TESL Reporter

Celebrating 50 Years!

TESL Reporter

A Forum for and by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Vol. 50, No. 2
October 2017

TESL Reporter

Volume 50 (2)   **October 2017**

CONTENTS

Celebrating
50 Years!

Jubilee Editorial

It is with great pleasure that I find myself the editor of the *TESL Reporter* on the auspicious occasion of its 50th year of publication. At the time of its conception (1967), there were only several other journals in the field. We are proud of our efforts to remain true to the journal's original intent, which was to provide a forum wherein teachers could share with each other their research and ideas pertaining to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language.

We remain committed to first time authors and non-native speakers. Over 50% of our published articles over the past 20 years have been submitted by non-native speaker authors who have come from a wide variety of educational contexts near and far, prestigious and humble.

The Department of English Language Teaching & Learning expresses its gratitude to Brigham Young University–Hawaii, which has generously underwritten the costs of the journal over these past five decades. To further the reach of the journal, without taxing the generosity of its sponsoring institution, the *TESL Reporter* has now become an online journal. This recent move will allow the journal to reach more potential readers, while remaining free to all.

– Mark James, Editor

English as a Second/Foreign Language Reading Comprehension: A Framework for Curriculum and Instruction

Ghazi M. Ghaith, American University of Beirut, Lebanon

Abstract

The purpose of the article is to present a curriculum and instruction framework for teaching ESL/EFL reading comprehension. Grounded in the L1 and L2 theoretical and research knowledge base, the proposed framework provides a number of dimensions and examples of best practice, based on which, reading teachers may organize their efforts to enhance their learners' reading comprehension in a language other than their own.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, Framework, ESL, EFL, Curriculum, Instruction

Introduction

Reading is an important act of specific and general communication frequently performed for personal, social, and academic purposes. The threshold of literacy is currently already high in most societies all over the globe and the demand for reading proficiency in daily life and the workplace has become more pressing than ever. This is primarily due to expansion in knowledge production and dissemination, modern communication technology, and globalization.

The outcome of the reading act is comprehension with its various types of literal understanding of stated ideas as well as higher-order types which include interpretive, critical, and creative comprehension (Roe & Smith, 2012). As such, comprehension of written texts, even in one's native language, is a complex psycholinguistic task which entails understanding the stated and implied ideas, making inferences, assessing information, and producing new products based on what is read. Furthermore, numerous textual, reader-related, and context-specific factors influence comprehension. This is particularly the case in the context of ESL/EFL reading where a range of linguistic and socio-cultural variations as well as social

factors may further impact readers' comprehension of texts written in a language other than their own, as suggested by Grabe (2009).

The preceding overview of the importance and nature of the reading process as a complex act of communication underscores the need for an instructional theory of reading instruction grounded in the extant research and based on exemplary best practice in the field of teaching reading comprehension. Consequently, I reviewed the knowledge and research base in L1 and ESL/EFL reading in order to explore and confirm the threads that appear to run through reading models, research base, and instructional best practices in order to devise an instructional theory of reading comprehension. The study is premised on the assumption that reading teachers and practitioners need a valid theoretical perspective from which to plan their endeavor, as well as examples of proven and effective teaching techniques and strategies.

The Instructional Framework

In developing the framework, I was guided by a number of hypotheses regarding the possible determinants of comprehension. These hypotheses were generated based on the pedagogical implications of a number of first language (L1) and second language (L2) reading models that have influenced ESL/EFL reading theories and instructional practices. According to Barnett (1989), L1 reading models can be categorized into bottom up, top down, and interactive categories of models. The bottom up category (e.g., Gough, 1972; Laberge & Samuel, 1974; Carver, 1977) views reading as a process of decoding the text in order to extract the writer's intended meaning in a linear fashion beginning with letters, words, phrases, and sentences, following which the text is processed in small chunks. Conversely, the top-down models (e.g., Goodman 1976; Smith, 1971) consider reading as an active-constructive process in which the reader draws on his/her background knowledge to actively create meaning. Meanwhile, the interactive models (e.g., Anderson & Pearson, 1979; Kintsch & Dijk, 1978; Just & Carpenter, 1992; Rumelhart & McClelland, 1981; Stanovich, 1984) assume that comprehension results from the interaction of the reader's background knowledge and the text.

Because of the peculiarities of the reading learning needs of ESL/EFL readers, whose linguistic and cultural knowledge of the English language may vary from one context to another, the preceding L1 reading models seem to not have fully explained how ESL/EFL readers read. This is despite the fact that these models have

influenced the understanding of the ESL/EFL reading process in a very major way. In fact, many ESL/EFL reading theorists and practitioners have underscored the importance of the specific reading learning needs of second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) learners, which led to the development of the "componential" models of the reading process (e.g., Bernhardt, 1986; 2010; Coady, 1979). Specifically, these models focus on the different types of components involved in reading such as conceptual abilities, process strategies, and background knowledge, rather than the process of reading. In applying these models to L2 and FL reading, the main issues include whether L2 reading is a developmental problem and whether knowledge of one aspect of the L2 such as knowledge of syntax or vocabulary, for example, can compensate for another aspect such as background knowledge. In the same vein, Bernhardt (2010) emphasizes the importance of the compensatory interplay of L1 proficiency and L2 grammatical knowledge in the fluent processing and comprehension of upper register L2 texts, particularly literature, commentaries, and essays. Such processing entails employing the L1 and L2 resources in terms of strategies, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, as well as underscores the significant role of automaticity and fluent word decoding skills in reading comprehension.

Furthermore, it should be noted that another category of reading models labeled as "modified interactive models" has been created to describe the L2/ FL reading process (e.g., Hedgcock & Ferris 2009). According to these models, the ordinary interactive models discussed above are self-contradictory since the essential components of bottom-up processing (i.e., efficient automatic processing in working memory) are incompatible with the strong top-down controls on reading comprehension because these controls are not automatic (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009). Hence, the modified interactive models emphasize the role of bottom-up processes and minimize the role of the top-down processes on the assumption that activating prior knowledge or schematic resources may be time-consuming. As such, a reader may recognize words by perceiving information from graphemes, phoneme–grapheme correspondences, and spelling without employing schematic knowledge (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009).

The above theoretical perspectives were used in generating a number of hypotheses regarding the role of text-based and reader-based processing, as well as context-specific variables in ESL/EFL reading comprehension. These hypotheses relate specifically to the role of emergent literacy along with a number of text-

based factors such as fluency in word and phrase recognition, vocabulary, and decoding of grammatical and syntactic complexities as determinants of comprehension. Likewise, background knowledge, metacognitive strategies, strategy instruction, and meta-discourse awareness are also considered potential important determinants of readers' proficiency and success in getting intended meaning. In addition, it seems essential to identify the corresponding effective and proven teaching techniques and instructional strategies in order to provide classroom support in reading comprehension and link theory to practice.

Consequently, I devised the instructional framework presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Curriculum and Instructional Framework of ESL/EFL Reading

Dimension	Related Activities
Emergent Literacy	• Playing with Alphabet Blocks • Listening to Stories • Auditory and Visual Discrimination of Letters • Sight Vocabulary • Environmental Print • Reading Aloud • Big and Predictable Books • Shared Book Experiences
Fluency	• Shadow Reading • Shape Recognition • Number Recognition • Letter Recognition • Word Recognition • Phrase Recognition • Rate Build Up • Repeated Reading • Class-Paced Reading • Self-Paced Reading
Vocabulary	• Determination Strategies: Using Dictionaries, Guessing Meaning from Context, Identifying Parts of Speech, Word Structural Analysis

	• Social strategies: Asking Others
	• Memory strategies: Connecting Learners' Background Knowledge to New Words
	• Cognitive strategies: Repetition, Taking Notes, Labelling Objects, Highlighting New Words, Making Lists, Using Flashcards, Keeping a Vocabulary Notebook
	• Metacognitive Strategies: Monitoring, Decision-making, Assessment of Own Progress
	• English Language Media, Studying New Words many times, Paying Attention to English words, Skipping New words
Grammatical Complexities	• Meaning of Affixes, Suffixes, and Word Roots
	• Structural Analysis of Words
	• Syntactic Structural Awareness
Background Knowledge	• Conversing Freely with Readers, Reading Together, Telling Stories, Traveling, Showing Pictures, Movies, and Trips
	• Previews, Anticipation Guides, Semantic Mapping, Writing before Reading, Brainstorming
	• Reconstructing the Organizing Structure of the Text
	• Identifying the Logical Linkage of Content through Discourse Markers
	• Graphic Organizers
Metacognitive Awareness and Strategies	• Think Aloud
	• Reciprocal Teaching
	• Asking Questions,
	• Accessing Prior knowledge, Predicting, Confirming, Making inferences,

	• Retelling • Summarizing and Clarifying Information • Verbalizing Thoughts
Critical Reading	• Critical Stance and Reflect on the Author's Competence, Purpose, Point of View, and Tone • Questions on the Timeliness, Accuracy, Adequacy, and Appropriateness of Information • Differentiating Fact from Opinion • Recognition of Propaganda Techniques • Discussion of Fiction and Nonfiction Literature

Table 1 shows that an instructional framework of ESL/EFL reading comprehension should underscore the importance of emergent literacy and creating a print-rich as well as a supportive home and school environment in order to lay the foundations for literacy in the formative years of children's life. Likewise, developmentally-appropriate practice in word recognition and vocabulary acquisition is essential to prepare meaning-centered and proficient readers who are effective and efficient in comprehending the literal meaning of written discourse, reading between the lines to get implied meaning, evaluating what they read, solving problems, and creating new products based on what is read. This is because reaching a "linguistic threshold" and achieving "automaticity," as respectively suggested by Eskey (2002) and Stanovich (1984), enables readers, especially L2 readers, to free up their minds to do higher order thinking in reading and thereby overcome the problem of text-boundedness resulting from not having adequately mastered the linguistic system of the target language. As such, "lower cognitive factors" such as word recognition, which entails orthographic and phonological processing, in addition to syntactic processing and lexical access, interact with "higher cognitive factors" including attention, noticing, and conscious making of inference to impact comprehension, as suggested by Grabe (2009).

Retrieving and/or building relevant background knowledge through the provision of vicarious and real world experiences is also important to ensure mean-

ingful learning and assimilating new information into the cognitive structures of readers. Because ESL/EFL readers are likely to encounter English language texts that reflect culturally-distant and topically- unfamiliar materials, they may experience problems in comprehension stemming from the instantiation of wrong schemata or reaching unwarranted, far-fetched, or implausible conclusions due to schema interference, or the lack of any relevant schema. As such, it is essential to ensure that L2 readers activate the relevant background knowledge that is relatable to the cultural and background knowledge reflected in the texts they read. They also need to read for meaning and to monitor their comprehension as well as assess the accuracy, relevance, timeliness and bias in what they read.

The subsequent sections discuss the various dimensions of the framework and present advice and recommendations for ESL/EFL teachers to address them.

Emergent Literacy

Research shows that laying the foundations for literacy during the first year of life enhances the life-long process of learning to read and write (Clay, 1979; Teale & Sulzby, 1987). These finding are also highlighted in the Report of the National Early Literacy Panel (Eunice 2010) which emphasized a strong positive link between the literacy skills developed from birth to age five with the conventional literacy skills developed later in the subsequent years of schooling.

Juel (1991) defines emergent literacy as the process of developing awareness of the interrelatedness of oral and written language. Teachers are advised to use the techniques of playing with alphabet blocks, listening to stories, auditory and visual discrimination of letters, sight vocabulary, environmental print, reading aloud, big and predictable books and shared book experiences in order to facilitate children's' awareness of the relationship of oral and written language. These activities and practices, among other developmentally-appropriate practice activities, enable children to understand the alphabetic principle, develop phonemic and phonological awareness, cultivate invented spelling skills, and build word recognition fluency as suggested by Pikulski (1987) and Holdaway (1979).

Fluency

Grabe (2010) maintains that teaching practices promoting fluency "need to be part of any well-developed reading curriculum" (p. 77), and fluency is not a

competing factor with accuracy in L2 language performance. Rather, fluency builds automaticity and is important for language learning, especially reading, as suggested by Nation (1991), Rasinski (2014) and Segalowitz (2000). Furthermore, a growing number of L2 studies have reported a positive link between word recognition fluency and reading ability (e. g., Shiotsu, 2009) and passage reading fluency and reading comprehension (e.g., Lems, 2005). Along similar lines, Taguchi et.al, (2004) reported positive effects for a silent reading intervention program on comprehension, a finding that corroborates those of Lightbown et.al, (2002) who endorsed extensive reading as an effective treatment to maintain ESL reading comprehension achievement at grade level standards from grade 4 through grade 6. Consequently, it is suggested that reading teachers draw on the seminal textbooks of Anderson (2013) as well as others (e.g., Fry, 1991, 2001a, 2001,b; Spargo, 2001), to apply proven techniques and activities to promote reading fluency. These techniques and activities include silent as well as oral reading practices such as shape, number, letter, and phrase recognition exercises; self and class-paced reading activities; and repeated, shadow, echo, and choral reading.

Vocabulary

Numerous studies have underscored the pivotal role of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension (Huang & Liou, 2007; Koda, 1989; Laufer 1992). These researchers, among others, have established that vocabulary knowledge impacts the comprehension of ESL/EFL readers in as very major way. Reading practitioners, on the other hand, have devised various learning strategies and instructional techniques for teaching vocabulary that ESL/EFL teachers can utilize to help leaners acquire the semantic system of the English language. According to Schmitt (2014), vocabulary learning strategies are classified into determination, social, memory, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies. This researcher maintains that the determination strategies include using dictionaries, guessing the meaning from context, identifying the parts of speech, and word structural analysis. Social strategies involve asking others such as the teacher or classmates inside or outside the classroom about the meaning of unknown vocabulary. Memory strategies help learners to acquire the new words by connecting learners' background knowledge to the new words. Cognitive strategies include repetition, taking notes, labelling objects, taking notes, highlighting new words, making lists, using flashcards, and keeping a vocabulary notebook. Finally, metacognitive strategies include moni-

toring, decision-making, and assessment of own progress. They can also aid learners to specify suitable vocabulary learning strategies for learning new words. Specific examples include using English language media, studying new words many times, paying attention to English words when someone is speaking English, and skipping or passing new words.

Grammatical Complexities

Grammatical complexities are defined in the context of this proposed framework in accordance to Gascoigne's (2005) definition of "grammatical competence" which entails knowledge of morphology, syntax, vocabulary, and mechanics. The extant research suggests that a "threshold of linguistic competence (morphology and syntax) is necessary for successful reading (Zarei, 2013). Furthermore, a number of studies have indicated a possible link between morphological awareness and reading comprehension (Schano, 2015). This suggests that automaticity in word recognition and knowledge of word formation rules of derivational and inflectional morphology in unfamiliar words improves independent reading and could lead to increased vocabulary breadth and depth and better comprehension (Fatemipour & Moharamzadeh, 2015; Schano, 2015). As such, ESL/EFL teachers are encouraged to teach the meaning of affixes, suffixes, and word roots as well as utilize the structural analysis of words strategy in order to increase their learners knowledge of vocabulary and enhance their textual understanding.

Several researchers have also underscored the role of understanding syntactic devices in comprehension (e.g., Ahandani, 2015; Berman, 1986; Bossers, 1992; Clarke, 1979). A basic assumption behind this research is that the provision of structural clues to ESL/EFL learners can improve their comprehension. This suggests that deliberate instruction in syntactic structural awareness is also useful in enhancing the reading comprehension of ESL/EFL readers.

Background knowledge

The role of background knowledge as an important determinant of comprehension has clearly been established and is widely recognized both in first language (L1) and second language/foreign (L2/FL) contexts. According to Pearson (1979) and Pearson, Hansen, and Gordon (1979), reading comprehension is described as the act of relating textual information to the reader's existing clusters of informa-

tion called schemata. Through direct and vicarious world experiences, parents and ESL/EFL reading teachers can provide readers with diverse opportunities to develop and enhance their schemata. This could be achieved through conversing freely with children, reading for them, telling stories, traveling, showing pictures, movies, surfing the web, and going on trips.

Because ESL/EFL readers may have developed experiential backgrounds and schemata that are different from those of their counterparts in English speaking countries, it is important ESL/EFL teachers to help them build and/or retrieve relevant schemata that match material they read at school (Drucker, 2003; Schwazzer, Haywood, & Lorenzen, 2003; Lohfink, 2009). Examples of teaching strategies and activities that teachers may use include previews, anticipation guides, semantic mapping, writing before reading and brainstorming.

Meta-discourse awareness, perceived in the context of this proposed instructional framework as the reader's awareness of how the author attempts to accommodate his/her audience and engage the reader, is also a significant determinant of ESL/EFL reading comprehension (Tavakoli, Dabaghi, & Khorvash, 2010). This is because it enables readers to better understand the author's text plan and thereby realize whether they are reading the introduction, the body, ancillary material (e.g., colored, boxed text) or conclusion of a text. Readers will also know when the author has shifted to a different topic or that certain ideas are considered more important than other ideas. Consequently, ESL/EFL teachers of reading are advised to consider using the techniques of reconstructing the organizing structure of the text, identifying the logical linkage of content through discourse markers, and using graphic organizers as effective means of building readers' text structure awareness and thereby enhancing comprehension.

Metacognitive Awareness and Strategies

In devising this framework, we perceived metacognitive strategies as acts that go beyond cognition and allow readers to organize their learning. In reading, these metacognitive strategies focus on comprehension monitoring and on taking measures to maximize it through setting a purpose for reading, planning how the text will be read, self-monitoring for comprehension, and self-evaluation of comprehension as suggested by (Keshavarz & Assar, 2011) Along similar lines, Anderson (2002) and Cohen (2003) posited that strategy use marks the difference between

effective and ineffective readers. This proposition is supported by Dhieb-Henia's (2003) findings that students who received training in strategy use did indeed benefit from it. Along similar lines, Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) indicated, based on empirical evidence, that both native and non-native high-reading-ability students showed comparable degrees of higher reported usage of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies than lower-reading-ability students in the respective groups. Consequently, it would be in order that ESL/EFL reading teachers support their learners to use metacognitive strategies in order to monitor and analyze their thinking and thereby improve both their comprehension and the study skills practices, more generally.

The think aloud and reciprocal teaching procedures, respectively suggested by Baumann, Jones, and Seifert (1993) and Palincsar and Brown (1986), entail a number of metacognitive strategies that improve comprehension. These strategies include asking questions, accessing prior knowledge, predicting, confirming, making inferences, and retelling of what is read. Readers may also summarize and clarify information as they verbalize their thoughts while reading and exchange roles with the teacher to discuss and monitor comprehension.

Critical Thinking Strategies

Critical reading is important for making sound and intelligent decisions based on what is read. This entails evaluating the material based on known standards and reaching conclusions regarding the accuracy, timeliness, relevance, and bias of information presented in text. As a form of higher-order comprehension, critical reading requires questioning, fact searching, and suspending judgment, with focus on getting the main ideas and supporting details stated in the text (literal comprehension) as well as grasping the implied ideas (interpretive comprehension) and reading between the lines, as suggested by Roe and Smith (2012).

Teachers of ESL/EFL reading at all levels of schooling and reading proficiency can promote critical reading by encouraging learners to adopt a critical stance while reading in order to reflect on the author's competence, purpose, point of view, and tone. Likewise, questions on the timeliness, accuracy, adequacy, and appropriateness of information as well as differentiating fact from opinion and recognition of propaganda techniques are also important in critical reading (Roe & Smith, 2012). Along similar lines, Lelan, Harste, and Huber (2005) propose

using exploiting fiction and nonfiction literature and asking questions regarding whose story is it?, who benefits form the story?, and whose voices are not heard? to promote critical reading. Similarly, McMillan and Gentile (1988) maintain that reading multicultural literature and having students question and compare character's actions and multicultural perspectives can contribute to building the skills of critical reading.

Conclusion

This article has presented a framework for curriculum planning and instruction in teaching ESL/EFL reading. The dimensions of the framework are based on a number of hypotheses generated based on a review of the current ESL/EFL reading research and knowledge base as well as in accordance with a number of effective teaching strategies and instructional procedures of proven efficacy. ESL/EFL reading teachers are encouraged to efficiently use this framework in planning their instruction as well as draw on the various suggested activities in order to diversify their teaching activities thereby improve learners' literal and higher order comprehension, taking into consideration available time and resources in their respective schools.

References

Ahandani, S. S. (2015). The effect of recognizing syntactic relations and categories on EFL reading comprehension. *Journal of Renewable Natural Resources, 3*(5), 11-19.

Anderson, N. J. (2002). The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED463659).

Anderson, N. J. (2013). *ACTIVE Skills for Reading*. (Books 1 -4), 3rd ed. Boston: National Geographic Learning.

Anderson, T., & Pearson, P.D. (1988). A Schematic-theoretic View of Basic Processes in Reading Comprehension. In P. Carell, J. Devine, & D. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 37-55). Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press

Barnett, M. A. (1989). *More than meets the eye: Foreign language reading*. New Jersey: Center of Applied Linguistics and Prentice-Hall.

Baumann, J. F, Jones, L. A., & Seifert-Kessell, N. (1993). Using Think Aloud to Enhance Children's Comprehension Monitoring Abilities. *The Reading Teacher, 47*(3), 184-193.

Berman, R. A. (1986). A cross-linguistic perspective: Morphology and syntax . In P. Fletcher and M. Garman. (Eds.), *Language acquisition: Studies in first language development* (2nd. Ed.; pp. 429-448). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bernhardt, E. (1986). "Proficient Tasks or Proficient Readers?". *ADFL Bulletin, 18* (1), 25-28.

Bernhardt, E. B. (1991). *Reading development in a second language: Theoretical, empirical, and classroom perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bernhardt, E. B. (2010). *Understanding advanced second-language reading*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Bossers, B. (1992). *Reading in two languages: A study of reading comprehension in Dutch as a second language and in Turkish as a first language*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Drukkerij Van Driel.

Carver, R. P. (1977). *Toward a theory of reading comprehension and reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 13*, 8-64.

Clarke, M. A. (1979). *Reading in Spanish and English: evidence from adult ESL students. Language Learning, 29*, 121-150.

Clay, M. (1979). *The early detection of reading difficulties*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.

Coady, J. (1979). A Psycholinguistic Model of the ESL Reader. In R. Mackay, B. Barkman, & R. Jordan (Eds.), *Reading in a second language* (pp. 5-12). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Cohen, A. D. (2003). The learner/s side of foreign language learning: Where do styles, strategies, and tasks meet?. *IRAL 41*(4), 279-291.

Dhieb-Henia, N. (2003). Evaluating the effectiveness of metacognitive strategy training for reading research articles in an ESP context. E*nglish for Specific Purposes, 22*(4), 387-417.

Drucker, M. J. (2003). What reading teachers should know about ESL learners. *The Reading Teacher, 57*, 22-29.

Eunice, K. S. (2010). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eskey, D. E. (2002). Holding in the bottom: an interactive approach to the language problems of second language readers. In P. L. Carrel, J. Devine, J., and D. E.

Eskey (Eds. 10th.ed.) *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. (pp. 93-100). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Fatemipour, H., & Moharamzadeh, S. (2015). The impact of textual enhancement vs. oral enhancement on learning English grammar. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6*(2), 327-332.

Fry, E. B. (1991). *Jamestown reading improvement- reading drills. Advanced*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fry, E. B. (2001a). *Jamestown reading improvement- reading drills. Introductory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fry, E. B. (2001b). *Jamestown reading improvement- reading drills. Middle*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gascoigne, C. (2005). Toward an understanding of the relationship between L2 reading comprehension and grammatical competence. *The Reading Matrix, 5* (2), 1-14.

Goodman, K. S. (1976). "Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game." In H. Singer, & R.B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (2nd ed. pp. 497–508). International Reading Association.

Gough, P. B. (1972). One second of reading. In J. F. Kavanagh and I. G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by ear and by eye* (pp. 661-685). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. (2010). Fluency in reading-Thirty-five years later. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 22* (1), 71-83.

Hedgcock, J., & Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching readers of English: Students, texts, and contexts*. New York: Routledge.

Holdaway, D. (1979). *The foundations of literacy*. Portsmouth, N.H: Heinemann.

Huang, H. T., & Liou, H. C. (2007). Vocabulary learning in an automated graded reading program. *Language Learning & Technology, 11*(3), 64-82.

Juel, C. (1991). Beginning reading. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 759-787). New York: Longman.

Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1992). A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual differences in working memory. *Psychological Review, 99*(1), 122-149.

Keshavarz, M. H., & Assar, M. (2011). Reading comprehension ability and metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among high, mid and low ambiguity tolerance EAP students. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 1*(2), 71-108.

Kintsch, W., & Van Dijk, T. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review, 85*(5), 363-394.

Koda, K. (1989). The effects of transferred vocabulary knowledge on the development of L2 reading proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals, 22*(6), 529-540.

LaBerge, D., & Samuel, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology, 6* (2), 293-323.

Laufer, B. (1992). Reading in a foreign language: How does L2 lexical knowledge interact with the reader's general academic ability? *Journal of Research in Reading, 15*, 95-103.

Lelan, C. H, Harste, J. C., & Huber, K. R. (2005). Out of the box: Critical literacy in first-grade classroom. *Language Arts, 82*, 257-268.

Lems, K. (2005). A study of adult ESL oral reading fluency and silent reading comprehension. In B. Maloch, et al., (Eds.), *54th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 240-256). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Lightbown, P., Halter, R., White, J., & Horst, M. (2002). Comprehension-based learning: The limits of 'do it yourself.' *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 427-464.

Lohfink, G. S. (2009). Culturally-relevant picture books for Mexican-american children. *Journal of Children's Literature, 35*(2), 34.

McMillan, M., & Gentile, L. M. (1988). Children's' literature: Teaching critical thinking and ethics. *The Reading Teacher, 35*, 876-878.

Nation, P. (1991). Fluency for learning. *The English Teacher, 20*, 1-8.

Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. (1986). Interactive teaching to promote independent learning from text. *The Reading Teacher, 39*, 771-777.

Pearson, P. (1979). *The effect of background knowledge on young children's comprehension of explicit and impnformation*. Urbana – Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Pearson, P. D., Hansen, J., & Gordon, C. (1979). The effect of background knowledge on young children's comprehension of explicit and implicit information. *Journal of Literacy Research, 11* (3), 201-209.

Pikulski, J. (1987). Questions and answers. *The Reading Teacher, 42*, 637.

Rasinski, T. (2014). Fluency matters. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 7* (1), 3-12.

Roe, B. D., & Smith, S. H. (2012). *Teaching reading in today's elementary schools*. Boston New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Rumelhart, D. E., & McClelland, J. L. (1981). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In J.T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 3-36). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Segalowitz, N. (2000). Automaticity and attentional skill in fluent performance. In H. Riggenbach (Ed.). *Perspectives on fluency* (pp. 200-219). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Schano, L. (2015). The influence of morphological knowledge on L2 reading comprehension. *Langues et Linguistique, 35*, 64-71.

Schmitt, N. (2014). Size and depth of vocabulary knowledge: What the research shows. *Language Learning, 64* (4), 913-951.

Schwazzer, D., Haywood, A., & Lorenzen, C. (2003). Fostering multiliteracy in a linguistically diverse classroom. *Language Arts, 80* (6), 453-460.

Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System, 29* (4), 431-449.

Shiotsu, T. (2009). Reading ability and components of word recognition speed: The case of L1 Japanese EFL learners. In Z. Han and N. Anderson (Eds.), *Second language reading research and instruction* (pp. 15-37). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Smith, F. (1971). *Understanding reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spargo, E. 2001). Timed readings plus (books 1-10). New York: McGraw Hill.

Stanovich, K. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16*, 32-71.

Stanovich, K. (1984). The interactive-compensatory model of reading: A confluence of developmental, experimental, and educational psychology. *Remedial and Special Education, 5*, 11-19.

Taguchi, E., Takayasu-Maass, M., & Gorsuch, G. (2004). Developing reading fluency in EFL: How assisted repeated reading and extensive reading affect fluency development. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 16*, 70-96.

Tavakoli, M., Dabaghi, A., & Khorvash, Z. (2010). The effect of metadiscourse awareness on L2 reading comprehension: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 92-102.

Teale, W. H., & Sulzby, E. (1987). Literacy acquisition in early childhood: The roles of access and mediation in storybook reading. In D. A. Wagner (Ed.), *The future of literacy in a changing world* (pp.111-130). New York: Pergamon Press.

Zarei, A. A. (2013). *Reading comprehension: Through vocabulary, syntax, and discourse-oriented activities*. Saarbrucken, Germany: Lambert academic Publishing.

About the Author

Ghazi Ghaith is Professor of TEFL at the American University of Beirut. His research focuses on the applications of cooperative learning and language teaching and on reading and writing.

Chinese Learners' L1 Use in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Programme

Yiqian Katherine Cao, Trinity College, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Abstract

This article reports on a classroom-based study that explored the functions of first language (L1) use in second language classroom discourse, particularly in pair and group discussions. Students' and teachers' perceptions of L1 use were also examined. Six Chinese students from an intact English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programme in New Zealand took part in this study. Their interaction in class was audio-recorded for two hours per week for eighteen weeks. Stimulated recall interviews were conducted with them once every month to gauge their perceptions of L1 use. The teachers were also interviewed about the students' participation in class and their L1 use. The results show that the students have negative views of L1 use in L2 classroom interactions while the teachers seemed to have mixed attitudes towards it. The functions identified for the use of L1 include maintaining flow of the communication, clarification of meaning, use of metalinguistic knowledge, and facilitation of deliberation of vocabulary and grammar. The findings suggest that due to the positive role that L1 use can play in L2 development, students should not be prohibited the use of L1 in L2 classes.

Keywords: First language (L1) use, classroom interaction, English for Academic Purposes, translanguaging, EAP

Introduction

In the past, behaviourist learning proponents viewed the use of first language (L1) in the second language (L2) process as predominantly negative. According to this once dominant view in the second language acquisition (SLA) field, old habits and patterns of the L1 can interfere with the learning process of the L2 (differences between the two languages can lead to negative transfer of the L1 (Ellis, 1985, 2008).

However, as a result of the rejection of behaviourism (in regards to language learning), researchers holding a minimalist view claim that learners of L2 can/should acquire a second/foreign language the same way as children acquire their L1. Thus, the influence of the L1 is of little importance in L2 learning (Dulay & Burt, 1972) and both maximizing L2 input and avoiding use of L1 are seen as essential in L2 classrooms. In this line of research, Krashen's (1982) comprehensible input hypothesis highlights the importance of teachers providing sufficient comprehensible input in their L2 classrooms for learners to accumulate sufficient competence in L2 (and overcome the problem of any potential L1 interference). That implied that the L2 could be acquired independently from the L1.

Although the importance of comprehensible input has been widely acknowledged, Swain's (1985) output hypothesis points out that comprehensible input alone is not sufficient for successful language learning; instead, comprehensible output is also a key factor in L2 development; that is, learners should make attempts to use L2 when they make grammatical choices, test hypotheses, and stretch their interlanguage system. Later, Long's (1996) interaction hypothesis suggested that interaction in L2 is also essential for successful language learning. In meaningful L2 interactions, learners internalise their L2 input and use opportunities to interact with their interlocutors and negotiate meaning. All these hypotheses have highlighted the importance of providing L2 input and opportunities for pushed output in meaningful L2 interactions.

L1 Use from Socio-cultural Perspective

More recently, however, the sociocultural theory of language learning has provided a different view of language learning. Central to this theory is the role of collaborative interaction in learning. Language learning is seen as a mediated process in collaborative interactions between students and between teachers and students (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Studies informed by sociocultural theory have examined the role of L1 and the functions it serves in collaborative interaction in L2 learning. Empirical research conducted in both EFL and ESL contexts in the last decade have revealed positive functions of L1 use in L2 interactions.

For example, Villamil and de Guerrero (1996) examined pair interaction of 54 EFL students in an essay revision task and found that the use of L1 enabled the

students to complete the task more effectively (i.e., they gained a clearer understanding of the text and offered suggestions on the improvement of the text). They also used the L1 to maintain the flow of the dialogue and externalise their thoughts. Similarly, Anton and DiCamilla's (1998) study on five pairs of L1 English learners of Spanish engaging in a writing task revealed similar use of L1. In particular, the use of L1 served a number of functions including providing each other with assistance, maintaining relationships, and vocalising their thoughts.

Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) investigated the use of L1 by Indonesian and Chinese learners of English in task interaction and found that the students mostly used L1 for task management, clarification of meaning, and searching for vocabulary. Interviews with the students revealed a negative attitude towards L1 use; that is, they felt reluctant to use L1 in L2 discussions but they thought it was nevertheless helpful. More recently, Storch and Aldosari (2010) examined the effect of learner proficiency pairing and task type on L1 use in EFL pair work in an Arabic context. The findings show that the use of L1 was moderate and students mainly used their native language for task management and to facilitate deliberations of vocabulary. Use of the L1 provided learners with the opportunity to gain a joint understanding of task requirements. When the L1 was used for deliberation of vocabulary, it helped interlocutors receive timely assistance about clarifying word meaning and word searches. Storch and Aldosari's study confirmed findings from previous research by Swain and Lapkin (2000) that learners use the L1 in pair work sparingly.

In the current globalised era where English is seen as a pluricentric language, there is a growing understanding of the practice of code-switching or code-mixing as a normal strategy that is practiced by all multilingual speakers. This practice is often referred to as translanguaging, which is viewed as a discourse practice centred on the natural, observable communicative practices of bilinguals and multilinguals (Garcia, 2009a, 2009b). From this point of view, languages are used as tools by bilingual and multilingual users to make meaning and maximize communicative potential. That means, a fundamental feature of translanguaging is that this practice occurs naturally as "individuals use the communicative potential of all languages at their disposal as they attempt to make meaning" of their daily experiences (Garrity, Aquino-Sterling & Day, 2015, p. 178).

From this point of view, the goal of modern language education is not only to produce proficient users of an L2 or L3, but strategic and resourceful bilingual and

multilingual users who are capable of utilising all of their linguistic resources and abilities in meaningful interactions and to make sense of their bi/multi-lingual worlds (Pennycook, 2014). Therefore, given the growing interest in the use of L1 in L2 learning, the positive results of L1 use from a handful of recent studies, and a large number of studies on translanguaging practice of bilingual and multilingual users of English, it appears that further research in L1 use with different learners in various contexts is still needed. Thus the current study aims to investigate the following research questions:

1. What are students' and teachers' perceptions of first language use in English classroom interactions?
2. What functions do the first language serve in the learners' interaction in pairs and groups?

Method

Context and Participants

This study, part of a one-year longitudinal classroom-based research project, was conducted at a university-based language school in Auckland, New Zealand. The participants were enrolled in a Foundation Certificate in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programme. The prerequisite for them to be accepted in this programme was a conditional offer of a place in a tertiary institution in New Zealand for study in either an undergraduate or postgraduate programme. To meet the English requirements as stated on their conditional offers and successfully pass the course, the students needed to achieve different course grades, such as an A grade for entry into master's degrees, a B grade for postgraduate diplomas and some undergraduate degrees, and a C grade for most undergraduate degrees. The EAP programme was intended to prepare students for academic studies in English and equip them with the necessary skills to succeed in their further studies in the academic context. The programme included developing skills in note-taking and presentation, communication techniques, writing academic reports and essays, and preparing for examinations.

Six Chinese students from an intact EAP class volunteered to participate in this study. The length of time the participants had lived in New Zealand ranged from 1 month to over a year. All of them had been learning English as a foreign language in their home country for over 7 years. They rated their overall profi-

ciency in English as average or above. Most of them had taken the IELTS test prior to studying in the EAP programme, with their results ranging from 5.0 to 7.0. They were identified by the programme as being at the advanced proficiency level. Three teachers were also involved in this study. They all had a postgraduate degree in Applied Linguistics with teaching experience ranging from 10 to 15 years.

Data Collection

The main source of data was collected by audio recording the classes for half a year. The class was observed and recorded 2 hours per week for 18 weeks in total. Stimulated-recall interviews were carried out with each student once per month. The interview questions were related to their feelings about their participation in class. Specific questions were asked about L1 use if they happened to have used Chinese in that class observed (Appendix 1). Each interview lasted from forty minutes to one hour. The teachers were interviewed about their class and students' participation (Appendix 2). Each interview lasted approximately one hour.

Data Coding and Analysis

The classroom data used in this study consisted of recorded and transcribed pair work and group work from each observed class. Any turns including students' use of Chinese were highlighted. To code the functions of L1 use in the class interaction data, Storch and Aldosari's (2010) framework was used as a starting point. The functions of L1 use in their study were identified as task management, discussing and generating ideas, grammar deliberations, vocabulary deliberations, and mechanics deliberations. Any new functions that emerged in this study were also added to the list.

The interviews with students and teachers were transcribed and content analysis was used to analyze the interview data. Any mention of L1 use in the data was noted and coded as students' and teachers' perceptions of the L1 use.

Results and Discussion

Throughout the data collection period, I observed numerous occasions when some of the students communicated in their L1, especially in group discussions. They knew they were not encouraged to use L1 and they did not feel positive about use of L1 in class. This is similar to previous studies (Storch & Aldosari, 2010;

Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003) which found that the learners were aware that they should avoid using L1 in L2 classes. They mentioned that they would not normally speak to another student in Chinese unless this interlocutor initiated the talk in Chinese. They felt obliged to respond in Chinese rather than English because it would feel unnatural for them to respond in a different language to an initiation in Chinese. Similarly, Peng (2008) reported that some participants in her study on Chinese students' communication behaviour in an EFL Chinese classroom also felt obliged to respond in their L1 to the group mate who initiated the talk in L1.

A number of functions of L1 use in class interactions were identified. Some students chose to ask for clarification from peers using an L1 in order to resolve comprehension difficulties,

> If something I don't know for example I didn't pay attention to teacher's speaking, and I misunderstand something yeah I ask I ask classmates in Chinese, yeah because… I know it's quite bad but but it's Chinese can help me to understand it completely. (Student Y)

When they lacked the vocabulary in English, they would switch back to L1 as a scaffold to communicating in English. As Student M noted,

> We most use Chinese to communicate the key word…I try to use English but when we're get involved with it's not I can't it's not er I can't think of English words, so I use Chinese.

It was thought that translating key words into L1 "helps other to understand the whole meaning whole sentence meaning" (Student C). But some students thought otherwise; for example, Student W disliked that her classmate explained the word in Chinese to her when they could have used English:

> If you speak to people who can speak Chinese, and even when you speak English, but you want to ask the word they want to use Chinese to respond you, just tell you what is the word meaning. I think it's not good, you can explain it in English.

Some of the students chose to switch back to L1 in discussion on account of it being less demanding to communicate in L1 with peers,

> Actually if I discuss with Chinese, maybe I will speak Chinese, that's easy more relaxed than English…sometimes I feel lazy I want to relax,

we use Chinese you can say it without thinking, in English you must think first say it. (Student C)

When there was an increase in task difficulty, there was the possibility of code-switching:

"the task the teacher give us the difficulty of task is increasing…we use more Chinese" (Student M).

They used L1 for socialising and chatting in class as well. When the chat concerned something more personal, it felt more natural to use L1:

Someone might think it's strange to talk with them in English especially we're discussing some something like your hair or your dress, because it's too complicated to talk in English and very strange. (Student A)

Similar to students' perceptions of their L1 use, the teachers' perceptions of students' L1 use were also not uniform. Some teachers disapproved of L1 use for taking a timeout from tasks. They exercised strict rules towards L1 use in class, such as stopping the students from talking in L1 and separating the two students who conversed in L1. As reported by the students,

In the morning class, [Teacher's name] usually forbid us to speak Chinese, our own languages, just English in class, John didn't mention about this too much. (Student C)

Teacher will hear and she will stop us to talk in Chinese and she will separate the two people who like to talk Chinese…when we speak use Chinese she will stop us. (Student W)

The fact that they sometimes took time out was also noticed by Teacher H, "They participate well but are not easy to keep on task sometimes. They tend to chat a lot. In afternoon class at least they are not prepared to put in a lot of effort". Certainly Teacher J's attitude towards use of L1 in class was not positive: "I think it's a waste of their money, I don't agree with that as a learning choice, er I think it's foolish, and I think they know that." But he chose to deal with this problem in various ways, some of which were more tolerant of L1 use for more appropriate purposes, such as giving explanation to aid comprehension:

Depend[ing] on what they're explaining, it'll be better if they try to do it in English, but if the idea is to structure a task or something then if they understand in their own language, it won't help much.

The teachers also identified different occasions when the students used their L1, including asking for clarification, getting excited about the discussion, or having to talk about something more personal:

> I guess my default assumption is that they do it, because they can communicate quite well in English I think, they do it just when they get too excited, or they want to I don't know talk about something really personal, or something about it, OK fair enough, but I count that as a break when it's part of their learning strategy and works well for them, once or twice I heard a discussion which seemed to be clarification, only once or twice. (Teacher John)

Freiermuth and Jarrel (2006) also found that some students reverted to their L1 to compensate for their weakness in their spoken L2. In situations where silence was identified as uncomfortable for teachers and students, it was convenient and stress-relieving for students to opt for their L1. It seems to be natural for the students to opt to their L1 when they all speak the same L1 (Duff, 2001; Kobayashi, 2003). The students in the current study used their L1 in both off-task chatting and on-task planning.

In comparing the students' report of L1 use in the interviews with their actual L1 use in classroom discourse, I found that some students did take timeout at times to chat with one another in L1, which, as suggested by Freiermuth and Jarrel, would impede their communication in L2. However, there were also occasions when use of L1 played a role not only in keeping the students on task, but also in aiding comprehension in an efficient and effective manner. I exemplify the positive role that reliance on L1 plays in this type of situation in the following three excerpts from classroom discourse.

In Example 1, Student C and A started off the interaction in L2 but then switched to L1 to discuss the meanings of the words "involve" and "export." Student C initiated use of L1 in this episode to give definitions of these two words. This is an example of vocabulary deliberation. It can be argued that use of L1 in this situation assisted comprehension and thus aided the flow of communication.

Example 1
1. C: Try involve. (…) zen me pin ya (How do you spell?)
2. A: Involve can I check, involve not evolve, in ((looks it up in dictionary))

3. C: involved, juan ru shen me xian ru lian lei ((gives several definitions of "involve"))

4. A: Well have you got example, have you got example, li ju (example)

5. C: XX get involved jiu shi shi ren juan ru shen me dang zhong (It means get sb. involved in), get involved in.

6. A: XX

7. C: Juan ru shen me shen me bao kuo (get involved in sth. means) include, juan ru jiu shi (get involved means) get involved, be involved.

8. A: ni gei wo xuan ge dong dong ci hao ma, gei wo xuan ge li ju (Could you choose a verb for me, choose an example for me)

9. A: Export, zhe shen me yi si (What does this mean?)

10. C: Chu kou (export) export.

In Example 2, Student C opted for L1 to give definitions of the words "analyse" and "consistence." He also used L1 metalinguistic terms for gerund and noun forms. This is an example of the grammar deliberation function. Like the preceding examples, use of L1 was entangled with use of L2. But it was clear that both of the students were on task and engaged in pair discussion.

Example 2

1. C: Analyse shi zhi fen xi de ma (means analyse) dong ming ci (gerund)

2. A: Is XX ((reads out the sentence))

    (…)

3. A: Cons, did you use this one?

4. C: Which one?

5. A: Er consist, consist. Consis-tence

6. C: This one consistence, consistence, ming ci shi (the noun form is) consistency

7. A: That's right.

8. C: Um consistence. Bu dui, gen consistence de yi si bu yi yang (It's not right. It has a different meaning from consistence). yi si shi zhu cheng de yi si (It means consists of.)

In Example 3, Student A was not certain if the use of 'involve' was correct in her sentence. She proposed use of present perfect tense in line 3. Student C pointed out directly that she should use the passive voice in the subsequent turn. Student A then suggested using the preposition from to collocate with "involve" in line 5. Student C corrected her misuse of from by suggesting "in" in line 6. To make the

rule more explicit, he explained it again in L1. Student A seemed to be suspicious of his correction of the preposition in and she was attempting to ask for clarification from the teacher.

Example 3

1. A: I'm not sure if it's right. Involve.
2. C: Involve the big trouble. You are.
3. A: I have involved
4. C: No no no, be involved. I have been.
5. A: Invovle from
6. C: Involve, not from, be involved in sth. ni bei juan ru shen me shi qing (You're involved in something). (…) A big financial pro (…) °° procedure or °°
7. A: °° Financial, be involved°°
8. C: For for months
9. A: Ask T2
10. C: In, involve of financial, involve from the financial

It can be seen from the three examples above that learners' communication in English interacted with the L1 use in class participation. Use of L1 seemed to play a positive role, maintaining their engagement with the tasks. Overall, the functions of L1 use that emerged in this study seem to resonate with the functions of task management, maintenance of group relationship, vocabulary deliberation, and grammar deliberation (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000).

Conclusion

To conclude, the findings of this study show that L1 use emerged naturally in L2 classrooms. Although students in general did not feel positive about their L1 use, the teachers in this study seemed to have mixed attitudes towards it. A closer examination of the functions of L1 use in the classroom discourse reveals that the students do switch to L1 within and between sentences for the purpose of maintaining flow of the communication, clarification of meaning, use of metalinguistic knowledge and facilitation of deliberation of vocabulary and grammar.

As stated before, the use of L1 is being seen in a much more positive light these days. The results of this study do provide further empirical evidence for positive

functions of L1 use in L2 task interaction and classroom interaction. As Storch and Aldosari (2010) have recommended, use of L1 by learners serves "important cognitive, social and pedagogical functions" and they should therefore not be restricted or prohibited the use of L1 in L2 classes as they might be denied "the opportunity of using an important tool" (p. 372). It can be concluded that the strategic use of L1 by both teachers and students can be a useful resource in the L2 classroom and this current study supports this notion. Future research should continue to examine L1 use as it occurs naturally in language classrooms, particularly in EFL contexts.

References

Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 54*, 314-342.

Duff, P. (2001). Language, literacy, content, and (pop) culture: Challenges for ESL students in mainstream courses. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*, 103-132.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1972). Goofing, an indicator of children's second language strategies, *Language Learning, 22*, 234-252.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: OUP.

Freiermuth, M., & Jarrel, D. (2006). Willingness to communicate: Can online chat help? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16*(2), 189-212.

Garcia, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: Global perspectives*. Malden: MA: Blackwell.

Garcia, O. (2009b). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 322-326.

Garrity, S., Aquino-Sterling, CR., and Day, A. (2015). Translanguaging in an infant classroom: Using multiple languages to make meaning. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*, 177-196.

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 337-368.

Lantolf, J., P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J., P., & Appel, G. (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lantolf, J., P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie, & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.

Peng, J.-E. (2008, August). Dynamic fluctuations of willingness to communicate in Chinese EFL classroom: A multiple case study. Paper presented at the 15th World Congress of Applied Linguistics. Essen, Germany.

Pennycook, A. (2014). Principled polycentrism and resourceful speakers. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL, 11*(4), 1-19.

Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(4), 355-375.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, J. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly, 37*, 760-770.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*, 251-274.

Villamil, O., & De Guerrero, M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classrooms: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behaviour. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*, 51-75.

About the Author

Yiqian Katherine Cao received her PhD from the University of Auckland in 2009. Her research interests lie in classroom interactions, second language acquisition, English as an International Language, and bilingual education.

Appendix 1

Stimulated-recall Interview for Students

Instructions:

What we are going to do now is to listen to the recordings from the class. I am interested in what you were thinking at the time you were talking. What I would like you to do is tell me what you were thinking, what was on your mind at the time.

You can pause the recorder any time you want. If you want to tell me something about what you were thinking, you can push pause. If I have a question, I'll push pause and ask you to talk about that part of the recording.

Stimulated-recall questions:
1. What were you thinking right then/at this point?
2. I notice that you used Chinese to talk to your classmate in the pair/group work. Can you tell me what you were saying? Why you were using Chinese?
3. Can you remember what you were thinking when s/he used Chinese to talk to you?
4. Can you tell me what you thought when she replied to your question in Chinese?

Appendix 2

Interview for Teachers

1. Could you describe the goals and content of the course you're currently teaching?
2. What's your general impression on the students' participation in class?
3. Have you noticed that some of the students used Chinese in their discussion in pairs or groups?
4. How do you feel about their use of Chinese in class?
5. What do you think they sometimes use the Chinese for?
6. Do you allow them to use Chinese in the pair/group discussion? Why /why not?

The Effect of Input Enhancement on Academic Vocabulary Learning among Intermediate EFL Learners in Iran

Sasan Baleghizadeh, Shahid Beheshti University (G.C.), Tehran, Iran
Shahriyar Yazdanjoo, Shahid Beheshti University (G.C.), Tehran, Iran
Hadiseh Fallahpour, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

The present study investigated the impact of textual input enhancement on the academic vocabulary learning among intermediate EFL Learners in Iran. The participants of the present study were altogether 56 EFL learners (28 males and 28 females) whose age ranged from 16 to 21. The 56 participants were randomly assigned to control (comparison) and treatment (experimental) groups. The participants, on the whole, were exposed to 14 sessions of instruction over a 14-week period. The participants received instruction under two unenhanced and textually enhanced conditions, covering one academic passage containing the targeted academic words in each session. The results indicated that the experimental group significantly differed from the control group in that they outperformed the control group in terms of both immediate and delayed receptive and productive vocabulary gain. Thus, exposure to input which is textually enhanced through different techniques (e.g. boldfacing, underlining) facilitates the learning of academic vocabulary. Overall, the present study brought about one major finding which indicated that the employed textual input enhancement (TIE) techniques in the present study helped both receptive and productive academic vocabulary knowledge to grow significantly.

Keywords: input enhancement, EFL, Academic Word List

Introduction

As a building block, vocabulary learning plays a crucial role in any effort to learn a second or foreign language, without which, the process of learning and using a target language would be greatly impeded. Generally, one of the basic rea-

sons for which vocabulary learning receives particular attention is the idea that learners encounter numerous unfamiliar and unknown words while they are processing text (and speech), causing numerous difficulties, especially in comprehension. As many researchers (e.g., Stahl, 1990) have posited, a good reservoir of vocabulary knowledge can lead to a complete comprehension of a text.

Vocabulary studies have played a long and important role in the research of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and also English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (Hyland & Tse, 2007). More specifically, academic vocabulary is defined as a core of high-frequency words which are found useful across academic disciplines (Coxhead, 2000), (as opposed to, for example, discipline-specific terms such as medical, legal, mathematical, or chemical terms). Apart from the irrefutable role of vocabulary learning, establishing and using appropriate techniques for vocabulary instruction is of utmost importance. Therefore, in pursuit of developing techniques for vocabulary teaching and learning, the concept of input enhancement (IE) has received specialized attention on the part of many researchers in the field of SLA. Input enhancement as a sub-category of form-focused instruction was proposed by Sharwood Smith (1991, 1993) and emphasized the role of making features of a language that express the tense, agreement and number of other features (e.g. accent, syllable stress, agreement, idioms) perceptually more salient.

Review of the Literature

Noticing Hypothesis

The field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) in recent years highlights the growing attention to the role of noticing in Second Language Learning (SLL). The attention given to form is important or, at least helpful, for learning of the foreign or second language. This attention will be more beneficial if it takes place during meaning-oriented activities (Leow 1997, 1999, 2001; Robinson 1995; Schmidt 1990, 1993, 1994; Tomlin & Villa 1994). In this vein, it can be implied that the "Noticing Hypothesis" a hypothesis that input does not become intake for language learning unless it is noticed, that is, consciously registered" (Schmidt, 2001, pp. 3-4) and the conscious processes converging towards it have been remarkably addressed in different studies. Thus, for Schmidt (1995), successful second language learning depends on conscious attention to linguistic form. In this

respect, a variety of techniques, ranging from more explicit to very implicit ones, have been used to draw learners' attention to formal aspects of the language. Further, Schmidt (1995) upgrades his definition of noticing as being "nearly isomorphic with attention," (p. 1). In this respect, attention is divided into three distinct but connected constituents, namely, "alertness, orientation, and detection for which awareness is not required" (Tomlin & Villa, 1994, p.199).

Input Enhancement

Input enhancement (IE) is defined as "pedagogical techniques designed to direct L2 learners' attention to formal features in the L2 input" Kim (2006, p. 345). The aforementioned definition has been based on Sharwood Smith's (1991) suggestion that learners' processing of linguistic material can be stimulated by changing of the quality of input. "You can't learn a foreign language (or anything else for that matter) through subliminal perception" (Schmidt, 1990, p. 142). As proposed by O'Bryan (2004) there are fundamentally three methods or techniques for enhancement or manipulation of textual input (TI), namely, 1) making specific features of language salient, known as typographical or textual enhancement, 2) providing a clear-cut explanation for the input, and, 3) provision of modified input. In addition, use of recurrence (repetition) of noticeable input, known as typographical input enhancement, can also cause the input to be more salient.

Basically, IE is built on two main premises; the first one draws on an abundance of comprehensible input during L2 learning, while the second considers the attention of the learners as a prerequisite for learning. (Rutherford & Sharwood Smith, 1985). As was alluded to beforehand, input enhancement (IE) is a sub-category of form-focused instruction (FFI) that refers to the recruitment of various techniques by which the "perceptual salience of the target items could be increased in the input" (Long & Robinson 1998, p. 24). In this regard, Sharwood Smith (1993) tried to avoid the confusion surrounding his earlier concept of conscious-raising (CR) which was difficult to observe or measure, and came up with the IE as a label. Sharwood Smith (1993) suggested that input salience can be augmented externally by overt examination of targeted forms, metalinguistic explanations, input flooding, negative evidence (error correction), techniques of garden-path, processing instructions, and textual enhancement (as cited in Gascoigne, 2006).

According to Ellis (1993, 1995), IE is a helpful option in English language teaching (ELT) whose significant role in making learners aware of some particularly targeted form(s) in a learning situation is of great importance. Textual or visual input enhancement (TIE) originates from the idea that sheer exposure to particular L2 forms or structures is not always enough for language acquisition or the mastery of the L2 (Smith, 1993). Consequently, there is a possibility for L2 learners to fail to notice particular nonsalient structures in natural input even after a long exposure, resulting in no intake (Lightbown & Spada, 1990). In this regard, Sharwood Smith (1991) maintains that interpositions by teachers are needed to direct learners' attention to the formal properties of L2, thus helping learners increase their awareness of target structures and process the input in order that it becomes intake. In addition, according to Widdowson (1990) left to their own devices, learners "do not very readily infer knowledge of the language system from their communicative activities" (p.167). TIE also draws learners' attention to special characteristics of input that may be not noticed under normal conditions through typographical manipulation (Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2013).

Textual Input Enhancement (TIE) techniques include (1) avoiding vowel reduction typical of rapid or casual speech, (2) Slowing down the rate of speech, (3) using exaggerated stress and intonation, (4) extensive repetition of words and phrases, (5) less pre-verbal and more post-verbal modification, (6) use of gestures, (7) underlining and other attention-catching textural techniques such as **boldface,** UPPERCASE LETTERS, color-coding, and so forth (Sharwood Smith, 1991). Textual Enhancement (TE) is defined as an "implicit and unobtrusive way of drawing learners' attention to targeted forms" (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011, p. 41). However, learners' internally generated salience may not always match with the salience created externally by teachers. It even seems that learners ignore evidence in the input in favor of their own internal instantiations of the target language. (Sharwood Smith, 1993). In response to this phenomenon, Sharwood proposed two types of enhancement: 1) typographical, realized as written input enhancement and (2) intonational, that is, oral input enhancement.

To date, a great number of empirical studies involving IE have focused on the acquisition of grammatical rules (e.g., Alanen, 1995; Izumi, 2002; Leow, Egi, Nuevo, & Tsai, 2003; Overstreet, 1998; Shook, 1994; Simard, 2009; White, 1998).

However, due to methodological differences and limitations, there is a lack of confident deductions on the efficacy of IE (Han, Park & Combs, 2008).

Input Enhancement and Vocabulary Learning

Regarding L2 vocabulary, studies on input enhancement have been centered on individual words. Kim (2006) explored the provision of meaning—lexical elaboration and textual enhancement—as two basic considerations that influence the incidental acquisition of vocabulary by Korean learners of English. The outcome was significant when the TEI was used together with lexical elaboration, and it resulted in learners' better recognition of targeted words or forms. IE techniques have been shown to be equally effective as explicit instruction as proven by Fahim and Vaezi (2011) among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. The results of the study showed that both visually enhanced input and direct teaching had a significant impact on the acquisition of verb-noun lexical collocations. Similarly, the effectiveness of visual input enhancement was studied by Kim (2010) whose study was designed to increase the salience of unknown English words (in the context of reading a book). The results disclosed that visual input enhancement helped the learners' notice the forms; however, it did not develop the rate of unknown vocabulary acquisition within the reading process. Further studies have shown that semantic input enhancement has been far more effective than visual input enhancement. For instance, Rott (2007) discovered that a higher input frequency was helpful for learners and that the semantic enhancement employing glosses boosted the rate of productive vocabulary gain. Williams (1998) points out that visual input enhancement can intrigue learners' attention to the written form of textual input and this technique can be largely used to direct learners' attention to the vocabulary. There are also other studies that scrutinize the theory of input enhancement not only in the area of vocabulary (Izumi, 2002; Kim, 2008; Maftoon & Sharifi Haratmeh, 2012; Rassaei, & Karbor, 2013) but also in other areas such as grammar, reading (e.g., Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2013). Thus, the present study aims to find the effect of typological input enhancement on academic vocabulary learning among EFL university students who study academic social sciences.

Academic Literacy

As a rule of thumb, the type of language used in academic literature is different from both fiction and non-fiction texts. Thus, understanding fictional texts does

not necessarily improve comprehension of academic texts. Academic language is "characterized by complex syntax, academic vocabulary, and a complex discourse style" (Krashen & Brown, 2007, p. 1).

Academic Lexis

As Chamot and O'Malley (1994) propose, academic vocabulary refers to the language which is employed by instructors and students for the sake of obtaining new knowledge, describing conceptual ideas, and developing student's abstract understanding. Elsewhere, Snow (2011) posits that lack of understanding of academic words will greatly impair academic literacy. Therefore, having a great reservoir of academic vocabulary is essential for text comprehension at the academic level; conversely, these words are seldom seen within the context of general, namely, fictional reading texts.

The Academic Word List

Coxhead (2000) has collected a list of 570-word families that involve about 10% of the vocabulary used in academic texts. This group of words only represents 1.4% of vocabulary in fictional texts and approximately 4% in texts from newspapers (Nation, 2008). All the words in the AWL can be spotted among the 10,000 most common words of English (Nation & Beglar, 2007).

Research Questions

Question 1: Does textual input enhancement have any statistically significant effect on EFL learners' immediate academic vocabulary learning, as measured by a receptive test?

Question 2: Does textual input enhancement have any statistically significant effect on EFL learners' delayed academic vocabulary learning as measured by a receptive test?

Question 3: Does textual input enhancement have any statistically significant effect on EFL learners' immediate academic vocabulary learning as measured by a productive test?

Question 4: Does textual input enhancement have any statistically significant effect on EFL learners' delayed academic vocabulary learning as measured by a productive test?

Method

Participants and Context:

The participants in this study were altogether 56 EFL learners (28 males and 28 females) whose ages ranged from 16 to 21. They were randomly selected from a pool of a population of 200 learners who were enrolled in general English classes in a private language institute in the city of Tehran and were exposed to four hours of classroom instruction per week. The participants had a prior exposure to EFL in primary and secondary schools, 2 to 4 years of which were formed in private language institutes. Only one of them had the experience of staying in a native English-speaking country. A form of consent for participation was administered with an indication of the general purposes to investigate English language learning and procedures of the study.

Materials and Instruments

Placement Test

In order to evaluate the proficiency level of the population, a sample Oxford Placement Test from Solutions Series, 2nd Edition (Edwards, 2009) containing 50 items testing vocabulary and grammar, was administrated. Participants were placed at an intermediate level of language proficiency, B1-B2 based on the CEFR.

Treatment passages

Fourteen reading passages on a range of academic topics were selected randomly from among more than 50 academic passages retrieved from an online website that enhanced the academic words textually (www.uefap.com). The learners who were assigned to an experimental group, were exposed to passages whose academic words were bold-faced, italicized, and underlined within instructional sessions, whereas the control groups' academic words within the passages were not enhanced through any IE techniques.

Vocabulary Knowledge Scale Test

Prior to forming the two groups, the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) Test of Paribakht and Wesche (1993), containing 117 academic vocabulary items was administered to the participants to check their prior knowledge of academic words

and to ensure that they were unfamiliar with the target words. The Vocabulary Knowledge Scale requires test takers to look at lexical items and then choose from among the following 5 options: (1) I don't remember having seen this word before, (2) I have seen this word before but I don't know what it means, (3) I have seen this word before and I think it means, (4) I know this word: it means, and (5) I can use this word in a sentence.

Immediate and Delayed Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Posttest

The immediate and delayed vocabulary post-test contained two sections. The first section, receptive tests, was designed to measure partial knowledge of the academic vocabulary and included multiple-choice items (30 questions of 4 options to test the 117 selected academic words). The productive vocabulary test contained a 20-item multiple choice test and 10 questions for which the participants were required to find the words whose letters were randomly highlighted. The vocabulary tests both for control and treatment group were selected based on the exercises in Focus on Academic Words in English by Baleghizadeh (2015).

Piloting

In order to ensure the reliability of the productive and receptive tests, similar tests were administered to a similar population in terms of age language proficiency. Based on the Oxford Placement Test the participants of the pilot group were reported to be at an intermediate level based on the CEFR framework of reference. The participants commented on the mechanics of the test. They mentioned any problems with the test instructions, instances where items were not obvious enough, and formatting and other typographical errors and/or issues were considered following the feedback provided by the pilot testing participants. The revised productive and receptive vocabulary tests based on the received feedback were prepared to be used in the real test situation.

Procedures

Target Words Selection

In order to select target words, the researchers analyzed participants course books which were being used at the time of the study. The word lists provided at the back of each course book, namely, the Top Notch: English for Today's World

3A-3B, Summit 1A-1B, Summit 2A-2B 2nd edition by Saslow and Ascher (2011), and Ready for First (3rd ed) by Norris (2013) were analyzed. Based on Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List of 570 academic headwords, the EFL participants of this study had already covered 453 words within their courses and 117 academic words were unknown to them. To make sure that participants were unfamiliar with all these words the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) Test of Paribakht and Wesche (1993) containing all 117 academic target words was administered to the samples to check their prior knowledge of academic words. VKS results indicated that 71.4 percent of the participants (N=40) chose the first option ("I don't remember having seen this word before."), 26.8 of the participants (N=15) checked the second option which was "I have seen this word before but I don't know what it means," and finally only 1.17 (N=1) of learners selected option 5 ("I can use this word in a sentence.").

Instruction Sessions

For the participants in both control and experimental groups, 14 sessions of instruction were provided within seven weeks. Each session took an average of 35 minutes for completion.

Data Analysis

The collected data with reference to each and every research question in the present study were analyzed using SPSS software version 23. The two group of control (comparison) and experimental (treatment), each of which attended 14 sessions of instruction under two enhanced and unenhanced conditions. As to the research questions which scrutinized the gain of vocabulary knowledge in terms of receptive and productive and reading comprehension achievement the control (comparison) and experimental (treatment) groups who experienced two sets of receptive and productive tests under immediate and delayed conditions were analyzed using t-tests at $p < 0.05$.

Results

Research Questions 1 and 2

In reference to the first and second research questions the study sought to answer, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the two group

means. In this regard, the gain of academic vocabulary, as measured by immediate and delayed receptive vocabulary knowledge tests under two unenhanced (control group) and enhanced (treatment group) conditions, was evaluated. As can be observed in Tables 1 and 2, the results of the immediate receptive test (IRT) in unenhanced group (M=16.9, SD=4.03) and enhanced group (M=23.2, SD=2.43) conditions, there was a statistically significant difference between the control and treatment groups (t =7.063, p = 0.00).

Likewise, the results of the delayed receptive test (DRT) show that between unenhanced group (M=15.4, SD=2.92) and enhanced group (M=20.79, SD=2.54) conditions, there was a statistically significant difference (t = 7.364, p = 0.00) between the control and treatment groups.

Table 1. Group Statistics for Immediate and Delayed Receptive Tests

Group Statistics					
Type of Test	**Conditions**	**N**	**Mean (30)**	**Std. Deviation**	**Std. Error Mean**
Immediate Receptive Test	Unenhanced	28	16.8929	4.03080	.76175
	Enhanced	28	23.1786	2.43514	.46020
Delayed Receptive Test	Unenhanced	28	15.3929	2.92295	.55239
	Enhanced	28	20.7857	2.54380	.48073

Table 2. Independent Samples for Immediate (IRT) and Delayed (DRT) Receptive Tests

Types of Tests		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
IRT	Equal variances assumed	8.589	.005	-7.063	54	.000	-6.28571
DRT	Equal variances assumed	.037	.849	-7.364	54	.000	-5.39286

Research Questions 3 and 4

With regard to the third and fourth research questions (productive vocabulary development), an independent-samples t-test was run to compare the mean of the two groups. As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4, the results of the immediate productive test (IPT) in unenhanced group (M=14.75, SD=3.23) and enhanced group

(M=22.71, SD=3.69) conditions, there was statistically significant difference (t = 8.583, p = 0.00) between the control and treatment groups. In the same vein, the results of the delayed productive test (DRT) show that between the unenhanced group (M=11.67, SD=3.07) and enhanced group (M=20.85, SD=2.77) there was a statistically significant difference between the control and treatment groups (t = 11.722, p = 0.00). Textual input enhancement techniques had a significant effect on productive vocabulary.

Table 3. Group Statistics for Immediate and Delayed Productive Tests.

Group Statistics					
Type of Test	**Conditions**	**N**	**Mean** (out of 30)	**Std. Deviation**	**Std. Error Mean**
Immediate Productive Test	Unenhanced	28	14.7500	3.23894	.61210
	Enhanced	28	22.7143	3.69040	.69742
Delayed Productive Test	Unenhanced	28	11.6786	3.07985	.58204
	Enhanced	28	20.8571	2.77174	.52381

Table 4. Independent Samples for Immediate (IPT) and Delayed (DPT) Productive Tests

Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
Types of Tests		**F**	**Sig.**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean Difference**	
IPT	Equal variances assumed	.091	.764	-8.583	54	.000	-7.96429	
DPT	Equal variances assumed	1.332	.254	-11.722	54	.000	-9.17857	

Discussion

The present study sought to investigate the impact of Textual Input Enhancement (TIE) on intermediate EFL learners' academic vocabulary learning. The results reveal that exposing the learners to the textually enhanced input increased learning, as seen not only by receptive, but also productive vocabulary tests, providing further support for Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis.

In line with the previous studies whose focus was on IE, the present study used several techniques of input enhancement (e.g. such as **boldface,** UPPER-

CASE LETTERS, and color-coding. Sharwood Smith (1991, 1993) claims that TIE aids the learners with the process through which input turns into the intake as it underscores linguistic forms which typically are overlooked.

The learning of vocabulary takes place incidentally. While the learner is consciously striving to comprehend the context, his or her language processing is being affected by the increased perceptual saliency of specific target forms in the input. With regard to the mentioned claim, Sharwood Smith (1993) emphasizes that the rationale behind IE technique is the probability of increasing the saliency of a form so as to promote the reconstruction of developing interlanguage system of the learners.

With regard to receptive vocabulary gains, the results of this study are in line with Alanen (1995) and Lee and Lee (2012) showing a better performance with enhanced. As for productive vocabulary gains, our results are in line with Rott's (2007) study in which glossing and use of input enhancement techniques together with increasing the frequency of occurrence of the targeted forms resulted in more productive vocabulary gain.

In sum, the results of the present study confirm those of Izumi (2002), Jourdenais et al. (1995), Leow (2001) and Lee and Lee (2012) and discovered that TE could be an influential tool in the process of drawing learners' attention to the target forms. In addition, what Shook (1994) and Jourdenais et al. (1995), whose studies showed a positive effect of textual enhancement, had in common was that their participants had background knowledge of the constructions of the targeted forms. And as to this, we might draw the conclusion that prior knowledge can accelerate students' noticing in the conditions which are textually enhanced. Gass (1997) postulated that what is considered as the frequency of the target form, namely, the number of the times a specific form occurs influences the noticing and therefore highly repetitive exposure can result in noticing more easily.

Conclusion

Without doubt developing strategies together with techniques for expanding vocabulary knowledge and promoting reading comprehension has always been among the concerns of ESL researchers and material developers. In this respect, the present quasi-experimental study scrutinized the impact of textual input enhancement on the academic vocabulary learning among intermediate EFL Learners

in Iran. The study compared two (control and experimental) groups of 28 members in terms of productive and receptive vocabulary gain by the means of immediate and delayed posttests. Overall, the results revealed that use of TIE was statistically significant in the promotion of both receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge under enhanced condition.

Considering these results, it can be concluded that not only Focus on Form instruction (e.g., Laufer & Girsai, 2008) but also implicit types of Form-focused instruction that are less presumptuous (Doughty, 2003) should be considered by teachers and language practitioners. We suggest that further research in this area investigate aural IE techniques with the focus not only on individual lexical items, but collocations and idioms, as well. In this respect, use of subtitled videos underscoring idiomatic expressions or movies' catch phrases may prove effective.

References

Alanen, R. (1995). Input enhancement and rule presentation in second language acquisition. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 259-302). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Baleghizadeh, S. (2014). *Focus on academic words in English*. Tehran: SAMT.

Chall, J. (1987). Two vocabularies for reading: recognition and meaning. In M. McKeown, and M. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition*. (pp.7-17). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(2), 213-238.

Doughty, C. J. (2003) Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In C. J. Doughty and M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 256-310). Oxford: Blackwell.

Edwards, L. (2009). *Oxford Solutions Placement Test* [Pamphlet]. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1993). Naturally simplified input, comprehension, and second language acquisition. In M. Tickoo (Ed.), *Simplification theory and application*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Ellis, R. (1995). Modified oral input and the acquisition of word meanings. *Applied Linguistics, 16*, 409-441

Fahim, M., & Vaezi, R. (2011). Investigating the effect of visually-enhanced input on the acquisition of lexical collocations by Iranian intermediate EFL learners:

A case of verb-noun lexical collocations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(3), 552-560.

Gascoigne, C. (2006). Toward an understanding of incidental input enhancement in computerized L2 environments. *CALICO Journal, 24*(1), 147-162.

Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gillett, A. (2015). Using English for Academic Purposes a Guide for Students in Higher Education. Retrieved from http://www.uefap.com/

Han, Z., Park, E.S., & Combs, C. (2008). Textual enhancement of input: Issues and possibilities. *Applied Linguistics, 29*, 597-618.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2007). Is there an "academic vocabulary? *TESOL Quarterly. 41* (2): 235-254.

Izumi, S. (2002) Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24*(4), 541-77.

Jourdenais, R., Ota. M., Stauffer, S., Boyson, B., & Doughty, C. (1995). Does textual enhancement promote noticing? A think-aloud protocol analysis. In R. Schmidt (Ed.) *Attention and Awareness* (pp. 183-216). National Foreign Language Center Technical Reports Series, No 9. Honolulu: University of Hawaii-Manoa.

Kim, C. E. (2010). Textual input enhancement: Applications in teaching. *OR-TESOL Journal, 28*, 22-27. Oregon Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages [ISSN: 0192-401X]

Kim, Y. (2006). Effects of input elaboration on vocabulary acquisition through reading by Korean learners of English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly 40*(2), 341-373.

Kim, Y. (2008). The role of task-induced involvement and learner proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition, *Language Learning, 58*(2), 285-325.

Krashen, S., & Brown, C. L. (2007). *What is academic language proficiency?* Retrieved March 29, 2015, from Books and Articles by Stephen D Krashen: http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/articles/krashen_brown_alp.pdf

Laufer, B. & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 694–716.

Lee, Y.H. & Lee, H.K. (2012). Effects of input enhancement techniques on word learning of Korean elementary learners. *Primary English Education, 18*(3), 381-398.

Leow, R. (1997). The effects of input enhancement and text length on adult L2 readers' comprehension and intake in second language acquisition. A*pplied Language Learning, 82*, 151-82.

Leow, R. (1999). Attention, awareness, and focus on form research: A critical overview. In J.F. Lee and A. Valdman (Eds.) *Form and meaning: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 69-96). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Leow, R. P. (2001). Do learners notice enhanced forms while interacting with the L2? An online and offline study of the role of written input enhancement in L2 reading. *Hispania, 84*(3), 496-509.

Leow, R., Egi, T., Nuevo, A., & Tsai, Y. (2003). The roles of textual enhancement and type of linguistic item in adult L2 learners' comprehension and intake. *Applied Language Learning, 13*,1-16.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 429-448. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009517

Long, M. & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.): *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp.16-41). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Maftoon, P. & Sharifi Haratmeh, S. (2012). The relative effectiveness of input and output-oriented tasks with different involvement loads on the receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge of Iranian EFL learners. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 4*(2), 27-52.

Mitchell, R. (2000). Anniversary article. Applied linguistics and evidence-based classroom practice: The case of foreign language grammar pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(3), 281-303. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.3.281

Nahavandi, N., & Mukundan, J. (2013). The impact of textual input enhancement and explicit rule presentation on Iranian elementary EFL learners' intake of simple past tense. *English Language Teaching, 6*(1), 92-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p92

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language class-rooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. London: Routledge.

Nation, P. (2008). *Teaching Vocabulary: Strategies and Techniques*. Heinle, Cengage Learning.

Nation, P., & Beglar, D. (2007). A vocabulary size test. *The Language Teacher, 31*(7), 9-13.

Norris, R. (2015). *Ready for First* (3rd ed.). Macmillian.

O'Bryan, A. (2004). *Pedagogical point-input enhancement: Introduction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University.

Overstreet, M. (1998). Text enhancement and content familiarity: The focus of learner attention. *Spanish Applied Linguistics, 2*, 229-258.

Paribakht, T.S., & Wesche, M. (1993). Reading comprehension and second language development in comprehension-based ESL program. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 597-618.

Rassaei, E. & Karbor, T. (2013). The effects of three attention drawing techniques on the acquisition of English collocations, *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 2* (2), 15-28.

Read, J. (2004). Research in teaching vocabulary. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 146–161.

Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics* (Third Edition). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Rott, S. (2007). The effect of frequency of input-enhancements on word learning and text comprehension. *Language Learning, 57*(2), 165-199.

Rutherford, W., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness-raising and universal grammar. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 274-282.

Saslow, J., & Ascher, A. (2012). *Summit* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Saslow, J., & Ascher, A. (2012). *Top Notch* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1993a). Awareness and second language acquisitio*n. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 206-26.

Schmidt, R. (1993b). Consciousness, learning, and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka, (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 11*, 11-26.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 165-209). London: Academic Press.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp.1-63). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1991). Speaking to many minds: on the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research 72*(1), 118-32.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*(2), 165-79.

Shook, D. J. (1994). FL/L2 reading, grammatical information, and the input-to-intake phenomenon. *Applied Language Learning 5*(1): 57-93.

Simard, D. (2009). Differential effects of textual enhancement formats on intake. *System, 37*(1): 124-35.

Stahl, S. (1990). *Beyond the instrumentalist hypothesis: Some relations between word meanings and comprehension*. University of Illinois.

Tomlin, R., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16,183-203.

Widdowson, H. G. (1990). Aspects of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 671-692). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

About the Authors

Sasan Baleghizadeh is Associate Professor of TEFL at Shahid Beheshti University (G.C.) in Tehran, Iran, where he teaches courses in applied linguistics, syllabus design, and materials development. He is interested in investigating the role of interaction in English language teaching and issues related to materials development. His published articles have appeared in both national and international

journals including TESL Reporter, TESL Canada Journal, ELT Journal, Language Learning Journal, *and* Issues in Language Teaching.

Shahriyar Yazdanjoo holds an MA degree in TEFL from Shahid Beheshti University (G.C.) in Tehran, Iran. He is an experienced EFL teacher and teacher trainer. His research interests include vocabulary instruction and materials development.

Hadiseh Fallahpour holds an MA degree in TEFL from Payame Noor University in Tehran, Iran. Her main areas of research interest are psychology and English language teaching methodology.

TIPS FOR TEACHERS

Rethinking Listening and Speaking Homework

Karina Jackson, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, USA

Homework serves a valuable purpose because it extends students' experience beyond the limited time and opportunity for practice in the classroom. However, creating engaging and effective homework assignments for a listening and speaking course can be challenging. By rethinking my homework assignments and how I assess them, I have seen significant improvement in both student engagement and completion of English language activities outside of class. This teaching tip offers suggestions for assigning meaningful homework in listening and speaking classes, using oral logs to report on it, and making use of technology for both.

Rethinking Listening and Speaking Assignments

Students typically see homework as a burden on their time imposed by the teacher. Assignments are typically one-size-fits-all, designed to preview or reinforce classroom work. If homework could be tailored to individual needs or interests, students might perceive it as relevant to their personal interests or helpful in building their confidence and fluency in English. In other words, they might become more invested in completing it. Fortunately, with modest use of computers, mobile devices, and the Internet, teachers can shift homework assignments from textbook or teacher-directed exercises that everyone must complete to personalized, self-directed tasks that students choose to complete.

Redesigning homework in the manner described here begins with creating a list of level-appropriate listening and speaking activities that students can complete outside of class. Ideally, this list would include a mix of traditional tasks and experiential learning activities. Traditional here refers to the typical tasks of listening to a passage or watching a recording and responding to the information in a specified way. For example, teachers can curate a playlist of podcasts or YouTube videos or a list of speaking topics for a conversation practice with a classmate or peer tutor. Experiential learning might include a list of campus or community ac-

tivities that would provide opportunities for students to practice the target language in an engaging environment, for example by attending a community celebration and reporting on what they learned, culturally, linguistically, or both. While such activities are easier to access in an English-speaking setting, thanks to the growing community of global English users and availability of English language media worldwide, locally-relevant experiential options can be found in EFL contexts as well. For any given topic or unit of instruction, options might include listening to podcasts, watching videos, and attending campus or community events.

Providing students with a variety of options and the freedom to choose from them is the key. Some students will relish the opportunity to choose tasks targeting areas they want to improve. For example, a student who struggles to keep up with academic lectures may choose to listen to podcasts or watch TED talks of professionals lecturing about topics of personal or professional interest. Other students will choose to watch instructional or entertaining YouTube videos based on their personal interests, family life, or long-term goals. In any case, freedom to choose means shifting student perspective from thinking of homework as busy work they are doing for a teacher to seeing it as an opportunity to do something beneficial, or at least pleasurable, for themselves.

Rethinking Assessment of Listening and Speaking Assignments

Just as important as rethinking homework assignments is rethinking how they are assessed. Traditionally, students complete exercises that are checked in class or turned in to the teacher for assessment. Introducing an oral log means that students must use the skills that they are supposed to be practicing—speaking and listening—to show evidence of the homework they have completed. Simply put, an oral log consists of short, weekly audio or video summaries of students' target language use outside of class. Logs can follow a variety of formats but frequently include setting, amount of time spent, topic, content summary, vocabulary learned, a personal response to the activity, and, if desired, an accompanying written record. Because students have chosen their tasks and the words they use to report on them, their logs frequently include thoughtful reflection on their strengths, weaknesses, and general use of English outside of class.

After students complete the activities of their choice, they record a weekly summary of their work. The length and details required in this oral summary will

vary according to size of class and proficiency level. Advanced students might be able to reflect metacognitively about their goals and successes with the various tasks, while novice students typically describe or list what they did day by day. Recordings can be uploaded to a learning management system, sent as email attachments, shared via Google Drive, or recorded on a device in the classroom. If technological resources or computer literacy are limited, one-on-one interviews with a teacher or trained tutor can work as well. Using the same technology, teachers or tutors provide feedback, encouragement, comments, and (if needed) correction tailored to the level and needs of the particular class or student.

Benefits and Challenges

There are many benefits of rethinking listening and speaking homework assignments and considering oral logs as the mechanism for tracking them. Most important, redesigning homework in the manner described here helps students use the skills they are supposed to be learning—listening to and speaking English. Another benefit is seeing students take responsibility for their own learning and become self-regulated learners and users of English outside of the classroom. They learn how to reflect metacognitively about their experiences using English in authentic or authentic-like contexts. As the students become more self-regulated, their confidence increases and they begin reporting with higher frequency of their successes with these skills, rather than focusing on frustration with the language. Building options, flexibility, and adaptability into homework tasks creates greater buy-in because students feel free to use the target language on their own terms.

Additional benefits come as students connect with one another and with the global community of English language users. Students frequently take it upon themselves to organize small group activities to fulfill out-of-class homework requirements., such an excursion to a museum or viewing an English movie. If options are directly connected to their majors or a topic covered in class, they are eager to share their own experiences with their peers. In an ESL environment, these tasks help students connect to the community where they are studying and feel less isolated during their experience studying abroad. Thanks to the Internet and the presence of English speakers in nearly every corner of the planet, EFL students can also connect to the global English-speaking community as well, even if in somewhat more limited fashion.

Finally, teachers benefit from listening to the students logs for three reasons. First, they hear how students are directly applying the lessons learned in the class-room. Second, they can evaluate students' progress in both listening comprehension and speaking comprehensibility in an informal, non-intrusive manner. Third, and possibly most important, teachers benefit from the opportunity to hear (and know) their students as individuals apart from what they can learn about them as members of a class.

Although the benefits of the homework design described here are many and significant, there are two potential challenges in implementation, one related to the assignment and another related to the oral logs. Some teachers, particularly in an EFL environment, will initially feel overwhelmed by the thought of creating lists of possible homework activities for students to choose from. The easiest way to counter this fear is to begin small with just one or two traditional tasks and a similar number of experiential tasks. Campus and community calendars, as well as existing playlists can save time; often teachers can simply provide a link to ac-tivities and events and allow students to choose on their own. It is also likely that students will begin providing their own suggestions that can be added to the list. Soon, teachers will be able to identify successful activities reported on by their students and create a master list of tried and true options.

The other perceived challenge from the teacher's perspective is the time needed to listen to oral logs especially in settings with large class sizes. This con-cern can be managed in a variety of ways. First, summaries can be limited by time and/or content. Teachers will be surprised to see how contentful and informative a 30-second clip can be, for example. Focusing comments and feedback on a spe-cific feature, such as one recently studied in class, can reduce the time it takes teachers to respond to a log entry. Classes can be divided into groups with rotating submissions dates. Listening and speaking logs can alternate weekly with more controlled homework assignments, such as a textbook exercise. Finally, students can be asked to self-identify one feature they want their teacher to focus on for example, pronunciation, fluency, or sentence structure.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the combination of self-directed homework tasks and oral re-ports on them encourages students to practice English outside of the classroom

and helps both teachers and students feel more engaged and invested in the process. By tailoring the options to fit the level, interests and needs of a particular class or setting, teachers can help students see the relevance and usefulness of homework. Student recordings serve as informative resources for teachers as they prepare future lessons. and create ongoing individualized dialogs with their students about their progress and successes. With adaptations for context and teacher-learner interests, rethinking listening and speaking homework can revitalize listening and speaking classes.

About the Author

Karina Jackson is the Listening and Speaking Skill Area Supervisor at Brigham Young University's English Language Center. Her research interests include distance learning, teacher education, curriculum development, and listening.

TIPS FOR TEACHERS

Using Viral Videos in the ESL Classroom

Simon Kew, Anjo Gakuen Senior High School, Aichi Prefecture, Japan

In today's 24/7 wired society, it is more important than ever to create lessons incorporating materials that speak to today's learners of English. English is far and away the dominant language on the Internet and serves as the lingua franca when users communicate online even when they come from non-English-speaking backgrounds. This means that the Internet is a repository of authentic and contemporary English language usage and content available to language teachers and students worldwide. If enough people all around the world share certain videos, images, and memes, they "go viral," that is, become widespread and popular, very quickly. Viral videos can be especially effective for engaging English language learners and enlivening English language lessons.

Integrating Viral Videos

Viral videos depict all facets of our world, on topics ranging from A to Z. They rely on a mass-appeal "hook" that encourages people to watch them repeatedly and share them widely. By their very nature, they are fresh and harbor the potential to add zing to the ESL/EFL classroom. They also provide an abundant source of material for the discerning language teacher, particularly material created by users of English outside English-speaking countries. By effectively integrating viral videos into their lessons, teachers can motivate learners and provide opportunities to connect their English studies to meaningful, real world communication. What follows are several strategies for incorporating viral videos in English lessons for high school or older students in an EFL context along with an annotated starter list of versatile viral videos.

Strategy #1: Using Viral Videos as Warm-ups

Viral videos tend to be only two to three minutes long. This means they can be simply and readily slotted into regular lesson plans for a variety of purposes, one of which is as a warm-up activity. Often, warm-ups function as points of tran-

sition from a previous lesson to English. Playing a short viral video is a low-stress activity since students can "just" watch it, yet they are sure to respond as well, even if in L1 or non-verbally. In any case, they will be both alert and ready for English. At other times, warm-ups serve to introduce a lesson. For instance, prior to teaching a lesson on the environment I have used a short, lighthearted, but thought-provoking, non-verbal animation called "Man" created by Steve Cutts and available on YouTube. It shows one person's perspective on human (mis)treatment of our natural world. I had students guess what they thought the lesson would be about and then elicited vocabulary they thought they would see or hear later on in the lesson.

Strategy #2: Using Viral Videos as a Mid-Lesson Change of Pace

Sometimes language lessons are long, difficult, or both. When energy seems to lag, a short, quick viral video can serve to wake up and re-energize the class. For example, "Man," the video mentioned above, can be used for a short, less than five-minute break with pairs of students working together to narrate what they see as it plays.

Strategy #3: Using Viral Videos as Lesson Closers

Viral videos function well as closing activities. They may be routine but pleasurable, just-for-fun conclusions to lessons or fillers when lessons finish unexpectedly early. They may also be planned to reinforce, review, or showcase a language point studied in a previous lesson or to foreshadow an upcoming lesson. In either case, viral videos can ensure that classes end with a short, stimulating, low-stress experience in English.

Strategy #4: Building Full Lessons Around Viral Videos

From time to time a viral video warrants a whole lesson, exploring issues, analyzing language, and having students express opinions orally, in writing, or both. Videos that focus on recent phenomena or cross-cultural comparisons work particularly well for such lessons. An example of a recent (at the time) phenomenon occurred in the summer of 2014 with fad known as the "ice-bucket challenge," dumping ice and water over people's (especially celebrities') heads as a means of raising funds for the Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) Association.

Another viral video from the same year worked well as the center of a lesson on cross-cultural comparisons. Avril Lavigne, a Canadian singer who is popular in Japan, released a music video called "Hello Kitty." It caused a storm of protest on American social media sites for its perceived exploitation or mocking of Japanese culture. My students viewed the original Hello Kitty viral video along with a YouTube Kids React discussion about it. The interviewees ranged in age from six to thirteen, so they used forms of English that were easier for my students to understand than usual. They were interested in the differences between Japanese and American perceptions of the content in the videos and worked hard to describe what they saw and to express their reactions to it (see Appendix A). Other topics of cross cultural comparison could involve differences of humor or non-verbal communication. Such videos can be a highly effective means of demonstrating nuanced differences of social practices, customs, and culture in different countries.

Strategy #5: Building Language-Focused Lessons Around Viral Videos

Because students love watching and talking about viral videos, they provide excellent input for language-focused lessons. I frequently assign students to three or four videos from a list of seven or eight that I provide. They briefly note their impressions (see Appendix B), and then we use the experience for follow-up language activities. For example, the sentence frame: I liked/enjoyed/hated [video name] because…encourages students to focus on critical thinking and expressing their opinions. These additional sentence frames: It was cute/funny/boring/moving when… or I was amused/excited/moved when… help students see contexts for the often-confusing use of present and past participial adjectives. The same lesson, repeated a few weeks later, with new viral videos, provides a valuable opportunity for review, as well as opportunities for building confidence and fluency.

A Starter List of Versatile Viral Videos

The viral videos described here are easy to locate by searching in YouTube and have been used successfully with English language learners in an EFL environment. The annotations show diversity in content, origin, and genre and are shared here merely as examples of the wide range of possibilities available to teachers interested in making use of such videos. It is quite likely that choosing locally-popular viral videos will prove more successful than adopting these.

1. *Around the World Selfie* is a beautifully filmed and edited travelogue of "selfie-stick" scenes from one man's trip to 36 countries in 600 days. It never fails to impress viewers. Anyone interested in travel should be inspired by this recording (2:58 minutes).

2. *Cliff Bike Ride* is an exhilarating "bird's eye" GoPro camera view of a mountain bike ride along a treacherous ridge. The viewer is led to believe the rider is perilously close to tipping over the edge (2:03).

3. *Dog Tease* is an intriguing video of a dog who appears to respond with human words to his owner's gentle taunts about edible delights hidden in the freezer and then given to people, a cat, and so forth. Viewers are made to empathize with the dog's frustrations as he "speaks" English, with the dubbed words of a man coming from his mouth. It is cleverly and humorously lip-synched (1:20).

4. *Gangnam Style* is a Korean-pop music video, which became a worldwide hit and, until 2016, the most viewed video in the history of YouTube. It makes effective use of unusual situations and slapstick comedy with scenes that are both silly and entertaining (4:13).

5. *Laughing Bride* shows a groom mistakenly reciting his marriage vows—awfully wedded for lawfully wedded—for example, prompting hysterical and infectious laughter from his bride and eventually the attendees and priest as well (2:23).

6. *Mentos and Coke* wows the viewer with its amateur scientific experiment testing what happens when cola and the brand-named candy are combined, resulting in a surprising geyser-like chemical eruption (1:57).

7. *Shadow Theater* is a Hungarian shadow theater troupe performing on the TV show Britain's Got Talent. It depicts the story of a young man and woman falling in love, marrying, having a child, and (the man) leaving to fight a war in a foreign land. The viewers see only shadows performers' bodies that cleverly evoke images, leaving the viewer happy, sad, and deeply moved (6:46).

8. *Sneezing Panda* plays on the element of surprise, with a baby panda sneezing and its mother's hilariously surprised reaction repeated in slow motion (0:35)

Conclusion

Viral videos offer a means to enliven and motivate students in the ESL/EFL classroom because they lower students' affective filter and encourage them to ex-

press themselves in both written and spoken English. They also provide stimulating content for meaningful language practice. The pool of available video resources is virtually limitless and growing constantly. Once we signal a willingness to use viral videos in English lessons, students are sure to contribute their own favorites. Nearly any video that provokes an emotional reaction, positive or negative, is suitable, taking obvious precautions with respect to language, content, and context into account. The key is to know our students and what will interest them. Engaging language learners as a class can be a challenge, but viral videos have elicited overwhelmingly positive reactions from my, sometimes difficult-to-please students. I have confidence they will do the same for yours.

About the Author

Simon Kew holds a BA in Asian Studies from Monash University in Melbourne, Australia. He worked three years as an assistant language teacher with the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Programme and has been teaching at a private high school in Japan ever since. He is an MA TESOL candidate at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies where his research interests include developing writing skills, comparative linguistics, and the interplay between language and culture.

Appendix A

Responding to "Hello Kitty"

Directions
- Think about the questions.
- Prepare to talk with your classmates.
- If needed, write a few words to help you remember your ideas.
    1. Who is the singer in the video? What do you know about her?
    2. In your opinion, what is the song about?
    3. Describe what happens in the music video.
    4. Do you think the video shows the "real" Japan? Why or why not?
    5. Some people say Avril is making fun of Japan. Do you think she is making fun of Japanese culture or respecting it? Explain.
    6. What did the KidsReact panel members think of the video?
    7. What social media do you use? Why? Does it have any bad points? Explain.

Appendix B

Talking About Viral Videos

A viral video is one that becomes very popular after many people have shared it on the internet. They are often songs, commercials or home-made videos. People share them using social media, such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. Until 2016, the most popular viral video was the K-pop song: Gangnam Style by PSY. It has been watched almost 3 billion times.

Directions

1. Go to YouTube.
2. Search for and watch four of these videos. You choose.
   a. Around the World Selfies
   b. Dog Tease
   c. Gangnam Style
   d. Laughing Bride
   e. Mentos and Coke
   f. Shadow Theater
   g. Sneezing Panda
3. Use this space to list the four videos you watched and your brief impression of each.
   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
4. Be prepared to use these sentence starters to explain your impressions.

   > a. I loved/enjoyed/hated/etc. [name of video] because...
   > b. It was surprising/exciting/boring/etc. when...
   > c. I was surprised/excited/moved/etc. when...

5. Are viral videos a fun way to communicate or are they a waste of time?

TIPS FOR TEACHERS

Low-Key, High-Impact Classroom Management Materials

Seth Wallace, Kinjo Gakuin Daigaku, Nagoya, Japan

Professional development courses and handbooks on effective teaching strategies always emphasize the importance of knowing one's students and understanding their needs as individuals. However, I teach large, multi-level English classes that typically meet once a week. I am on the go, and my students are, too. It is difficult to see them as individuals; in fact, it can be difficult to learn their names and keep track of their attendance without sacrificing valuable instructional time. Over the years, however, I have discovered some time-saving strategies for managing classroom routines and getting to know my students as individuals. The two tips described below are variations on what seasoned teachers probably call a name tent and the One-Minute paper with adaptations for classroom management purposes.

Nameplates

The traditional nameplate, or tent, is a folded piece of paper that stands on the student's desk with student's name facing the teacher, making it possible for the teacher and classmates to call each other by name. Typically, there is extra, empty space next to the name and on the back of the tent. Both spaces can be put to good use. Alongside their names, my students draw small images to give the class visual clues about themselves, for example, their hobbies, club or team memberships, and part-time job sites. The images help with memory, and gradually, class members (and I) begin to see each other as more than just names or invisible members in a group.

The side of the nameplate facing the student can be useful, too. I have begun printing essential classroom English phrases in this space (see Appendix 1). Students use the expressions like a cue card or scaffold that helps them begin and sustain their use of English. I adjust the list of expressions depending on the level of

the class, and students frequently add their own useful expressions to my list as they see the need.

Personalized Reflection Cards

Angelo and Cross (1993) described a wide array of options for helping teachers collect valuable feedback on their classes in efficient, unobtrusive ways. My "personalized reflection card" functions as both a Minute Paper (Angelo and Cross, 1993) and a dialog journal adapted for large, once-a-week classes. On one side of the card is a graphic organizer where students write a short comment at the conclusion of each class, for example, what they liked, what they learned, or what was difficult. Since the space provided is small and time is short, they are not intimidated by the task. My short but personal reply to each comment ensures that every student is seen as an individual even when we do not have much person-to-person time in class.

The time needed for writing my personal responses is not as burdensome as I once thought it would be. Over the weeks, the comments grow into a personalized dialogue much like a text message or blog thread does. With large classes, patterns of response are particularly important. If a dozen students had difficulty with the same task, I know immediately know how to begin planning my next lesson. Students personalize the reverse side of the card with their names and other details of their own choosing and design. The result is a visual "About the Author" page and, like their nameplate, helps me see my students as individuals rather than an anonymous member of a group.

Possibilities

Nameplates and reflection cards can be used in a variety of ways other than those described above. For example, they can be efficient means of taking attendance; the nameplates or reflection cards that are not picked up show who is absent and can be set aside for record keeping after class. They can also function as place cards, showing students where to sit. This works well for giving students new conversation partners or for forming groups based on shared interests, proficiency level, or project-based teams. Both nameplates and reflection cards have empty space that I have not yet used well. Students could, for example, record their major quiz and test scores inside their nameplates or in a reserved space on their reflection

cards to track their progress in the course. They enjoy the opportunity to be the teaching assistant by handing out, collecting, and assigning seating using the nameplates. They often have better insights about creating effective student groups than I do, and they thoroughly enjoy challenging themselves to learn and remember more about each other. Because both nameplates and reflection cards are used in every lesson, it is best if they can be constructed with cardstock rather than lightweight paper, and it is important that both are retrieved by the teacher at the close of each class.

In conclusion, students—even students who love their digital devices—enjoy making simple classroom management materials such as the nameplate and personalized reflection card described here. More important, using them has a powerful, positive impact on group dynamics, raising the energy level and degree of interaction among students and creating, in turn, ideal conditions for communication.

Reference

Angelo, T. and Cross, P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

About the Author

Seth Wallace earned an MA in French at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. Today he lives in Japan where he enjoys family time, dog training, gardening, marine sports, and motor scooter adventures. He is interested in world politics, current affairs, the environment, and his current pursuit—a master's degree in TESOL from the Nagoya University of Foreign Studies.

Appendix 1

Nameplate

<table>
<tr><td>
ǝɹǝɥ ǝɯɐN

Classroom English: Use these sentences as often as you can

1. I have a question
2. I don't understand.
3. Could you say that again?
4. How do you say/spell ___?
5. What does ___ mean?

6. How do you say ___ in ___?
7. Let's be partners.
8. What's the answer?
9. I'm finished.
10. Is this okay?
</td></tr>
</table>

Appendix 2

Personalized Reflection Card

Week	Date	Student Comment	Teacher Response
1	4/25	My partner, Saaya, speaking is very good. I want to speak like her.	It's great that Saaya inspired you! Maybe you and she can speak English for fun outside of class, too.
2	5/2	Today's activity was very fun. I love Harry Potter.	So glad you enjoyed it! What other stories do you like as much as HP?
3	5/9		
4	5/16		

Notes to Contributors

The **TESL Reporter** is a refereed semiannual publication of the Department of English Language Teaching and Learning of Brigham Young University–Hawaii and is dedicated to the dissemination of ideas and issues of interest to teachers of English to speakers of other languages worldwide.

Articles: Manuscripts (fully refereed) should be typed and double spaced throughout, generally not exceeding thirty-five pages. Each manuscript should be accompanied by a cover sheet with the title; author's name, position, and address; and a short (less than 50 words) biodata statement. Identifying information should not appear elsewhere in the manuscript in order to insure an impartial review. Authors are encouraged to follow APA style and review past issues of the *TESL Reporter* for matters of style. Any tables, graphs, or illustrations should be sent in camera-ready form whenever possible.

It is expected that manuscripts submitted to the *TESL Reporter* are neither previously published nor being considered for publication elsewhere. Upon publication, authors will receive four complimentary copies of the issue in which their article is published. Manuscripts are generally not returned to authors. Authors should retain a personal copy.

Submission of manuscripts can be sent to the Editor, *TESL Reporter,* BYUH #1940, 55-220 Kulanui Street Bldg 5, Laie, HI 96762-1293, USA, or by email to mark.james@byuh.edu

Tips For Teachers: Manuscripts (chosen at the discretion of the editor) should be typed and double spaced throughout, generally not exceeding eight pages. Editor invites submissions in either paper or electronic format, preferably as a Word attachment to an email message. Each manuscript should be accompanied by a cover sheet with the title; author's name, position, and address; and a short (less than 50 words) biodata statement. It is expected that the manuscripts submitted to the *TESL Reporter* are neither previously published nor being considered for publication elsewhere. Upon publication, authors will receive three complimentary copies of the issue in which their "tip" is published. Manuscripts are generally not returned to authors. Authors should retain a personal copy. Submissions should be sent to Jean Kirschenmann, c/o Center for English Language Programs, Hawaii Pacific University, 1188 Fort Street Mall Room, Honolulu, HI 96813, USA. Email: jkirschenmann@hpu.edu

Reviews of recent textbooks, resource materials, tests, and non-print materials (films, tapes, or computer software) are also invited. Potential reviewers who indicate a particular area of interest to the review editor will be contacted concerning recent titles in that area. Requests for review guidelines should be addressed to the review editor. Authors of published reviews will receive two complimentary copies of the issue in which the review is published. Reviews can be sent to Review Editor, BYUH #1940, 55-220 Kulanui Street Bldg 5, Laie, HI 96762-1293 or by email to mark.james@byuh.edu

Advertising information is available upon request from the editor.

Abstracts of articles published in the *TESL Reporter* appear in *Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts*.