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Welcome to the Fifth Issue of Texas English Language Teaching (TexELT)

With the fifth issue, TexELT has become almost “venerable” now. This issue features an article by a North Texas school administrator, one by a faculty member of a university in South Korea, and one by two faculty members of a university in China and a faculty member of a university in East Texas. For all but one of the authors, this is their first peer-reviewed publication. One of the articles focuses on improving content area instruction provided to English learners in a Texas middle school with a large ELL populations. Such instruction is often provided by teachers who have not had significant preparation to teach ELL students. Another article provides guidance for teachers preparing to teach English as a foreign or additional language in South Korea or who teach students from Korea in other countries. The third article involves the motivation of Chinese students of English in Intensive English Programs (IEPs) in the USA. Please take time to read the authors’ biographies along with the articles to see how in spite of diverse professional settings and learning needs, common concerns bring our efforts together to seek the best learning opportunities for the ESL and EFL students we teach or prepare others to teach.

The TexELT publications team this year, as last year, included our Publications Copy Coordinator, Dr. Jeyashree (Jey) Venkatesan, another TexTESOL V Board member, Les Brinkerhoff, who served as a reviewer, and TexTESOL V member, Dr. Lana Sloan, who served as a second stage editor with strengths in copy editing, including in-depth experience with the details of APA format. As previously, our talented and hard-working primary content reviewer and former TexTESOL V Board member, Margaret Redus, made essential major commitments early on and throughout the editing process as our primary content reviewer and as the primary content editor. She persevered through several revisions to guide the authors in shaping their manuscripts so that their messages would be clear, understandable, and useful for the professional purposes of our readership. For final stage copy editing issues, we continued to rely on our TexTESOL V Board Publications Copy Coordinator Dr. Jeyashree Venkatesan. Thus once again, I had the good fortune to bring these talented individuals together with our authors to produce a valuable contribution to our profession.

--Rita Deyoe-Chiullan, Ph. D., Publications Coordinator, TexTESOL V and Editor, TexELT, 5(1).
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Introduction to the Contents of This Issue

For the publications team at TexELT, every year brings the joy of new perspectives, new findings, and new recommendations. Once our submissions are accepted, we actively engage with our authors in a number of exchanges of drafts as their articles are shaped for our global audience. In the process, we editors form cyber-friendships with our authors as we press together toward the deadline. At times this particular summer, several authors persevered with professional determination, while also dealing with unexpected outside crises, to hone their experiences/research/findings to share. To all of our authors, we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude for presenting their work to benefit our readership of professionals within the English Language Teaching community.

In our first article, authored by Dr. Chauncey Reese, readers gain a first-hand look at the search of an administrator for an effective approach to collaborative teacher training that will also support the needs of ELLs in content area classes. Dr. Reese serves as Dean of Instruction at a middle school in Texas that is considered low-performing, and his charge is to facilitate improvement in student performance there, especially vis-à-vis the state benchmarking exams. He explains in careful detail the steps he took to implement the Lesson Study Collaborative Model (LSCM) approach with a cluster of content area teachers who serve the same group of students. Procedures are thoroughly documented for those who might wish to replicate his work and add further to the limited body of research in this area.

A different perspective in the arena of English Language Teaching is offered by Mark Anderson, a professor at the University of Ulsan in South Korea where he teaches a variety of courses in English and English Conversation. Mr. Anderson reports on the “English Fever” in education in Korea and offers helpful background to EFL instructors who may be interested in teaching in Korean schools. His discussion will also benefit any English language teachers with Korean students. In his article, Mr. Anderson outlines the economic and cultural conditions behind the demand for skill in English, describes major differences between Hangeul (Korean) and English, and discusses the university environment and what incoming EFL instructors there should expect. Finally, he gives specific examples of ways he employs the Communicative Language Techniques (CLT) approach in his work with his students.

Our third article reports on a research study conducted by Juan Xu and Zhaoling Sun, EFL professors at Wuhan University in China, together with their exchange program liaison, Dr. Teresa Kennedy, at the University of Texas at Tyler, during their two-semester stay at U.T.-Tyler. Through the development and administration of a survey among adult students in an American IEP (Intensive English Program), they investigated factors that motivated these students in the important process of learning English vocabulary. Findings and recommendations from their analysis are reported in terms of feedback given to the students’ instructors. The useful examples included will also benefit other teachers in similar teaching situations.

We close this volume with a review by Dr. Rita Deyoe-Chiullán of three books with unique qualities that will be of value to many ESL and EFL students, teachers, and administrators.

--Margaret Redus, M.L.A., Primary Content Reviewer and Content Editor for TexELT 5(1).
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Impact of Collaborative Lesson Study for Content Area Teachers of English Language Learners*

by

Chauncey D. Reese, Ed.D.
Sam Houston High School
Arlington, Texas

Abstract

This case study examined the use of the lesson study collaborative planning model (LSCPM) by junior high school content area teachers. The teachers chosen for this study were not certified for English as a Second Language (ESL). The purpose of the study was to determine the effectiveness of this model in helping English language learners (ELLs) access course content when their content area teachers were not trained in ELL instructional strategies. Research questions addressed the dynamics and impact of lesson planning for the different language proficiencies as teachers met in interdisciplinary meetings and participated in lesson study implementation. Analysis of multiple classroom observations and reflections of participating instructors were used to generate patterns. Findings indicated that implementation of lesson study facilitated professional growth of the teachers through exposure to the instructional practices of peers and shared understandings of lesson planning. Lesson study implementation also provided teachers structure and focus to prepare learning outcomes for ELLs. Impact on the ELLs’ understanding of the science material was less definitive, though teachers reported positive impacts on their instructional practice in the areas of lesson planning and linguistic differentiation.

Key Words: Lesson study, secondary ELLs, lesson planning, job-embedded professional learning

*This research was done as a Doctor of Education program requirement for Walden University and was revised and expanded as an article for this publication.
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Introduction

For almost two decades, research has indicated a concerning national trend. ELLs are largely being taught in content area classrooms by teachers who have not received training in specific language approaches for meeting the needs of ELLs (New York Appleseed, 2016). Secondary teachers work in departmentalized, subject-driven classrooms and perceive their roles as being independent from—rather than part of—the whole academic system of shared responsibility (Huang, 2004). Typically, secondary lesson planning occurs by department, not in a cross-curricular manner. Teachers within the same course or level create the learning experiences of that course or level independent of conversations or contributions from other content areas. Increasingly diverse student populations yielding classrooms of learners with varying language proficiencies create an immediate need for content area teachers to be trained in methodologies and strategies that make content more comprehensible to ELLs. Huang (2004) described the instructional climate of many secondary schools in this way: language arts teachers are responsible for literacy instruction, and content area teachers are responsible for the mathematics, science, and social studies (p. 97).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this case study was to investigate whether the lesson study collaborative model could be effective as a collegial instructional strategy for content area teachers who instruct ELLs within the general population of their classes. In this study, the content area teachers were teachers of record for math, science, English, and social studies. The content teachers comprised a cross-curricular team, which focused on supporting the science teachers and science content. The campus instructional coach for math/science, who was ESL certified, already served each academic team as an ad hoc member. The instructional coach’s role was to serve as the content and ESL strategist in the lesson planning. The instructional coach provided each team access to resources and strategies for lesson delivery when the team stalled on their own efforts. The researcher also wanted to determine the impact the lesson study model would have on ELLs’ learning as measured by standardized tests, retention, and subsequent graduation from high school.

With an understanding of how teacher collaboration enhances cross-curricular goals, ELLs may benefit from instruction that is inclusive of multiple exposures to academic vocabulary and concepts across content areas. The following research questions guided the study:

1. In what ways does interdepartmental teaming support or not support ELL students’ understanding of the science curriculum?
2. In team lesson planning conducted in this study, what kinds of specialized instruction for ELL students are discussed and developed?
3. How do the content area teachers involved describe the effects of lesson study collaboration on their instructional practice in general?
4. How do the teachers describe the effects of lesson study collaboration on the academic performance of their ELL students?
Conceptual Framework

This study was grounded in two paradigms that are used to support instructional collaboration: the cooperative learning model and lesson study collaborative planning (Ledlow, 1999; Sachs, Candlin, & Rose, 2003; Smith, Teemant, & Pinnegar, 2004; Stewart & Brendefur, 2005). The cooperative learning model was chosen because it provides the basis and benefits of collaboration for students. The lesson study collaborative planning model was selected because it provides a framework for collaboration among teachers. The approaches were combined to determine their effectiveness in increasing the academic performance of ELL junior high students. Thorough research of the effectiveness of these approaches provided the basis for their selection for use in this study and will be discussed further in the literature review section.

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is defined as a group activity in which learning by both the group and the individuals is dependent on a social structure of information exchange (Olsen & Kagan, 1992). The learning experience is shared through pre-assigned member roles such as facilitator, note taker, reporter, time keeper, etc. Demonstration of learning is the responsibility of the group, not of the individuals. In this study, the dynamics of cooperative learning formed the framework for the collaborative lesson planning work among the content area teachers. The teachers’ communication and development of lesson plans occurred solely in group settings. Furthermore, all instruction and its observation occurred in team settings. Finally, the discussion of individual reflections occurred collectively.

Lesson Study Collaborative Planning Model

Lesson study is characterized by a seven-step process, which is led by a group of teachers. The first step is the formation of an academic team, either content-based or cross-curricular. In step two, the team determines an instructional focus. Step three is development of a collaborative lesson plan using input from all members. In step four, the teachers determine the specific aspects of the lesson that will be observed and noted. During step five, one member of the team teaches the lesson while the other members observe. Step six is a team-debrief to consolidate notes from observation sessions. Finally, step seven is the process by which members reflect on the lesson outcomes and determine by consensus whether the lesson should be retaught with instructional changes or the observed teacher should continue on to the next lesson (Richardson, 2004; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999). In this study, the seven steps formed the structure for collaborative work among the teachers.

Literature Review

Cooperative Learning

Birthed in the social psychological research of the 1920s, cooperative learning did not receive its classroom application until the 1970s (Sachs et al., 2003). Depicted as a group activity organized in such a way that learning is dependent upon a social structure of information exchange between learners in groups (Olsen & Kagan, 1992), cooperative learning has been globally adopted as an instructional technique and an area of interest by teachers and researchers (Sachs et al., 2003).
Cooperative learning embodies the sociocultural perspectives of learning according to Smith et al. (2004)—these views are as follows:

1. Knowledge is cultural understanding and competent participation.
2. Learning is social.
3. Teaching is assisting.
4. Performance is situative.

When used as a learning tool, Smith et al. (2004) indicates cooperative learning has strong impact on student achievement as well as increased motivation and improved social interactions with adults and peers. The documented educational benefits of cooperative learning in various academic settings show positive impact on teaching and learning (Liang, 2004). For teachers, the social aspect of collaboration is the arena in which the individual constructs personal understanding and negotiation of shared meanings (Smith et al., 2004). Due to the cohesiveness and vitality that group work creates, there is an interdependence among group members that triggers changes from individuals to whole group and vice versa (Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2000). Another advocate of cooperative learning is Jones (2007). He notes that the interchange of expertise and experience shows new instructional options to teachers. Participants experience what Jones describes as “positive teacher talk” (p. 2).

**Lesson Study**

The term “lesson study” is a translation of the Japanese words *jugyou kenkyuu*. Originating in Japanese pedagogy and professional learning, the lesson study model was introduced to the United States educational community by Stigler and Hiebert in 1999 (Lewis, Perry, & Murata, 2006). According to Chokshi and Fernandez (2005), the lesson study process begins with teachers developing one goal within one content area. The lesson study model is characterized by groups of teachers who meet regularly to work on lesson design implementation, testing, and improvement (Stigler & Hiebert, 1999). Figure 1 graphically depicts the lesson study collaborative model, which is characterized by the following steps: formation of team, focus of study, plan of study, preparation for observation, teaching and observation of lesson, debriefing after lesson, and reflection on lesson and progress (Richardson, 2004; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999).

The lesson study model is a reciprocal process of constantly reviewing and revising lessons until a team’s desired articulated goal is reached.

![Lesson Study Diagram]

*Figure 1. The lesson study model illustrating the reciprocal nature of the process of planning, teaching, evaluating, and reteaching a specific, collaboratively planned lesson.*
Lesson study begins with team formation. Teachers are recruited based on those who worked with similar groups of students. One member of each group, usually an individual not teaching at the campus, is designated the “knowledgeable other” (Richardson, 2004, p. 3). This expert can be an instructional specialist, a college professor, a retired teacher, or a member of the community. This person brings an objective, student-centered view to the team. Once the team has been established, the teachers decide upon the objective that is to be taught. After the problem or targeted objective has been articulated, teachers begin actual planning. This planning is where the majority of the team’s work occurs. Individual teachers contribute their expertise and experiences in creating the lesson. Teachers share strategies, what they know about particular students they share, and if applicable, resources to meet the learning objective (Richardson, 2004, p. 3).

In planning, members begin sharing about lesson experiences with the topic. By consciously thinking like their students, they pose questions that frame a lesson that anticipates students’ responses. Lessons include four parts: steps of the lesson, student activities, teacher’s responses to students’ anticipated reactions, and methods of evaluation (Lesson Study Research Group, 2001).

Lesson evaluation is the observation component of lesson study. Observation preparation consists of giving each observer a role so that information recorded from the actual lesson focuses on different aspects of the lesson delivery. These notes indicate the parts of the plan that the teacher missed during instruction and also record the conversations students are having about their learning.

Debriefing is the next step of the process. Debriefing follows an agenda; roles of facilitator, timekeeper, and recorder are assigned to keep debriefing focused and moving (Lesson Study Research Group, 2001). The last step, reflection and progress, is the stage at which the team decides whether re-teaching should occur or whether the lesson notes should be archived for future use or reference. The Lesson Study Research Group (2001) recommends that the reflection process needs to be given time for careful, deliberate consideration. In other words, the team should not try to meet immediately after the lesson is taught to discuss the outcomes of the lesson.

It is important to note that the lesson study model needs to be viewed as far more than a series of steps or procedures. Lesson study is more than simply having teachers write a lesson plan together. This collegial interaction provides a framework for establishing a routine that unites the varying levels of education, experience, and expertise existent within an academic team. Lesson study promotes professional interaction and collective response. The learning that takes place from implementing the model can be seen as a form of job-embedded professional development (Chokshi & Fernandez, 2005). A benefit of implementing the lesson study model as a planning guide and agenda in the context of collaboration is that it reduces the “tendency to wander in conversations,” thus maximizing the limited time teachers have to plan in a cross-curricular manner during the instructional day (Stewart & Brendefur, 2005, p. 684).

As opposed to the traditional secondary school format of planning within the same department or grade, the use of the lesson study model offers ESL certified and non-ESL certified teachers an opportunity to work collaboratively. In settings where the ESL-certified personnel are only staffed in the English/Language Arts/Reading programs, the model provides a structure for the ESL certified teachers to share with content area teachers the ways to make content comprehensible and to differentiate for
varying language proficiencies within the content class. Each content area objective has the potential to be supplemented with a linguistic differentiation teaching strategy.

After interviewing Japanese educators over the past 10 years and reviewing the U.S. research into lesson study, Lewis, Perry, and Hurd (2004) found “key pathways” to instructional improvement via lesson study: (a) increased knowledge of subject matter, (b) increased knowledge of instruction, (c) increased ability to observe students, (d) stronger collegial networks, (e) stronger connection of daily practice to long-term goals, (f) stronger motivation and sense of efficacy, and (g) improved quality of available lesson plans (pp. 19-21).

Methodology

Setting and Demographics

The research for this study was conducted at an urban, Title I, public junior high school in Texas. In the school district where the school was located, junior highs served only grades 7 and 8. Of the 899 students, 35.2% or 316 were English language learners. In comparison, the district percentage of ELLs was 23.9%, and the state average was 16.3%. The instructional faculty membership consisted of 15 content area teachers for 7th grade and 13 content area teachers for 8th grade. In addition, three ESL certified teachers serviced both grades as the English teacher of record for all ELLs. This setting was selected because the campus had the district’s highest ELL junior high population and represented the district’s lowest performing junior high campus in standardized test scores of mathematics, science, social studies, and English/language arts. Out of the tested areas, science historically held the lowest passing rate. For the academic years of 2010-2012, the campus was rated low-performing due to low state test scores and missing AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) under the No Child Left Behind mandate. At the time of this study, ELLs lagged behind their cohort counterparts at a minimum of 10% and a maximum of 29% across mathematics, science, social studies, and English/language arts at the campus.

The researcher decided to focus this study on science instruction because science had been a pressure point for years at the campus. Eighth grade science had the lowest percentage pass rates of all tested areas from 2008, its initial year of being tested, through 2012, the year of this study. In 2010, ELL science had a 62% passing rate compared to a 71% passing rate of non-ELLs. In 2011, ELL science had a 59% passing rate compared to a 71% passing rate of non-ELLs. In 2011, ELL science had a 59% passing rate compared to 69% of non-ELL.

Participants and Logistics

For this study, participants were junior high content area teachers of ELLs and a member of an academic team. All participants had little to no formal training in sheltered instruction; however, the teachers were responsible for teaching roughly 160 of the campus’s 316 ELLs. Ten teachers volunteered to participate in the study, providing representation of three academic teams, one from 7th grade and two from 8th grade. Team composition and descriptive data can be found by team in Tables 1-3 later in this section.

Although support personnel were assigned to each team, they were not a part of the lesson study implementation teams. Each team taught two lessons within the six-week research window. Each lesson was 45 minutes in length. Thus, each of the 160 ELLs received roughly 1 ½ hours of instruction from which to potentially benefit from the lesson study collaborative model. The length of each academic team’s planning session, classroom observation, and debrief session was 45 minutes, giving each teacher 4 ½ hours of lesson study implementation.
Procedures

Data Collection on Backgrounds of Participants

With the goal of understanding the teachers’ backgrounds and their prior experiences in a structured, prescriptive collegial model, I created teacher questionnaires for each participant who consented to participate in the study (Appendix A). The questions were framed based on the existing structure of campus academic team meetings as well as the construct of the lesson study model. Analysis of the initial questionnaires showed the level of collegiality to which each teacher was accustomed, the degree of familiarity with the lesson study collaborative model each had, and the number of years of experience in instructing ELLs each brought to the study.

Team A, Descriptive Data

Team A consisted of five 7th grade teachers, one from each content area: Teacher 1 from mathematics, Teacher 2 from English, Teacher 3 from writing, Teacher 4 from science, and Teacher 5 from social studies. Table 3 below shows the team’s profile as generated from the individual teacher questionnaires. Three of the five teachers had 0-5 years’ experience teaching, and two participants, Teacher 3 from writing and Teacher 5 from social studies, had 16-20 plus years. No team member was ESL certified, but the math, English and science teachers had received Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) training. Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol, also known as SIOP, is a 2-day training for general education content teachers of ELLs in methodologies that target the integration of second language acquisition and content area instruction. Only the math teacher had received any specific ESL staff development in the past academic year. The two teachers with 16-20 plus years of teaching experience were the only teachers who indicated that they were “very familiar” with differentiated instruction for ELLs. The other three teachers stated they were “somewhat familiar.” The entire team indicated that zero days per week were dedicated to team lesson planning, and that zero percent of team time was dedicated to lesson planning. However, team meetings on 3 to 5 days a week were dedicated to data discussion, and such conversation centered on student performance on teacher-created assessments, common assessments, district assessments, or state assessments. All participants indicated that no peer observations had taken place in the last academic year. All but the math teacher had consulted an ESL teacher one or two times in the past academic year for lesson planning; the math teacher indicated that no consults had been sought. The math and science teachers had not consulted an ESL teacher for data analysis of ELL student performance on any district or state assessments during the past academic year, the English and writing teachers had consulted an ESL teacher one to two times for data disaggregation, and the social studies teacher had consulted an ESL teacher three to five times for data. No team member was familiar with the lesson planning collaborative model.
Table 1 - *Teacher Descriptors for Team A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Teacher 4</th>
<th>Teacher 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16-20+</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16-20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Trained</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development in the Past Year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Team Plan Per Week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Team Time for Planning</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Data Talks days/wk</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Peer Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of ESL Consult for Lessons times/yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of ESL Consult for Data times/yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarization with Collaborative Plan</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team B, Descriptive Data

Team B consisted of three 7th grade teachers, one instructor each from science, math, and English. A fourth teacher from social studies attended the initial observed academic team meeting but decided to withdraw before participating in the lesson study collaborative model. Table 2 below shows the team’s profile as generated from the individual teacher questionnaires. All three held 0-5 years teaching experience, no team members were ESL certified, and only the math teacher had taken SIOP training. The science and math teachers had received specific ESL staff development in the past academic year; however, the English teacher had no ESL training. All three teachers indicated they were “somewhat familiar” with differentiated instruction for ELLs.

The science teacher indicated the team spent 3-5 days planning lessons, while the other two instructors stated that zero days per week were dedicated to team lesson planning. The science teacher also reported that 50% of the team time was dedicated to lesson planning, whereas the other two teammates stated that 0% of team time was dedicated to lesson planning. All three teachers indicated varying numbers of days per week dedicated to data discussion. The science teacher said one day per week was devoted to viewing student data, the math teacher indicated that data talks occurred only when there were student failures, and the writing teacher stated that data discussions occurred three to four times per week. The science and math teachers had participated in one to two peer observations in the past academic year, while the English teacher had not participated in any peer teaching and observation opportunities. The math teacher had consulted an ESL teacher one to two times in the past academic year for lesson planning; the other two participants had not requested or received any ESL lesson consults. None of the team consulted an ESL teacher for data disaggregation during the past academic year. While the math teacher was “somewhat” familiar with collaborative lesson planning, the other two teachers were “not” familiar with this method.
Table 2 - Teacher Descriptors for Team B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Trained</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development in the Past Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Team Plan Per Week</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Team Time for Planning</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Data Talks days/wk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failures</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Peer Observation times/yr</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of ESL Consult for Lessons times/yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of ESL Consult for Data times/yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarization with Collaborative Plan</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Team C, Descriptive Data

Team C consisted of three 8th grade teachers, two teachers from science and one instructor from social studies. This team had a membership of five, but the reading and math teachers were unable to participate due to prior campus commitments for tutoring. Table 3 below shows the team’s profile as generated from the individual teacher questionnaires. The first and observed science teacher, Teacher 1, and the social studies teacher, Teacher 2, had 0-5 years teaching experience. The second science teacher, Teacher 3, had 6-10 years and was the only team member holding ESL certification. In addition, Teacher 3 was the only teacher who had SIOP experience and had attended an ESL-specific staff development in the past academic year. Both Teacher 1 (first science teacher) and Teacher 2 (social studies) indicated they were “somewhat” familiar with differentiation techniques for ELLs. Teacher 3 (second science teacher) was “very” familiar with ELL differentiation.

During team meetings, Teacher 1 indicated that 1-2 days a week were dedicated to lesson planning, with 25% of team time spent on lesson planning. However, Teacher 2 and Teacher 3 reported that zero days were spent planning lessons with zero percent of team time dedicated to lesson planning. Teacher 1 noted that 2-3 days of team meetings were focused on data talks. Teacher 2 said zero days were focused on data, and Teacher 3 said data was discussed four times a year. This last statement indicated that student test results were viewed only after each of the district’s benchmark test administrations. For peer observations, Teacher 1 had participated 1-2 days in the last year, Teacher 2 had not participated at all, and Teacher 3 had 5 or more days of peer observations. Teachers 1 and 2 had not consulted an ESL teacher for lesson planning or data analysis in the past year. Teacher 3 had consulted an ESL teacher for lesson planning five or more times this academic year and three to five times for data analysis. In terms of familiarization with the collaborative lesson planning model, Teacher 1 indicated being “somewhat” familiar. Teacher 2 was “very” familiar, and Teacher 3 was “not” familiar.
Table 3- *Teacher Descriptors for Team C*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Certified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Trained</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development In the Past Year</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarization</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Team Plan Per Week</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Team Time for Planning</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Data Talks days/wk</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 times/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Peer Observation times/yr</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of ESL Consult for Lessons times/yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of ESL Consult for Data times/yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarization with Collaborative Plan</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation of Regularly Scheduled Team Meeting

The second phase of data collection was my observation of a regularly conducted 45-minute team meeting of each of the three teams participating in the study. During this time, I did not present components nor did I speak about the study; I merely observed and collected data using the ELL Reference Rubric (Appendix B). During this initial observation, I tallied the number of times an ELL-specific reference was discussed in two domains: instruction and assessment. This ELL Reference Rubric was used during my initial observations of team meetings and during two subsequent observations of regularly scheduled academic team meetings throughout the course of the study. I analyzed the frequency or infrequency of ELL-specific references occurring as collaborative lesson planning became a part of the team meeting agenda.

The content of discussion of Team A, Team B, and Team C did not include any specific references for ELL students in any of the domains. These team meetings were administrative in nature; campus-based issues were discussed as well as end-of-the-year procedures for team awards and an upcoming field trip. Team C did have a discussion on logistics for tutorials prior to the retake of the state exams, but no instructional targets were discussed. This conversation centered on which teacher was responsible for offering tutorials. These team meetings, one per team, were the only ones observed prior to implementation of the lesson study collaborative model.

Introduction of the LSCPM to Participating Teams

At the next team meeting, I introduced the Lesson Study Collaborative Planning Model to the participants. I reviewed the Planning Template (Appendix C) and the Observation Protocol (Appendix D) and answered any questions the participants had concerning the planning and/or team member observation process. After the orientation, the lesson objective to which the lesson study model would be applied was determined. In lessons where more than one objective existed, the science teacher or instructional coach selected the one on which to focus. This meeting concluded with teams completing the planning template (Appendix C) as a group. By following the steps on this form, participants were actively engaged in the actual collaborative planning process. When answering the questions, participants captured the thoughts, brainstorms, and instructional goals that were to be observed by team members during at least two executed lessons. Data collected on this template included team members’ names, the lesson objective, actual lesson plan, evidence of student learning (planned assessments), analysis of student assessment data, and instructional changes if the lesson needed to be re-taught to achieve higher levels of student mastery of the objective. A sample of one of the collaboratively planned lessons is found in Appendix E.

Teaching of Collaboratively Planned Lesson #1 (Cycle 1)

On a subsequent day, the science teacher of record taught the collaboratively planned lesson while the other members of the academic team observed using the observation protocol (Appendix D) as a part of the Lesson Study Collaborative Planning Model. Data collected on the observation protocol included the number or proportion of ELLs in the observed class period, evidence/examples of student understanding of topic/vocabulary, ownership of learning, use of academic vocabulary in class
discussions, student engagement, student disengagement, cooperative group dynamics (if applicable), clarity of instructions, and any other substantial pieces of data that would be of aid to the team in editing the previously planned lesson to increase student achievement.

Participants brought their completed protocols to the next team meeting. I did not participate in the classroom observation of the executed lesson; rather, I was only a part of the academic team meetings where the collaboration and debriefing occurred. A data collection sample from this observation is found in Appendix F.

Debriefing Session Following Lesson #1 (Cycle 1)

Team members reconvened during a regularly scheduled team meeting to debrief the observed lesson. I was present at this meeting to observe and collect data on the ELL Reference Rubric (Appendix B) during their work together. I tallied the frequency with which ELL-specific references were made during the discussion of findings from the observed lesson and lesson planning process of participants. Teams discussed findings and analyzed student performance on the lesson objectives and predetermined assessment. All three teams determined that their lesson was successfully taught and objectives were satisfactorily assessed. Thus, no team entered the reteach or rewrite phase for lesson plan Number 1. Observation notes and minutes were saved in a binder with electronic transcription for future use. My tally results for Cycle 1 implementation from each team observation are found in Appendices G, H, and I under the Cycle 1 column.

Procedures for Revising and Reteaching a Lesson If Needed

If a team were to determine that student performance could be increased or instructional differentiation could be more specific, the team would revisit the Planning Template (Appendix C) and make needed instructional changes for the lesson to be retaught. A norm each team made voluntarily for this study was to limit any reteach lesson to one execution of reteaching. After the reteaching, the science teacher of record would make instructional decisions about that objective independently. This determination was made to respect the scope and sequence of instruction of the science teacher and to avoid compromising the remaining team meeting agendas.

Team Planning for Lesson #2 (Cycle 2)

Since all three teams decided that reteaching was unnecessary, the teams continued with the next learning target and repeated the collaborative planning steps using the planning template (Appendix C) and the observation protocol (Appendix D) for one more science lesson. As was true in Cycle 1, after the Cycle 2 science lesson, none of the teams felt that reteaching was necessary. The tally results and comparisons between Cycle 1 and 2 are located in Appendices G, H, and I.

Reflection on Impact of LSCPM at End of Study

The final phase of data collection occurred after the completion of the two Lesson Study Collaborative Model cycles by all participants. See the Teaching Impact Template (Appendix K). Data collected on this form included the individual experience of each participant through the entire process of implementation. Participants were asked, at a later time of their choosing, to reflect on and write a
recapitulation of their experiences using the lesson study collaborative planning model and its influence, either negative or positive, on their individual teaching practice and their teaming efforts. Teachers were also asked to articulate their students’ performance before and after using lesson study. A synthesis of teacher responses is found in Appendix J.

Data Analysis

Data for Research Questions 1 and 2
The first portion of analysis focused on research questions 1 and 2. The first asked how the interdepartmental team structure supported or did not support ELLs’ access to content. The second asked, within the team lesson planning in this study, what kinds of specialized instruction for ELLs were discussed and developed.

Because these questions focused on the work of the academic team rather than on individual teachers, I coded these data under the header, “group experience.” The data collection documents were the ELL Reference Rubric (Appendix B), the lesson planning documents (Appendix C), and the observation protocol (Appendix D). To organize these data for analysis, I grouped all planning and debriefing documents by team number and lesson number. From there, I created a table (Appendix J) that compared the three teams on gains/losses for the implementation of the lesson study collaborative model. The purpose was to identify similarities and differences across the instructional and assessment domains and categories from the ELL Reference Rubric (See Appendix J).

The second portion of analysis focused on the individual instructional experience of each teacher as requested on the Teaching Impact Template reflection (Appendix K). I coded these data under the header, “individual experience.” Responses were grouped into the five categories identified in Appendix L: participant involvement, teaching improvement goals, lesson study experience, impact on student performance, and impact on teaching practice. Once these responses were categorized, patterns within each category were identified by type and frequency of matches.

Data for Research Questions 3 and 4
To answer research questions 3 and 4, I examined the summative written reflections of each participant (Appendix K). Question 3 asked teachers to describe the effects of lesson study collaboration on their professional practice. Question 4 asked teachers to describe the effects lesson study collaboration had on the academic performance of their ELLs. Responses were categorized and documented in Appendix L.

In addition, I analyzed the dialogue I had heard and recorded in my observation notes (Appendix B) during debrief sessions concerning student performance, especially that of ELL students. Also, as the science teachers of record shared how students fared on the assessments of each lesson, I took anecdotal notes.

In the process of analyzing data for question 4, I discovered that the science teachers discussed their findings as a generalization of ELL performance within the context of lesson activities designed in lesson study planning rather than in terms of performance by individual students or student populations. I had not proposed to create a causal relationship between the data and the instruction; instead, my intent was twofold: to describe the academic impact of lesson study on the ELL students and to describe the
experiential impact of collaborative lesson planning on content area teachers of academic teams. Finally, I reviewed the findings from each of the three academic teams to create patterns showing the impact the lesson study collegial model had on student performance through a change in the way lessons were prepared. With each header color-coded for team A, B, or C, I looked for commonalities and differences among teams. Appendix L provides a summation of the process.

Results

Research Question 1
In what ways does interdepartmental teaming support or not support ELLs’ understanding of the science curriculum?

I found a consistent drop in ELL-specific references across instructional and assessment domains except in the area of instructional modeling. At the beginning of the study, in the pre-implementation team meetings for all three teams, I observed no ELL-specific references; instead, the discussion for all three teams was characteristically administrative in nature and dealt with campus-based issues.

In reviewing team data collected on the ELL Reference Rubric (Appendix B) of the existing interdepartmental teaming, I found no evidence that teaming composition and practices at this campus promoted ELLs’ access to content in general education classes. When I received data from the two debrief meetings (Appendices G through I), which occurred as part of the implementation of the lesson study collaborative model, I found that ELL-specific references regarding instruction and assessment either remained stagnant or decreased from Cycle 1 to Cycle 2. Thus, I determined that ELL support through interdepartmental teaming did not significantly increase through the lesson study collaborative model.

Research Question 2
In team lesson planning meetings conducted in this study, what kinds of specialized instruction for ELL students is discussed and developed?

Data collection tools for this research question were the ELL Reference Rubric (Appendix B) and documents collected from the collaborative planning sessions (examples in Appendices E and F). Reviewing these, I found no evidence that ELL differentiation was collaboratively planned for by any team. When differentiation existed in any collaboratively planned lesson, it referenced grade redemption for failing students rather than language acquisition. Thus, the differentiation for ELLs either through discussion or collaborative planning was virtually non-existent before implementation and during the lesson study process.

Research Question 3
How do the content area teachers involved describe the effects of lesson study collaboration on their instructional practice in general?

In terms of experience, data collected from the Teaching Impact Template (Appendix K) revealed that peer observations were a personal learning tool. Participants learned more about each other and about themselves from authentic peer observations of the collaborative planned lessons.
Collaboration surfaced as a benefit to all practitioners, save one. This outlier indicated that teammates’ lack of science content knowledge hindered their ability to provide specific feedback during planning or debriefing.

In regard to impact on their instructional practice, seven out of 10 participants reported some impact in planning and in instructional strategy. Analysis of participants’ written reflections revealed instructional paradigm shifts. Participants stated that they now had a new way of thinking about lesson planning and that ELL differentiation was both feasible and necessary. Thus, although an impact was not evident in the findings from the team work samples (Appendix J) and my observed data from the ELL Reference Rubric (Appendix B), on an individual level via the reflection template (Appendix L), participants themselves reported an impact.

Research Question 4
How do the teachers describe the effects of lesson study collaboration on the academic performance of their ELLs?

Analysis of participants’ responses on the Teaching Impact Template (Appendix K) revealed that only four out of 10 participants noted an impact at the student level from the lesson study collaborative model. However, responses did reveal classroom level impact from teacher-designed activities in which students engaged collaboratively. Within these instances of student collaboration, teacher observation notes (Appendix D) showed that ELLs worked under leadership of their peers, took ownership of their learning, gained clarification from their peers, and were comfortable discussing content. Teacher responses also revealed that processing time (wait time) was reinforced, and that students wanted information chunked into shortened amounts. These behaviors had not been evident prior to lesson study implementation. Neither teacher responses nor observed discussions showed evidence of impact of the lesson study collaborative model on ELLs’ performance as measured through assessments within the two cycles of implementation. Within this participant sample, there was too little teacher data to definitely support or deny the impact on ELL students’ performance.

A number of themes emerged from the Teaching Impact Template related to the following: participant involvement in the study, instructional improvement goals, academic team experiences, student performance outcomes, and individual teaching practice influences. Most participants indicated that participation in the lesson study model was positive and cited both personal and instructional effectiveness.

Discussion and Implications

Alignment of Study Within Literature on LSCPM

With a limited bank of available published research on lesson study targeting ELL instruction, published data on lesson study’s impact on student learning is even more limited. This study sought to fill a gap in existing literature by providing data on the impact of lesson study on ELL students’ learning experiences. At the close of this research effort into the effects of lesson study upon instructional practice, I determined that its results were consistent with previous studies, including those with longer research timeframes and those with fewer participants.
After six years of implementation, Lewis, Perry, Hurd, and O’Connell (2006) found that lesson study changed school culture by shaping an administrative and campus response to secure lesson study time within the school day. In addition, mentoring was able to occur during lesson study as a by-product for novice teachers, and teachers shared their investigations with peers. With only four participants, Dumitrascu and Horak (2008) found that “lesson study had a strong potential to support teachers’ cumulative growth” (p. 16). This small participant base provided these researchers with a deep analysis of teachers’ understanding of content knowledge and of teaching ELLs. Data from that study and that of the limited publications of the full lesson study cycle indicate that this collaborative model has positive effects on its participating teachers’ instructional practice.

In terms of the lesson study model’s impact on student performance, only one study referenced this outcome. Dumitrascu and Horak (2008) found that standardized test scores increased at a campus where teachers who piloted and implemented lesson study remained at that campus for more than one academic year. However, these researchers did not identify lesson study as a correlation or causal relation for the increased test scores. All other published literature on lesson study implementation focuses solely on teacher development.

Effects of LSCPM on ELL Students’ Access to Content

Prior to my implementing this study, administration at the research site had established interdepartmental teaming to support ELL students’ access to content. Team meetings were built into the master schedule of the school day as an opportunity for all content area teachers of a particular cluster of students to meet and discuss the cross-curricular instruction and behavior support of students.

For each of the three teams in my study, I made one observation of a team meeting prior to introducing the LSCPM. In these meetings, the team leader facilitated discussions concerning campus-based events or procedures. The only conversation I observed that referenced instruction was a tutorial planning session for students who were unsuccessful on a recently administered state exam, and that conversation referenced logistics, not instructional support. Documents and artifacts that could have guided instructional conversations such as student samples, lesson plans, and instructional manipulatives were not evident in any of the observed sessions prior to implementation. I observed neither team norms nor agendas in use.

During the two lesson planning meetings of Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 that I documented per team (Appendices B, C, and D), only one team referenced ELL differentiation although there was at least one sheltered trained teacher on each team. The one reference occurred during lesson planning for a Cycle 2 lesson toward the end of the study. Because there was capable representation of ELL interests on each interdepartmental team, the finding that ELL differentiation was virtually non-existent during lesson study implementation was unexpected. The finding was further notable because scaffolding for ELL differentiation had been built into the Planning Template (Appendix C) used during team planning of the two lessons and also built into the Observation Protocol (Appendix D) used by team members to annotate observations as the lessons were being taught. When I evaluated the lesson objectives and teaching observations following the teaching of the lessons, (see examples in Appendices E and F), I found that the interventions that were collaboratively planned were designed for grade redemption for failing students rather than for language acquisition of ELLs.
In addition, data collected on the ELL Reference Rubric (Appendix J) after the lesson study implementation, showed no significant increase in ELL-specific references in team meetings. In fact, consistent drops were evident in ELL references in both instructional and assessment domains over the three-phase course of implementation. Based on these findings, this study was unable to determine ways that ELLs’ access to content in general education was supported by the current format of academic teams at the research site.

This study, however, yielded data that identified ways ELLs were not supported through interdepartmental teaming. These teams were composed of few ESL certified teachers and even fewer members who were trained in language acquisition pedagogy. Prior to the LSCPM, the structure and time expenditure of these daily meetings were not conducive for an academic focus and the conversations supporting ELLs’ access to science content in general education science classes were non-existent.

In terms of effects of LSCPM as reported in reflections after the study in the Teaching Impact Template (Appendix K), teachers described effects on ELLs’ academic performance as changes in student learning behaviors as opposed to performance on assessments. Participants noted that student behaviors such as learning collaboratively, participating in classroom discussions, and getting clarification from peers did not occur prior to the teachers’ implementation of lesson study. In debriefing meetings, teachers discussed the behavior and learning of particular ELLs in comparative classes. Teachers shared questioning techniques and grouping strategies that promoted the desired behavior or that increased participation. For example, some of the team members had not known a particular student was identified as ELL until the science teacher discussed how the student changed when the collaboratively planned lessons and activities were offered. After observing the science teacher’s interactions with that student and/or seeing what the student had actually produced orally and in writing, other teammates shared how they could implement those stimulating pieces of the lesson in their own classrooms in the future. Although lessons included both formative and summative assessments, participants did not share how the targeted ELLs fared.

Effects of LSCPM on Teachers’ Instructional Practice

Teachers described the effects of lesson study collaboration on their instructional practice in personal ways. Data from this study revealed that seven out of 10 participants’ planning and instruction were positively affected by participating in lesson study. Only one participant stated that lesson study had no effect. This participant cited teammates’ lack of content knowledge as a factor that mitigated a personal instructional benefit from participation. In terms of the lesson study experience, four common themes emerged from the data:

- Peer observations are a learning tool for how students behave in other classes.
- Immediate feedback informed teacher decision-making processes for reteaching.
- Collaborative planning was beneficial for sharing successful instructional strategies.
- Team members increased their science content knowledge and identified areas of transfer within their own content area.

Although not evident from submitted work samples (examples in Appendices E and F), individuals
described personal paradigm shifts of understandings of lesson design and execution in their reflective writings. Participants had more to say on the effect of lesson study on their own practice than the effect upon students. It may be that the impact of the lesson study model affected the participants in such a way that personal instructional practices and changes may have overshadowed the actual effects upon student performance.

**Recommendations for Action**

The findings from this study suggest that participation in lesson study is a research-based, time-efficient, and cost-effective way to foster collaborative planning and progress monitoring of non-ESL certified teachers responsible for teaching ELLs.

Results of this study also suggest a number of future research directions. Additional studies should examine the application of the lesson study model in elementary master schedules where self-contained classrooms are prevalent as well as in high school scheduling options where academic teaming does not exist. Another useful direction would be to examine how the lesson study model would impact ELLs’ performance in elective classes such as the arts and technology. A third dimension of research would be to conduct a longitudinal quantitative study that would allow for examination of how ELLs’ mastery of grade-level standards continues and yields impact as these students’ transition through primary grades or through secondary 6-12 under instruction that is designed within the lesson study framework.
References


Huang, J. (2004). Socializing ESL students into the discourse of school science through academic writing. Language and Education, 18(2), 97-123.


Jones, B. (2007). Teacher conversations that support teaching and learning. Unpublished manuscript., Denton, TX: Texas Woman’s University


Appendices

Appendix A: Teacher Questionnaire

Team Name: ___________________________________   Grade: ______ Date: ______

1. Which content area best describes your teaching assignment
   a) Math   b) Science   c) Social Studies   d) Language Arts

2. How many years have you been teaching?
   a) 0-5   b) 6-10   c) 11-15   d) 16-20 plus

3. Do you hold an ESL teaching certification?    ____Yes ____No

4. Have you been sheltered trained?  ____Yes  ____No

5. In the past year have you attended or participated in ESL-specific professional development?
   ____Yes  ____No
   If yes, name the course(s) or offering(s): ____________________________________

6. How would you categorize your familiarity with the instructional needs of ELLs in content classes?
   a. Very familiar   b. Somewhat familiar   c. Not familiar

7. How many days per week does your team meet to lesson plan?
   a) Zero times   b) One to two times   c) Three to five times   d) More than five

8. On average, what percent of team planning time is dedicated to lesson planning?
   a. 0%   b. 25%   c. 50%   d. 75% or more

9. How often does your team meet to discuss data?
   ___________________________________________________________________

10. In the past year how many times did you observe a lesson in a teammate’s classroom?
    a) Zero times   b) One to two times   c) Three to five times   d) More than five

11. In the past year how many times did you consult an ESL teacher to assist in planning a lesson?
    a) Zero times   b) One to two times   c) Three to five times   d) More than five times

12. In the past year how many times did you consult an ESL teacher to assist in disaggregating data?
    a) Zero times   b) One to two times   c) Three to five times   d) More than five times

13. What is your level of familiarity with the lesson planning collaborative model?
    b. Very familiar   b. Somewhat familiar   c. Not familiar
Appendix B: ELL Reference Rubric

Team Name: ___________________  Date: ___________________

### Instructional Domain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>English Language Proficiency Standards</th>
<th>Nonlinguistic Representations</th>
<th>Higher-Order Questions</th>
<th>Differentiated Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral language through use of science notebook, teacher and peer demonstrations, use of manipulatives and scientific tools/equipment</td>
<td>ELPS (English language proficiency standards), sheltered instruction (SIOP), group configurations, science note booking, hands-on activities, technology integration</td>
<td>Visual aids, advanced organizers, Thinking Maps ©, realia, manipulatives, scientific tools, virtual experiences, technology integration</td>
<td>Bloom's Taxonomy: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation, synthesis</td>
<td>Reference to standardized assessments: TELPAS (Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System), STAAR/EOC, district benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tally mark for each ELL reference to the aforementioned

### Assessment Domain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring</th>
<th>Formative</th>
<th>Summative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questioning, Observations, Student work</td>
<td>Specific immediate feedback; student, parent, other, teacher conferences</td>
<td>Benchmarks, grades,</td>
<td>Student work, tests, quizzes, presentations, rubrics</td>
<td>End-of-year tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tally mark for each ELL reference to the aforementioned
Appendix C: Planning Template

1. Forming a Team
   • Who will be on your team? For each participant, record the person’s name, dept/unit, and email.
   • Briefly describe the course, its place in the curriculum, and the student population.

2. Developing Learning Goals
   • What topic will your lesson focus on? Why did you choose this topic?
   • What specific learning goals will the lesson address? Write these in terms of what students will know and be able to do as a result of the lesson.
   • What long-term qualities will the lesson support? These are abilities, skills, dispositions, inclinations, sensibilities, values, etc. that you would like students to develop in your program.

3. Planning the Research Lesson
   • What are the steps of the lesson? Include descriptions of main activities, prompts and estimates of the time for each part of the lesson.
   • In what ways was the lesson designed to help students achieve the learning goal?
   • Predict how students will respond to the lesson.

4. Gathering Evidence of Student Learning
   • What kinds of evidence will be collected (e.g., student work and performance related to the learning goal)?
   • What aspects of teacher and student activity should observers focus on?

5. Analyzing Evidence of Student Learning
   • Summarize the evidence, identifying major patterns and tendencies in student performance.
   • Describe major findings and conclusions about what, how and why students met or did not meet learning goals.
   • Based on your analysis how will you change the lesson?

6. Repeating the Process
   • As you repeat the lesson study process, describe changes in the lesson and the results of your study. (e.g., step 2--how you changed your goals; step 3--how you redesigned the lesson; step 4--what additional evidence you collected; step 5--what your new findings and conclusions are for the revised lesson.)
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Appendix D: Observation Protocol

**OBSERVATION PROTOCOL: (Insert Science Lesson Objective) RESEARCH LESSON**

The purpose of having several instructors observe the class is to gather as much information about the process of the lesson as possible. Your primary task is to observe *how the students respond to the lesson and make some conclusions about how well the LESSON worked*. In other words, please note behaviors of the students and the benefits/difficulties of the lesson, NOT the behaviors of the instructor!

You will be observing one group of approximately __ ELL students.

Given the goal of helping students understand the (insert lesson objectives), please look for evidence/examples that students are tying their understanding of (concept).

Please *do* take notes on your group’s behavior. In addition to noting any good and poor examples of their ability to think about the (insert lesson objective), please also note such things as:

- How the group developed their definition of (key term/concept). Did they integrate their individual definitions? Did they simply string their individual definitions together? Something else?
- Did they use the term “insert academic vocabulary” during their work? If so, in what ways? Based on their discussion, evaluate their understanding of “insert concept.”
- Any evidence that the students seemed interested and/or engaged in the lesson
- Any derailing of the process
- Any problems in the group dynamics (dominating members, quiet members, etc.)
- Any problems understanding the directions
- Anything else you think is substantial!

Please *do not* make comments to your group, i.e. do not correct any misconceptions, clarify instructions, etc.

---

**Appendix E: Grade 7 Lesson Study Lesson Plan Document**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Grade: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEKS:</strong></td>
<td>Objective: SWBAT demonstrate knowledge of Earth &amp; space by using Edusmart tech lab and notebooking.</td>
<td>Language Objective: SWBAT demonstrate knowledge of Earth &amp; space by reading, writing, and speaking to answer questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier I:</strong></td>
<td>Tier II: Peer and teacher assistance</td>
<td>Tier III: Extra assistance from teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe Earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and space by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using an Edusmart tech lab.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Knowledge Activity:</strong></td>
<td>Which planet is the only planet that can support life? Why?</td>
<td><strong>Materials/Technology:</strong> Projector, laptop, pencil, paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td>Assessment: Will be assessed during the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm-up, tech lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Teacher Sample Observation Protocol

Relation of Earth & Space

The purpose of having several instructors observe the class is to gather as much information about the process of the lesson as possible. Your primary task is to observe how the students respond to the lesson and make some conclusions about how well the LESSON worked. In other words, please note behaviors of the students and the benefits/difficulties of the lesson, NOT the behaviors of the instructor!

You will be observing one group of approximately 6 ELL students.

Given the goal of helping students understand the (Relation of Earth & Space), please look for evidence/examples that students are tying their understanding of (concept).

Please do take notes on your group’s behavior. In addition to noting any good and poor examples of their ability to think about the (insert lesson objective), please also note such things as

- How the group developed their definition of (key term/concept). Did they integrate their individual definitions? Did they simply string their individual definitions together? Something else?

From memory & notes, they were able to integrate individual definitions.

The warm-up had two multiple choice questions & one fill-in-the-blank. The fill-in-the-blank question forced the students to recall the definitions from memory or to refer to notes.

- Did they use the term “insert academic vocabulary” during their work? If so, in what ways? Based on their discussion, evaluate their understanding of “insert concept.”

The students were forced to use the terms throughout the class: in the warm up; during the lesson several had a mini-video presentation and teacher called upon students to respond to questions at the end of the presentations.

- Any evidence that the students seemed interested and/or engaged in the lesson

Yes, the students were engaged & interested based on the questions they came up with:

1) Can other solar systems/galaxies support life?
2) How many galaxies are out there?
3) Is there wind on other planets?

All these were very good questions and relevant to the discussion.

- Any derailing of the process: No
- Any problems in the group dynamics (dominating members, quiet members, etc.): One female student had potential to be dominating but was situated up front by the teacher.
- Any problems understanding the directions: No
- Anything else you think is substantial!: Teacher had closure at the end of her lesson. There were two main factors that they had discussed which enabled Earth to support life: atmosphere and position of Earth in solar system.

She picked on students to discuss these two factors. The teacher also asked about a 3rd factor which was a prelude to the next day’s lesson (nicely done!!!). ELLs got a lot of exposure to the vocabulary words. The teacher also used Popsicle sticks to ensure EVERYONE was called on to answer and practice using academic vocabulary.

Call on “Student A” more; he had his head down a couple of times. Continue to use popsicle sticks to ensure all students are able to participate, mix it up, call student name or seat number.

Please do not make comments to your group, i.e. do not correct any misconceptions, clarify instructions, etc.
Appendix G: Team A Cycle References and Comparisons

Team A, Cycle I and II Comparison of ELL-Specific References in Academic Team Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Cycle I References</th>
<th>Cycle II References</th>
<th>Gain/Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency Standards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlinguistic Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Team B Cycle References and Comparisons

*Team B, Cycle I and II Comparison of ELL-Specific References in Academic Team Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Cycle I References</th>
<th>Cycle II References</th>
<th>Gain/Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency Standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlinguistic Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Team C Cycle References and Comparisons

*Team C, Cycle I and II Comparison of ELL-Specific References in Academic Team Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Cycle I References</th>
<th>Cycle II References</th>
<th>Gain/Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency Standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlinguistic Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Three-Team Comparison of Implementation Cycles

Three-Team Comparison of Gains/Losses after Two Cycles of Lesson Study Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Team A</th>
<th>Team B</th>
<th>Team C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency Standards</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlinguistic Representation</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K: Teaching Impact Template

**REFLECTION**
In this section, tell the reader what you have learned from lesson study and how it has affected your classroom instruction and/or pedagogical thinking. Cite specific examples to illustrate changes in your practices or thinking.

1. Why did you become involved in lesson study? What are your teaching improvement goals?
2. Discuss specific insights about student learning that came out of the lesson study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Involvement in Lesson Study</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve my teaching skills for ELLs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to assist researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have very little experience teaching ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources from peer observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to observe other ELL teaching approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It intrigued me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in how to help ELL population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlated with my master’s thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have ELLs out of the danger zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Discuss ways your teaching has changed or begun to change in terms of class planning, goal setting, classroom practices, assessment of student learning, use of assessment to improve teaching and learning, your understanding of how students learn the subject you teach.
### Appendix L: Teaching Impact Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Improvement Goals</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consciously calling on and engaging students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan lessons with a goal in mind</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks for understanding throughout the lesson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantly grow and implement strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master art of differentiation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan lessons with ELLs in mind</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with colleagues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a resource to my colleagues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct on-site staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate more activities that stimulate vocabulary retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relate to my students and build a relationship with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lesson Study Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning tool from peer observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate feedback to inform decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from working and learning together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshing to see another’s classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration was beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templates kept team focused on goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was produced can be applied in other classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made job as a teacher more effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm shift on lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight was added to science lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not get much from the lesson study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team member had a tough time relearning science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact on Student Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinforced “wait times” for student processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided student collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned students want information shortened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students worked under the leadership of peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students took ownership of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students gained clarification from peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were comfortable discussing content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Teaching Practice</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make sure I focus more on the goal of a lesson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I focus on checking for understanding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on the need for reteaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a new way of thinking about lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative lesson planning has a meaningful impact on my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL differentiation is feasible and necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I now include more talk time for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use conversation stems to facilitate discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses of more visuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating more peer tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole child approach, forced to look at teaching students in a different way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

“English Fever,” for better or worse, has taken hold of the Republic of Korea (also known as South Korea and hereafter referred to simply as Korea or Korean in the case of its citizens) over the past 20 years, making it a hotbed for EFL teaching opportunities to students of all ages from kindergarten all the way up to retirees. The salaries and benefits are some of the best in the world and the country's location makes it a convenient home base for travel and adventure throughout Asia. This article provides helpful contextual information to EFL educators considering university teaching opportunities in Korea. In addition, this information is relevant for educators outside of Korea who teach English to Korean students at universities or those of university age, as it provides much useful background on Korean culture, educational practices, and language transference problems.
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Introduction

Over the course of the past fifty years or so, South Korea has moved from being an almost exclusively agrarian society to being today a major global economic force in the development and manufacture of state-of-the-art products. Following the end of the Korean War, this transformation, often referred to as the “Miracle on the Han,” has led to a multitude of focused changes leading to impressive social and economic strides over the past few decades.

*This research was done as a Master in Education program requirement for the American College of Education and revised as an article for this publication.

Citation

At the beginning of the 1960s, Korea was one of the poorest countries in the world. However, within a single generation, it has successfully joined the ranks of industrial democracies, and currently stands in 15th place among global economies. From the early 1960s to the mid-1990s, the Korean economy experienced the highest average rate of growth in the world, coming in at roughly 9% (Beck, 1998). This growth was due to massive amounts of international aid and assistance that flooded into Korea during this time, the main contributors being Japan, the United States, and the UN Developmental Organization. According to a joint publication by the Korean Civil Society Forum on International Development Cooperation (KoFID) and the Korean think tank Re-shaping Development Institute (ReDI), the US alone, between 1946 and 1978, offered the country about $60 billion in grants and loans (Cha, Choi, Hong, Kang, Kim, Kim, & Yun, 2011).

Unlike similarly impoverished countries, the Korean leadership effectively used the influx of money and support to plan and execute extremely successful five-year economic plans. The results rapidly increased export-fueled growth (which significantly strengthened the GDP), industrialization (automotive, iron and steel, chemical, textiles, heavy industry, and electronics), technological breakthroughs, major upgrades to the education system, and a large jump in living standards across the country (Jeong, 2015).

Additional factors in Korea's growth were a rapid attainment of nearly 100% literacy, beginning during the final Japanese occupation and ending with Korean liberation in 1945, and noteworthy governmental land and market reforms, which not only created the middle class but also helped Korea begin trading with the world. Although less tangible, a powerful influence supporting these many changes came from the Korean people themselves in the form of a robust cultural work ethic and a shared desire for a more resilient and prosperous future.

With strong governmental leadership and an abundance of determination by its citizens, Korea has been able to implement far-reaching changes in order to achieve its social and economic goals. With this growth comes a need for Koreans to be capable of communicating in the de facto global language of business and industry—English. The impact of English fever and the importance of EFL are further amplified by the value Koreans place on education within their embrace of Confucianism.

South Korea’s English “Fever”

Since the end of the Korean War, as Korea has been making rapid economic and social developmental gains, there has remained one constant—an emphasis on education. This focus can be traced back to the traditional “educational fever” (kyoyuk yeol –교육열) or “preoccupation/enthusiasm for education,” which has been a national obsession for a long period of time (Seth, 2002). Recently, ability in the English language has become an increasing part of this obsession (Park, 2009). In the 1990s, policy makers elevated the status of English in the education system, making it one of three dominant subjects (along with Korean and mathematics) on university entrance exams. Parents typically go to great lengths to provide the best possible opportunities for the success of their children. In the case of learning English, they might, for example, send their children abroad to study English or strive for them to achieve perfect pronunciation through a procedure called lingual frenectomy, where,
in a ten-minute operation, a thin band of tissue under the tongue is cut, making it longer and more flexible (Ryall, n. d.)

These costly and generally extreme measures aside, because of this embracing of “English fever,” as a part of overall “education fever,” Korean students are spending increasing amounts of time studying English. This study generally occurs in private academies (known as hagwons) after normal school hours (Geddes, 2016; Kim, 2013). According to the Swiss-based language learning company EF-Education First, the average Korean, from kindergarten through university, gets nearly 20,000 hours of education in the English language. This inundation with English language learning for such a long period of time has caused a growing trend where students develop negative attitudes regarding studying English, particularly when the bulk of learning stems from in-depth grammar study and memorization.

In 2012 alone, total expenditures on Korean students’ private English language education were approximately 19 trillion won ($17.7 billion), according to Statistics Korea. The average cost of private education per student is nearly 3 million won ($3,000) per year or around 13% of total economic output by value per person. Kim notes that there are currently over 17,000 hagwons that teach English in Korea or roughly one hagwon for every 647 students. As further evidence of the value placed on English instruction, it has been estimated that, in 2010, there were more than 22,000 native English teachers working in Korea in the public and private sector at all age levels (Lee, 2010).

Another aspect of the emphasis on ability in English is the importance of the skill in the realm of Korean employment. Competence, fluency, knowledge, and overall ability in the English language developed through direct instruction by and imitation of native speakers (Ahn, 2011) is increasingly important in obtaining employment. This is especially true in business. In the hiring process, emphasis is placed on scores on exams like TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) or TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language). Furthermore, a few major Korean companies are developing their own aptitude tests for prospective employees, which include an English competency section.

The Role Confucianism Plays in Korea

In the midst of all the rapid economic changes, Korea remains firmly entrenched in the philosophy of Confucianism in many ways, particularly through its cultural traditions and customs. Confucianism has played a vital role in the everyday life of all Koreans since Confucian principles of government were adopted by the Koryo dynasty (936) and officially ‘enacted’ at the onset of the Chosun dynasty (1392). Confucianism is not a religion but rather a philosophical social code of behavior and a belief system that continues to permeate government, society, and justice today. In fact, the impact of Confucianism is more evident in Korea than in any other nation in Asia (Molloy, 2013).

Confucianism places high esteem on age and social standing and embraces an ideology of doing what is best for the family, community, and country. Thus, there exists a strength and determination to move Korea forward through collective unity. In large part, Korean society moves in response to Confucianism’s strict orders of social behavior that include virtue, morality, and filial piety (ProQuest & BYU, 2007) and constant self-cultivation through education. As it is viewed as a cornerstone of society, education is thus an effective fundamental instrument for fostering national strength.
The Structure of the South Korean University and the Role of English

At a typical Korean university, all freshmen, regardless of major, are required to fulfill an English language component, which could be either a semester or a year. Although there is no exit exam to gauge competency in English, successful completion is a requirement for graduation. The justification for this English requirement stems from the need for Korea to remain competitive on a global scale.

Each university may have its own approach to teaching conversation classes as there is no mandatory national guideline. For certain majors, such as Engineering, International Relations, or Tourism, more coursework in English may be required since graduates will likely need stronger abilities in English to successfully do their jobs. Nevertheless, a majority of coursework, regardless of major, is taught in Korean. However, there has been a trend over the past decade for more classes to be conducted in English, particularly those classes whose graduates should expect to use English in their jobs.

Dr. Chi Mo Park, Dean of the University of Ulsan Engineering Department, notes more than 50% of all engineering classes are taught in English and the expectation is for that number to continue to rise gradually (personal communication, July 9, 2016). As a result, universities are seeking native English speaking or bilingual professors to teach students who are majoring in International Business, International Relations, International Studies, English, Foreign Trade, Engineering, and a sprinkling of Social Sciences. These fields are some of the most active in shifting to more English-medium instruction.

A final aspect of English instruction at universities as well as in private academies (hagwons) across the country is the heightened focus on the TOEIC test. Although these courses are optional and not relevant towards graduation credit, there has been a huge push for these classes as the TOEIC test is widely used as a means of identifying prospective candidates for job vacancies in various fields. These classes are taught outside of the regular class schedules and housed within the university as “for profit entities” within departments as Language Education Centers. Although TOEIC prep has no relationship with required English coursework and instruction, it is viewed as an important component in securing a good job with major companies operating in Korea. These classes focus on strategies for passing the test rather than practical forms of English conversation and communicative skills.

Basic Differences Between the Structure of the Korean Language Hangeul and English

Korean native-speakers face numerous challenges when learning English, but I will address the three primary differences in grammar between the two languages—word order, varying parts of speech, and honorifics—as well as phonology and pronunciation. The following information is a compilation of information from authoritative online sources and the author’s personal experience. It serves as a starting point for understanding the differences between the two languages.

Word Order

English sentences typically follow a strict Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) order that differs from the usual Korean word order. In English, the speaker states what a subject does to an object. ‘I eat pizza.’ {I (S) eat (v) pizza. (O)}. Sentences in Hangeul are arranged in a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV)
order. The speaker names the subject, then the object, and then what is done to the object. ‘I pizza eat.’ {I (S) pizza (O) eat. (V)}. Korean students often master the English SVO word order fairly easily (Shoebottom, 2015). However, once that step is mastered, it is also important to introduce the skill of adding sentence variety within permitted exceptions and to allow students relevant practice with these variations.

Descriptive words do the same job as verbs in Hangeul, by indicating the tense, which is something many native Korean speakers transfer into their English sentences. Beyond that, they also use nouns as adjectives. For instance: ‘My daughter is illness.’ One must also understand that there are situations where Korean ELLs will employ only a subject-adjective sentence structure, neglecting verbs altogether as in ‘I beautiful.’

Parts of Speech

When examining both the formation and usage of various parts of speech, grammatical categories in Korean do not always clearly correspond with those of English. The result is commonly demonstrated with learners occasionally treating adjectives and nouns as if they belonged to the same class of words, such as using a noun where English would expect an adjective: ‘My daughter doesn't come to school today because she is illness.’

Subject-Verb Agreement - Unlike the case in English clauses with verbs in present tenses, Hangeul does not require subject-verb agreement. An example might be Korean students saying or writing ‘She like...’ rather than ‘She likes...’ in the sentence, She like[s] to eat pizza. This means that most Koreans need careful instruction with clear, concise examples as well as continued practice in producing such subject-verb pairs.

Preposition vs. Postposition - Postpositions are suffixes or short words that immediately follow a noun or pronoun in Korean grammar and fulfill a number of functions and are more commonly referred to as subject and object particle markers. For instance, 30분동안 잔어요. – 30 minutes for slept. (I slept for 30 minutes.). Hence, information is added to the end of the verb (sleep is 자다 but changes to 잔어요) to make it contextual, representing things like mood or tense, instead of being contained within the sentence. This leads to the difficulty Korean students face because of postpositions and their overall significance. Providing sustained practice in developing recognition and understanding proves to be an effective strategy to help students master this concept.

Articles - In English, articles are used to signify the specificity or generality of nouns. In Hangeul, however, no distinction exists between definite and indefinite articles. For instance, ‘I bought new car this week,’ or ‘I played guitar song in school festival.’ Typically non-native English speakers do not achieve complete automaticity with the use of English articles, but English learners can, with targeted instruction and practice, learn to use articles with a reasonable level of accuracy.
Verbs – Korean utilizes two verb categories: action (They usually have an English equivalent.) and adjectival (They describe the state/characteristic of things or a person’s feelings and often have no exact English equivalent.). Furthermore, since personal reference is avoided, in some instances, it can be common to encounter Korean sentences that only include a verb, omitting the subject and object altogether. This is usually done when there is no need for clarification or it is related to something currently being talked about, but this isn’t always the case.

The biggest difference, perhaps, comes when examining Korean verbs and their use in conveying information. Things like the subject and tense are all added onto the verb, making it much longer (sleep is 자다 but changes to 졌어요). English uses separate words (auxiliaries), which can be a difficult concept for beginners to master. Korean also does not require conjugation of verbs depending on the subject of the sentence, which can take some getting used to. Based on mother tongue influence and proper use of verb forms, confusion arises between present and future tense or past simple and present perfect. Ultimately, verb usage must be carefully explained and taught with sufficient repetitious practice to achieve a sustained, working understanding.

Honorifics

Like many Asian languages, Korean uses a number of honorifics in language to denote social context in conversation, whereas in English, this is generally handled through tone and body language. While this slightly simplifies learning the English language for Koreans because of lack of new vocabulary in this area, it may make it difficult for them to convey social meaning because of the relative monotonicity of their English accent. Because verb endings and the choice of nouns, adjectives or pronouns depend on the status of the speaker to the listener or writer to reader, Hangeul adds honorifics to the end of statements or questions to indicate tense, mood, and social relations between speakers and listeners. In essence, Hangeul uses a base verb + suffixes to form other, meaning-related parts of speech. So, to some extent, it can actually make English easier for Koreans to learn rather than the other way around, since honorifics have an extremely limited role in the English language. Regardless, Korean English learners still need intentional guidance and targeted practice in order to learn the social nuances of intonation and stress that often communicate respect in spoken English.

Language Pragmatics - Many languages structure requests in a way that politeness is built into how the other person is being addressed. The result is that to an English instructor newly arrived in Korea, learner requests may appear somewhat rude or demanding. Therefore, teachers need to monitor students’ language and provide more ‘native’ phrasing. For instance, a Korean student might ask to go to the bathroom by saying, “Teacher, toilet,” the literal Korean translation. As Rita Deyoe-Chiullán has suggested (personal communication, May 2, 2016), due to linguistic and grammar rules, Korean English language learners may unintentionally appear to be making demands when in actuality, they merely intend to request something.

The expression of deference in Korean can also result in word choice or syntax that seems unusual to a new instructor. As an example, a student might discuss his/her attendance at the next class by saying, “Teacher, maybe I won’t be here tomorrow.” In instances like this, educators take on the role
of cultural and linguistic translators and advocates (Rachel Salcedo, personal communication, April 28, 2016). This request can then become a cultural teachable moment because Korean culture discourages direct responses about future presence in the class as it can be considered disrespectful to the teacher, whereas, it is completely common and acceptable in Western culture.

Finally, English negative and tag yes/no questions confuse Koreans who respond to yes/no questions based on whether or not the question is true or false and the answers need to be practiced carefully in order to better understand the clarification of either agreeing or disagreeing. For example, for native English speakers, the answer to the question, “You don’t like mushrooms, do you?” would normally be “No, I don’t.” However, the appropriate and expected response in Korean would be “Yes” (I don’t like mushrooms) or “No” (I do like mushrooms).

Phonology and Pronunciation

There are a number of phonological differences between the languages. Where English uses sentence level accentuation and intonation to convey contrastive meanings, Korean is a syllable-timed language where word stress is insignificant and accents on different words do not change the meaning of the sentence or cause difficulty in understanding them. This causes Korean English speakers to sound flat or monotone and English speakers of Korean can sound overly accented or “too emotional.” Shoebottom (2015) points out that unstressed delivery can result in somewhat unnatural delivery during communication, particularly in longer instances of speaking, such as presentations. In practice, then, Koreans need a systematic approach to learning and practicing stress both within words and at the sentence level. A good strategy for improving this aspect of speaking would be continued activities involving listening to various examples of native English speakers, identifying differences between their own production and that of the native speaker, and the repetition of specifically difficult words for students to gain knowledge, understanding, and relevant practice.

A number of English language sounds don't exist in the Korean phonological inventory, making pronunciation of certain English words difficult. A significant issue stems from the pronunciation of consonants, since several English consonant sounds simply do not exist in Korean, ultimately affecting how clearly Koreans are able to speak.

It should also be noted that words do not necessarily ‘start’ with a vowel in Hangeul but rather utilize a silent letter before a vowel with no distinction between long and short vowels. Moreover, words can only end in vowels or certain consonants, so students often add a vowel to English words ending in certain consonants, which leads to their pronunciation becoming inaccurate. For instance, Mark, is pronounced Mah-Kuh, Sprite = Spuuh-raa-ee-ttuuh, bus = Buhss-uh.

Sound: Common Substitutions

Since Korean does not have f/f/, the most similar sound is the unaspirated /p/ that is medial in English while the aspirated initial English /p/ might be substituted in initial position and sound more similar to fricative /f/. Therefore, Korean speakers tend to start with a /p/ and force air between their lips with the result sounding almost identical to an /f/. However, problems arise when they pair the substitute sound with other consonants. For example, “free,” sounds markedly different when pronounced using
this common /f/ substitution. At other times, they may pronounce an /f/ as an unmodified /p/ so a word like “coffee” is pronounced “coppee.”

These other English sounds that are not part of the Korean sound inventory also lead to substitutions of the closest or most similar sound:

/v/ (Vancouver) is often substituted for a /b/, so Vancouver is pronounced “Bancouber.”

/th/ (third) /s/ is often substituted for “th” /θ/, so “think” sounds like “sink.”

/th/ (the) /d/ is often substituted for “th” (ð), which makes “this” sound like “dis.”

/zh/ (vision) and /z/ are both often pronounced as a vague /dʒ/ sound, so “zip” sounds like “jip” and “pizza” becomes “pija.”

Understanding the Korean Educational Environment

The author currently works as professor of English and English Conversation at the university level in Korea, and the information included here is presented primarily for readers seeking job opportunities at the university level across the Korean peninsula. Much of the following information is based on the author’s personal experiences and observations, as well as on his professional communication with both Korean and native English speaking peers and colleagues.

Instructors coming from a native-English speaking educational environment have learned there are a variety of ways to approach English Language teaching and may wonder how to prepare for their potential new teaching environment. In Korea, there is no specific curriculum or instructional model in place nationally for the teaching of English at the university level. Most universities allow English language instructors to work within their own style and methodology but generally encourage a ‘fun’ environment for learning English. This presents a relatively unique concept for Korean university students given the widely used approach of rote memorization and teacher-centered environments.

For Korean students, an engaging, interactive, cooperative, student-centered learning environment requires some time for buy-in. Whether one approach to teaching is better than the other is debatable, but incoming English language instructors need to understand there will be an adjustment period and should not give up on or shy away from using an interactive format in the classroom.

Another adjustment for incoming native English speaking instructors is that many university English Language Departments are run by Korean non-educators who have no first-hand knowledge of or experience or training in educational practices, pedagogy or curriculum development, particularly a Western style, student-centered approach. Decisions are made based on maximizing profits rather than on achieving best outcomes for students. The presence of English instruction in university curriculum is a business decision. Therefore, as long as student evaluations are high and instructors are acting appropriately, Korean administrators generally take a hands-off approach to teaching style.

Most native English speaking teachers in Korea have little, if any, educational training and commonly end up teaching English due to limited job prospects in their home countries. However, to teach English at the university level in Korea, it is almost mandatory to hold a Master’s degree, regardless of discipline. When native English speakers are hired, the administration considers that they know the best way to teach English when, in reality, styles and overall effectiveness can vary greatly.
In general, to American English speakers, the Korean university classroom environment is very different from what they have experienced in American universities. In American classes, teachers often provide opportunities for student ownership, collaboration, projects, and presentations by creating a student-centered approach to learning, and at Korean universities, newly arrived American instructors can often draw on that experience to present a similar learning environment. At first, Korean students may appear impassive and unenthusiastic because they have previously studied in teacher-centered classrooms, where they are expected to comply with the requests and commands of teachers. Classroom practice generally includes rote memorization of information needed for success on the college entrance exams or standardized testing. This expectation of memorization is reinforced by the practice in cram schools (hagwons). The result is incoming Korean students view English as a subject to be memorized and learned, much like math or science.

Korean students should be introduced to a different learning environment carefully, particularly if they do not understand why the change is needed. They may doubt the effectiveness of a different approach and fear they may not be adequately prepared for future exams. The new instructor needs to allow time and provide appropriate scaffolding for students to come to trust a different approach.

An instructor may notice that students are hesitant to answer their questions since Korean culture dictates that if you cannot produce with perfection, you should not say anything. Do not let this cultural nuance dissuade or frustrate you. It is essential to let students know that, in the classroom, it is okay to make mistakes. This way of working with learners’ errors sets a precedent for students to feel accepted and to become comfortable with imperfection. Making this transition allows them to use errors to learn and move more quickly in improving their English.

**Introducing the Communicative Language Techniques (CLT) Approach**

To maximize effectiveness in my main areas of instruction, English and English Conversation, I rely on a student-centered, interactive, and collaborative learning environment. I use the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach because I have found it ensures more consistent student buy-in, participation, and greater rates of realistic communication and speaking production.

To provide the reader with some background on the CLT approach, a brief discussion follows. For starters, the key elements of CLT include communication according to ability, accuracy as well as fluency, the promotion of learning, and motivation (Belchamber, 2007). Li (1998) suggests CLT is an effective, desirable approach. ELLs interact and respond to genuine communicative needs in realistic situations while developing strategies for understanding language as it would normally be used by native speakers. To produce such scenarios, a student-centered environment focused on a high percentage of partner and small group activities sets the expectation for learners to engage and interact as they apply what they are learning. In my experience, a highly effective approach introduces authentic, real-world materials, providing learners opportunities for genuine language with real scenarios while also addressing their present ability level. Therefore, it is important to develop lessons with strategies for learners to better understand and apply English.

Much of what happens in a student-centered, communicative environment lets learners apply relevant concepts, content, and topics through authentic, meaningful language use, consequently maximizing student talk time (Felder & Brent, 1996). Given that we are social creatures, I have noticed
that humans enjoy learning in a social context; thus, collaborative learning is perfectly appropriate for this tendency and presents a stark contrast to the rote memorization and repetitious nature present while students are learning grammar and sentence structure. Even though this latter approach is commonly used, it tends to be ineffective in the overall development of communicative learning. A better option is to serve as a facilitator by encouraging and promoting practical application throughout the process in a safe, non-threatening learning environment focused not on perfection but rather on realistic opportunities for practice while addressing specific, communicative objectives.

Although CLT encourages accuracy and fluency, there are many instances when communicative production is far more beneficial than ensuring precision and can be accomplished through various games, activities, role-plays, interviews, surveys, collaboration, and, ultimately, learning by teaching. Thorough supportive and positive interactions amongst students as well as with the teacher allow for students to make continuous progress in reducing their affective filters while also building student confidence. With this in mind, George (1994) suggests that the inclusion of group work can also lead to remarkable improvement in both student achievement and student attitudes toward instruction. Having applied this approach, I have seen these marked improvements through more engaged, motivated, and participatory classes, regardless of ability level or content.

Beyond that, using collaboration with the CLT approach enhances student learning while addressing important skills for students’ futures through what Tielman et al. (2012) refers to as the ‘five pillars’ - positive interdependence, individual accountability, the promotion of interaction, interpersonal and small groups skills, and collective group processing. Jacobs et al. (2002) also note an improvement in complex and cognitive higher-order thinking, the creation of positivity among students and about school, and a heightened sense of responsibility. Based on my six years of experience using CLT, I would suggest two additional considerations. First, I have found that it can be beneficial to shuffle group members for different tasks. This allows students to regularly share ideas and complete objectives with various peers as they step out of their comfort zones by working and interacting with a variety of students. A second consideration necessitates the integration of things like graphic organizers, word walls, visuals, scaffolding, and technology integration, among others. In conjunction with shuffled collaboration, these strategies offer multiple opportunities for the consumption of information while providing other avenues for increasing student confidence, self-esteem, and motivation.

Devising Speaking Assignments as Preparation for Everyday Speaking Situations

As previously mentioned, the main focus of my teaching involves English conversation at a Korean university but also includes a smattering of English related to specific purposes, such as Presentations, Film English, English for Engineers, World or Global English, Tourism & Hospitality English. The more specific ‘content focused’ courses still encompass many aspects similar to the conversation classes, but they are geared toward the specific purposes for each major discipline rather than general conversational development. In that work, my focus is primarily on communicative conversation to improve speaking and listening, and it is important to provide opportunities for students to have meaningful, relevant conversations based on specific, everyday topics. Realistic conversation is a skill with which incoming students have had little practice, especially with a native English speaker.
At the beginning of the first day of any English-related class, I pose a basic question that students have heard, repeated, and responded to hundreds of times: “How are you?” Without fail—and in unison—the entire class responds: “I’m fine, thanks, and you?” This uniform response leads the students to realize they have been conditioned to answer without considering for themselves personally. From this point, I mention that, although their answer is ‘correct,’ they will, in this class, have unscripted conversations and share opinions to expand their communicative abilities.

Throughout each semester, we cover a variety of topics in class and use various partner and small group activities to not only practice but also reinforce related language components such as vocabulary, grammar, typical questions and answers. Early in the semester, students partner up and introduce themselves to one another using topics they are familiar with, including their hometown, family, hobbies or daily routines. Later, they can use similar partnering activities to interview classmates by using common questions to gather information and then follow up with more questions to gain more specific details. Role-plays are another way I give students opportunities to practice targeted topics and vocabulary, as well as situation-specific language and phrases related to our topics. With partners or within small groups, students take on assigned roles to create realistic dialogues. On a few occasions throughout the semester, students are organized into small groups and given a random topic. The goal is that they then have a ‘free talking’ conversation for a few minutes. The goal is to discuss the topic spontaneously and naturally, as native speakers would do, without worrying about perfect grammar. Each of these classroom activities allows students a safe, authentic environment to practice what they have been learning and, in the process, gain confidence in their ability to communicate in English.

To extend students’ learning beyond the classroom, I devise homework assignments that support objectives and goals mentioned in the course syllabus and reinforce what they have been learning and practicing in class. These assignments are also designed to support skills necessary for upcoming speaking assessments as well as for everyday speaking situations.

My intention for everything I do in my classes is to provide opportunities through which students can develop and demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and application of topics, grammar points, and real-life dialogues. Assignments have included the following:

- A three-to-five minute ‘self-introduction’ interview with me in my office.
- An audio or video recorded interview with someone in English (preferably a foreigner but a classmate is acceptable).
- An unscripted, spontaneous four-minute video ‘conversation’ with a group of friends.
- A three-minute topic-based role-play with a partner generally performed in my office, but, for higher-level classes, done in class with classmates as an audience offering evaluative feedback alongside my assessment.
- A three-minute topic-based role-play with me in my office.
- Online discussion-style writing assignments in which students share thoughts on topics from class.
The preceding class and homework assignments serve to reinforce what students are learning in class, to expand on that knowledge, and to use it in a relevant way, thus demonstrating their progress throughout the semester.

Although most of the assignments focus on listening and speaking, there are also opportunities to work on reading and writing. I am primarily concerned about students understanding topics and then clearly and effectively expressing themselves relative to the material learned. More focus is given to the clarity of their ideas than to grammatical accuracy or perfect pronunciation.

Devising Speaking Assessments to Effectively Gauge Progress

To gauge the progress students make throughout the semester, I employ three speaking assessments. These assessments involve the kinds of activities students have practiced in class and for homework. The assessments can take place in the instructor's office or in class with other students watching. Before each assessment, students receive rubrics that clearly define both the scope and content of the assessment, provide the categories and skills they will be graded on, and give examples of scoring. Presenting students with different, yet similar, rubrics for each assessment shows them clear course expectations and gives them the opportunity to track their progress. They can also ask in advance about any points that may be confusing or unclear. Although I would like to record assessments and sit down with students to offer feedback and suggestions, those procedures are not possible due to time constraints and the sheer number of students I teach, about three hundred each semester. Instead, I rely on the three assessments to extend the scope of the students’ conversations and gauge their emerging skill.

A role-play conversation serves as the first of my three assessments. Because students have two weeks to prepare a script and practice, they have a certain level of comfort conversing in English. They also have the freedom to choose their own partners or groups as well as the topic. In their first semester with me, students perform their role-plays in my office, but in the second semester, they perform them in front of the rest of the class. During the second semester, the class members become the audience and complete a rubric, evaluating and providing feedback for each group.

In preparation for the second speaking assessment, students create a homework video in which three to five students ‘free talk’ about specific material and topics from class, as if they are having a naturally occurring conversation with their friends in English. Then, for the second speaking test, I randomly select groups of three or four students who have a round robin discussion with only two students talking at a time. The first two randomly select a topic; one asks questions, and the other answers. The procedure continues until each student has had an opportunity to ask and answer questions on different topics for approximately two minutes. Points are awarded based on students’ understanding of questions, relevance of answers, length and detail of questions and answers, meaningfulness of follow up questions, and overall ability to ‘free talk’ about the given topic.

Finally, near the end of the semester, students have a two- to three-minute, one-on-one, ‘interview’ with me. During the interview, I start with a leading question that guides them to discuss topics they have learned about during the semester. As the instructor, I can guide the conversation to ascertain the student’s level of understanding and general grasp of material.
Procedures for assessments can vary from instructor to instructor but almost always include at least one written and one speaking test. In my experience at three universities, most native-speaking English language instructors I have worked with give only one speaking assessment during the semester, either as a midterm or final exam, depending on university mandates. The most common is a scripted role-play where students spend approximately three minutes having a conversation based on a specific topic or a set of topics covered in class.

While my approach to homework and assessments is more time-consuming, it offers students valuable extensions of what they have been learning in class. It also enables me to gauge each student’s progress while providing constructive, relevant feedback and suggestions.

With assessments, there is the question of grading. In my case, each assessment is worth 10% of a student's final grade. Points are given based on rubrics specifying criteria that have been provided and explained in class before each assessment. My courses focus less on perfect grammar and pronunciation and more on a student’s ability to have a realistic conversation that clearly expresses personal thoughts and opinions using topics from class. My emphasis is on speech clarity, pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, tone and intonation, and overall content usage.

Conclusion

Given the wide range of information presented in the previous pages, I have probably only scratched the surface in regards to teaching English and English conversation at the university level in Korea. However, my hope is that I have provided a good foundation for understanding the emergence of Korea on a global scale and with it, Korea’s English Fever. As is the case with travel or life abroad anywhere, it is extremely important to appreciate cultural nuances in play in Korea. Of these, perhaps the most important is the role Confucianism plays within society as well as the educational system. Beyond that, if one is serious about teaching English at the university level in Korea (or teaching Korean students at any level anywhere, really), knowing the structure of the South Korean university and the role English plays within it are paramount to a long, successful, and enjoyable career. Having outlined a few of the basic differences between Korean and English and touched on the general Korean educational environment, I hope I have also given the reader motivation to effectively integrate the CLT approach into a university classroom. To that end, this paper has offered various strategies and activities to use in class, practical homework suggestions, and a sequence of speaking assessments that provide a good measure of students’ progress and overall ability with English language skills.
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Abstract

In this research study, as part of an exchange visitor program year in the USA, two Chinese instructors, together with their American university liaison, developed a survey to use with adult EFL students in an American IEP program. The purpose was to investigate factors that motivated these students in the critical process of learning English vocabulary. As background, the researchers developed a thorough review of literature on motivation for learning. Using input from this review, they created and administered a detailed student questionnaire. After they analyzed the results, findings and recommendations were prepared as feedback for the instructors of these students. Examples of effective learning activities will be of benefit to other instructors in similar language learning environments as well.
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Introduction

Two of the researchers of the study described in this document are Chinese university EFL instructors supported by their country to spend one academic year in the USA. Their purpose was to experience the American educational system and to study motivation factors involved in EFL adult students’ acquisition of vocabulary. Then, once back home in China, they would apply and share their findings. The survey discussed in this document is a part of a larger research effort that included an analysis of current perceptions related to teaching and learning EFL in China and the USA, in both secondary and higher education environments, and will culminate in a comparative study based on EFL motivation to learn vocabulary and related learning strategies in Chinese and American universities.

Citation.
Recent English education reform initiatives in China are aimed at improving English competencies on Chinese college campuses. English education in China begins in the early years, and nearly all kindergartens with quality facilities located in large cities are required to offer bilingual lessons. Children from 6-18 years of age are required to participate in a minimum of 10 English lessons each week, from primary school through tertiary education, at which point English learning is split into classes focused on English majors and non-majors.

The Chinese government’s education blueprint, “Guidelines on Works in Opening Up the Education Sector in the New Era,” issued in August 2016 by the Ministry of Education in China, is aligned with the country’s current Five Year Plan and shows great concern for and positive promotion of education (Smith, 2016). The Chinese government acknowledges the value of collaborative educational research initiatives supporting student success in the global marketplace and encourages dissemination of best practices from abroad. English is commonly recognized as the global language of technology and commerce. As a result, English proficiency is one of the most important skills sought by employers in many Asian countries (Lee, 2014), and these employers typically seek applicants with high levels of English proficiency. The demand is expanding to all professional-level jobs, especially in China. According to Johnson (2009, p. 150), “English is increasingly becoming a ‘must learn’ subject for those who hope to rise above low-level employment in China.”

In his February 2014 article, “The English Empire,” in The Economist, William Olney (2016, p. 1) offers a succinct statement of the global movement toward English usage. As background, The Economist is a London weekly newspaper of insight and opinion on international news, politics, business, finance, science, and technology. Olney states, “The spread of the English language has been profound. It is used throughout the business world, intergovernmental agencies, and academia and there is really no viable alternative.” He stresses that, even though the Mandarin language could be determined to be a more common language due to the population of China, in reality, English remains the most commonly used commercial and technical language of the world. Ryder (2014), author of a blog cited in The Economist, acknowledges that Mandarin Chinese, the most probable contender, is one of the world’s most difficult languages to master.

“English is now the language most widely taught as a foreign language—in over 100 countries, such as China, Russia, Germany, Spain, Egypt and Brazil—and in most of these countries it is emerging as the chief foreign language to be encountered in schools, often displacing another language in the process” (Crystal, 2003, p. 5). An important topic of worldwide concern for EFL educators is addressed by Crystal, who observes that even as students are strongly motivated to learn English, they may at the same time resent the amount of effort it takes to master it. For that reason, the authors believe it is important for English language educators to more fully investigate the numerous factors that contribute to overall motivation to learn the English language.

In China, most EFL students at the university level have made the choice to study English with a specific profession in mind, and in most cases, have also made a significant financial investment towards achieving their learning goals. English is a compulsory course for all non-English majors during their first and second year of study at colleges in mainland China. Students are told the importance of achieving at least the minimum score (425 out of the full mark of 710) on the National
College English Test 4 (CET-Band 4) upon arrival at colleges. Failure of this benchmark translates into poor academic performance in English, which will to some extent, affect their prospects of finding professional jobs after graduation. Generally speaking, most companies in China, regardless of whether they are state-owned, private, or joint ventures, regard the certificate of a higher score of Band 4 as a significant factor during job interviews and the process of evaluating future employees.

In regard to preparing students for future employment in China, the general English course offered to most freshmen and sophomore non-English majors, called “College English,” covers the following topics: Intensive/Extensive Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking. In recent years, more and more universities are realizing the importance of teaching English across Disciplines and recognize that this approach is more closely connected to their students’ individual career development. However, implementation of this strategy becomes challenging as it requires instructors who are both fluent in English and competent in interdisciplinary knowledge. Therefore, for some students, the study of English during their college career is viewed simply as completing a graduation requirement and nothing more. Perhaps if students were more internally motivated to gain a higher level of EFL proficiency, they would make more of an effort to learn more. However, perception of the lack of relevance of general English to their major appears to result in students whose motivation levels are low, resulting in their not putting forth much effort toward learning English when compared to the efforts that they spend in courses related to their major.

Because English learning motivation varies from student to student, and from major to major, to motivate EFL students to excel at language studies is still a much-debated issue for most Chinese instructors, especially for those teaching non-English majors. As a result, frustration levels are high for students as well as for their instructors who struggle to match pedagogical strategies to the specific language proficiency levels of their students’ diverse language abilities and motivation levels.

In China, the general belief is that immersion in an English-speaking culture provides the most effective educational environment for learning English. For that reason, the number of Chinese university students traveling to the U.S., as well as other English-speaking countries, continues to grow. According to the Open Doors Data Fact Sheets by Country (Institute of International Education, 2015), 2014-2015 marked the sixth year in a row that China was the leading place of origin for international students studying in the U.S., with Chinese students representing 31.2%. The report shows 303,040 Chinese students studying in the U.S., up 10.8% from the previous year, with 45,000 of those students specifically studying in Intensive English Programs (IEPs).
Figure 1. IEP Students and Students-Weeks by Place of Origin, 2014 (Adapted from the Institute of International Education (2014) Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEP Students and Students-Weeks by Place of Origin, 2014</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Average Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>7,733</td>
<td>45,819</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>43,235</td>
<td>39,930</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>18,053</td>
<td>18,252</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Weger (2013, p. 89), Intensive English Programs (IEPs) provide opportunities for EFL adult learners to be “explicitly studying English alongside learners from diverse first language (L1) backgrounds while in an English-dominant community.” While IEPs are predominately associated with universities and community colleges across the U.S., stand-alone language institutes have also become quite common.

Globally, most educators agree that successfully teaching English to speakers of other languages will remain a priority for years to come. This need raises the importance of determining the role motivation plays in the learning process since lack of motivation could negatively affect English proficiency in any or all of the four domains of language. Thus, a research question of great interest in China is how to best enhance the motivation of Chinese EFL students and additionally, for those who study English abroad, how to facilitate a successful transition into American academic environments. The Chinese education ministry, in another effort to advance English learning in China, actively supports faculty in traveling abroad to improve their language skills, promote collaboration with teachers and professors internationally, and conduct critical research. This study is part of the research effort to identify best practices to more effectively support student learning in EFL environments. The results of this research will assist instructors in China to better prepare Chinese students for the global marketplace.

Significance of the Study

Factors contributing to language learning are complex, and the role motivation plays in achievement is a particularly interesting question that merits study because motivation toward learning a language is found to be of importance in predicting outcomes. Research further suggests that motivation can influence language learning outcomes independently from language aptitude (Gardner & Lambert,
In adult EFL students, the combination of different teaching and learning strategies at home and abroad could impact their learning behavior and, thus, the ultimate language proficiency gained. Since words and simple combinations of words serve as the basic building blocks of communication, acquisition of vocabulary forms the cornerstone of EFL learning. According to Lieb (2006, p. 84), “grammar, sentences, and syntax come later and, while important for effective communication, serve primarily to add structure to a solid base of vocabulary.” Thus, investigating the motivation factors behind EFL adult students’ vocabulary learning will help U.S. teachers in IEPs, as well as visiting instructors from other countries, to better understand factors affecting their students’ achievement and better prepare them to meet the needs of their diverse EFL populations.

**Objective and Research Questions**

This study examined distinct motivational attributes pertaining to learning the language and the motivation inspired by dynamics in the English language classroom environment, as well as the influence confidence and other internal/external motivation factors. The researchers’ observations of Chinese students in English language classrooms indicates that their success in vocabulary acquisition may be attributed to two factors: pedagogical applications (teaching and instruction) and students’ intrinsic motivation to learn a new language (intensity and persistence of effort spent). Therefore, the following two research questions were established in order to determine the underlying factors for adult EFL students’ motivation to learn English vocabulary.

1) What are adult EFL learners’ perspectives regarding motivation to learn vocabulary?
2) What are adult EFL learners’ perspectives regarding the importance of having their teachers use specific strategies to increase vocabulary learning?

This study analyzed both questions focusing on the types of motivational attributes the learners brought to their task in order to better understand their experiences learning English as a foreign language and also to give sound recommendations to teachers for best meeting the academic needs of their students.

**Review of Literature and Conceptual Framework**

**Types of Motivation**

In relation to second language acquisition, learning motivations can be categorized into two major types: “Integrative motivation” and “Instrumental motivation” (Krashen, 1988, p. 22). Integrative motivation denotes the strong desire to learn a second language in order to integrate and participate in the ESL culture, while instrumental motivation focuses on the use of the foreign language to gain specific rewards such as passing exams or obtaining better jobs for personal benefits. Motivation, and in particular integrative motivation, is an essential factor in the acquisition of a second language.

Classroom learning environments have a major effect on L2 learners’ motivation levels, and numerous studies have been conducted on university L2 students to learn more about specific
motivational factors inspiring them to learn a new language. According to Daily (2009), four factors influence adult L2 learners’ motivation. These include a learner’s (1) positive attitude towards the L2 community, (2) enjoyment of learning the language, (3) possession of a meaningful vision of his/her future self as an L2 language speaker, and (4) identification of external pressures hindering his/her learning. Some researchers also make a distinction between Extrinsic Motivation and Intrinsic Motivation, reiterating that “intrinsic motivation remains an important construct, reflecting the natural human propensity to learn and assimilate” (Arnold, 2000, p.14). This statement implies that classroom teachers need to understand the social contextual conditions that support intrinsic motivation.

Since each student enters the classroom with unique background experiences and internal motivations, it is easy to understand why instructors have difficulty encouraging their L2 adult learners to internalize motivation behaviors while at the same time stimulating students’ self-perceptions as successful language learners. Intrinsic motivation arises from within the adult learners’ themselves, and therefore to a large extent, is often beyond the reach of instructors (Nicholson, 2013). Therefore, the role of the EFL teacher also involves assisting their students to take responsibility for their learning and assisting them to discover and utilize good learning strategies themselves.

Ryan and Deci (2000, p. 65) stress that in order to provide students with opportunities to become self-determined learners, teachers must create classroom conditions “that support the innate needs to feel connected, effective, and agentic as one is exposed to new ideas and exercises new skills.” Thus EFL learners who are intrinsically motivated will have the internal desire to learn English voluntarily and not worry about whether they want to invest the effort. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation requires an outside push which triggers the students’ internal desire to learn English purely for the reward of utilitarian goals. Gardner (1985) explains that this phenomenon is due in part to social factors, such as a demanding teacher or the promise of a reward if a certain level of success is achieved, since motivation is a combination of devotion, the desire to reach one’s goals, and positive language learning attitude, which all play a key role in EFL students’ vocabulary learning.

Relevant Research

Research on adult EFL learners has revealed many interesting findings, some of which elicit additional questions and the need for additional research. For example, a study on the relevance of motivation and age in receptive vocabulary acquisition carried out among a total of 186 secondary school EFL Spanish students in grades 8 and 9 found no variation in the learners’ level of motivation as they advanced to a higher level (Fontecha & Gallego, 2012). A similar study reported significant differences through t-test analyses between highly-motivated and less-motivated Iranian adult EFL learners, reporting that highly-motivated learners outperformed in EFL vocabulary acquisition (Sadeghi, 2013).

Research conducted in Taiwan shows that the greatest factor affecting college students’ EFL vocabulary learning is intrinsic motivation, and that another influential learner variable factor is family background, including family involvement and years of study, indicating that learning motivation is a paramount factor affecting the use of vocabulary learning strategies (Wu, 2013). Various strategies to motivate students to learn English vocabulary in the adult EFL context have been investigated by
scholars around the world. For example, the use of games, both in and outside of the classroom environment, has been shown to increase students’ ability and motivation to memorize new words effectively (Al-Shawi, 2014).

Research conducted on EFL learners’ motivation toward vocabulary acquisition at colleges in mainland China described motivation factors affecting learning English such as confidence/fear, learning environment, and teaching methodology. According to Gui (2006), it is understandable that Chinese students might have a “vocabulary phobia” when encountering new words because of the use of the Roman alphabet and inherent influence from mental lexicon already built up in their mother tongue. Therefore, it is essential to motivate students by assisting them to become active learners who are able to understand how to select and use vocabulary learning strategies, and by placing priority on helping them to build confidence levels in their abilities to acquire new vocabulary through organized contextual experiences. Gui stressed that only when they are strongly motivated, can students be truly engaged in the learning process persistently and joyfully.

Six key elements that affect Chinese EFL learners’ motivation include learning attitude, learning purpose, self-identity, learning environment, classroom teaching, and classmate relationships (Bernard, 2010). When learners are appropriately guided to have an active attitude with strong purpose in mind, these elements could exert a positive influence on learning motivation. However, it is important to remember that EFL learners can easily become discouraged, which could lead to passive learning and inefficient study habits that continuously reoccur in a vicious circle, and ultimately diminish their learning motivation (Wang, 2004; Wang, Kong, & Farren, 2014).

A survey administered to 766 university EFL learners in China investigated learners’ demotivating behaviors and their correlated factors using a 40-item self-designed questionnaire using a Likert scale. This research suggested that to a large degree, the outcome of the classroom experience, in terms of whether it results in an increase in learners’ vocabulary retention or whether it makes no significant difference at all, depends on the extent to which learners are motivated (Zhou & Wang, 2012). In regard to EFL teaching, Thanh and Huan (2012) recommend that EFL instructors make better use of task-based approaches to motivate non-English majors to acquire English vocabulary.

Some research studies have documented interesting findings regarding motivation factors for EFL students enrolled in intensive English language programs in the USA. In order to assess the academic performance of English language learners enrolled in American institutions of higher education, Komiyama (2013) examined motivation of EFL reading students enrolled in 53 IEPs affiliated with colleges/universities across the U.S. This research indicated that activities integrating authentic materials through technology, such as incorporating YouTube videos for warm-up exercises, increased students’ motivation. In addition, instruction encouraging learner awareness of social-networking sites (SNS) fostered learning motivation and resulted in more learner-learner interactions and transcultural, plurilingual identities.

An online survey on student teachers’ technology proficiencies and uses of various tools in an adult Intensive English Program (IEP) at a private graduate institution on the East Coast of the United States found that using technology to enhance students’ acquisition of vocabulary was facilitative but could not fully replace face-to-face communication in regard to actively using the language in a natural setting (Fucus & Akbar, 2013).
In another study conducted in an IEP environment at an American university on the West Coast of the U.S. with a substantial population of Asian students, it was reported that the Critical Pedagogy (CP) approach had a positive effect on student learning. Students participating in this program reported having higher motivation levels when activities using a “drama” component were introduced into the lessons and daily activities (Ro, 2016). However, an important observation made by researchers in another study, who were investigating the impact of instruction that focused on developing learner awareness, found that students considered playing games to be a waste of time when important tests, such as pending TOEFL examinations, were the immediate priority (Reinhardt & Zander, 2011). These research findings indicate that the timing and application of specific educational activities is essential to the success of the individual learner.

Research Methodology

Setting and Participants
This study took place in an IEP located at a regional institution of higher education in Texas. The program is organized into two 8-week sessions each semester, and each session consists of 168 instructional hours of classroom time. Depending on scores received on the program’s placement test, students are placed in one of seven levels of instruction, from beginning to advanced. The teacher-to-student ratio averages 10-12 students per class, and the Intensive English Language Institute (IELI) core curriculum focuses on listening and speaking, reading, writing and grammar. All students are required to attend an American culture course in order to help them to adjust to life in the USA and on an American university campus.

In addition to the core requirements, advanced students (levels 5-7) are required to take a course in listening and note-taking skills, which includes preparation for the Texas Success Initiative (TSI). Students must receive a final grade of at least 80% (B) in each session to advance to the next level of study. However, students making rapid progress are able to advance at mid-term during each session.

The subjects who participated in the study consisted of 30 advanced students, studying in levels 5-7, from eight countries (Brazil, China, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Japan, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Ukraine and Vietnam). All students were in their first year of studying English in the U.S. While the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accredits the institution to award bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees, these students do not receive university credit. Instead, the purpose of their study is to improve their English skills in order to meet the standard university admission requirements for English proficiency in American institutions of higher education, and matriculate into the degree program of their choice at an American community college or university in the future.

Research Instrument
The research instrument, The Motivation to Learn a New Language Student Survey: Vocabulary, was developed in order to gain insight into student motivation for learning a new language. The questionnaire consisted of 23 questions, among which 22 multiple choice questions focused on the EFL adult learners’ motivational factors for learning English vocabulary; there was one open-ended question at the end prompting the respondent to explain how they best learn vocabulary. Eighteen questions
were adapted from the *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery* (Gardner, 2004), and four questions adapted from *Attitude Testing* (Prapphal, 1981). The instrument used a 6-point Likert Scale adapted from Gardner’s original Attitude/Motivation Test Battery measuring integrative and instrumental orientations in learning a second language (English version, AMTB) and ranged from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”

Participants were instructed to circle one answer that best reflected how they personally felt or thought about each statement. The 22 multiple choice questions were categorized into the five different motivation orientations listed below following questionnaire processing strategies established by Dörnyei (2003). These orientations were used for analytical purposes to better understand the respondents’ personal perceptions and their attempts to explain their experiences learning English as a foreign language.

- **Instrumental Orientation (Questions 1, 2, 7, 12).** The study of English is essential for success in job/studies (obtaining good grades); reaching expectations of self/other; etc.
- **Knowledge Orientation (Questions 5, 11, 19, 21).** The study of English is essential to become a more knowledgeable/educated person; to broaden one’s outlook on life/travel abroad possibilities; to be able to read English books, newspapers, magazines for academic purposes; etc.
- **Sociocultural Orientation (Questions 3, 6, 10, 20).** The study of English is essential in order to get to know and keep in touch with new people from different parts of the world; to understand English-speaking films, videos, TV, radio (to understand English pop music); to better understand various cultures and people (what is happening in the world); etc.
- **Achievement Orientation (Questions 4, 15, 18, 22).** The study of English is enhanced through specific learning strategies (beliefs that certain behaviors affect outcome/achievement).
- **Constructive Orientation (Questions 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17).** The study of English is related to enjoyment, interests, opinions, self-abilities and/or anxieties regarding language learning.

**Data Collection and Procedure**

Participation in the questionnaire was voluntary. The researchers conducted the administration of all questionnaires. Participants were provided with clear instructions about the purpose of the survey and instructions regarding the Likert scale. Questionnaires were collected and analyzed immediately after the completion of the survey.

**Data Analysis**

The data from the surveys were analyzed using descriptive statistics through the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS), to determine motivations and variations among the different types of EFL vocabulary learning motivation orientations. Four reverse coded items were inserted randomly into the questionnaire in order to gain more validity: these questions required participants to carefully and fully engage in answering the questions rather than circling answers without reading questions thoroughly. Reverse coded were questions 9 and 16 (constructive orientation) and questions 15, and 22 (achievement orientation). All four reverse coded items were adjusted when running SPSS.
A six-point Likert scale was used to measure the level of disagreement or agreement based on the criteria outlined in chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.34-6.00</td>
<td>High degree of motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67-4.33</td>
<td>Moderate degree of motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-2.66</td>
<td>Low degree of motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

Three major components were examined to determine the findings of the study: (1) general information about the subjects, (2) motivations orientations, and (3) results from answers obtained on the open-ended question.

General Information about the Subjects

General demographic information about the respondents in regard to gender and age group is shown below in Tables 1 and 2 below.

**Table 1. Gender of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that among the 30 respondents participating in the study, female respondents accounted for the majority (73.33%), and male respondents were the minority (26.67%).

**Table 2. Age of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates the different age groups of the respondents. More than half of the respondents were in the age range of traditional undergraduate university students, 18-23 years of age, while the other IELI students fell into the range of ages 24-40.

Motivation Orientations

The 22 multiple choice questions in the questionnaire were categorized into five different motivation orientations: Instrumental Orientation, Knowledge Orientation, Sociocultural Orientation, Achievement Orientation and Constructive Orientation, which are all shown in the following six tables.
(Table 3 - Table 8). The resulting itemized scores were summarized through descriptive statistics of Mean scores, Standard Deviation (S.D.) and their corresponding motivation levels for further analysis.

**Instrumental Orientation**

**Table 3. Instrumental Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Orientation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Rating of Motivation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Studying English vocabulary is important because I will need it for my career.</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My parents feel that it is very important for me to learn English vocabulary.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I want to learn English vocabulary so well that the language will become natural to me.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Studying English vocabulary is important because other people will respect me more if I know advanced English vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 demonstrates that the respondents had a high level of Instrumental Orientation, as indicated by the total average mean score of 5.07 in the table. Item 1 (Studying English vocabulary is important because I will need it for my career.) has the highest mean score (5.40), followed by item 7 (I want to learn English vocabulary so well that the language will become natural to me.) with a mean of 5.33, and item 2 (My parents feel that it is very important for me to learn English vocabulary.) scored 5.17. Item 12 had the lowest score with a mean of 4.37 (Studying English vocabulary is important because other people will respect me more if I know advanced English vocabulary.).

**Knowledge Orientation**

**Table 4. Knowledge Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Orientation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Rating of Motivation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Studying English vocabulary is important because it will make me more educated.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I would like to know more English vocabulary.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Learning English vocabulary is important for traveling abroad.</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Studying English vocabulary helps me to be an open-minded and sociable person.</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 reveals a high motivational level of Knowledge Orientation as indicated by the total mean score of 5.13. Item 11 (I would like to know more English vocabulary.) has the highest mean score of 5.43, and item 21 (Studying English vocabulary helps me to be an open-minded and sociable person.) has the lowest mean score of 4.80.

**Social-cultural Orientation**

**Table 5. Social-cultural Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social-cultural Orientation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Rating of Motivation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning English vocabulary is important because it will allow me to meet and speak with more and varied people accurately.</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Studying English vocabulary is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate English-speaking cultures.</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If I planned to stay in an English-speaking country, I would try to learn more English vocabulary.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Studying English vocabulary enables me to understand English books, movies, pop music, etc.</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows a high motivational level of Social-cultural Orientation with a total mean score of 5.37. Two items, item 3 (Learning English vocabulary is important because it will allow me to meet and speak with more and varied people accurately.) and item 6 (Studying English vocabulary is important because it will enable me to better understand and appreciate English-speaking cultures.) share the same highest mean score of 5.47. The mean scores of item 10 (If I planned to stay in an English-speaking country, I would try to learn more English vocabulary.) and item 20 (Studying English vocabulary enables me to understand English books, movies, pop music, etc.) are respectively 5.33 and 5.20; these two scores are also considered very high motivational levels ratings.
Table 6. Achievement Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Orientation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Rating of Motivation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I learn more English vocabulary by working on it almost every day.</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would rather see a TV program dubbed into my language than in its own language with subtitles.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I mainly focus on using English vocabulary for class assignments and the exams.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I tend to give up and not pay attention when I don’t understand new English vocabulary used in the classroom.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows an overall moderate motivational level of Achievement Orientation. Item 15 and item 22 are reversed coded questions, and, therefore, participants’ scores are statistically reversed from the original Likert scale when running the SPSS. Table 6 demonstrates a moderate motivational level of Achievement Orientation with a total mean score of 4.17. Thus, the mean score for these items is below the mean range of high degree of motivation. The mean score of Item 18 (I mainly focus on using English vocabulary for class assignments and the exams.) is 4.17, which is the same as the average mean score of Achievement Orientation. The lowest mean in Achievement Orientation is item 15 (I would rather see a TV program dubbed into my language than in its own language with subtitles.) with a score of 3.23, in the moderate category. Item 22 (I tend to give up and not pay attention when I don’t understand new English vocabulary used in the classroom.) has a mean score of 4.30 which places it with Items 18 and 22 in the category of moderate degree of motivation. The only high mean score in this subdivision of motivation orientation is Item 4 (I learn more English vocabulary by working on it almost every day.), which received a score of 4.97.
**Constructive Orientation**

**Table 7. Constructive Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive Orientation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Rating of Motivation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. It worries me that other students in my class seem to use more advanced English vocabulary than I do.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Learning English vocabulary is a waste of time.</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I get nervous when I can’t think of the words to express myself in my English class.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I wish I were fluent in English.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I don’t have a desire to learn more than basic English vocabulary.</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I enjoy learning English vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reveals an overall high motivational level of Constructive Orientation with a total mean score of 4.74. Item 9 and item 16 are reversed coded items questions and the participants’ scores are statistically reversed from the original Likert scale when running the SPSS. Item 9 (Learning English vocabulary is a waste of time.), item 14 (I wish I were fluent in English.), item 16 (I don’t have a desire to learn more than basic English vocabulary.) and item 17 (I enjoy learning English vocabulary.) all have higher means and belong in the high degree range of motivation, with their scores listed in order: 5.07, 5.50, 5.03 and 4.60. However, not all items in Constructive Orientation are high. The mean scores of item 8 (It worries me that other students in my class seem to use more advanced English vocabulary than I do.) and item 13 (I get nervous when I can’t think of the words to express myself in my English class.) are respectively 4.23 and 4.03, which are relatively low, with moderate motivational ratings. In addition, the score of 4.60 received on item 17 is not significantly higher than the mean range indicating a high degree of motivation.
The Comparison of the Orientations

Table 8 shows the comparison of mean scores for all five motivation orientations examined and reveals the comparison among all the motivation orientations. The highest mean score is Social-cultural Orientation (5.37), followed by that of Knowledge Orientation (5.13) and Instrumental Orientation (5.07). The mean of Constructive Orientation is still high (4.74), although the mean of Achievement Orientation (4.17) is considered to be a significant finding as it shows a moderate rating of motivation level. Overall, the total mean scores of all the five motivation orientations are suggestive of a high degree of motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Rating of Motivation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Orientation</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-cultural Orientation</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Orientation</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Result from the Open-ended Question

Question 23 is open-ended and elicits participants’ responses to the following statement: “I learn vocabulary best by....” This prompt was designed to allow students the opportunity to describe their personal beliefs and assist the researchers to better understand individual IELI students’ preferences that may affect their motivation levels to learn English vocabulary.

Table 9. Best Ways to Learn Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best ways to learn vocabulary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By reading, speaking and writing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By watching movies, TV or listening to music</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By games, splash cards, and other strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows four categories into which answers to Question 23 (I learn vocabulary best by…) were grouped: By reading, speaking and writing; By watching movies, TV or listening to music; By games, splash cards, and other strategies; and No answer.
Examples of the responses described in the 14 answers belonging to the first group “By reading, speaking and writing” include “applying in speaking and reading,” “talking with native speakers,” “talking with teachers,” “basic communication” and “daily communication.” This category represents 46.67% of the responses, the largest portion of the total. These data suggest that almost half of the participants possessed a certain degree of Instrumental Orientation to learn English vocabulary.

Eight respondents gave answers belonging to the second group “By watching movies, TV or listening to music” and included specific examples such as “watching movies with English subtitles,” “watching TV,” and “listening to music and English songs.” These responses, in part, can be related to the respondents’ acceptance of English culture. Therefore, these responses could fall into the Integrative Orientation category.

The third answer group, “By games, splash cards, and other strategies” was cited by four out of 26 students and specific descriptions included “games,” “using flashing cards,” and “working hard every day and trying all means to learn vocabulary”, all of which are, to some degree, related to Constructive Orientation. Four participants, for reasons not disclosed to the researchers, did not answer the open-ended question.

**Discussion and Recommendations**

Data gathered from student survey responses provided insight into specific learning strategies and the motivation intensity of these particular EFL adult learners in regard to studying a new language in an IEP setting.

The results indicate that these adult EFL learners possess a strong motivation to learn English vocabulary. Based on comparisons among different motivation orientations toward learning English vocabulary, researchers concluded that these participants have high orientations in the following, listed in order from the strongest: Social-cultural, Knowledge, Instrumental and Constructive. These participants, however, possessed only a moderate rating of Achievement Orientation which merits additional discussion and investigation.

As for the motivation orientations with comparatively high ratings of motivation levels, it is important to reinforce those factors that concentrate on vocabulary instruction. This focus had, for these students, occurred during curriculum design and/or language program activities, such as incorporating vocabulary instruction into activities related to all four domains of language learning, as well as into the American culture classes. Instructors had done this to provide an environment in which students felt drawn to learn and use new words in a natural context. When new words were to be introduced, instructors had developed a variety of opportunities for the learners to use in order to practice them, such as through visual, contextual and linguistic supports and think/pair/share activities. These activities were intended to help instructors confirm that the students understood the new vocabulary and contexts for using it. In addition, instructors had provided students with opportunities to write and then present their initial thoughts, reflectively listen to others, and verbally expand their original ideas. Using activities such as the ones described above encouraged active participation and helped instructors to avoid teaching vocabulary in an isolated monotonous manner. Through theme-based applications that spanned the different classes students attended during the day, the instructors were able to facilitate connections and build students’ experiences in all language domains, including grammar.
In regard to improving the moderate rating of Achievement Orientation, the program has, since feedback from this research survey was received, begun to weave strands related to the students’ desired fields of study into specialized seminars in order to build concepts and language attainment as well as to increase student motivation to learn. Outside of the classroom, instructors have begun to require their language students to become involved in community and campus-wide events such as International Fest, occurring during International Education Week, where students present their home country and culture through a poster presentation, since these types of experiences provide an active opportunity to build additional English vocabulary on a daily basis, and have provided opportunities and assignments for students to use new vocabulary beyond the traditional classroom setting. This procedure also facilitates moving new vocabulary into long-term memory.

Responses to the open-ended survey question indicated that these adult learners’ personal preferences for English vocabulary learning lean toward teacher-guided activities. Therefore, it is recommended that formal listening, speaking, reading and writing activities be repeated with variations in order to continue reinforcing new vocabulary through extended use. Additional suggestions for follow-up activities, based on the findings, include showing students ways to blend vocabulary learning into their daily use of the English language, such as conducting community interviews and attending community cultural/social events. Finally, instructors should work individually with students to help them understand their personal learning styles and motivations as interpreted through this research study. Because the sample size of this survey is 30, limitations on implications and broad applications exist. A larger sample size is recommended for subsequent studies to obtain additional data to establish stronger trends involved in motivation factors that affect EFL adult learners in IELI settings.
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Abstract
This is a brief review praising the positive attributes of three books. No attempt is made to be objective or comprehensive in critiquing the books. This is simply a limited attempt to highlight the positive characteristics of three useful teaching and learning tools.

Key Words: English language learners, grammar, teaching ESL, teaching EFL, ESL teacher preparation, translanguaging, and authentic literature for diverse learners.


Why didn’t I find this book sooner? With an unfulfilled glorious goal of writing my own linguistics text, I stubbed my toe on treasure. All of the teachers I have taught in diverse contexts and climates, pre-service and thirty-year veterans, could make good use of Parrot’s (2010) grammar book. Besides having a wonderfully clear, straight-forward style and layout, what probably contributes most to the 35 five-star reviews the book has on Amazon is that it provides authoritative information without the technical vocabulary used to describe the structure of the English language by linguists. Even after a couple of linguistics courses, I’m sure my former students do not make good use of that terminology, which they shouldn’t try to teach to second graders anyway.

The author of this grammar for English language teachers book, Martin Parrott, is described on the Cambridge University Press website (2016) as having been a teacher, teacher trainer, and director of teacher training at International House, London, as well as having written and produced a series of radio programs for BBC English. In addition to having taught and trained teachers in many parts of the world and at universities in England, he has authored three books about language teaching. Clearly he has the credentials to write a useful book for practicing (or practising) teachers of English.

What impressed me the most as I read through the first topic in the book--15 pages about nouns and how, when, or whether they can be made plural, was the lack of anything that would confuse a reasonably well-educated English speaker who needed some concise examples of what to do and how to pronounce it that she could use when explaining the language to an English language learner. The quantity of the explanatory information and the number of examples are precisely measured. Just enough is provided, never too much.

The four pages of “consolidation exercises” that form the last third of this brief chapter carefully implement the concepts with additional examples and explanations about how the language is changing and what differing “rules” one may encounter. Examples of the sorts of errors English language learners...
may make based on borrowing the structure of another language or making reasonable but incorrect extensions and analogies seem particularly helpful, I think. I cannot prepare teachers to expect all the kinds of errors their students will make even if they were to complete contrastive studies of several languages, so including a few of the most common errors with a few words of explanation of the probable sources of the errors is a welcome addition to the generic descriptions of how English works.

As the topics become more complex, the explanations expand to cover aspects that need more contextual information. For example, in Chapter 10: Multiword verbs and verbal expressions, four main types of these are described, followed by eleven kinds of typical difficulties with comments about whether the difficulty is more likely to be noted in speech or in writing. Chapter 19: Conditional sentences explains that depending on the language background of the learner, there may be different ways to introduce the ideas conveyed by these sentences. If the learner’s language has a conditional verb tense that must be used then that may provide a basis for understanding the structures in English, even though English does not actually have a separate verb form for conditional verbs. What is especially helpful in this chapter’s introduction is the advice to teach the two clauses of the conditional sentence separately because students have difficulty managing the complete structure all at once.

Circling back to my comment about the lack of linguistics terminology that would confuse a reasonably well-educated English speaker--that is a priority for this sort of book in the parts of the world that have been infected with “English fever” and that choose to believe any native speaker of English is qualified to teach the language. I hear it echoed in quiet complaints of highly competent graduate students who teach in China, Japan, and South Korea who notice the lackluster performance of “colleagues” who lack preparation as ESL/EFL professionals. Yet, they also comment that colleagues with advanced degrees in linguistics may know all of the rules but fail to conduct classes that effectively engage their pupils in actually learning to use the English language for practical applications.

Revolution! The very idea! Asking students to actively and openly use the native languages that always lie near the surfaces of their minds to problem-solve with classmates is not a new action. But it has usually been prohibited in most classrooms and schools both in the USA and elsewhere. Sometimes the belief seems to be that the deeper you sink the student in English, the more likely she is to swim. (Desperation leads to competence?) Other times the fear of losing control of the classroom dynamics if students can use languages their teacher doesn’t know leads to demands of “My Way; there is no other highway.” Teachers need to develop the courage to learn a few words of some new languages and struggle along with their students, while letting the learners walk on both legs instead of amputating one before the learning is allowed to begin.

As I think back over quite a few years of observing classes for English language learners in our schools and as I look at the current demographics of our schools, the word that comes to mind is apartheid. Yes, I looked it up to make sure I wasn’t misusing the word. Most of the online definitions couldn’t get past talking about South Africa to focus on the concept of “separating” nonwhites in an unequal social and economic setting where a minority of whites rule the place. I don’t need to cite the latest demographics to tell you that teachers are a minority in the population of a school, most of them are white, and they attempt to rule over students, most of whom are not white except in schools and neighborhoods that have not experienced diversification.
The image I have in my mind is of one particular school fairly near my home where the ESL and bilingual classes were all on one wing, completely separate from the rest of the school. I think that embodies part of what Guadalupe Valdés had in mind when she referred to the “ESL ghetto” in her thoughtful introduction to the translanguaging book by García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017). Valdés points out, “At a time when we are engaged in a national conversation about race, inequality, poverty, opportunity, and immigration, this book brings us a groundbreaking and daring pedagogical vision.” (p. vi) She goes on to use a phrase I used to use when she says it challenges the “well-meaning pedagogies that provide few challenges for pobrecito students” (p. vii). I recall characterizing a graduate school classmate’s solution of bringing her rocking chair to school to soothe a child she couldn’t communicate with instead of finding a linguistic solution as a “pobrecito syndrome” (deficit) attitude.

García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017) base their book on three principles:

1. Bilinguals use their linguistic repertoires as resources for learning, and as identity markers that point to their innovative ways of knowing, being, and communicating.
2. Bilinguals learn language through their interaction with others within their home, social, and cultural environments.
3. Translanguaging is fluid language use that is part of bilinguals’ sense-making processes. (p. xi)

Unlike some other recent publications that talk passionately about the need overcome our deficit attitudes about different ways of using languages, but don’t give any explicit indication of how to do that, this book gives very specific guidance, beginning with an analysis of a particular fourth grader’s Performance along the Dynamic Translanguaging Progressions (p. 85). This is followed by a Translanguaging Unit Plan containing Big Questions, Content Standards, Content and Language Objectives, Translanguaging Objectives, Translanguaging Assessments, and Texts (pp. 87-88). Then there is a Translanguaging Design Cycle graphic that illustrates the flow of the learning processes (p. 89). Toward the end of the chapter, we find a Completed Integrative Assessment for another child, illustrating assessments by self, group, family, and teacher, leading to an integrative score and comments. It is an exceptional example of holistic, authentic, whole child assessment. In the next chapter, we see the same general process applied in the context of an 11th grade student. So, now we have no excuses; we’ve been shown. And that brings us to the other special book I chose.

What do you do when there are no books in your library for the children who now attend your school and who deserve stories they can relate to? Do it yourself--by gathering the students’ experiences and stories and creating a homegrown book for them as principal Tammy Wilson (2016) in Minnesota did for her Somali students. It is a lovely book in any climate! Order a few copies for your students to read and for your teachers and administrators to emulate.
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