a factor which greatly affects learning by influencing the input to which students will be exposed. In a foreign language context, teachers must constantly work to expose students to enough language input, as class time might be the only time they are exposed to English. In a second language environment, we must complement the exposure our students receive since exposure alone is not enough to notice or learn every-thing necessary to be a competent L2 speaker.

Culture and language overlap one another and this creates a challenge for many language learners. The challenge arises from differing practices, values, and expectations. Our own culture sets the tone as to how we interact with others. Accepting the relationship between culture and language as inseparable is essential for a successful language learner. Culture and language are very complex, and for many people the task of understanding and adjusting can be daunting. As teachers, we can find ways to break down the language and cultural barriers in order to help our learners.

Ultimately, even the hairball metaphor fails. Although it conveys a notion of innumerable pathways and touching points, it fails to incorporate a fourth dimension: time. From what we now know, the relationships and influences of these variables are dynamic and fluid. As teachers, we have always “known” this. (“Johnny” was on task minutes ago but now seems distracted. “Susan,” once your best student, has recently turned inward and uncooperative.) Dornyei (2009) summarized the parallel universes of research that have contributed to our understanding of these matters as effectively as anyone. Watson-Gegeo’s Language Socialization Approach (Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003) made it seem that nothing short of thick ethnographic longitudinal research will reveal what we need to know. This current state of things makes it seem almost impossible for even the best of teachers to succeed as they are making decisions about what to teach, when, and how.

However, on a more positive note, this fluid complexity supports Kumaravadivelu’s (2001) “post-method” assertion that no one else on the planet is in any better position than the teacher. Research can only discuss generalizations and principles. The “particularity” of the classroom, to use Kumaravadivelu’s term, demands that teachers (informed by principles, of course) be recognized and empowered in making the day-to-day, moment-to-moment decisions.

Hopefully, these thoughts have left you, as a teacher, stirred but not shaken. To conclude with a line from another movie, “Good luck, Jim, should you choose to accept this assignment. This article will self-destruct in 5 seconds.”

References


About the Authors:

Juan Escalante, is a TESOL Education major graduating in April 2015. He hopes to pursue a Master’s Degree in Applied Linguistics. Mark James is Professor of Second Language Acquisition in the Department of English Language Teaching & Learning at Brigham Young University–Hawaii, where he has taught since 1981.
A Teacher’s Flexibility in a Thai Classroom
By Hyungjung An

Introduction
From June 3 to July 23 in 2014, I taught English to Thai students for 8 weeks as part of a practicum for my M.A. in the Second Language Studies program. Based on the course description I was given before practicum, I was supposed to teach reading and speaking course to nursing students, but no information about their English proficiency level was available. Believing extensive reading (ER), which pursues pleasure in reading books written in easy vocabulary (Day & Bamford, 1998), is appropriate for Thai students, I developed a teaching plan to implement ER incorporating speaking.

On arrival in Thailand, I faced the sudden changes in class schedule and course as well as challenges with culture adjustment. I heard the classes were available only on Sunday due to nursing students’ internships in hospital, so I had to teach them for 6 straight hours every Sunday. I also had to teach TOEFL preparation course as a nursing department requested, abandoning the materials I had developed before Thai practicum. I prepared for a practice test of TOEFL for the first class assuming their English level was appropriate to take a TOEFL test. In the meantime, I planned to introduce ER to the nursing students and encourage them to read outside class.

Research Question
• How can I find a balance among the department/faculty’s needs, the students’ interests, and the teacher’s goals and intentions?
• How does extensive reading influence low English proficiency level of EFL learners’ attitude toward reading in English?

Findings
Finding Balance among Stakeholder Interests
I tried to sustain communication with both nursing department and students considering subtle cultural difference heedfully to balance main stakeholders’ needs. Acknowledging TOEFL was beyond students’ English level, I maintained academic writing activity in lieu of TOEFL reflecting nursing department’s need after negotiation with a vice dean of nursing faculty. I also implemented ER according to my faith as a teacher to pursue pleasure in learning. I carefully designed class activities referring to students’ reflection papers to monitor students’ changing needs after every class. Given that Thai students tend to be reluctant to express their honest opinions to avoid confrontation with a teacher in their cultural context, I had students to choose the most effective activities we had each class and write the reasons rather than speaking publicly not necessarily confronting a teacher.

Course Adjustment for 5-Week Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1 (6 hours)</th>
<th>Academic writing</th>
<th>ER or ER related activities</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>introduction activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>questionnaire (attitude in reading)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOEFL reading, speaking, writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 (6 hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td>predict the next scene (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>character description(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>both (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 (6 hours)</td>
<td>two paragraphs (body) writing (3)</td>
<td>vocabulary matching (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extensive reading (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 (6 hours)</td>
<td>one paragraph (body) Writing (2)</td>
<td>writing a letter to a character (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extensive reading (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5+6 (3 hours each)</td>
<td>one paragraph (body) writing (6)</td>
<td>character trait (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extensive reading (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning words in context(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number in parenthesis indicates the number of students who selected the activities as effective.

(Continued on page 17.)
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Negotiation with a Vice Dean of the Nursing Department

On the first day of class, I confirmed that their English proficiency was not sufficient for preparing for a TOEFL test. I thought I had to talk to someone in the Nursing Department and got the chance to talk to a Vice Dean of Nursing faculty during lunchtime on the first day of class. I asked her permission and recorded our talk. In the interview with her, I found that TOEFL was not a requirement for nursing students to graduate and the course I would be teaching did not count toward their credits. She also said that the nursing faculty had an exchange student program for three excellent nursing students to study in universities in Singapore, Indonesia, Laos, Cambodia, and the Philippines. She wanted me to help these three potential exchange students learn academic English so that they could study in foreign countries.

This meant that the TOEFL class was planned based on the nursing faculty’s decision, not the students’ needs. I tried to persuade her in a roundabout way by saying TOEFL appeared very boring to nursing students. Fortunately, the Vice Dean of Nursing was willing to accept my suggestion, so I was able to get permission to implement ER in the Thai classroom. I went one-step further to change the TOEFL preparation course to academic English. As such, we reached the consensus of teaching academic English, not necessarily TOEFL.

ER influence on low-level EFL learners’ attitudes toward reading in English

I examined how the nursing students had changed their attitude toward reading after five weeks by comparing a pre and post questionnaire when implementing ER, which was a different reading approach to what they had experienced before. According to the result of the pre questionnaire on attitude towards reading in English, five students responded that they liked reading, ten students checked ‘neither’ and one student did not enjoy reading. I encouraged nursing students to borrow graded readers and read them at home from the first day of class. From the third class, I had them choose and read the books in class as well. Most students showed a positive attitude towards ER in the post questionnaire. Ten students changed their attitude toward reading positively whereas one student changed her attitude negatively. Those who changed their attitudes positively explained that the reason was that the interesting stories in the books were beneficial for improving their English. On the contrary, students who answered ‘neither’ to the question attributed the reason to difficult vocabulary in the books. The Thai students’ insufficient vocabulary was a main obstacle keeping them from reading with pleasure. More graded readers with a variety of interesting stories written in easier English appeared to motivate Thai students to continue reading.

Implication and Conclusion

My action research has implication for not only educators teaching abroad but also to instructors currently teaching students from various cultural backgrounds. The research shows why understanding different cultural and social factors are crucial to understanding the students’ needs in the different cultures.

This study has considerable limitation in that the whole period of class lasted only five weeks with only six whole class sessions, and it can be rarely generalized to a normal classroom. Yet, action research is ‘pragmatic’ when addressing researchers’ or teachers’ issues or concerns efficaciously. From a practitioner’s perspective it encourages him or her to cope with the problems as a professional teacher (Hyland, 2002, p. 150). The daunting situation that I faced was reality, and I had to explore how I could address this problem as both a teacher and a researcher in a different culture. This was feasible only in the realm of action research.

Finally, I argue that teachers must have authority in course development regardless of the different culture in which they work. I have highlighted how a teacher’s understanding of different cultures influenced their teaching, but tolerance to different cultures may be put aside when it comes to course development because teachers are the ones who have professional knowledge in teaching their students, and administrators ought to acknowledge the teacher’s knowledge and give authority.
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English as a Third Language: Reading Strategy Questionnaire
Dr. Gonzalo Isidro Bruno

What happens when bilingual/bicultural learners embark in the learning of English as a third language (EL3)? Will they transfer their second language (L2) literacy skills into the third language? Current research supports the notion that most L3 learners have the potential to transfer or adapt such skills while engaging in reading processes in a third language (Alsheik, 2011; Fitzgerald, 2003; Isidro, 2002; Jessner, 2006; Jessner and Cenoz, 2007; Razi, 2008). The key to successful crosslinguistic transfer is to raise awareness in emerging trilinguals of the fact that skill transfer is possible. Such awareness can be metalinguistic, cognitive and or metacognitive before, during, and after reading a text in the third language. In this article, L3 learning and L3 literacy development are treated as two very connected phenomena.

A larger number of individuals who use two languages to move in and out of two cultures and who sometimes are schooled in two languages or more is increasingly being acknowledged around the world. Being bilingual/bicultural/biliterate cannot only be described as an accomplished static ability of using two languages, but also as a dynamic set of skills/competencies along multiple continuums while using two languages.

Hornberger (2010) proposes 12 interconnected continua of biliteracy in four categories in which a learner is located at varying points:

1. context of biliteracy (micro/macro context, oral/literate, bi(multi)lingual/monolingual),
2. development of biliteracy (receptive/productive, oral/written, L1/L2),
3. content of biliteracy (minority/majority, vernacular/literary, contextualized/decontextualized), and
4. media of biliteracy (simultaneous exposure/sequential exposure, dissimilar structures/similar structures, divergent scripts/convergent scripts).

Similarly at any given point, a L3 learner/reader can be at 12 points in the continua of biliteracy as she/he embarks in the L3 journey. Rather than focusing on the variation, let us investigate what strengths biliterate readers bring to the table.

Emerging trilinguals have the potential to strategically position themselves at various points in their 12 continua of literacy in each of their languages. Their L3 repertoire of skills and competencies can be expanded by the fact that they have already been at various points in their two initial languages. It is true that in many cases, bilingual/bicultural/biliterate individuals are not fully aware of the range of skills that they have already mastered during their cognitive development in school, the streets, or at home. So it is imperative to bring them to the realization that L3 can be easier if they are fully aware of what they, as trilingual readers/learners, do. This awareness is called metacognitive, and it goes beyond the awareness of using multiple languages.

By the time bilingual individuals undertake the study of English (as a foreign or new language in the case of recent immigrants), they are already ahead of the game by the simple fact of being emerging biliterate.

The Assessment Instrument
Have you ever thought that now more than ever there are more learners of English as a third language in Hawaiian classrooms? I would strongly suggest that you ask all your new students once they join your classes. Cognitive/Metacognitive reading instructions has been shown to be useful to all developing readers (Berkowitiz, 2004). In particular, once you identify L3 learners, there are ways for you to be supportive of their specific learning conditions.

I propose the use of a shortened Trilingual Reading Strategy Questionnaire to help L3 learners improve their performance. This is a simplified version of a longer questionnaire published in 2006 (Isidro). The aim of the questionnaire is to identify the frequency with which cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies are used by L3 readers. Reading strategies are purposeful actions or procedures that readers use when reading in any language.

See insert for the questionnaire.

Analysis
There are a number of ways to analyze the collected data to make it available to teachers who have student with English as an L3. One is to review the answers so that the teacher can have a personalized profile of the L3 students. Two is to determine which students are less or more aware of what they do while reading. Three is to sit down and discuss their answers with them.

Instructors can save paper by running these questions in a Google survey or a similar online site. They can keep track of how many EL3 readers they have over the years in terms of their individual profiles.

Discussion and Interpretation of Results
Question 1 addresses both reader motivation and interest while reading in each of the languages. It could be that what a reader reads in the L1 or L2 is mostly what they are intrinsically interested in. Conversely what they read in their newest language is not something that they select, but what they are told to read. However, it could be that L3 readers of English are genuinely interested in this new language.

Questions 2 to 9 address specifically skills and behaviors at the cognitive level (making associations, identifying key words, reread or confirm information, use titles, pictures or diagrams, deduce or infer, translate, summarize or recap information).

(Continued on page 19.)
Questions 10 to 14 address the metacognitive strategies that are used by readers. These strategies are utilized when a reader purposefully monitor their comprehension and level of success of the reading task itself (anticipate/predict content, reflect on what to do to improve reading, stop to check on comprehension, be aware of reading challenges and use reading strategies across languages).

Recommendations

Raising EL3 reader awareness by using a questionnaire is a simple way to align several goals at hand: to support crosslinguistic strategy transfer, to provide English teachers with individualized ways to diversify emerging L3 readers’ strategy use, and to enhance multiliteracy in the classrooms.

As Fitzgerald (2003) has indicated, multiliteracy should be grounded on current multilingual reading theories and educational approaches. “Using metacognitive assessments to create individualized reading instruction” (Israel, 2007) can be extremely useful to support multiliteracy in trilingual readers. Furthermore, Jessner (2008) has reviewed and confirmed the key role of metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness in multilingual learning. The remaining task is to enable English teachers to bring this awareness into their classrooms as has been suggested by Gallaway (2003).
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(Dog: “You really need to work on your pronunciation!”)
Retrieved from https://translatorslife.wordpress.com/2011/05/20/trilingual-dog-business-card-on-steroids/
On November 6, 2014, the Big Island Hawai‘i TESOL chapter, in association with the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo (UHH) Pacific Islander Student Center (PISC), hosted its annual professional development event. This year’s focus was on the academic success of Pacific Islander students. With a student panel comprised of both UHH and Hawai‘i CC students, an audience of approximately 50 participants took advantage of the opportunity to learn how Hawai‘i Island educators can better understand, support, and address the academic needs of Pacific Islander students.

Several participants noted that the session provided insightful information that would help them become better teachers. For example, Mary Gorman wrote, “I really enjoyed this session. How encouraging it was to see such passionate young men and women in our community. They have an ambition to learn and a respect for their culture. I appreciate the UHH students’ candor in sharing their experiences as an ELL student in our public school system. It will help me become a better teacher.” The panel discussion also included themes about early support for reading, promoting multicultural clubs and events, and being aware of the differences between college and K-12 expectations.

About the Author: Carrie B. Mospens teaches at Hawai‘i Community College.
Recent Political Activities about English Language Learners in Hawai’i
By Shawn Ford

In the first few months of 2015, there has been more political activity about English Language Learners (ELLs) in the state of Hawai’i than we have seen in many years. Within one month, teacher licensing to better support ELLs, education policy to recognize and support ELLs, and a state bill to support biliteracy have all been proposed and discussed.

Hawai’i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB)

On Wednesday January 14, 2015, I represented Hawai’i TESOL on a panel sponsored by the Hawai’i Teachers Standards Board (HTSB), which was charged with reviewing the current K-12 teacher licenses offered in the state and making recommendations for additions, deletions and/or changes. Of special interest to Hawai’i TESOL was the inclusion of TESOL in the review of the current licensing system.

Also included on the panel were 2 HTSB directors, 4 members from UH Manoa’s College of Education (elementary education ESL specialist, elementary education director, special education director, and Hawaiian education director), 3 special education teachers, 1 HSTA (Hawai’i State Teachers’ Association) representative, 2 DOE administrators, and 1 Hawaiian immersion charter school representative.

I made comments and provided opinions about one specific agenda item related to TESOL: Should the TESOL license for secondary education require an additional content area?

Currently, the most common pathway to TESOL licensure in the state is completion of a BA in TESOL, followed by completion of a post-bac certificate in TESOL. This amount of coursework is almost equivalent to a masters degree (about one semester short). These licensed teachers can then seek jobs in 6-12 schools. I personally know of only a few teachers who have gone this route and who are currently teaching in DOE high schools.

However, in many schools, these teachers wind up teaching in sheltered content programs, teaching content that they are not highly qualified to teach. For example, they may teach sheltered English, History, Math or Science courses (meaning only ELL students in the class, developing English while learning a content area for graduation requirements) with only a TESOL degree and license. Conversely, highly qualified content area teachers wind up teaching in sheltered content classes when they have little to no background in TESOL. So, ideally, highly qualified teachers for ELLs in secondary should have a BA in a specific content area (as opposed to a BA in TESOL) and a Post-Bac certificate in TESOL, especially if they are teaching sheltered content, and as it is increasingly being recognized, even if they are teaching in traditional pull-out ESL programs, which then, in effect, become more like sheltered content programs. So, dual licensure is a national trend that makes sense for the best development of ELLs.

My comments were that a dual licensure requirement does make sense, particularly given the modern trend in TESOL toward content-based instruction and sheltered content instruction. Also, having teachers who are dually licensed in TESOL and a content area would solve some of the problems of unqualified teachers working with ELLs. Additionally, dual licensure would help make teacher candidates more marketable in the DOE and more flexible for job security.

However, I pointed out that a strict requirement of dual licensure might be too restrictive. Some schools have traditional pull-out programs and/or newcomer ESL programs, neither of which absolutely need teachers who are dually licensed in TESOL and content areas. These programs need coordinators and teachers who are highly qualified primarily in TESOL. I also pointed out the problem of not having enough positions available in the first place for ESL teachers.

although there definitely is high need for them given the number of ELLs in the state system (currently @ 13.5%, Hawai’i is ranked 4th in the nation). If there are few positions for ESL teachers in the DOE, then few candidates will seek this type of licensure. But, if the HTSB requires specific licenses for specific positions (distinguishing between sheltered content instruction and pull-out or newcomer programs) and if the DOE requires teachers who have these qualification to be hired into these positions, it would force schools to create the positions and hire the teachers to avoid being non-compliant. So, while there is a need from a student learning perspective, there is no policy from above that’s forcing the issue. The HTSB representatives responded that the board cannot enforce hiring policies; its function is to manage the system of teacher licenses that are available. Hiring is the responsibility of the DOE.

Another member of the panel asked if currently practicing ESL teachers would be impacted by having to get licensed in a content area if they are not already licensed. The HTSB reps responded that NO, that is generally not the case, at least in the short term, until the teacher is up for licensure renewal, at which time they may be given a professional development plan to help them get the new qualification.

In the end, the panel decided that since the HTSB already has a standalone TESOL license for secondary education, and it allows secondary-level content teachers to add a TESOL license and secondary-level TESOL teachers to add a content area license, then forcing all TESOL teachers at the secondary level to also be licensed in an additional content area would be too restrictive.

Another interesting bit of news that came out of this discussion was that the College of Education at UH Manoa is creating an Elementary Ed – Dual Prep in ESL degree, which would allow for licensing TESOL teachers at the elementary level. There currently is no TESOL licensing pathway for elementary teachers in the state. This degree will be launched fall 2016.

**Board of Education (BOE)**

There was a Board of Education meeting on Tuesday, January 20, 2015. Community members presented written and oral testimony on issues around ELLs in Hawai’i to help the BOE formulate an ELL policy.

**Mission:**

To ensure the Hawai’i public school system provides an excellent and equitable education for multilingual learners. We believe all students in Hawai’i deserve the opportunity for an equitable education and that all students in Hawai’i contribute to the cultural richness of our home state.

**Rationale:**

There is currently no language in education policy that specifically targets multilingual/ELL education in Hawai’i, which means there is a need to provide a comprehensive and research-based vision and practices for schools to ensure all students have the opportunity for an excellent education. Multilingual/ELL learners currently make up 13.5% of the student population and the number is growing. According to the DOE 2013 Achievement data, 46% of ELLs were proficient in English language arts and 41% proficient in math, which is significantly below the 72% proficiency ratings in English language arts and 60% in math of all students.

The community was invited to share their voices to illustrate the impact a language in education policy focused on ELLs would have on their children’s education and to show their support on this issue. This was an important step in engaging the community in developing a culturally and community responsive policy that will meet the language needs of ELLs.

**My Testimony:**

I believe the education of our state’s ELLs is a seriously important issue because many ELLs in Hawai’i DOE schools are not receiving adequate support for their English language or content area development. Current ELL census data coupled with current ELL success data are testament to the importance of this issue. A comprehensive survey of Hawai’i DOE schools would clearly show that many ELL programs (“pull-out” classes) are coordinated and staffed by licensed teachers or even unlicensed part-time teachers who are not adequately qualified to teach their ELLs, and that many K-6 classroom teachers and 6-12 content area teachers who have ELLs in their classrooms (so-called “inclusion” classrooms) are not adequately qualified to teach their ELLs. The DOE’s own policies require any ELL coordinator or teacher to have at least 12 credits of ELL training in her/his portfolio, and any K-12 teacher with any ELLs in her/his classroom to have a minimum of 6 credits of ELL training. Not only do many teachers in the state not meet these minimal requirements, but even when they do, the DOE’s 6/12 credit minimal training requirement is woefully inadequate compared to the need.

The DOE can begin to change the current state of ELL education by doubting its minimum ELL training requirement to at least 12 credits for every K-12 teacher who has ELLs in her/his classroom and 24 credits for every ELL coordinator or teacher. Ideally, the DOE should follow the lead of other states and require ELL coordinators and teachers to have degrees (B.A.s or M.A.s) and licenses in TESOL, and require other K-12 teachers who have ELL students to have certifications or endorsements specifically for working with ELLs. TESOL certifications or endorsements may require HTSB approval, but it can be done, just as it has been done in much larger states.

With these rigorous requirements in place, the DOE then must uphold its own policies regarding appropriate training for its teachers who work with ELLs, when making hiring and promotion decisions. Schools must be accountable for creating positions to support ELLs and staffing those positions with teachers who meet the minimum requirements. Only when the entire K-12 education
Recent Political Activities . . . (continued)
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establishment in Hawai‘i realizes the grave situation that it’s in regarding ELL education will the situation improve.

Hawai‘i State Legislature

There is a draft of a new bill winding its way through the state legislature that provides for a mechanism to award high school graduates with a Seal of Biliteracy, indicating that they are bilingual to a certain level in English and another "foreign" language. The bill references the fact that other states have already approved such a seal. Here is the link to the text of the bill.

http://www.capitol.Hawai‘i.gov/session2015/bills/SB900_.HTM

This is yet another good opportunity to lobby and advocate for our ELLs in the DOE by pointing out the gaping hole in this bill where immigrant languages should be. In other words, many of our immigrant students arrive already literate in a "foreign language", and they develop biliteracy in our DOE schools by learning English, which is taught by ESL teachers.

Therefore, these immigrant students should be acknowledged by this bill as well and have a mechanism to get a seal of biliteracy as well after meeting their English requirements. There doesn't seem to be a specific mechanism for awarding non-English speakers a seal of biliteracy. The emphasis is on native English speakers who learn foreign languages.

Hawai‘i TESOL Testimony:

Hawai‘i TESOL is writing today to express support for the proposed bill that will establish the Hawai‘i State Seal of Biliteracy, which will be affixed to certificates of recognition awarded to graduating students who attain proficiency in English and at least one other language. Such a distinction will promote the development and maintenance of literacy in two or more languages and recognize the rich and diverse language assets of Hawai‘i’s DOE students. It will better position the students and the state for the economic and cross-cultural needs of our globalized world.

It is the assumption of Hawai‘i TESOL that immigrant students, who enter Hawai‘i’s DOE schools with first languages other than English and who achieve proficiency in English while maintaining or continuing to develop proficiency in their first languages by graduation, are subsumed under this bill. However, the proposed bill seems to focus primarily on the study of world languages in elementary and secondary schools as the means to achieve biliteracy. Therefore, Hawai‘i TESOL strongly encourages the following additions to the proposed bill:

- Addition of language in Section 1 of the bill explicitly recognizing the importance of the world language resources that immigrant English Language Learner (ELL) students bring with them to Hawai‘i’s DOE schools;
- Addition of language in Section 2 (c) to recognize and promote the continual development of the first languages of immigrant students as a means of achieving biliteracy; an
- Addition of a subsection (E) to Section 2 (d) (2) that reads “Demonstrating first language proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing, in a language other than English, as certified by the student’s high school to the superintendent.

With these additions, we believe S.B. 900 will be clearer of its inclusion of immigrant students and the unique process of their language development, thereby addressing all of the possible pathways to the State Seal of Biliteracy in the Hawai‘i DOE. Hawai‘i TESOL would be happy to provide additional comments on a revised bill and testimony supporting its passing.

About the Author: Shawn Ford works at Kapi‘olani Community College and is the Socio-Political Action Chair of Hawai‘i TESOL. He can be reached at sford@hawaii.edu.
Who’s Who at Hawai‘i TESOL

Elected Positions
President: Mark Wolfersberger
Vice President: Neil Anderson
Membership Secretary: Perry Christensen
Treasurer: pending
Program Committee: Priscilla Faucette
Socio-Political Action Chair: Shawn Ford
The Word Newsletter Editor: Lisa Kawai
Members at Large: Stephen Peridore

Big Island Liaisons: Carrie Mospens, Julie Mowrer

Board Appointer Positions
Conference Chair: Neil Anderson
HITESOL / TESOL Ukraine Liaison: Jean Kirschenmann, pending
Social Media Chair: Perry Christensen
Webmaster: pending

Who’s Who at Hawai‘i TESOL

If you are interested in becoming an executive committee member, please go to the HITESOL website to see what opportunities are available and contact Mark Wolfersberger at <maw44@byuh.edu always>. The committee is happy to hear from interested people and welcome new members aboard.

Submission to The Word

Topics
We welcome any topic which would be of interest to HITESOL members or ESL professionals in Hawai‘i. We are interested in, for example: recommended internet sites (or a tech type column), book reviews, a grad student’s perspective, field trips/learning outside the classroom, reports from members working overseas, content-based teaching ideas, using video and music in the classroom, online teaching, CALL, a “gripes” column, DOE news/concerns, K-12 news, neighbor island news, applying theory to practice, interview with someone in the field, etc. This list is by no means exhaustive. Please feel free to send any articles about these topics or others that you consider interesting to ESL educators in Hawai‘i. (You do not have to be a member of HITESOL to submit an article).

Format & Style
Articles should be no more than 4 pages, double-spaced, Times New Roman font, 12 point, attached as an MS Word document. Accompanying photos or clip art are optional but welcome. Please also include a short biography statement about the author (email address optional). In general, articles are written in a fairly informal, non-scholarly style. Please refer to previous issues of The Word to get a sense of the types of articles which appear in the newsletter, or contact the editors with questions.

Submission Deadlines
Please note that the next deadline for submissions will be posted on the website.

Please submit the articles via E-Mail to Lisa Kawai at ikawai@hpu.edu

We look forward to receiving your submissions.

The Word Newsletter Committee: Lisa Kawai

Up Coming Events

March: TESOL International Convention & English Language Expo
Date: March 25-28
Location: Toronto, Canada

April: Business Meeting & Highlights from TESOL International Convention
Date: TBA
Location: TBA

The annual business meeting serves multiple purposes: to hear from members who attend the International TESOL Convention, to reflect on HITESOL’s year of events with reports from board members, and finally to elect new officers to serve on the executive board. Have you been thinking about getting more involved with HITESOL? This is your opportunity to step up and join the 2015-2016 executive board. Please join us—all members are welcome.

May: Language Experience (Target Language TBA)
Date: TBA
Location: TBA

Don’t miss our final event of the year: it is always a crowd pleaser. The language experience introduces a lesser-known language through a “mini” lesson by a native or fluent speaker, allowing participants to sample a new language and culture. Audience members have fun attempting an unfamiliar tongue and are reminded of what it is like to be the student instead of the teacher. Recent languages have included Vietnamese and Chuukese. Target language for 2015? Stay tuned.
Trilingual Reading Strategy Questionnaire

Circle the option that best fits what you do when reading in each of your languages.

In order to improve reading comprehension of a text . . .

1. Do you usually read most texts with the same level of interest or involvement?
   - L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

2. How often do you make associations with other books (remember other stories in other books) you have previously read?
   - L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

3. How often do you identify key words in a text?
   - L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

4. How often do you intentionally reread or go back in the text when you are having trouble understanding or to confirm what you understood?
   - L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

5. How often do you use the title (subtitles), pictures or diagrams in a text to help you make sense of the reading?
   - L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

6. How often do you deduce information (or the meaning of a word) from the context of the text?
   - L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

7. How often do you infer information from the context of the text?
   - L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   - L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
8. How often do you translate certain words, phrases, or sentences to one of your other languages while reading a new text?
   L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

9. How often do you summarize or recap while reading a long text?
   L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
   L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

10. How often do you make predictions or anticipate what is going to happen or to be next in the text?
    L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

11. How often do you reflect about what to do to help you read better?
    L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

12. Do you stop reading from time to time to check if you are understanding the text?
    L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

13. Are you aware that you might encounter reading challenges?
    L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always

14. Are you aware that you might use one of your other languages or a skill you use in another language to help you understand a text?
    L1 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L2 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always
    L3 Don’t know  Not Usually  Sometimes  Often  Always