ISSN 2433-5851

EFL LEARNER ENGAGEMENT: MODELS AND MODES

EFLにおける学習者エンゲージメント：モデルとモード

甲南大学総合研究所
叢書　138

Table of Contents

EFL LEARNER ENGAGEMENT: MODELS AND MODES

Welcome Message

Learner engagement continues to gain traction as a conceptual framework and area of scholarly research in school settings, and we can now find references to the growing body of literature on the topic in second-language acquisition studies. Still, although the term engagement comes up quite often in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, it is often used in more general terms with little or no connection to this broader body of research. This gap was one of the underlying reasons for forming this team and setting out on this research journey. The papers gathered here represent a range of perspectives on the topic of learner engagement, especially as they apply to our team's teaching context, university EFL in Japan. Our research proposal included three main themes: Models and Modes of Learner Engagement, Teacher Expertise, and e-Learning platforms of problem-based learning. We have thus organized here our research findings around these three themes. Specifically, in the first paper, Keiko Yoshida reviews a range of survey instruments used around the world to gauge learner engagement and presents findings from a small-scale study using a questionnaire adapted from representative studies in Australia and North America. Next, Brent Jones shares findings from a qualitative study of teacher characteristics that influence learner engagement in university EFL classes in Japan. On the topic of teacher expertise, Mayumi Asaba offers an overview of her study of student perceptions related to learner engagement and expert teaching. Finally, Roger Palmer outlines an action research project in which university freshmen in a management department in Japan learned discourse structures and features through modeling and explicit teaching using e-Learning platforms. Audio and video recordings of student interactions highlighted the instruction and fed back into a loop of informed peer assessment. This paper describes the methodology and models of instruction while at the same time offering an overview of how students performed and were appraised by their peers. It is hoped that this collection of papers helps bring to the forefront the

topic of learner engagement and stimulates further discussion and research on related issues and topics.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ENGAGEMENT IN LEARNING EXPERIENCES IN A JAPANESE UNIVERSITY

Keiko Yoshida, Institute for Language and Culture

Student Engagement

Currently there have been studies made on various types of engagement, including customer engagement, employee engagement, community engagement, patient and family engagement, academic engagement, undergraduate engagement, student engagement in higher education, etcetera.

In the field of education, Input-Environment-Output (IEO) model introduced in Astin (1993) is widely utilized to evaluate their learning outcome. Input is the knowledge and skills students have at their university entry and output is those at their graduation. Environment, in the middle, means their experiences in school and it is mainly divided into two categories; opportunities schools provide for students, and challenges and efforts students make for the granted opportunities (Okada et al. , 2011). Ogata (2008) considers that the phrase, “student engagement”, is closely related to the latter and showing them with various factors such as student active learning, academic engaged time outside class and class attendance.

The concept of student engagement has been actively used as the new measuring tool for institutional assessment since the 1990s in the United States. With the growing number of student engagement studies, theories, conceptual frameworks and dominant perspectives have been also developed. The behavioral perspective that describes the relationships between student behavior and teaching practice has drawn researchers’ attentions most. One representative survey method to investigate the relationships is the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which is one unit of Center for Postsecondary Research in the Indiana University School of Education. Another is the Australian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE) introduced by the Australian Council for Educational

Research. The five engagement scales that the NSSE includes mainly focus on educational approaches, such as academic challenge, active learning, interactions, enriching educational experiences and supportive learning environment. The AUSSE, on the other hand, puts its emphasis more on outcomes of education such as higher order thinking (e.g. critical thinking and problem solving), general learning outcomes, career readiness, grade, departure intention and satisfaction. The NSSE and the AUSSE are called The Dominant Paradigm by Bryson (2014).

Kuh (2001), one of the developers of the NSSE, explained validity, reliability and credibility of self-report data, while some researchers were concerned about weakness of the student responses, wide variety of learning styles and focuses in different disciplines (Kahu, 2013). She also argues that we must not only look at the behavioral perspective, which is realized by academic challenge and active learning, but also other psychological, social-cultural and holistic perspectives, to describe the construct of engagement more in details. Emotional and cognitive dimensions are, for example, in Psychological perspectives.

Reviewing the terms to explain student engagement in the previous literatures, Yamada (2018) defines it as below. He describes student engagement is the concept to capture 1) the educational system and environment universities provide, considering students' situations and contexts, to increase their learning and development, 2) the deep commitment teaching and administrative staff make in their daily instruction and guidance, 3) the process and a series of experiences students choose on their own to be proactive in their learning, and 4) the interconnectedness and dynamics between quality and quantity of involvement made by each university, teaching and administrative staff member, and student.

> *学生エンゲージメントとは、大学生の学習と発達を促すために、彼らの置かれている状況や文脈も考慮しつつ、大学が提供する制度や環境、教職員が日常的に行う教育・指導等における深い関与、学生が自らの意志で選択し、学びに対して主体的に*

関与するというプロセスや一連の経験、そして大学、教職員、学生それぞれが払う関与の質と量の相互連関やダイナミクスを捉える概念。

Findings from Previous Studies on Student Engagement

The NSSE Research

The NSSE research in 2014 investigating engagement of first-year and fourth-year students in 622 four-year colleges in the States had the following findings: that student experiences in college and interchange with their instructors vary among schools and they are not related to school size or difficulty degree to enter, that the number of advising sessions in their first year with their academic advisor has the positive correlation with student perception about supporting environment provided for them by schools, and that use of social media in their learning is positively correlated with all the criteria related to their engagement.

The AUSSE Research

A series of AUSSE Research Briefing reports, Volume 1-12 with different focuses, were published by AUSSE between 2008 and 2011. Volume 6 in 2010, for instance, reveals that one in 15 first-year students in Australia are planning to move to another university. Regarding their experiences, first years in Australia are less likely to ask questions in class, make class presentations or join community-based projects than last-year students or their counterparts in the U.S. Also, it shows that first years in Australia and New Zealand discuss their grades or career plans with teachers much less than first-year students in America. More detailed analysis based on their majors tells that science students work more on memorizing facts and engineering students on application of theories into practices, while humanities students focus more on analysis.

The CRUMP Research

In Japan, Center for Research on University Management and Policy (CRUMP) of Tokyo University adapted the NSSE and conducted its own surveys in 2007 and 2018 with a clear purpose of describing a precise picture of tertiary education in Japan for its future reform. 48,233 students in 127 colleges participated in the former and 32,913 students in 77 universities did in the latter. Ogata (2008) analyzes the data collected in 2007 and concludes that both features of education programs and student engagement are important to build general skills and academic skills. To improve general skills, active learning, for example, participation in discussion and questions to instructors, is effective as well as academic engaged time outside class, but class attendance is not. To raise academic skills, active learning, academic engaged time outside class and class attendance are all important but the impact of active learning on academic skills is not as strong as on general skills. To have higher grades, active learning and class attendance are the significant factors.

Research Design

The present study attempts 1) to adapt student engagement questionnaires, common methods used by various schools and institutions in several countries, from the previous overseas research to university student context in Japan, 2) to conduct a small-scale survey on student learning experiences and environment at one university in Japan which can be administered simply by a single teacher and 3) to share results in this university with a hope that they can give some hints to develop student learning and instructors' teaching.

Method

Participants

A total of 67 students of a university in Japan answered the student engagement questionnaire designed to collect data on activities, focuses and environment of their current learning. Out of them, learning activities they experience at college is

a special emphasis of the questionnaire. 65 students are freshmen and the rest two are sophomores. The participants are in three different courses. 48 of them are in the Regular course, 12 in the Science and International Studies course and seven are in the English Intensive course mainly for students aiming to study abroad. This university has eight different faculties and 29 of all the participants of this study are from Business Administration, 26 from Economics, six from Science and Engineering and six from Intelligence and Informatics. They all study in one of the three campuses of the school. Therefore, it cannot be said that the experiences of them represent those of students in all the faculties of the university.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire was adapted from the AUSSE (2011) and the CLASSE STUDENT that was revised by University of Alberta from the NSSE originally developed by Indiana University. Since the NSSE, the AUSSE, and the CLASSE STUDENT in University of Alberta were designed to collect data from college students in English speaking countries, they were modified for this study on engagement of Japanese university students. In the AUSSE, the questions ask students about their classes in general and usually start with "In your experience in your institution during this academic year, …." or "During the current academic year, …", while in the CLASSE STUDENT the items ask about their specific class and the question statements are like "So far in this semester, how often have you done each of the following in your [Course XYZ] class?" or "So far in this semester, how much of your coursework in your [Course XYZ] class emphasized the following mental activities?" As the purpose of this study is to investigate student general learning experiences and their perception about their experiences for development of our teaching in this university, the former style questions as in the AUSSE were chosen.

The questionnaire with a total of 60 questions is divided into six main parts and a personal data section. Part one consists of 27 statements relating to

engagement activities of students. Five questions (Questions 1, 4, 9, 25 and 27) are about student choices in engagement activities, for example, asking questions in class (Q1) and making efforts when they feel the class content is difficult (Q4). Five (Questions 3, 5, 7, 13 and 15) relate to class design and assignments such as making presentations (Q3) and combining ideas and concepts from other courses together when completing assignments (Q7). Six (Questions 2 and 17-21) are on relationship with teachers and advisors, including communication with (Q2, 17, 18 and 19) and feedback from (Q20) them. Four (Questions 10, 23, 24 and 26) ask about relationship with entire classes, for instance, contribution to a class (Q10) and consideration of entire class success (Q24). Four (Questions 11, 12, 14 and 22) are about relationship with other students such as cooperation with classmates for assignments (Q11 and Q12) and offering support to other students (Q14). Three (Questions 6, 8 and 16) are to find their use of university learning support facilities including SALC (Self-Access Learning Center) (Q8) and university online network for assignments and discussions (Q16). Responses in part one are on a Likert scale from one to four, with one coded as never/rarely and four as very often.

Part two consists of five statements (Questions 28-32), and all of them relate to cognitive skills which students consider were focused and trained in their classes. As in the CLASSE $_{\text{STUDENT}}$ in University Alberta, among various cognitive skills, in particular, five skills are asked in this part: memorizing facts, ideas and methods (Q28); analyzing the basic elements of each idea or theory (Q29); synthesizing obtained ideas and information to create a new perspective (Q30); making judgement on value or validity of information, discussions, or methods of others and self (Q31); applying theories or concepts into practices (Q32). Responses in part two were on a Likert scale from one to four, with one coded as very little and four as very much.

Part three consists of eight statements relating to other educational practices. One question (Question 33) is about efforts for better achievement, two

(Questions 34 and 35) are on class preparation time, one (Question 36) relates to attendance, two (Question 37 and 38) ask about textbooks, and two (Questions 39 and 40) are about difficulty level of classes. Responses in Question 33 were on a Likert scale from one to seven, with one coded as very little and seven as very much. Responses in Questions 34-40 were all on a Likert scale from one to four, but with different names of steps, because there were different types of questions asking time durations in a certain period, frequencies, degrees, and difficulty levels.

Part four consists of five statements and all of them are about class atmosphere. One question (Question 41), however, asks about atmosphere in conversations with teachers. The rest four (Questions 42-45) are on interactions with classmates such as learning from classmates (Q44) and contributing to classmates (Q45). Responses in Question 41 were on a Likert scale from one to four, with one coded as very uncomfortable and four as very comfortable. Responses in Questions 42-45 were all on a Likert scale from one to four, with one coded as very little and four as very much.

Part five consists of four statements relating to career development education. Three of them (Questions 46, 47 and 49) are about existence and experiences of career education given by teachers and advisors and the rest one (Question 48) is about student perception about usefulness of class contents for their future career. Responses in part five were all on a Likert scale from one to four, but with different names of steps, because there were different types of questions asking frequencies, degrees, and perceptions.

Part six consists of seven statements regarding student learning at university in general. Three of them (Questions 50-52) elicit student perceptions about affiliation with their university (Q50) and about academic advice they received there (Q51). Four (Questions 53-56) are relationship with people surrounding them on campus including teaching staff (Q54) and learning support staff (Q56). Responses in Questions 50 and 53-56 were on a Likert scale from one

to seven, but with different names of steps, because there were different types of questions asking student sense of affiliation with school and relationships with others on campus. Responses in Questions 51 and 52 were on a Likert scale from one to four, with one coded as poor and four as excellent.

In personal data section, students answered their gender (Q 57), course selection (Q58), grade year (Q59), and faculty (Q60).

Results

Engagement Activities

Table 1-1 shows that more than half students consider they frequently focus on their coursework at hand and accomplish it responsibly, though they do not think they ask questions or prepare for the class lessons often. They might regard voluntary questions in class and previews for lessons as some extra activities which are not included in their coursework.

Table 1-1 Student Attitudes and Engagement Activities for Classwork

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Total
Q1 Questions	28 **(42%)**	28 **(42%)**	9 (13%)	2 (3%)	67
Q4 Efforts	3 (4%)	27 (40%)	31 **(46%)**	6 **(9%)**	67
Q9 Previews	12 **(18%)**	35 **(52%)**	17 (25%)	3 (4%)	67
Q25 Focused	1 (1%)	28 (42%)	29 **(43%)**	9 **(13%)**	67
Q27 Responsible	3 (4%)	21 (31%)	33 **(49%)**	10 **(15%)**	67

In their response to Q33 about student efforts for final exams or assignments, however, more than ten percent of students rate their efforts as 7, highest on the Likert scale, and more than half rate either 5 or 6. It can be assumed that they evaluate themselves as being serious and responsible if they work hard on large or final tests or assignments of classes.

To grab more details about their actual previews, Q34 and 35 asked how much time students use to prepare for classes. The answers revealed that a little more than half of them sometimes spend over one hour for class preparations and a little fewer than half never spend over three hours for previews.

The frequency and length of their previews may be subject to their class contents, therefore, it is necessary to look at them. Table 1-2 shows the high percentages of the responses of "Never" for Q5 and Q15. They are partially due to individual English class syllabi and entire English education curriculum of the university. In education of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) on Okamoto campus in this university, though students take College English Reading and Writing classes in their first year, the focus of them seem to be heavily on reading. Only a limited number of students taking English Intensive course are trained to complete and submit their writings after experiencing process writing with two or more drafts in their first year.

It must be a little challenging to incorporate community activities in a class syllabus of classes for first year students. Recently, however, courses called Overseas Volunteer Activities have been created and others called Area Studies, which are summer/spring intensive courses, sometimes include community activities even outside Japan. Thus, responses of higher frequencies for Q15 are expected to increase in the future.

Table 1-2 Learning Opportunities: Class Designs and Assignments

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Total
Q3 Presentations	15 (22%)	16 (24%)	24 (36%)	12 (18%)	67
Q5 Two or More Drafts	34 **(51%)**	15 **(22%)**	12 (18%)	6 (9%)	67
Q7 Resources	14 (21%)	28 (42%)	18 (27%)	7 (10%)	67
Q13 Other Class Knowledge	6 (9%)	35 (52%)	21 (31%)	5 (7%)	67
Q15 Community Activities	53 **(79%)**	7 **(10%)**	7 (10%)	0 (0%)	67

There are several freshmen orientations at the beginning of the academic year about how to use the facilities and online systems of university. All students on Okamoto campus are supposed to visit and study at LOFT, the Self Access Learning Center, for English study for their first year College English Speaking

class, and ten percent of the entire class score is earned by their work at LOFT. Since this self-report questionnaire survey was administered at the end of the second semester, their answers “Never” for Q8 in Table 1-3 is a bit surprising. It is assumed that if they have never visited Learning Support Center, they answer “Never” in Q8. However, the table also indicates 70-80 percent students have used the library, learning support center, SALC and online systems for their classwork.

Table 1-3 Uses of School Facilities and Resources

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Total
Q6 Library, etc.	13 (19%)	23 **(34%)**	18 (27%)	13 (19%)	67
Q8 Support Center & SALC	20 **(30%)**	21 **(31%)**	16 (24%)	10 (15%)	67
Q16 School Online System	14 (21%)	22 **(33%)**	13 (19%)	18 (27%)	67

Cognitive Skills

Regarding cognitive skills which are trained in their classes, students perceive all the following skills below in Table 2 have a similar frequency pattern of training opportunities. The responses to Q30-32 indicate that training of higher cognitive skills, such as integration of what they study in various classes, critical thinking toward various ideas, methods, and theories and application of learned knowledge to new problems and situations, has been already started and evenly implemented in their first year at college.

Table 2 Cognitive Skills Trained in Classes

	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	Very Much	Total
Q28 Memorizing	3 (4%)	33 **(49%)**	20 (30%)	11 (16%)	67
Q29 Analyzing	2 (3%)	35 **(52%)**	16 (24%)	14 (21%)	67
Q30 Synthesizing	7 (10%)	34 **(51%)**	19 (28%)	7 (10%)	67
Q31 Judging	8 (12%)	32 **(48%)**	21 (31%)	6 (9%)	67
Q32 Applying	7 (10%)	37 **(55%)**	19 (28%)	4 (6%)	67

Other Educational Practices

The data in Table 3 tells student perceptions about their class textbooks and contents. The answers to Q37 and Q38 imply their positive ideas about textbook choices, which are made by their teachers, departments, institutes or centers, for example, interesting topics and a good challenge level of them. On the other hand, approximately one third or one quarter of them responded "Difficult" and largest percentages of them answered "Somewhat Easy" in Q39 and Q40 about class contents. The different sets of answer choices in the questions about textbooks and class contents (Easy, Somewhat Difficult, Difficult and Very Difficult for textbooks; Difficult, Somewhat Easy, Easy and Very Easy for class contents) in the original questionnaire, which were applied in this study, made it difficult to interpret their responses in this section. It can be suggested that textbook contents and levels be kept as they are but class contents and difficulty levels be easier for some students and a little bit more challenging for others. More flexible teaching level adjustment according to student skill levels seems necessary.

Table 3 Textbooks and Class Contents

	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	Very Much	Total
Q37 Interest in Textbooks	7 (10%)	25 (37%)	30 **(45%)**	5 (7%)	67
	Easy	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Very Difficult	Total
Q38 Textbooks	7 (10%)	45 **(67%)**	12 (18%)	3 (4%)	67
	Difficult	Somewhat Easy	Easy	Very Easy	Total
Q39 Class Contents	20 (30%)	40 **(60%)**	7 (10%)	0 (0%)	67
Q40 Keeping up with Classes	18 (27%)	39 **(58%)**	9 (13%)	1 (1%)	67

Class Atmosphere

While about twenty percent of students answered Very Comfortable, approximately ten percent of students responded "Uncomfortable" in communicating with teaching staff. Follow-up questions to find reasons for that

should have been asked. The overall atmosphere and learning environment among students and with teachers are considered to be fair, but the responses to all the questions in this section indicate that there are around ten percent students who find it difficult to talk and work together with teachers and other students. More detailed investigations, individual supports and carefully designed activities which help them to get involved more with ease are needed.

Table 4 Class Atmosphere

	Un-comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Comfortable	Very Comfortable	Total
Q41W/Teaching Staff	7 (11%)	20 **(30%)**	24 **(36%)**	15 (23%)	66
	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	Very Much	Total
Q42 Enjoy GW	5 (8%)	26 **(39%)**	22 **(33%)**	13 (20%)	66
Q43 Interaction w/ Classmates	6 (9%)	23 **(35%)**	22 **(33%)**	15 (23%)	66
Q44 Learning from Classmates	8 (12%)	22 **(33%)**	21 **(32%)**	15 (23%)	66
Q45 Contributing To Classmates	12 (18%)	28 **(42%)**	18 (27%)	8 (12%)	66

Career Education

Table 5 indicates students had different frequencies of chances to talk and consult about careers with teachers and more than half of them had none. To the contrary, over half of them receive support from the Career Center of the university. Students consider that contents of their classes include subject matter relevant to their future career to some degree. Teachers can more proactively connect their lessons with students' prospective future careers and make the connection clear to them.

Table 5 Career Education

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Total
Q46 Talk on Career with Teaching Staff	39 **(59%)**	17 (26%)	9 (14%)	1 (2%)	66
	Very Little	Some	Quite a Bit	Very Much	Total
Q47 Contents Relevant To Career	16 (24%)	39 **(59%)**	9 (14%)	2 (3%)	66
Q49 Support for Career Planning	15 (23%)	35 **(53%)**	13 (20%)	3 (5%)	66

Learning at University

Majority of students recognize that advice they receive at university in general is fair or better. Table 6 presents that they evaluate higher their experiences at school than advice. In addition, regarding the relationships with teaching, administrative, and learning support staff, the largest number of students rate 5-6, 4, and 4, respectively in Q54-Q56. As an educational institute, there is much room for this university to raise quality of academic, life-related, and career advice and experiences and student perceptions about them.

Table 6 Learning at University

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Total
Q.51 Advice	2 (3%)	36 **(55%)**	23 (35%)	5 (8%)	66
Q.52 Experiences	2 (3%)	21 (32%)	31 **(47%)**	12 (18%)	66

Conclusion

The results of the present study replicate some of the findings of the research reported by Yamada from Benesse Educational Research and Development Institute in 2018. The research presented the results of three surveys conducted in 2008, 2012 and 2016 with participants of approximately 4,000-5,000 college students across Japan. For example, students in the both Yamada (2018) and this study answered that they do have responsible attitudes and make sufficient efforts

toward classwork but do not ask questions in class or preview for classes at all or so often.

The longitudinal research of Yamada and other researchers above reported the sharp increase in the percentage of students who experienced classes with frequent output opportunities and peer support among students, which can be actually aimed and designed by teachers. Student side behavioral engagement in groupwork and discussion also increased accordingly with the more output chances described above. It implies that the changes made in class designs by teachers may positively affect student engagement in the long run. Therefore, thoroughly planned revisions of class design and curriculum and systems to check the effects of them are necessary. For such revisions and check systems, it can be said that longitudinal engagement research within a university will be one possible good method.

REFERENCES

相原総一郎(2015).「学生エンゲージメントの一考察ーアメリカにおける学生エンゲージ　メント調査（NSSE）の発展ー」『広島大学高等教育研究開発センター 大学論集』, 47, 169-84. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from https://ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/files/public/3/37319/20150526104626227478/DaigakuRonshu_47_169.pdf

Astin, A.W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bryson, C. (Ed.). (2014). *Understanding and Developing Student Engagement.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Kahu, E.R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), 758-773. Retrieved August 15, 2017 from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505?needAccess=true

Kuh, G.D. (2001). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties, Indiana University, Center for Postsecondary Research. Retrieved August 20, 2017 from http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/psychometric_framework_2002.pdf

小方直幸(2008).「学生のエンゲージメントと大学教育のアウトカム」『高等教育研究』 11: 45-64. Retrieved April 2, 2017 from https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/jaher/11/0/11_45/_pdf/-char/ja

岡田有司, 鳥居朋子, 宮浦崇, 青山佳世, 松村初, 中野正也, 吉岡路(2011).「大学生における学習 スタイルの違いと学習成果」『立命館高等教育研究』, 11, 167-182. Retrieved April 2, 2017 from http://r-cube.ritsumei.ac.jp/repo/repository/rcube/2679/hes11_12okada.pdf

山田剛史(2018).「大学教育の質的転換と学生エンゲージメント」『名古屋高等教育研究』, 18, 155–176. Retrieved April 7, 2019 from http://www.cshe.nagoya-u.ac.jp/publications/journal/no18/09.pdf

山田剛史(2018).「学生エンゲージメントが拓く大学教育の可能性～改めて『誰のための』『何のための』教育改革かを考える～」『第 3 回大学生の学習・生活実態調査報告書（ベネッセ教育総合研究所）』, 31-39. Retrieved August 7, 2019 from https://berd.benesse.jp/up_images/textarea/05_daigakusei_sec2_P30_39.pdf

Appendix – Questionnaire

クラスにおけるエンゲージメントについてのアンケート

このアンケートに答えるのは自由です。以下の各項目について、該当すると思う数字に○をつけてください。できるだけ最も適切だと思う数字を選んでください。回答は研究の目的にのみ使用され、回答者や教職員の皆様にいかなる影響を及ぼすものではありません。ご協力をお願い致します。

甲南大学総合研究所 2017-2018年度 研究プロジェクト
国際言語文化センター 吉田桂子

パート1. 学習における活動について

今年度、大学において、以下の各項目をどのような頻度で行いましたか。

1. 授業で発言や質問をしたり、オンライン（メールや My Konan など）で質問をしましたか
   1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした
2. 教員にアドバイスを求めましたか
   1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした
3. 授業でプレゼンテーションをしましたか
   1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした
4. 授業内容が難しいと感じた時に、努力をしましたか
   1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした
5. 課題を最終的に提出する前に、2 回以上、下書きをしましたか
   1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした
6. 図書館やオンラインの資料を使用しましたか
   1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

7. 様々な資料から意見や情報を統合する課題を行いましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

8. 学習支援サービス（Loft や教育学習支援センターなど）を利用しましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

9. 教材を読んだり課題を行うなど、準備を完全にしてから授業にのぞみましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

10. 学習の進度についていっていましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

11. 授業内の課題や活動に、クラスメイトと協力して取り組みましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

12. 授業外の課題や授業の準備に、クラスメイトと協力して取り組みましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

13. 授業の課題やディスカッションをする際に、他の授業で学んだ知識や概念を活用しましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

14. 他学生への学習支援や指導（有償・ボランティアを含む）を行いましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

15. 学習の一部として、地域のプロジェクトに参加しましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

16. 課題やディスカッションを行うために、オンラインのシステム (My Konan など)を使用しましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

17. メールや My Konan などで、教員とコミュニケーションをとりましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

18. 課題や成績について、教員と授業以外に話をしましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

19. 授業準備や課題について、教員と授業以外で話をしましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

20. 学習成果について、教員やアドバイザーからすぐに（記述の・口頭の）フィードバックをもらいましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

21. 教員やアドバイザーの水準や期待に合わせるために、思っていたよりも努力して取り組みましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

22. 課題や授業について、授業外で他の人（他学生、家族、バイト先の人など）と話をしましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

23. 自分の授業への参加度が授業全体の向上に貢献していましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

24. 授業全体の成功について考えましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

25. 授業や課題に集中して取り組みましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

26. 授業やクラスメイトと足並みを揃え、課題に取り組みましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

27. 責任をもって授業・課題に取り組みましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

パート２． 認知スキルについて

今年度の授業において、以下の知的活動にどの程度重点が置かれていましたか。

28. 事実、知識、手法を覚える

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

29. 知識、経験、理論の基本要素を分析する（事例・状況の詳細な分析、要素の考察など）

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

30. 知識、情報、経験を統合し、新しいより複雑な解釈や関連性に発展させる

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

31. 情報、議論、手法の価値を決定する

（他者のデータ収集・解釈方法の分析、自己の結論の堅実性の評価など）

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

32. 理論や概念を実際の問題や新しい状況に応用する

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

パート3. その他の教育実践について

今年度の授業に関する以下の項目について答えてください。

33. 試験や最終課題で良い結果を出すために、どの程度の努力が必要でしたか

ほとんど必要ではなかった 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常に必要であった

34. 平均的な１週間で、1時間を超える授業外課題はいくつありましたか

1 なし 2 １つか２つ 3 ３つか４つ 4 5つ以上

35. 平均的な１週間で、3時間を超えて授業準備（調査、資料の読み込み、課題、実験、データ分析、リハーサル、その他）を行ったことはどのくらいありましたか

1 ほとんどなかった 2 時々あった 3 しばしばあった 4 しょっちゅうあった

36. 今学期、１つの授業を平均何回欠席しましたか

1 ０回 2 １~２回 3 ３~４回 4 5回以上

37. 授業の教材を学ぶことにどの程度興味がありますか

1 ほとんどない 2 あまりない 3 ややある 4 かなりある

38. 授業の教材の難易度はどうでしたか

1 簡単である 2 やや難しい 3 難しい 4 かなり難しい

39. （授業内・授業外の）学習内容・課題・試験の難易度はどうでしたか

1 難しかった 2 やや簡単だった 3 簡単だった 4 かなり簡単だった

40. 授業についていくことはどうでしたか

1 難しかった 2 やや簡単だった 3 簡単だった 4 かなり簡単だった

パート４. 授業の雰囲気について

今学期の授業の雰囲気に関する以下の項目について答えてください。

41. 教員と話すことはどうでしたか

1 不安だった 2 やや安心だった 3 安心だった 4 かなり安心だった

42. クラスメイトとのグループワークを楽しむことがありましたか

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

43. クラスメイトとの交流はありましたか

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

44. クラスメイトから学ぶことがありましたか

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

45. クラスメイトに貢献できることはありましたか

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

パート5. 授業とキャリア開発について

授業とキャリア開発に関する以下の項目について答えてください。

46. 教員やアドバイザーに、キャリアプランについて話をしましたか

1 しなかった 2 時々した 3 しばしばした 4 しょっちゅうした

47. 教員より授業の学習内容と今後のキャリアの関連性が説明されていましたか

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

48. 授業の学習内容が今後のキャリアにおいて役立つと思いますか

決して/ほとんど思わない 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常に思う

49. 今後のキャリアの目標設定に関する教育的サポートがありましたか

1 ほとんどなかった 2 いくらかあった 3 わりとあった 4 非常にあった

パート６. 大学での学習について

大学での学習に関する以下の項目について答えてください。

50. 大学・学部・授業で学んでいることを誇りに思いますか

決して/ほとんど思わない 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常に思う

51. 全体的に大学で受けた学術的アドバイスをどのように思いますか

1 よくない 2 ふつう 3 良い 4 非常に良い

52. 全体的に大学での経験をどのように思いますか

1 よくない 2 ふつう 3 良い 4 非常に良い

53. 他学生との関係はどうですか

不親切である・疎外感がある　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　親切である・仲間意識がある

54. 教員との関係はどうですか

助けにならない・思いやりがない 1　2　3　4　5　6　7　助けになる・思いやりがある

55. 職員との関係はどうですか

助けにならない・厳格である　1　2　3　4　5　6　7　助けになる・柔軟である

56. 学生支援担当者との関係はどうですか

助けにならない・思いやりがない 1　2　3　4　5　6　7　助けになる・思いやりがある

あなたの基本情報

57. 性別：

1　男性　　2　女性

58. コース：

1　通常コース（1 TS・２ MS・３ PSいずれかに○をしてください）

2　英語集中コース　　3　Dコース　　4　エリアスタディーズ

59. 学年：

1　1年生　2　2年生　　3　3年生

60. 学部：

1　文　2　法　　3　経済　４　経営　５　マネジメント創造　６　理工　７　知能情報

8　フロンティアサイエンス

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES THAT INFLUENCE LEARNER ENGAGEMENT

Brent A. Jones, Hirao School of Management

Introduction

This report outlines partial findings from a larger study of learner engagement in university English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes in Japan. Although similar or related topics have been discussed in the second language acquisition (SLA) literature (Osterman, 2014, Philp & Duchesne, 2016), there is still much work to do in terms of conceptual clarity, theorizing and suggested application. Specifically, while great strides have been made in theorizing on second language (L2) learning motivation (Boo, Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015), there is a relative dearth of practical advice for making use of this better understanding of related constructs to effectively and efficiently help learners engage with their in-class second language studies (Anjomshoa & Sadighi, 2015).

My motivation for studying learner engagement in this context comes from the struggles that I have witnessed among my learners and wanting to help them and others with their language learning endeavors. For a variety of reasons, the trend is for English language ability among Japanese students—at least as measured by standardized proficiency tests—to actually drop over the four years of university. It is hoped that the current study contributes in some small way to reversing this trend.

Learner Engagement was operationalized in my study as the observable outward indicators that the learner is focused on and involved behaviorally, cognitively, emotionally and agentically in classroom language activities (Reeve, 2012). The word “Engagement” appears often in educational literature, and learner engagement is commonly understood as an important precursor to academic achievement and school success (Chapman, 2003; Marzano & Pickering, 2010). This is true as well for the general field of second language

acquisition (Ohta, 2000) and more specifically EFL in Japan (Murphey & Falout, 2010). However, it is often unclear in the literature what exactly is meant by engagement (Reeve, 2012; Chapman, 2003). Intuitively, as a teacher, I feel that I can recognize engagement or disengagement in my own learners when I see it. Zyngier (2008) cites Newmann (1986) as expressing this same recognition, "engagement is difficult to define operationally, but we know it when we see it, and we know it when it is missing" (p. 1765). However, I am less sure of exactly where this recognition comes from, and wonder how well my perceptions align with learner realities.

In opening the lid on learner engagement, I find several areas of interest, including the interplay of cognitive and emotional engagement, and the relationship between engagement and motivation. The overall research question for the larger study was what does learner engagement look like in this context. The specific research question addressed in this report is what instructional practices best promote learner engagement in my teaching context. Having a better grasp of the construct of engagement in this specific context should facilitate more well-informed classroom decisions and further advances on the research front. As mentioned by Parsons and Taylor (2011), "educators must continue to seek to understand and apply specific, well considered, if not agreed upon strategies that support student engagement in learning both in and beyond the classroom" (p. 4).

My mission in this research journey was to help students and teachers in my teaching context to have more satisfying and efficacious learning and teaching experiences. A better contextual understanding of learner engagement as an educational construct and classroom phenomenon can potentially make classroom interactions more significant and productive for students and their teachers. Increased student and teacher satisfaction should also result in less disaffection, alienation and burn-out for all parties. The better contextual understanding should also aid program administrators, material developers, teacher trainers and policy makers in their endeavors.

Research Design

Due to the social and psychological nature of the construct of learner engagement, I did not set out to test any hypotheses or work deductively toward any hard-fast truths. Instead, I aimed to inductively and abductively work towards one (of many) truths for a specific context using a qualitative case-study research approach. The mixed-method research design included a combination of classroom observations, follow-up interviews with teachers and students, questionnaires and reflective journals. The cases that I chose for the study were three second-year required courses being taught at two different private universities in a semi-urban part of western Japan. Specifically, I observed three teachers and their students at three different times during the fifteen-week Spring semester (April - July). I supplemented these nine observations and rounds of teacher and learner interviews with questionnaires and related course documents.

I did not have a concrete plan for data reduction going into the study, but hit on the idea of writing up vignettes during my early attempts at thematic coding and writing up the findings. I wanted to share with the readers the story that was unfolding for me as I observed the classes and met with teachers and students, and vignettes for each case at each stage of the study seemed like the best way to do this. These vignettes included descriptions of the physical setting, flow of the lesson, interactions among participants and classroom atmosphere. I also included some participant impressions gleaned from the interviews, as well as my own initial thoughts and possible areas for follow-up. The vignettes also included a short introduction as well as a follow-up with some general commentary on each round of observations and interviews. This commentary dealt mainly with issues related to the basic psychological needs of competence, autonomy and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000), but also included other topics from the literature on learner engagement and L2 learning motivation and that seemed to merit further analysis. As mentioned above, I employed thematic analysis alongside the phases described by Miles and Huberman (1994). I actually started this thematic analysis prior to

hitting on the idea of vignettes, as soon as I had completed the first transcriptions. I embarked on this thematic analysis to discover common themes or issues according to suggestions by Braun and Clarke (2006) listed below in Table 1.

Table 1 Six Steps for Conducting a Thematic Analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006)

Step	Description
1. Familiarising yourself with your data	Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas
2. Generating initial codes	Creating interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code
3. Searching the themes	Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme
4. Reviewing themes	Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis
5. Defining and naming themes	Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme
6. Producing the report	The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back from the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis

Conceptual Framework

The theoretical framework that I identified as being a useful lens through which to analyze data collected for these three cases was self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), mainly the basic psychological needs of competence, autonomy and relatedness. This decision was made at least partially on my perceptions of the Japanese secondary education system as doing very little to meet the needs for competence and autonomy, especially in terms of English language education, and a realization that these earlier experiences lay a foundation of learner attitudes and beliefs for students entering tertiary education. My understanding is that much of the time and energy devoted to English is spent on checking or testing what students do not know. These language classrooms are also much more about control than supporting learner autonomy (Holden & Usuki, 1999; Sakai, Chu, Takagi & Lee, 2008). Students have very little choice with regards to what, when and how they study English in the classroom. At the same time, I recognize that meeting the psychological need of relatedness is one of the strengths of secondary education in Japan. Much time and effort is devoted to group cohesion as well as building and maintaining relationships among students and between teachers and students.

Contextual Background

Learners in this context will have studied English for a minimum of six years upon entering university, and will likely be required to demonstrate English language proficiency on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) or other standardized test when applying for jobs in their last year of university. For a variety of reasons learner attitudes towards and proficiency in English vary greatly and, as mentioned above, the general tendency is for English language ability to actually drop over the four years of university (Tomei, 2017). Despite a series of government policy initiatives in Japan since 1989 that stress the importance of fostering English language skills and communicative competency in schools, Japan test takers continue to underperform on standardized tests of

English proficiency compared with counterparts in other Asian countries (ETS, 2017). Thus, there is a clear need for further research into how motivation is translated into action (engagement) in this context.

Findings

To maintain participant anonymity, I use pseudonyms for each of the teachers and students. Throughout this report I use the terms instructional practice and instructional approach interchangeably to mean ways in which the instructor interacts with the instructional content and learners. This includes, for example, when and how teachers use repetition, ask questions and promote interaction among learners. At the same time, this includes choices made by teachers regarding material, tasks, transitions between tasks, etc. In other words, instructional practices are the interface that the teacher provides between the curriculum and the learners. In my analysis of the vignettes as well as raw data from the observation sheets, interviews and support documents, I soon realized that delineating instructional practices from both teacher characteristics and contextual features would be challenging, and despite some obvious overlap I attempt here to keep the focus on teachers' actions in the classroom. Several instructional practices that I observed in the classroom and discussed with participants surfaced as influencing learner engagement, some positively and others negatively. For the purpose of answering the research question, I present here four instructional practices that clearly facilitated learner engagement, namely the strategic use of pair and group work, patterns or rhythms of instruction, questioning style and scaffolding techniques. These categories emerged mainly from reoccuring themes that appeared in the thematic coding of qualitative data and were supported by classroom observation sheet data. I conclude this section by presenting findings regarding practices that appear to hinder learner engagement, as well as how findings related to this subsidiary question help to answer my main research question.

Strategic Use of Pair and Group Work

Drawing on data from the observation sheets and interviews, the highest levels of learner engagement in each class meeting for all three teachers were observed when teachers got their learners to communicate with each other in English or with the teacher, and when there was a clearly perceived need to convey or gather information. This observation, again, was based on learners' facial expressions such as raised or furrowed eyebrows, body language such as forward leaning posture or gesturing with hands, as well as length and content of verbal interactions (indicators). Length was subjectively judged by apparent willingness to communicate (i.e. not retreating from interaction) and elaboration or questioning. These high perceived levels of engagement in pair or group work were confirmed in interviews with both teachers and learners. When discussing levels of engagement during Robert's (Case One) week three European Studies class, one female student (Minako) expressed feeling most engaged when listening to her partners' presentation about research they were doing on EU and non-EU countries. The following excerpt comes from the follow-up interview:

Researcher: *Okay, about food or culture—*

Minako: *Yes.*

Researcher: *—something like that?*

Minako: *Or the location about the movie.*

Researcher: *Oh, okay, where they shot the movie?*

Minako: *Yes.*

Researcher: *Oh, really? Which country was that?*

Minako: *It was Hungary, about Kiki's Delivery Service.*

Researcher: *Right. That's the Miyazaki—?*

Minako: *Yes. And Heidi.*

Researcher: *And Heidi. That's the location?*

Minako: *Yes.*

She mentioned this interaction as especially engaging because she had to listen carefully to catch what her partner was saying and that she liked learning something new about a country she had never visited. In discussions with Robert, he explained that learners were responsible not only for information they were gathering for their own EU or non-EU countries but also information they recorded from classmates' presentations. Reflecting on my own classroom experiences, *laissez faire* or hands-off approaches to pair or group work are often unsuccessful, and the teacher needs to provide structure, offer or facilitate feedback, and remain engaged themselves. The following comment by Minako on how Robert keeps her and her classmates engaged in pair and group work reminded me of this (all direct quotes are presented verbatim).

> *It happens when we have to work with partner, and after we finish, he—while we work, he always goes around to see if they are working, and also if they have a question or not because Japanese people feel shy to ask question in front of the class, so when he ask, like, "Do you have a question or something?" or people say, "Yes, I don't know this," or something. And then he always explain about extra information.*

I also commented in my field notes on another occasion that while students are checking their partner's paper, Robert is moving from group to group and is down at eye level asking individual students what their partner's main argument is.

Three other episodes stand out as showing the power of well-structured pair or group work in this context. One was an activity in Mariko's (Case Two) week nine Intensive Reading class where students worked in groups to prepare an illustration (visual representation) that reflected contents from a paragraph they were reading on megalopolises. The second was an inflection activity in Sylvester's (Case Three) week ten Business Communication class where students would read a paragraph to a partner while using voice inflection to stress certain content. The final example was an information gap in Mariko's week fourteen class where students were assigned one of two paragraphs, completed a worksheet, confirmed their understanding with classmates who had read the same paragraph, and eventually summarized the paragraph for a student or students who had read the other paragraph.

The Illustration Activity. In Mariko's week nine class, the learners were working through a challenging textbook passage on the topic of economic corridors (or megalopolises) that have developed in different parts of the world. While much of the textbook reading is assigned out of class, the basic approach for this and other similar readings during the class is for (1) Mariko to present the topic or focus of the text verbally and/or with slides she has prepared, (2) Mariko to assign a paragraph or section of the text for students to discuss and answer prepared comprehension and/or personalization questions, and (3) Mariko to follow up with a whole class discussion. In my three observations of Mariko's class, engagement levels and focus normally dropped while learners (re)read the text and struggle through some awkward silence with their partners, but eventually the energy levels rise and most learners exhibit facial expressions and body language that hint at cognitive engagement. With the illustration activity, the dynamic was different.

Students still struggled to get going at the beginning, but quickly seemed to immerse themselves in the activity and became quite animated (emotional engagement).

The high levels of engagement during this activity were also mentioned by Mariko and the two female students (Amiri & Maki) who were interviewed following the lesson. Both girls singled out this part of the lesson as being most engaging. Maki expressed that she and her partner were struggling to interpret the numbers in the sentence and that this kept her focused on the activity. Amiri mentioned the novelty of the activity, “Also, writing the image of the topics from these sentences. It’s a new idea for us in English class for a long time.”

In the following excerpt, Mariko responds to my question about a time when she saw that either one student or a group of students was completely engaged in what was happening during a lesson:

> *Mmmm, I saw in today’s class, they were pretty good at, you know when they had to do that illustration thing, they were really thinking how to interpret those numbers. I could tell because they were talking in pairs and some of them got their illustration totally wrong. They thought that 660,000,000 was the total world population rather than 10%. And they’re really thinking in pairs, and some of the students on the participation sheet wrote “Oh, my partner really helped me understand.” So I thought they were engaged in that moment.*

One additional comment here is that Mariko had changed the seating arrangement earlier in the class, so students were working with a new partner. I commented in my notes that this would likely impact levels of engagement, especially in this class where students seemed to regularly sit with the same partner in the same part of the room near the back corner. However, energy and

engagement levels through the first part of the lesson fluctuated between low and medium (on the observation sheet) and it was only for this illustration activity that high engagement was sustained (9 consecutive 2-minute intervals). During the interviews, I found out that this group of students were taking four English classes a week together. So, while changing seating arrangements might impact levels of engagement, I interpreted the high levels of engagement as resulting from how Mariko had set up this activity (instructional practice) rather than seating arrangement or partner (contextual features).

The Inflection Activity. Another pair work activity that impressed me as greatly promoting learner engagement was observed in Sylvester's week ten Business Communication class. At about thirty-three minutes into the class, Sylvester distributed a worksheet and explained that one point which concerned him in the Company Expo (a job-fair type event) was that some students did not effectively use voice inflection such as stress or tonal variation. He emphasized that this was a very important part of public speaking and informed students that they would review something they had done in their year-one *Speech and Discussion* class. Using the worksheet (with an excerpt of a short speech), he asked students to listen and repeat each sentence without inflection. He then asked students to go through the worksheet and underline any words or phrases that they felt should receive emphasis or stress when they next read it out loud. Finally, he had students stand up and *JANKEN* (rock-papers-scissors) with a partner to decide who would speak first. He explained that the winners should read one sentence at a time without emphasis and the loser should (without looking at their paper) repeat each sentence with the proper inflection. Students got started right away and the energy level quickly rose. Students were focused on their partner and facial expressions and gestures hinted at high levels of engagement. As the noise level began to die down after both partners had read with inflection, Sylvester asked them to stop, praised their efforts and advised them to say each sentence with the inflection and

gestures two or more times. He then told everyone to find a new partner and try the activity again. This was repeated one further time so that all students were assured three chances for practice. While the students were still standing, Sylvester emphasized to students that deciding what to stress and then practicing is an important step in preparing for their presentations.

After students returned to their seats, Sylvester asked them to take out their textbooks again and turn to the last page of the chapter which included instructions for preparing their upcoming sales presentations. This was basically a review of key points from the chapter, and Sylvester asked students to *JANKEN* (rock-paper-scissors) one last time, and read either the first paragraph or second and third paragraphs. Even though they were working in the textbook (normally accompanied by lower levels of engagement), the level of engagement remained high and students were much more focused than before the voice inflection activity. High levels of engagement were recorded on the observation sheet from the forty-minute interval (when they began working in pairs) through the fifty-four minute interval (when they finished the pair work) to the sixty-two minute interval (where they completed the textbook activity).

In the follow-up interviews, Sylvester and the two female students (Kana & Erika) all felt the highest level of engagement in the lesson was achieved during the inflection practice. Kana talked about her interest and confidence in public speaking, and that this activity had some meaning (relevance) for her. She and Erika both agreed that they had to stay focused to hear what their partners' were saying and working out where to stress or what tonal variation to use. Sylvester mentioned that he was basing his interpretation of higher levels of engagement on body language and perceived levels of concentration (indicators). Again, it is interesting that these higher levels of engagement during the voice inflection activity also seemed to carry over into the following textbook activity.

The Information Gap. Information gaps are a staple part of the EFL teacher's repertoire, likely because they encourage interaction and provide a structured

communication activity with clear goals and immediate feedback. Towards the end of Mariko's week fourteen Intensive Reading class, where students were working through the last part of a textbook reading on mortality rates in preparation for the final quiz the following week, Mariko organized an information gap that resulted in the highest levels of perceived learner engagement that I had witnessed during any of my visits. Here are her instructions:

> *Okay. I have divided you guys into two groups. Okay. Half of you have paragraph 10. The other half have paragraph 12. Okay. If you have paragraph 10, could you come over here? [pointing to front right corner of room]. And if you have paragraph 12, could you sit over there? [pointing to left side of room] Okay? And your job is to really, really understand the assigned paragraph. Okay? And you can work together with people who have the same worksheet. Later, you have to explain this paragraph to your new partner who doesn't have the same one. Okay? And, I made some comments on the side with questions. Okay? This will help you understand the reading. So, try to answer the questions. Also some words are underlined. That means I want you to explain the meaning of the words. Okay? So, paragraph 10 can you come over here? Paragraph 12 can you please come over here? You can work in a group. Go ahead.*

As with almost every pair or group activity in all three cases, there were a range of responses and it took most groups several minutes to begin interacting with their partners. Mariko seemed to recognize this and began prodding each group to check their understanding. There was a slow but noticeable increase in levels of engagement, and there was a distinct change in the type of interactions within groups. Individual members seemed much more determined to

get their meaning across (repetition, gestures and facial expressions), and there was much more give and take to these interactions. My notes at around twelve minutes into this activity read:

> *The highest observable level of engagement occurred when students were trying to explain something to another student - there seemed to be an authentic need to make oneself understood or convey the content that one was responsible for.*

With just a few minutes left in class, Mariko assigned new groups of four with two members having the same paragraph. She instructed students to share what they learned from their respective paragraphs. This transition was the smoothest of the entire class (possibly because class was nearly finished) and all groups seemed to get started right away. Students who were explaining were using gestures and checking with their partner who had read the same paragraph. The other two members were writing notes and asking questions. Again, my notes:

> *Definitely highest level of engagement comes right at the end of this lesson. Students intent on explaining and listening to their partners. The fact that students stay after the bell and continue with the task into their break time is a good indicator of high levels of engagement - not everyone though? Clear goal to the task and cognitive and linguistic challenge of the task seems to be important contextual/task factor that influences levels of engagement.*

In our follow-up interview, Mariko also mentioned this last activity as being the most engaging for the students. She said her impression was that students were intent on both conveying their information and listening to their partners, to

the point that staying late did not matter. The following is an excerpt of our interview:

Mariko: *Ummmm, and then I think, as you can see probably, the information gap part was the most exciting for them.*

Researcher: *Sure, it changed . . . The whole atmosphere of the class changed.*

Mariko: *Right. So I think they were engaged in . . . after . . they didn't mind staying after the . . . even after the bell rang.*

Researcher: *Yeah, that one group in the middle in the front, especially the one, the one guy right he was kind of leading that discussion. But they probably could've kept talking for another 20 minutes. (laughs)*

Mariko: *Right, right. And I saw one kid from one group who couldn't quite understand their partners, so he went to another friend and they explained it to him too.*

Researcher: *Oh good.*

Mariko: *So they just kept on going, so that was good. I don't like keeping students late...that was the first time in the semester...but yeah, I think they got really into the topic. So . . .*

Amiri was the one student that I interviewed immediately after the lesson. We spent most of our time talking about the guided journaling she was doing as part of the current research project, but she did make a point of describing how the worksheet that Mariko had prepared helped her and her classmates understand the contents of the reading and also provided structure for their conversations about the respective paragraphs. She also mentioned that the

pressures of the test the following week had helped to keep her invested in the activity. Some conflicting results came out of the classroom observation sheet, where the initially high level of engagement at the sixty-four minute interval was not maintained. Medium levels of engagement were recorded from the sixty-six minute mark through to the eighty-eight minute interval and the end of the lesson. In reviewing the video recording, we can see two pairs (four students) during the first phase and one group (five students) in the second phase that cut the activity short and/or seem preoccupied with something other than the task. I maintained the conservative cutoff for high engagement at 80% or more described in Smith, Jones, Gilbert and Wieman (2013). This accounts for the drop from high to medium soon after the start of the information gap, while Amiri and other participants perceived the activity as being engaging.

It should be noted that learner engagement in all nine classroom observations varied greatly from task to task and from student to student. Thus, even when I recorded high levels of overall engagement, there were individual students who exhibited signs of not being as engaged as their classmates.

Patterns or Rhythms of Instruction

One thing that became clear in the observations was that each teacher has their own patterns or rhythms of instruction but also that there is a general pattern which looks something like this: (1) the teacher introduces a topic or issue via a lecture, reading or video clip, (2) the teacher assigns some type of pair or group task, (3) the learners work collaboratively on completing the task, (4) the teacher checks on outcomes by leading a class discussion or debriefing session. From my experiences in the classroom, this pattern is pretty standard and accounts for the majority of interactions in many educational settings. The predictability of these patterns likely have a settling effect in that learners can anticipate what is coming and can prepare behaviorally, cognitively and emotionally. The downside is that this predictability also allows students to tune out (Ainley, 2012). In our follow up

interview after Sylvester's week ten Business Communication class, Kana said that she was fairly engaged throughout the class, with an estimate of eight out of ten, but that she had grown accustomed to the video tasks where a bad example is followed by a good example. She expressed that this had become boring for her and that she sometimes catches herself thinking, "enough already, let's move on." In the same interview, Erika estimated that four out of ten was her low, and said these dips came when she could anticipate what was coming and didn't need to listen that carefully or concentrate on what was happening.

The influences that these patterns or rhythms of instruction have on levels of engagement were seen in all three cases, and I will present here three instructional practices that illustrate this point: Pulling Learners in with Quizzes or Tests, Mixing it Up, and Well-Timed Shifts. Again, these categories emerged mainly as recurring themes in the thematic coding of qualitative data and were supported by classroom observation sheet data.

Pulling Learners in with Quizzes or Tests. One somewhat surprising finding for me was the power that quizzes or tests have to focus the attention of learners in this context. Upon reflection, however, learners in this context are accustomed to test taking and are familiar with this style of study (Goto Butler, 2015). Also, I have noticed this tendency for Japanese university students to dive right into quizzes or tests in my own classes as well. In my analysis of the nine vignettes, I found four examples where teachers started their lesson with a quiz, test or test-related activity. First, in Robert's week three European Studies class, he had pairs of students quiz each other on information researched for their EU and non-EU countries. Then, in Robert's week eight class, he uses a more formal quiz to check learners' understanding of other information they had collected about these same countries using a teacher-prepared worksheet. Next, in Mariko's week nine Intensive Reading class, she passes back the mid-term test that students had taken the previous week and leads a debriefing session on parts of the test that students

struggled with. Finally, in Mariko's week thirteen class, she leads off with a vocabulary quiz. My observation notes for all four instances include comments about how these quizzes or activities seem to pull learners in. The topic of quizzes or tests did not come up with any regularity in the interviews and I am relying here on my observation notes, commentary in the vignettes, and remarks by learners on the participation sheets. Beginning the lessons with these quizzes, tests or test-related activities may or may not have been a strategic instructional practice on the part of the teachers, but it did seem to have the favorable outcome of increased learner engagement (at least behavioral and cognitive) early in the lesson for these two groups of learners in their 9:00 a.m. classes. Both teachers and learners made more than one mention of engagement levels at the beginning of these classes as normally being particularly low.

Mixing it Up. Also related to the patterns or rhythms of instruction, was how teachers wove together activities and either stretched or shortened tasks in ways that influenced (and were influenced by) levels of learner engagement. When observing Robert's classes, I saw examples of mixing it up in the ways he varied the style of quizzes, how he shifted the order of regularly-occurring tasks (country presentations, e-portfolio work, mini-lectures with note-taking). Robert also used at least one instructional practice that caught me off guard. After learners finished the quiz at the beginning of the week eight class, he called on each student and asks them to publicly report their score on the quiz. When I queried him about this in the interview, he explained that he did this to put a fire under some students who had gotten off to a slow start and were not doing much research on their countries or preparation for the classes. Robert also picked up on learner interest and stretched out a couple of classroom exchanges. One of the lengthier interactions involved the topic of false friends, or loan words from English into Japanese that have completely different meanings from how they are used in English. The words "mansion" and "tension" are two of the examples he touched on. This topic seemed

to be of interest to students and Robert picked up on this and expanded on the topic.

Although my general impression was that Mariko mixed things up less than the two other teachers, likely due to the restraints placed on her by the textbook, she did have her own ways of switching things around to keep students engaged. Despite the general pattern of classroom interactions outlined earlier, Mariko would vary the types of questions she prepared for the slides, interject with personal stories or advice, or organize supplementary tasks like the illustration and information gap activities mentioned above. In her week nine class, she and the learners were struggling through a particularly challenging part of the text on the megalopolises. There were several rounds of students reading and discussing with a partner, followed by Mariko checking comprehension and trying to personalize the material. In one of these exchanges where the topic of light emissions mapping came up, Mariko closed the shades and played a short video of satellite images of light emissions from the Earth at night that was accompanied by music. Students were focused on the screen throughout, and Mariko followed up by switching back to the slideshow and questions about what these light emission maps tell us. This interjection (although rated as a medium level of engagement for the sixty-two and sixty-four minute intervals) seemed to have the desired result of refocusing the learners and helping them through this part of the text.

My observations of Sylvester revealed similar practices to the other two teachers, namely the shifting of order of regularly-occurring tasks, interjecting with personal stories or advice, and expanding on topics of perceived interest to learners. One example of an attempt to mix it up came in his week four class where they were preparing to watch one bad and one good example of a business presentation. In preparation for the bad example, he asked students to work in pairs, and assigned one student to focus on what was wrong with the manner in which the speech was delivered (physical message) and the other to focus on the content of the talk (story message). The assignment of roles or areas

of focus for the listening task seemed to have the desired effect, and most students seemed highly engaged, even Kana who later reported some boredom with these video activities. This strategy was mentioned in the teacher's manual and Sylvester had slightly altered it to good effect for his class.

Well-Timed Shifts. Another instructional practice related to patterns or rhythms of instruction are short, strategic shifts in direction or jolts that are used by the instructor to grab attention or shake learners out of a lulled state. In the three classrooms that I observed, these shifts sometimes came when teachers seemingly recognized drops in engagement or when an activity was winding down. I am relying here mainly on my observation notes and commentary related to the vignettes. However, I was able to augment these with interview data. The two most prominent of these shifts were the game of rock-papers-scissors used by Sylvester to decide speaking order or student roles and short breaks used by Mariko to wake up or refresh learners. After students are in pairs in Sylvester's week three class, he tells them to *JANKEN* (rock-paper-scissors). Sylvester uses the Japanese word *JANKEN* and later explains that this is one of his strategies he often uses for getting students' attention and keeping the class engaged. He refers to the winner as *JANKEN* Master (a twist on a Jackie Chan movie) and the loser as Lucky Loser. In our follow up interview, Sylvester makes a point of mentioning his use of *JANKEN* to keep students focused:

> *Yeah. I—I've sort, I did -- I taught in high school, and it's – part of the culture isn't it? With janken I think if it's there why don't you use it? [. . .] Because they're used to that kind of action. And sometimes I noticed them sort of dropping off a bit if I speak too much. I ask them to do janken they're awake suddenly, so it's a good quick thing to get them back into the lesson.*

This was obviously a go-to strategy for Sylvester, and I observed him using it between three and seven times per lesson on the three occasions that I observed his class. In my vignette for Sylvester's week fourteen class, I note that at the beginning of the lesson Sylvester asks students to open their textbooks and again uses *JANKEN* to decide reading order. The students seem quite accustomed to this routine and the winners immediately start reading their part (problems) aloud while their partners follow along in the textbook.

At around forty-five minutes into Mariko's week three class, she comments to learners on the waning energy level in class and tells students to take a short break, get up and walk around, stretch, get some coffee, etc. There is a palpable sigh of relief and the energy level spikes upwards as students move around and talk in Japanese. Although I did not complete an observation sheet for this meeting, my fieldnotes included mention that a majority of learners exhibited signs of cognitive engagement when they came back from the break and continued working through the text. In the follow up interviews, Mariko mentioned this break was an attempt to bring the students back, and both Amiri and Yuri (another female student) also mentioned high levels of engagement when Mariko gave them a break. In one of my follow up questions after Mariko's week nine class, I asked Amiri and Maki what they would do if they were in the position of the teacher. Amiri offered the opinion that students are often very busy, stressed or tired and she said she would offer them more breaks and concentrate the study into shorter chunks. This topic of the packed schedule of students came up in earlier interviews and may be an area for further study. In my notes for Mariko's week nine class, I entered the following:

> *Although Mariko has asked students to check with a partner, most students are working by themselves. My impression is that some are not sure how to proceed. The contents are quite challenging, with information about how these economic centers attract global*

talent and of how global talent is mobile. Mariko recognizes that students are struggling to stay focused on the reading and uses different strategies to maintain interest. She tries to connect the contents of the reading to Japan and students' realities, offers words of encouragement, and eventually tells learners to take a short break and passes around a bag of candies.

In talking with the three teachers, it was clear that they recognize engagement when they see it. They described "reading" students or the class and making adjustments. These teachers also seem to have strategies for boosting engagement (Sylvester using *JANKEN* and giving students responsibility, and Mariko providing students with breaks). Returning to my conceptual framework, these strategies would be part of the interface between motivation (context and self) and engagement (action), in that teachers are likely to be interpreting contextual and self features in ways that help them translate learner motivation into action.

Questioning Style

Another instructional practice that impressed me in the observations and interviews as impacting levels of engagement was questioning style. Questions that were directed at getting the learners to connect the content to their own experiences or reflect critically on their own assumptions or beliefs clearly had a positive impact on overall levels of engagement. Conversely, questions straight from the textbook or restricted to comprehension seem to be less engaging. Questioning styles where the teacher is looking for one correct answer seemed least engaging. This type of questioning might be necessary to gauge student understanding, but there clearly seems to be a downside. Mariko having students discuss particularly challenging passages from the text seemed to be much

preferable to just asking comprehension questions or dishing out the answer and teacher interpretations.

Questioning style also refers to how the teacher poses questions: to the class in general, by asking one student, or questioning a limited number of students engaged in group work. When asked about things Robert does to keep students interested or engaged, Minako talked about how he moves from group to group during the activities and checks their understanding and progress. She mentioned this as especially important since she and her classmates are normally shy about asking questions in front of the class, and felt that everyone appreciates that he always offers explanations and extra information. Three other issues that came up in this same interview were calling students by name, active participation in class, and classroom atmosphere. Minako mentioned that in some of her other English classes, the teacher asks questions to the group but all members are reluctant to raise their hand even if they know the answer (contextual feature). She feels that Robert does a good job of calling students by name, making it much easier for students to answer and reducing the amount of wasted time.

When talking with Mariko after her week three class, she highlighted that different questions impacted engagement in different ways. With some questions, students find the answer right away and then tend to drift off with little or no interaction with their partner. At other times, when the question is too difficult, they also switch off. She feels the most engaging questions are open-ended, opinion type questions and said she was still testing what worked with this group of students. During the same interview, Mariko expressed feeling that a big part of her job was to think on her feet and make adjustments when delivering lessons. This discussion comes up in the literature on expert teachers (Goodwyn, 2010) and reflective practice (Farrell, 2008), and might be an area requiring further analysis. She talked about picking up on some eye contact and body language from students which she interpreted as expressing engagement and a desire to be called on. She also recognizes that students do not react well to

questions aimed at the class, but sometimes does this intentionally with the understanding that students will likely be faced with this questioning style when studying abroad. In talking with Amiri and Yuri (another female student) after this same class, their feeling was that the average level of engagement was up around eight (out of 10). Amiri felt her engagement was highest when Mariko was asking questions, especially questions outside of the textbook that required students to use their imagination.

I commented in my observation notes that Sylvester sometimes asks a question to the whole class, and that these questions are mainly met with an uncomfortable silence, but that eventually the same two or three students speak up. In talking about posing questions to the class, Sylvester expressed that this is something he still struggles with. He says he doesn't expect students to put their hands up right away, but feels putting them on the spot a bit is a form of positive pressure. He tries to offer hints and tries to read students' expressions for signs that they understand the question and/or know the answer.

Returning to SDT and my conceptual framework, we need to ask how certain questioning styles meet or thwart learners' psychological need for competence, autonomy or relatedness. Both Mariko and Sylvester mentioned using easy questions to promote feelings of competence. Mariko commented in interviews that competence is extremely important, and offered the observation that Japanese students are especially hard on themselves and require a boost in confidence. She feels she promotes feelings of competence through the use of easy questions, praise and positive reinforcement. My impression is that listing up the various questions on slides, having students discuss possible answers and then checking answers as a class is one way the Mariko's lessons can potentially boost feelings of competence. As for autonomy, the open-ended, experience-based and opinion-type questions provide learners with room to exert their autonomy and agency. In terms of relatedness, we can recognize a preference for questions aimed at individuals rather than the group, and calling on students by name is well

received in this (and likely most) contexts. Again, we see questioning style as one more interface between motivation and engagement, i.e. getting learners to translate their motivation into language learning behaviors in the classroom.

Scaffolding Techniques

One additional practice that seemed to help learners engage with the instructional task or material was the skillful use of scaffolding. The practice mentioned above of preparing slides with questions and having learners read and discuss possible answers is one example. Others were the worksheets that Mariko used to facilitate the information gap described earlier and the ones that Sylvester used to facilitate the company expo meetings in his class. In discussing the meetings, Sylvester stressed that the detailed worksheets seemed to be working but that his plan was to slowly offer less structure so students would not become too dependent on them. In the interview with Mariko after her week nine class, she described another class where she had provided scaffolding for listening comprehension and how this had engaged her students:

> *Uhh, also today in the second period, we were studying content words and function words and I used uhh Eric Clapton's "Change the World." Uhh, they had to listen to it and especially pay attention to content words, so I took out some modals, you know, "I can change the world, I would . . . could be the king" and for the highest level students I took the modals out, I say "Listen carefully because he uses "can" and "could" differently," he uses "can" in the beginning and changes to "could" because he feels less confident about this woman he wants to get, so when I play the song I could tell my higher level students are really listening and say "Oh that was can" or "That was could" so I could tell they were really listening carefully, talking to their partner, asking me questions like "Oh wasn't it will" or "Why*

was it would. Let's listen again." I thought that they were quite engaged.

Robert's use of scaffolding was apparent in several parts of each meeting that I observed. Some of the more salient examples were (1) the detailed agendas and lists of learning outcomes that he wrote up on the whiteboard each week, (2) the information cards used on week three to focus attention on the types of information learners should be investigating, and (3) the e-portfolio examples he used to illustrate what was expected of learners. Additionally, Robert transitioned to a mini lecture in his day fourteen class by asking students to discuss with their partner the meaning of capitalism. This scaffolding or priming also seemed to bolster learners' sense of competence and encourage deeper investment in listening to the lecture. In my conceptual framework, these deeper levels of investment in classroom activities are theorized as promoting better quality language learning.

Summary

I will conclude with a few instructional practices that seemed to have a detrimental impact on learner engagement, and reflect back on the larger research question. Based on observation sheet data and the vignettes, the lowest levels of engagement came when learners were in a passive role as receivers of information from the teacher, or when they perceived the task or material as either too difficult, too easy or too predictable. Minako brought up the fact that students in her program are expected to work in small groups and be active. She contrasted this to her experiences in secondary school classes, where, "We have to sit, and we have to stay silent, and we just have to write or read something. It's not like we are join. We are just working about one thing."

Although not directly related to any of the instructional practices outlined above, Erika mentioned her disappointment when teachers do not collect

homework assignments. She feels it is frustrating when she has put the effort into doing a good job and then the teacher does not make the effort to check.

Relating back to my main research question, we have support for the claim that learner engagement in this context is experienced through the instructional practices, with active interactions with fellow learners and the teacher offering the most engaging experiences. At the same time, instructional practices that are personalized, meaningful (relevant to the learners' realities) and appropriately scaffolded promote the highest levels of engagement. These findings lend support to discussions of teacher expertise (Hattie, 2003), professional development (Day, 1999), and expanding young people's capacity to learn (Claxton, 2007). Viewed in relation to the conceptual model, these instructional practices seemingly work with other contextual features to meet or thwart the psychological needs (self), and thus strengthen or weaken the motivation (via learner identity). The strength of the resulting motivation is then translated into action (engagement), possibly via learner investment.

Conclusion

As mentioned earlier, the above investigation into teaching strategies was part of a larger study aimed at gaining better conceptual clarity regarding learner engagement in university EFL classes in Japan. It is hoped that the findings listed here contribute in some small way to readers' understanding of the role of learner engagement in these and other contexts, and that language teachers can add to or strengthen their own individual approaches to classroom interactions that engage their learners and promote higher levels of language learning.

REFERENCES

Ainley, M. (2012). Students' interest and engagement in classroom activities. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 283-302). New York: Springer.

Anjomshoa, L., & Sadighi, F. (2015). The importance of motivation in second language acquisition. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3*(2), 126-137.

Boo, Z., Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). L2 motivation research 2005-2014: Understanding a publication surge and a changing landscape. *System, 55*, 145-157.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Chapman, E. (2003). Alternative approaches to assessing student engagement rates. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 8*(13). Retrieved May 23, 2015 from PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=13

Claxton, G. (2007). Expanding young people's capacity to learn. *British Journal of Educational Studies. 55*(2), 1-20.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing Teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer Press.

ETS (Educational Testing Services). (2017). *Test and data score summary for TOEFL iBT Tests: January 2016-December 2016* Test Data. Retrieved from www.ets.org/s/toefl/pdf/94227_unlweb.pdf

Farrell, T., S.C. (2008). Reflective practice in the professional development of teachers of adult English language learners. *CAELA Network,* 1-4.

Goodwyn, A. (2010). *The expert teacher of English*. London: Routledge.

Goto Butler, Y. (2015). English language education among young learners in East Asia: A review of current research (2004-2014). *Language Teaching, 48*(03), 303-342.

Hattie, J. (2003). Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence? Presentation to Australian Council for Educational Research Annual Conference on Building Teacher Quality.

Holden, B., & Usuki, M. (1999). Learner autonomy in language learning: A preliminary investigation. *Bulletin of Hokuriku University*, *23*, 191-203.

Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. (2010). *The highly engaged classroom.* Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher, 13*, 20-30.
Murphey, T. & Falout, J. (2010). Critical participatory looping: Dialogic member checking with whole classes. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*(4), 811-821.

Newmann, F. M. (1986). Priorities for the future: Towards a common agenda. *Social Education, 50*, 240-250.

Ohta, A. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition and L2 grammar. In J. L. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 51-78) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Osterman, G. L. (2014). Experiences of Japanese university students' willingness to speak English in class: A multiple case study. *SAGE Open, 4*(3), 1-13.

Parsons, J. & Taylor, L. (2011). *Student engagement: What do we know and what should we do?* AISI University Partners, Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 36*, 50-72.

Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149-172) New York: Springer.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68-78.

Sakai, S., Chu, M., Takagi, A., & Lee, S. (2008). Teachers' roles in developing learning autonomy in the East Asian Region. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL, 5*(1), 93-117.

Smith, M. K., Jones, F. H. M., Gilbert, S. L., & Wieman, C. E. (2013). The classroom observation protocol for undergraduate STEM (COPUS): A new

instrument to characterize university STEM classroom practices. *CBE-Life Sciences Education, 12*(4), 618-627.

Tomei, J. (2017). Private correspondence. December, 2017.

Zyngier, D. (2008). (Re)conceptualizing student engagement: Doing education not doing time. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1765-1776.

EMOTIONAL LEARNER ENGAGEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF AN EXPERIENCED EFL TEACHER

Mayumi Asaba, Hirao School of Management

Introduction

It is a common practice for professionals to study experts who have exceptional skills and knowledge in their specific field. Figure skaters watch videos of the previous Olympic gold medalists numerous times to analyze their movements in an attempt to model their fluid performance. Similarly, pianists repeatedly listen to music performed by world reknowned pianists to create similar sounds. Experts are role-models not only for novices but also experienced professionals, who continue to refine and develop their skills. In the same way, teachers and teacher educators can gain valuable insights from studying the performance of experts.

The ultimate goal of L2 teachers is to help students become proficient in the target language. One way to achieve this goal is to observe and understand elements of expertise demonstrated by expert educators in the field. What are some tasks that can be used to facilitate students' learning, and how are they introduced to students? What elements of expertise in L2 teaching are reflected during high levels of learner engagement? If you have experienced expert teaching in your life, you probably remember how you felt in the lesson. You may have been intrigued by the content in a way that you wanted to explore the content on your own even after the lesson was finished. You may have found a meaningful connection between what you were learning in class and you were experiencing outside the classroom. You may have been inspired to take on challenges because of the support and encouragement that you experienced in the class. This small-scale study, which investigated students' perceptions related to learner engagement and expert teaching sets out to answer these questions.

Expertise in Teaching

Previous researchers of expertise studies in education point to the effect that knowledge has on expertise in teaching (Berliner, 2001, 2004; Day, 1999; Korthagen, 2004). Shulman (1986; 1987) proposed a model of knowledge bases essential to expertise in teaching. The knowledge bases range from knowledge about educational purposes, content that teachers teach (content knowledge) to general principals of teaching, such as how to manage a class (pedagogical knowledge). In addition, he argued that effective teachers have rich knowledge about their own curricula (curricular knowledge), learners and their characteristics, educational ends and purposes, and educational contexts. Finally, one of the most significant aspects of teacher knowledge, which comprises all these aspects of teaching is pedagogical content knowledge (Hattie, 2003; Turner-Bisset, 2012).

Pedagogical content knowledge is critical to excellent teaching. It allows teachers to rely both on their knowledge about theories and practice and deliver the content in a flexible, comprehensible, and effective manner to their learners (Shulman, 1986). In addition, teachers use pedagogical content knowledge to incorporate students' perspectives into their teaching. Among the few studies conducted in L2 teaching settings, for example, Richards, Li, and Tang (1995) investigated how three groups of ESL teachers of different levels of knowledge approached their lesson planning. They found that teachers who lacked knowledge about both content and pedagogy dedicated all their attention to simply teaching the material without considering students. However, teachers with pedagogical content knowledge considered students' perspectives when they planned a lesson, such as how relevant and interesting the materials would be to students and what kind of problems students were likely to encounter in the lesson.

One of the aspects of pedagogical content knowledge concerns learners. According to Turner-Bisset (2012), expert teachers have knowledge of learners in regards to social and cognitive aspects. They understand social aspects of students; for example, what students find interesting and how various factors

affect their learning. Expert teachers are also knowledgeable about cognitive development of learners. Based on their knowledge of learners, expert teachers not only incorporate students' perspectives into their teaching (Richards, et al., 1995), but also adapt their teaching toward their targeted learners (Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Tsui, 2009). For example, in four case studies of experienced EFL teachers at Japanese universities, I (Asaba, 2019) analyzed how the teacher participants chose and revised materials and tasks. In the results, I reported that these teachers considered how materials and tasks were interesting and challenging for their learners. Pedagogical content knowledge supports expertise because it allows teachers to adapt their teaching effectively to engage their target learners.

Learner Engagement

Facilitating students' engagement is an essential aspect of expertise in teaching. According to Richards (2010), one of the most important aspects of expertise in L2 teaching is reflected in a learner-focused approach. It includes teachers' abilities not only to shape the lesson based on students' responses, but also to raise the level of student engagement with the lesson. In fact, teacher participants who had rich pedagogical content knowledge in the study by Richards et al. (1995) claimed that they considered students' engagement to be the most important element of their teaching.

Three factors facilitate learner engagement: tasks, students' perceived roles in class, and their relationship with teachers. For example, Shernoff, D., Csikszentmihalyi, Schneider, and Shernoff, E. (2014) reported that students experienced increased level of engagement when they perceived that there was a good balance between the difficulty of a task and their competence and when they thought they had an active role in class rather than a passive role. This argument concurs with what Yazzie-Mintz and McCormick (2012) found in their study. They explained that their student participants experienced high level of engagement when they collaborated and generated knowledge together with their

peers and teachers. Furthermore, the participants indicated their belief relating to teachers as powerful factor for their engagement. Interestingly, students' responses demonstrated that their expectations for teachers were not related to their academic growth, but rather their own personal growth. That is, the students sought encouragement and hoped to construct a meaningful relationship with teachers. This study was conducted with high school students in the United States. However, the findings provide important implications to L2 teaching, especially in the Japanese context. That is because interpersonal relationship between teachers and students is considered to be an essential aspect of teaching in Japanese educational settings (Tsui, 2005).

Despite of numerous studies done in the area of learner engagement, the definitions of learner engagement differ among researchers. For the purpose of this paper, I use a definition by Assor's (2012), who described engagement as efforts and actions taken by students to achieve set goals. In addition, in order to understand how expertise in L2 teaching affects learner engagement, I used the framework proposed by Yazzie-Mintz and McCormick (2012). According to these researchers, the quality of engagement can be divided into three components; behavior, cognitive, and emotional. Behavior engagement refers to observable actions taken by students inside and outside the classroom. It includes their participation of extracurricular activities, assignments, and activities. Cognitive engagement relates to students' actual learning of content, which can be reflected in their mastery of the materials. Emotional engagement concerns affective aspects of students' learning. They include their motivation about learning and a sense of connection they feel between what they learn and their own experiences.

Understanding how students perceive their engagement from emotional aspect is important. Students are an essential aspect of school culture. Therefore, without understanding how students perceive their own experiences about various aspects of their school lives, it is impossible to create a holistic picture of student engagement (Taylor & Parson, 2011). Exploring students'

emotional dimension of engagement is a particular interest of teachers and researchers when unveiling students' perceptions. That is because emotional dimension focuses "largely on students' internal lives not frequently expressed explicitly in observable behavior and actions (Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick , 2012, p. 750). In addition, affective aspects of L2 learners, such as motivation are one of the most significant factors to facilitate L2 learning (e.g., Dörnyei, 1994; Ushioda, 2010). Understanding how teachers can enhance emotional aspects of learner engagement is necessary.

Therefore, the purpose of this research is to uncover hidden aspects of learner engagement by investigating how this process can be facilitated. In particular, by utilizing the framework of expertise in L2 teaching, I analyze how one experienced EFL teacher at a Japanese university attempted to increase emotional aspect of learner engagement. In addition, I examine the effects that his teaching had on students from their perspectives. I propose the following research questions:

1. What are teaching practices that enhanced students' emotional engagement?
2. What emotional effects did the students experience as the result of his practices?

Methods

This paper is a part of my dissertation research I conducted at Temple University, Japan; therefore, I first provide a brief explanation of the dissertation study. In the dissertation, I examined characteristics indicating L2 teaching expertise based on four case studies of EFL teachers at Japanese universities. The purposes of the research was to identify characteristics indicating expertise and describe the developmental processes of expertise. I identified teacher participants who were likely to demonstrate the characteristics of expertise based on the criteria suggested by Palmer, Stough, Burdenski, and Gonzales (2005). The criteria

included qualifications, experience, and recommendations from supervisors. I selected four teacher participants who met the criteria.

Data collection included classroom observations, interviews with teacher participants, a collection of artifacts, and focus group interviews with students from observed classes. For the purpose of this paper, I mainly analyzed the data I gathered from interviews with one of the teacher participants and student focus groups from his classes I observed. I chose to focus on the teacher participant I refer to as Walt, and what his students said about his teaching. That is because they had extensive discussions about how Walt engaged students with his teaching, materials, and feedback.

Walt (all names are pseudonym) is originally from the United States and came to Japan to teach English at a conversation school. He then obtained his Master's degree in TESOL at an American university in Asia. Upon completion of the degree, he started to teach English at a university. At the time of data collection, he had been teaching EFL at Japanese universities over ten years. He was a part-time instructor and was teaching 13 classes at four universities, including Oka University (pseudonym). He worked in the department where students studied international affairs, such as economics and world culture. All students were required to take English courses. Walt's recommendation came from his former full-time colleague at this university. He described Walt to be different from other part-time teachers in the program because of his contributions to creating projects and sharing handouts.

Data Collection

Classroom observations. Classroom observations took place in a writing course and extensive reading (ER) course Walt taught during the fall, 2015. The purpose of the observations was to gain insights into the participants' teaching practices, such as how he engaged his students in his lessons. I visited two different courses to understand how he approached classes, which had different students and content

areas. I visited his classes during week 3, 8, 9, 12, and 13 in a 14-week semester. During classroom observations, I took field notes to keep a record of events in the classroom. In addition, I placed a video recorder on a tripod at the back of each classroom during observations upon permission from participants and their students.

Interviews. I interviewed Walt and audio-recorded interviews upon receiving his permission. I followed the general framework of three-stage interviews by Seidman (2006). He suggested that the first stage is to explore participants' life history. The purpose of the second stage is to ask questions related to participants' current experiences. The final stage is related to their reflection on the meaning of their experience.

I conducted my first-stage interview with Walt before the semester began. I mainly asked about why he came to Japan, his first job at an English conversation school, and his transition to university teaching. The second stage interviews took place three times right after classroom observations. I asked questions related to the observed classes and certain events that I took notes during the observation. They include his interactions with students and activities that he introduced in class. In the final interview, my questions centered around how he reflected on his experience as an EFL teacher in Japan, particularly at universities. I also asked about what he hoped to achieve in his career.

I transcribed and summarized the interview data. I transcribed data that indicated reoccurring ideas based on themes suggested in the literature on expertise. I summarized the parts I did not consider important, such as when the participant was thinking aloud what he wanted to say or simply describing things that happened during the class. I had a native-speaker of English check my transcriptions of quotes that I used in this report and revised accordingly.

Student focus groups. I conducted focus group interviews with students from the observed class to understand how Walt and his teaching were perceived by his students. I chose focus groups for two reasons. The first reason concerns the richness of data. According to Morgan (1997), one advantage of focus groups is that it provides the ability to deal with a topic that is "either habit-ridden or not thought out in detail" (p. 11). That is, often participants do not recall certain events or do not deeply reflect on these events unless they have a chance to discuss with others who share the same experience. Therefore, I hoped that interactions that students have with each other would uncover elements that are often hidden or forgotten, such as some events that occurred in a lesson and what they thought of it.

Second, I chose focus groups because of my positionality. At the time of research, I was teaching as a full-time instructor at Oka University and was teaching or had taught some of the students from Walt's class in my own classes. I was concerned about my positionality as their teacher that I would be putting too much pressure on the students, especially if I had conducted individual interviews with students. Therefore, I chose focus groups because they allow researchers to investigate participants' perspectives "without pressuring them into making decisions or reaching a consensus" (Liamputtong, 2011, p. 5). By allowing students to have their classmates in the same proximity, I attempted to create an environment, in which they had "peer group support and reassurance" (Liamputtong, 2011, p. 107) and help "produce a livelier group dynamic" (Morgan, 1997, p. 20).

A total of five students from Walt's classes volunteered to participate in the focus-group interviews. Three male students, Nigel, Makoto, and Yuta participated the focus group interview from the writing course, a female student Nana and a male student Ryo participated the interview from ER course. The focus groups took place in a classroom at Oka University. To ensure that students have

had sufficient time in Walt's class, I conducted focus groups after the semester was over, in which classroom observations took place.

Prior to focus groups, students signed the informed consent form, which I had prepared in Japanese. Then I explained that the purpose of my research was to understand Walt's teaching practice, and their comments about the class and his teaching would be kept confidential. With their permission, I used a voice recorder during the focus-groups. I played the role of a moderator to ensure students stayed on topic during the discussions. I introduced the questions I had prepared (See Appendix) and presented them both visually and verbally. Each student focus group interview took approximately one hour. I transcribed the recordings in full and translated them into English.

Data Analysis

I used both deductive and inductive approaches to analyze the data. For the deductive approach, I relied on the findings of previous research in the field. This research was strongly influenced by knowledge about expert teachers. Therefore, I looked for characteristics indicating expertise described by previous studies in both general education and L2 teaching. This included types of knowledge, such as pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of learners. I also looked for themes that indicated the emotional component of learner engagement. The inductive approach involved analyzing the data by focusing on specific pieces of information and by making connections among them for meaningful patterns (Hatch, 2002). Finally, I investigated not only how the participants approached the two courses similarly, but also differently. The examination of within-participant variation provided me with dynamic insights.

Findings

Two questions posed for this study concern practices that Walt demonstrated to consider students' emotional engagement and the effects that students experienced

as a consequence. Three themes concerning Walt's practices related to students' emotional engagement were salient: raising students' interest and confidence, helping students build personal relationships with each other, and easing students' anxieties.

Raising Students' Interest and Confidence

Walt demonstrated his beliefs that increasing students' interest for a target skill was an integral aspect of his teaching. For example, he believed that one of his roles as an ER teacher was to help students gain appreciation and interest for reading. In the pre-semester interview that I conducted prior to classroom observations, Walt compared two types of curriculum for ER courses that he had taught from in the program. The objectives for the original curriculum were to assist students to read a certain number of words mainly through sustained silent reading. In this curriculum, students read silently for most if not all of the class time. In contrast, the revised curriculum included discussion as one of the suggested activities. When asked about his reaction to the revised curriculum, he responded, "I loved it, yeah, it's a much better approach" (interview, pre-semester, fall, 2016, 55:27) because one of his goals for the course "was to get them [students] really interested in reading" (interview, pre-semester, fall, 2016, 55:39). One of suggested activities that he used was reading circles, in which students read and discussed the same book, *Holes* by Louis Sachar.

Walt used reading circles in order to enhance students' interest for reading. For example, he explained in the interview how reading circles gave students an authentic experience of a good reader:

> . . . because a lot of stories are really interesting, and you can tell that some of the students were really . . . deeply involved in stories as far as engaging with each other, in the class, asking each other really good questions, but also asking me questions . . . about why the author decided

> to do that, what's [sic] meaning of this. I think that anytime you read something, and you are engaged with the reading, you always tend to ask those kinds of questions . . . there is no really right answer when you read, you know a good reader will be . . . having an imaginary conversation with the author . . . you are really getting into the story and into books, so I think by doing those reading circles, that really helped cement that idea into their heads.
>
> - interview, pre-semester, fall, 2015, 55:46

This quote demonstrates Walt's idea about what good readers do. He considered a good reader as someone who enjoys having a dialogue with a story and an author. He wanted his students to have a similar experience as a good reader by using reading circles.

When reflecting on the semester the classroom observations were conducted, Walt again discussed his goal to help students find joy in reading. He stated, "I wanted them to kind of to fall in love with reading, I don't think that was part of the curriculum, [but I wanted to] just get them to have a positive experience reading in English" (interview, post-semester, fall, 2016, 3:30). He explained further about his goal to teach students the value of reading, describing two aspects of reading in this way:

> . . . hopefully they walk out with a more positive experience of reading in a class because too many students that you talk to say "Oh I hate reading". . . . If they are reading something interesting then they may be more likely to have a more positive view of reading and you know not only in L2 but also L1, maybe by this class, "Oh you know reading is actually important you know to understand the world".
>
> - interview, Week 8, fall, 2015, 21:02

Furthermore, Walt raised students' interest through the movie and allowing them to make predictions about the story. He believed raising students' interest was necessary. He said it was because "I think it's the key to, you know, having good reading classes when you get readers hooked on the material, and they want to continue to keep reading" (interview, Week 3, fall, 2015, 15:12). He made students predict the story in groups (field notes, Week 3, fall, 2015) because he said, "I think by doing that, hopefully [it'll] raise their interest in the story, so that when they read, they will be able to figure out if their prediction came true or not" (interview, Week 3, fall, 2015, 15:36). These comments illustrate Walt's belief that raising interest among students was a necessary component for learner engagement.

Walt also believed it was important to raise students' confidence for a target skill. Comments from his ER student focus group indicates that this goal was achieved. When asked about the positive influence he had from Walt's class, Ryo, who was a freshman at the time of data collection, explained that it was the amount of reading he did. He said,

> 本読む回数がめちゃ増えました。その英語だけじゃなく日本語も日本の日本語の本もだいぶ増えて、ていううか高校の時の時に読まなさすぎて年に１冊か２冊がまあ丁度いいだろう。でも大学の１学期にもう10,10冊ぐらいは…プライベート、そう授業以外の時でもまあ少しずつ読むようになったかな。とうのは自分の中で変化はありました。
>
> I read a lot more often. Not only in English, but Japanese too, Japanese books in Japanese. Well, I didn't read at all in high school. Maybe one or two books a year was the most I did. But I read about ten, ten books in the first semester of university. . . . I could feel the change inside of me, I started reading in my private time, even outside classrooms.
>
> - FG, Ryo, 23:18

Nana shared a similar view. She explained that she bought a book as thick as *Holes*, while she was in Canada, which she stopped reading after reading 30 pages. She explained that she gave up reading the book because she got bored with the story. However, she said: 「それでもあの本を読み切れたってことはなんか若干自身にはなった…宿題やったけどちゃんと読めるんやなっていう。」"The fact that I was able to finish the book [*Holes*] kind of gave me a sense of confidence . . . I felt I could finish reading even though it was homework" (FG, Nana, 24:27). Their comments indicate the fact that Walt was successful in helping students gain confidence for reading both in English and Japanese.

Expert teachers believe that they have the ability to influence students' lives, such as raising students' interest for the content they teach (Dunkin, 1995). Gregory (2005) proposed a teaching model that goes beyond delivering content-related knowledge and is similar to what I found in Walt's case. Gregory emphasized the important role that college and university professors play in using course content to reach students' potentials in life as human beings. He explained the essence of education as an experience whereby students "get educated because they learn how to study our beloved content, and they carry the how of that learning with them in the world as cognitive and intellectual skills that stick long after the content is forgotten" (p. 97). Gregory suggested teaching fundamental aspects of life through academic content. The aspects range from teaching students how to analyze academic content critically and logically to relating the content to their own lives. The descriptions I provided about Walt' teaching does not necessarily indicate that his teaching assisted students' academic growth based on Gregory's definition. However, his teaching influenced students' attitudes toward the target content. That is, students learned to gain appreciation and confidence for reading.

Furthermore, teachers play an essential role in influencing students' motivation in L2 learning (Dörnyei, 2001). One of these influences involves convincing or tempting students to engage in tasks rather than passively waiting

for them to absorb knowledge from teachers. Another way that these teachers motivated their students intellectually was their ability to teach and share the joy of learning, which is another long-recognized characteristic of expertise (Lowman, 1984). Walt demonstrated various ways to show students the joy of learning, which became the foundation for students' motivation to learn. These endeavors that he made to enhance students' motivation accord with what Lortie (1975) said about his participants, who did not believe "that children are naturally eager to learn. They believed it takes a teacher to stimulate intellectual curiosity and interest in school" (p. 114). Walt also understood the importance of fostering students' motivation and was able to effectively bring out and enhance students' motivation by utilizing his knowledge about Japanese university students who study English as a second language.

Making Personal Relationships

Walt also believed it was important for students to make personal relationships with other students to maximize the effect of learning. When Walt discussed a list of things he thought students gained from his class, he said, "they learned about each other a lot, which I think is important so they got to know each other as classmates and possibly friends during the course of the year or the semester" (interview, post-semester, fall, 2015, 19:08). He also explained one of his personal goals for the class was to help students "have positive experiences in their school life, so as long as they do their work in class, I'm really happy . . . establishing friendships in the class I think is important, making friends with other classmates and going out and doing fun things. . . ." (interview, post-semester, fall, 2015, 6:15).

Walt also explained the importance of showing the progress that students were making as a factor to keep up with reading. He stated, "Instead of [students] looking at it as like 'oh this is something we have to do," [they can] look at it more like some friendly competition between other students in the class"

(interview, Week 13, fall, 2015, 24:54). Two students from the focus group shared their experiences related to this point. Ryo commented:「あっと、あー。あの(Walt の本名)が毎週みんなの進行度を比較するやつは結構好きだな。」"I liked the thing (Walt's real name) did to compare everyone's progress every week" (FG, Ryo, 7:49). He continued and said, 「すごいまあ客観的に見れていいなっと思う。多分人によっては『わー、私のいっちゃん遅い、わーいややわあ』って思う人も多分いると思うんですけど。でもまあそのひとの為にもいい、いいのかなっていうのは思いました。」"it was good that you could see it objectively. Maybe some people thought 'Oh no, I am the slowest, no', but I think that's good for that person too" (FG, Ryo, 8:04). Walt's manner of teaching students how to be responsible for their own reading progress by motivating them indicates his creativity.

Furthermore, both students agreed that they could not have finished reading the book, *Holes* alone. Nana felt it was mainly because of reading circles that she was able to finish the story. She said,

> いやまあ、授業で絶対ここまで読んで来なさいっていうのもあるし、それによってそのかだい、課題もあるから人に迷惑を掛ける訳にはいかないからやっぱりね、やらなきゃいけないっていう使命感とでも読んでたら面白いから話の内容もいいから、「あれ、これもう終わっちゃったんだな」って気づくことがあって、だから全然苦にならなかったっていうのが一番多いかな。
>
> I was assigned pages that I needed to read as a part of class, and because of the assignment, I felt a sense of obligation to read and not cause other people trouble, you know, and as I continued to read, the content of the story was interesting, so sometimes I found myself thinking "I am already done [reading]," so I never suffered [from reading] at all.
>
> - FG, Nana, 24:54

Their comments demonstrate that his class helped them achieve the instructional goals. One of the significant factors was his ability to help students build a relationship with each other. He used their close relationship as a way to motivate students and make them responsible for their contribution to class.

Walt demonstrated knowledge that students should have positive interpersonal relationships in order to achieve instructional goals. Markus and Kitayama (1994) created a framework in which the Japanese see oneself and understand how to be a person in relation to others as an *interdependent* view of self. Based on this model, one attempts "not to become separate and autonomous from others but to fit-in with others, to fulfill and create obligation, and, in general, to become part of various interpersonal relationships" (p. 97). Walt created a learning environment, in which students felt responsible for achieving goals as a group and as an individual.

Easing Students' Anxieties

The most salient aspect of Walt's teaching regarding emotional engagement was to consider students' anxieties in class. He attempted to ease students' stress and anxieties in several ways. For example, the manner in which Walt gave a quiz also indicated that he considered students' anxieties. He explained that the purpose of pairing students to work on a quiz was ". . . to take the pressure from them because it's not like a normal assessment where it actually counts for a percentage of their grade" (interview, Week 8, fall, 2015, 9:05). Walt used the quizzes only to award students with word counts from the book, *Holes*. Therefore, Walt did not see the necessity of giving extra pressure to students, especially because the quizzes were low-stakes tests. His creative use of quizzes and a movie to reinforce understanding from students relieve students' anxieties, allow students to learn from each other, and raise interest and confidence in reading. These choices of activities demonstrated his expertise.

Walt demonstrated his ability to relate to students' anxieties in other ways. He said that one of his strengths as a teacher was his sense of humor. He believed that this was especially important. He said,

> . . . learning a language can be a stressful thing for some students, you know, having to speak or communicate in a foreign language when you don't have a strong grasp of that language, it can cause a lot of anxiety, so by lightening the atmosphere, I can kind of help with that.
>
> - interview, post-semester, fall, 2015, 52:32

This comment illustrates Walt's understanding of how students might feel about speaking in their L2, especially in front of others.

In addition to his humor, Walt also used positive class dynamics to ease other students' anxieties. When I began my data collection in the second semester, there were some students who joined from this semester. He discussed how he paired new students with old students on the first day of the semester so that old students could explain the class to new students. When asked about why he did not explain it himself, he responded,

> Just to help them feel more comfortable in the class. Rather than me explaining, it's good to get peer explanation from the students because they might say things that I wouldn't say maybe. And also I think maybe students are more likely to listen if it is not coming from the teacher, it is coming from a couple of students.
>
> - interview, Week 8, 2015, fall, 6:45

He continued,

> Maybe they are more likely to hear to, to remember things or to listen to

> things from their peers versus from the superior. I just think back to my student days as well when I was a college student, how much information I could get from just a fellow classmate versus from my professor. Fellow classmates are more approachable I think and easier to kind of talk to. [A] Professor, or the teacher can be kind of intimidating.
>
> - interview, Week 8, fall, 2015, 7:14

These comments demonstrate his ability to take students' perspectives based on his own experiences as a learner.

Walt also indicated his knowledge about what can cause students' anxieties in this particular context. During classroom observations, I noticed that he was constantly walking around the classroom while students were working in groups or individually. When asked about this point, he said that he usually did this because

> I think in Japan, a lot of students can sometimes be a little bit reticent to ask questions. . . . If a student has a question, sometimes they don't wanna raise their hand and ask in front of the whole class, but as you are walking around, sometimes students will actually grab you and say, "What does it mean?" or "Can you help me?" or sometimes I'll actually specifically ask them just to confirm that they know what they need to work on . . . just to make sure they are on task.
>
> - interview, Week 3, fall, 2015, 12:31

By providing students with opportunities to individually ask him questions or to ask students to explain what they were supposed to do, Walt was able to view this issue from students' point of view.

Furthermore, Walt allowed students to rely on their first language (Japanese) on some occasions by taking students' perspectives. For example, he

told students that they could research about a topic in Japanese for a problem-solution paper. Because he conducted his class in English, I asked why he allowed them to use Japanese for this occasion. He said,

> I think a lot of L1 support in this case is important because they are doing research, they are trying to get some topic knowledge about their topic, and I think if I was gonna write a research project in Japanese, it probably would help me to do a lot of background research in my native language, in English first, just so I get a deeper understanding of the topic at hand before I start writing about it.
>
> - interview, Week 3, fall, 2015, part 2, 8:43

As I described before, he demonstrated his ability to understand how students might feel by associating himself with students. By focusing on his priority, which was to help students write a paper in English, he was able to see how students researching in their L1 would be beneficial.

Comments that students from Walt's ER class made in a focus group also supports this point. They discussed using Japanese in several situations in his class, such as when they asked questions about how to use Microsoft Word, how to pronounce certain words, and how to correct grammar mistakes. They found it helpful that Walt not only understood Japanese but allowed them to communicate with him in Japanese occasionally. Nigel said,「ワードのここがおかしいとか言われへんねん。」 "I don't know how to say there is something wrong [about a particular thing about] Microsoft Word [in English]" (FG, 14:14). Another student said,「そういうときは日本語使って聞いたら答えてくれるし。ての良かったかな。」"In such situations, if I asked in Japanese, he would respond. That was maybe good". He continued,

> わかれへんねんな。無理やろ、普通に。普通にしゃべられへんのに、そんなん余計無理やわ…フォントあと、てんぱってるやん、なんかこ

> っちもミスが、その、なんていったらいいん、不具合があってやってるから、こっちもテンパってるから、説明できへんなかなか。そのときにやっぱ日本語通じた方が、やっぱりこう、安心感はある。
> I just wouldn't know. It's impossible obviously. I can't even normally speak [English], and it is even more impossible . . . like [changing] a font, I was panicking, I made a mistake, you know, what can I say, because I was having a problem, so I was panicking, so I couldn't explain really well. So if we can use Japanese, I feel a sense of relief.
>
> - FG, Yuta, 14:42

This comment illustrates that students found it helpful that Walt was flexible enough to help them deal with issues in Japanese. Walt demonstrated his abilities to ease students' anxieties so that they can focus on achieving the instructional goals. His creative manner in helping students feel relaxed in class underpins L2 expertise in teaching.

Several L2 researchers pointed out some time ago the importance of considering anxieties that learners feel when speaking their L2 (e.g., Dörnyei, 2001; Krashen, 1985). The participants also demonstrated their knowledge related to this aspect. Based on this knowledge, they focused on lowering students' anxieties by utilizing collaborative work, giving individual students opportunities to ask questions in person, and allowing students to rely on L1 in a flexible manner. Walt created an environment that allowed students to focus on learning and using the language rather than having their anxieties interfere with their learning. His manner in approaching teaching from students' perspectives and providing a safe community underpin his expertise.

Conclusion

I set out to explore how emotional aspects of learner engagement is facilitated by expertise in L2 teaching. The teacher participant, Walt considered three areas of emotional aspects to engage learners such as raising students' interest and confidence for reading, helping students build relationship with each other, and easing students' anxieties. His teaching practices affected students' emotional engagement positively as reflected in their comments about his classes. This study demonstrated the integral role that pedagogical content knowledge plays in understanding students' perspectives to enhance the effect of L2 teaching.

There were several limitations that may have affected the results of this study. The first limitation concerns a small number of students that participated in the focus group interviews. Further research should include more student participants, particularly students of different proficiency levels to better understand how proficiency plays a role in student perception of teachers. Second, including more teacher participants to analyze learner engagement is necessary. For the purpose of this paper, I only focused on one teacher participant. Finally, future researchers should consider using other data collection methods, such as surveys that students can answer during class or one-on-one interviews with individual students. This will provide more in-depth and dynamic understanding about learner engagement, including changes that occur based on specific in-class activities and incidents of interactions between students and teachers.

REFERENCES

Asaba, M. (2019). *Investigating expertise: Four case studies of experienced EFL teachers at Japanese universities* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.

Assor, A. (2012). Allowing choice and nurturing an inner compass: Educational practices

supporting students' need for autonomy. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook on Research of Student Engagement* (pp. 421-439). New York: Springer.

Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *35*(5), 463-482. doi:/10.1016/S0883-0355(02)00004-6

Berliner, D.C. (2004). Describing the behavior and documenting the accomplishments of expert teachers. *Bulletin of Science*, *Technology and Society, 24*(3), 200-212. doi:10.1177/0270467604265535

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1988). The flow experience and its significance for human psychology. In Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, I.S. (Eds.), *Optimal experience: Psychological studies of flow in consciousness* (pp. 15-35). New York, NY: Cambridge University press.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning.* London, England: RoutledgeFalmer.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The modern language journal*, *78*(3), 273-284

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. London, England: Longman

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hattie, J. (2003). Distinguishing expert teachers from novice and experienced teachers. Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence? Camberwell, VIC: Australian Council for Educational Research: *Annual Conference on Building Teacher Quality.* Melbourne.

Johnston, B., & Goettsch, K. (2000). In search of the knowledge base of language teaching: Explanations by experienced teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Language Vivantes*, *56*(3), 437-468. doi:10.3138/cmlr.56.3.437

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(1), 77-97. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2003.10.002

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* New York, NY: Longman.

Liamputtong, P. (2011). *Focus group methodology: Principles and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lowman, J. (1984). *Mastering the techniques of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). The cultural construction of self and emotion: Implications for social behavior. In S. Kitayama & H. R.

Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture* (pp. 89-130). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Palmer, D. J., Stough, L. M., Burdenski, Jr. T. K., & Gonzales, M. (2005). Identifying teacher expertise: An examination of researchers' decision making. *Educational Psychologist*, *40*(1), 13-25. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep4001_2

Richards, J. C. (2010). Competence and performance in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, *41(2)*, 101-122. doi:10.1177/0033688210372953

Richards, J. C., Li, B., & Tang, A. (1995). A comparison of pedagogical reasoning skills in novice and experienced ESL teachers. *RELC Journal*, *26*(1), 1-24. doi:10.1177/003368829502600201

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2014). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. In *Applications of flow in human development and education* (pp. 475-494). Springer, Dordrecht.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Research*, *15*(2), 4-14. doi:10.3102/0013189X015002004

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform.

Harvard Educational Review, *57*(1), 1-23. doi:10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411

Taylor, L. & Parsons, J. (2011). Improving Student Engagement. Current Issues in Education, 14(1). Retrieved from http://cie.asu.edu/

Tsui, A. B. M. (2005). Expertise in teaching: Perspectives and issues. In K. Johnson, (Ed.), *Expertise in L2 learning and teaching* (pp. 167-189). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2009). Distinctive qualities of expert teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *15*(4), 421-439. doi:10.1080/13540600903057179

Turner-Bisset, R. (2012). *Expert teaching: Knowledge and pedagogy to lead the profession*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yazzie-Mintz, E., & McCormick, K. (2012). Finding the humanity in the data: Understanding, measuring, and strengthening student engagement. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 743-761). Springer, Boston, MA.

この論文は、2019 年にテンプル大学で発表した博士論文の一部を加筆・修正したものです。

ENGAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY:TOWARDS A PEDAGOGY FOR LEARNER ENGAGEMENT IN SPOKEN TEXTS

Roger Palmer, Hirao School of Management

Overview of the Study

This paper investigates the kinds of casual conversations that language learners participate in during their classes (de Silva Joyce, 2000). The central argument is that such informal talk has a unifying structure which tends to be overlooked, one which can be identified and taught explicitly just like any other whole text. The three main areas addressed are the nature of pedagogic discourse, multimodal social semiotic approaches, and the semiotic landscape of the classroom.

Pedagogic discourse is taken to mean the way exchanges in teaching are organized (Rose, 2014). These are the short meaningful conversations which go back and forth, involving the instructor and the class/individuals, and the learners responding to the instructor and each other. Students take part in those exchanges with the teacher and with each other in various ways, as initiator or responder. What frequently emerges is a pattern of engagement for the high achievers and exclusion for the others. Other considerations are the building of knowledge through the exchanges, the way learning activities are structured, and the particular modes employed at any one time and how they are brought into the exchanges (Rose, 2014).

A multimodal social semiotic approach brings together the modes used in society to make meaning. In the classroom, audio recordings of student utterances will only produce transcripts that fail to take into account the three dimensions that video can capture, encompassing books, gaze, gesture, image, notes, notebooks, posture, screens, speech, and writing (Bezemer et al, 2012). Developments which allow for descriptions of the semiotic landscape of the classroom (Bezemer et al, 2012) have repercussions for the pedagogic function of texts, influencing decisions taken by

instructors to include and exclude particular texts and the ways they are used in class. A typical shift over time would witness a teacher moving from discussing classical texts, to displaying historical texts via multimedia, to focusing on student-generated texts to be discussed and interacted with, to editing them together with the class. The process of making student texts the object of discussion heightens learner engagement.

The current study took place in 2017, building on research into the structure of casual discourse and measurement of student performance in casual conversations (Banks, 2000). The participants were freshmen in a management department in Japan. Modeling and explicit teaching helped the students learn relevant discourse structure and features. Recordings of student talk using voice recorders and video cameras highlighted the instruction and fed back into a loop of informed peer assessment. Students participated fully in the pedagogic discourse, working in pairs as conversationalists or peer assessors. The paper illustrates the research methodology, the models for explicit instruction, and offers a view of how the students performed and were measured/appraised by their classmates. The aim of the paper is to help instructors to achieve active engagement by all members of a class and to offer suggestions on how to attain measurable improvement by students in their casual conversations in target language texts.

Oral Paper: Background

The oral presentation of the paper, Towards a Pedagogy for Learner Engagement in Spoken Texts, was given on March 3rd, 2018 at Text & Context: Oita Text Forum Workshop 9. The conference was held at the Dannoharu Campus of Oita University under the theme of, 'Literacy and Technology in Language Pedagogy and Use.'

The talk focuses on the need for greater and more effective learner engagement in relation to spoken texts. It fits in with action research on engagement conducted in the classroom for the study. The emphasis on action research is in response to the

difficulties of applying prevalent research-based theories, among them Second Language Acquisition (SLA), to actual students studying in a class context. A theory of language, or about language, may struggle to describe the ways students interact in the second language (L2). Some seem to succeed with ease while for others there is great toil and frustration, and a possible loss of interest and focus in their studies.

For the purposes of the current paper, what is meant by casual conversations in class (de Silva Joyce, 2000) is not limited to chatting. It is understood that L2 teachers will at some time allocate less controlled or unstructured speaking time for their students. Learners are given the opportunity to talk in pairs, or in groups, about a topic, using the various linguistic resources available to them. Those resources are of course limited by their knowledge of the L2 and factors affecting their performance, such as anxiety. Some of the questions which arise, and gave impetus to this study, concern whether casual conversation can and should be taught and improved (Banks, 2000). It is pertinent to ask if conversation is teachable, and if so whether progress in speaking casually is measurable. By extension, it might be appropriate to ask if it would help students to chart their own progress in speaking.

One of the concerns of the study is to overcome a drift in classroom chat and a devaluation of it. If it is consigned to being merely spontaneous talk and of notional use for practice, then there is a danger of the language teacher's role becoming cut off from teaching it, hence constrained to the instruction of discrete language items or error correction. This point of view has sometimes been framed as the primacy of language accuracy. On the other hand, there is a position which argues that time and practice may be more important than explicit language instruction. This pushes research to fall into a trap of language fluency being paramount. Such an either/or situation is open to the criticism that fluency-based discussion in groups about a topic does not improve speaking in concrete terms, while controlled language practice based on accuracy fails to let students express their own ideas. One way out of the

dichotomy of fluency and accuracy is to reconsider the classroom as a social space: it is above all a place for students to build knowledge and express their own meanings. Using Teachers' Voices (de Silva Joyce, 2000) as a guide, this study set out to investigate these issues by placing students, and the need to engage them, at the heart of the learning process. The research tries to help learner difficulties with unstructured speaking, so that they improve and they are able to see and track their improvement.

The Nature of Pedagogic Discourse

If we imagine a class, there will generally be a small group of the most involved (fully engaged) or high-achieving students at the front and middle, a larger group of mid-range students sitting further back who are somewhat engaged, and the biggest group of students who are likely to fail and have tuned out (not engaged) sitting at the extremities of the class (Rose, 2014). If a question is posed, the students at the front are liable to notice and attempt to answer.

As regards casual conversations, it is possible to reframe the conference theme of language pedagogy in general as pedagogic discourse in particular. Then, we would consider the way conversational exchanges in class, typically short conversations taking place between partners, come to be organized (Rose, 2014). When observing precisely what the teachers and students are doing, it is apparent that some students interact with the teacher, while others do not, and that some interact fully with each other while others appear to not be engaged at all in the learning process (Rose, 2014). Not only the conversations themselves, but the transfer of knowledge is implicit in the exchanges. Instructors need to design tasks that build in activities to capture the attention of all of the students. Rose (2014) suggests that teachers address the different modalities, including speaking and listening and reading and writing and the role of images or symbols, to see how they can be part of the meaning-focused conversations. In this, there is a role for technology to play in multimodal discourse.

The argument presented here is not about new methodologies. It is not concerned with huge changes which are hard to implement in most institutions, where they fail to take account of each unique situation and the individuals in that context. The assumption is that the same teacher in the same educational environment can make incremental changes with the right support. The first step is to identify the structure of casual discourse following the research of Peter Banks (2000), who measured student performance in casual conversation. The main difference is that in the current study, it was applied to management students at a university in Japan. Since the earlier study in 2000, it has become much easier to make audio and video recordings than it used to be, with the advent of affordable iPads for video recordings and high quality audio recorders.

To help learners master casual conversations an explicit teaching approach was adopted, which presented models of casual conversation. Students were helped to identify the structure and features of casual talk and then practice it themselves. A simple project was set up involving a new group of first year university students fresh from high school. They were assigned to the bottom level English class based on their placement scores in the management department. Within the confines of a regular study skills L2 class, the research was made part of the time devoted to discussing books that students were reading. Some of that time had been identified as a possible weak link in the class, since it was being used mainly for practice rather than to extend language. Students had been talking in pairs, but they had not made use of new structures or discourse features or related it to their own social needs as an English speaker. They had tended to talk about the books but not about the meanings they attach to the books or the writers or the characters.

Multimodal Social Semiotic Approaches

A study conducted through the Institute of Education in London University (Bezemer et al, 2012) investigated learning in institutions as widely divergent as hospitals, museums and schools. The research helped to demonstrate that learning in general, and this includes language learning, is part of social research. A classroom is a social space as much as a public hospital is a collectively used social area. The approach of the study is social semiotic and multimodal, that is, one which focuses on meaning-making in different modes. Multimodality is involved with the various modes that are used, while semiotics is concerned with signs and symbols. In the classroom just as in society as a whole, multiple modes are in operation at any one time. The researchers (Bezemer et al, 2012) took into account gaze, gesture and posture as much as pictures and writing. They also examined the media of the classroom, such as screens, books, and taking notes (Bezemer et al, 2012). The current study seeks to apply technology (such as video) that can capture the diverse modes to the action research, in an attempt to enhance language teaching and learning.

To bring learner engagement together with literacy and technology, it is helpful to consider in more detail the importance of social semiotics, the theory that deals with meaning. Essentially, the kinds of technology that we use to communicate or represent images, and thereby express meanings, have their own affordances (Kress, 2010). What can be accomplished in one mode and by one device, such as a pen, cannot necessarily be accomplished in another mode, such as by using voice. When discussing literacy, it requires the learner to be adept in numeracy, reading and writing. Above and beyond this, the demands of the 21st century demand that the learner is tech-savvy or they are disadvantaged in the workplace and all their social interactions. Hence for the learner, relatively small decisions, such as choosing a smartphone instead of a desktop computer as their medium, has a much wider impact: as Kress (2010) explains, the affordances of the medium which is selected will have an effect on the way the individual makes meaning. Furthermore, within society

the medium may shape the identity of the user (Kress, 2010). To elaborate, the person using the mobile device takes it with them to the classroom; they interact with it as a dictionary; they text their friends; they record the class notes on the board as a photo; they upload the picture to their cloud and reuse it later in their e-learning portfolio as well as sharing it with their friends; during that time the image is resized and edited. Hence the new mobile learning device forms a part of their identity through which they live their lives. This is an entirely different social function from that of the desktop computer.

The Semiotic Landscape of the Classroom

Within the classroom, the work that goes into the pedagogy helps to build student literacy. Having observed how the affordances of the technology play a crucial role in shaping learning behavior, it becomes easier to see the important role of emerging technologies which change the resources available to teachers as well as students. Much previous research has separated the L2 from the student's native or first language (L1), however, there is much to be gained from work on literacy development in a variety of settings. A study carried out by Bezemer et al (2012) investigated the teaching of L1 poetry in an English school. Though the student groups differed, many other elements were consistent between the class in 2000 and 2006: the curriculum remained unchanged and the instructor was the same. The technology of instruction underwent some important revisions, in that an interactive whiteboard (IWB) took over the role that formerly belonged to an overhead projector (OHP) with transparencies (Bezemer et al, 2012).

Some of the key points from the research (Bezemer et al, 2012) were that the affordances of the OHP technology pushed the instructor towards certain teaching behaviors. For example, the kinds of texts which were displayed and discussed and placed at the heart of the class tended to be well-known English texts by prominent authors, acting from a position of authority. Conversely, the move towards the IWB

allowed much more flexibility and interaction with the medium of instruction. Consequently, the texts which formed the object of discussion were those composed by the students themselves. Bezemer et al (2012) highlights the change of roles of the participants in the classroom and the different power relations that newly exist as part of the pedagogy.

A number of issues arise which link the technological affordances to the level of engagement of the students. Should an instructor copy or scan student reactions to the poem or text in question (Bezemer et al, 2012), or write their own poems, then these can be represented during class by means of the IWB. Any editing or annotating or correction of the texts can involve the student-generated texts themselves: furthermore, students are directly engaged in the process of editing. The instructor and learners are able to build a text together, with implications for both ownership of the pedagogy and classroom as social space and authority over it (Bezemer et al, 2012).

The authors of the study draw attention to a transformation in 'the semiotic landscape of the classroom' (Bezemer et al, 2012). Over time, changes in pedagogy and advances in technology have repercussions for what texts and images are shown in the classroom. Whereas the OHP tends to place the focus on speaking and writing, other modes are favored by the IWB, with superior image quality and manipulation of images, as well as color and overall layout important factors. In fact, the kinds of textual analysis also undergo a transformation (Bezemer et al, 2012). Seen in this light, technology has profound implications for literacy, with implications for the choice of texts, the way they are shown, and how to interact with the text.

In previous papers, I have reported on a study I carried out with a fellow researcher in Indonesia, as reported in the Swiss ETAS Journal (Palmer & Septina, 2013). The study, conducted at a relatively early stage in the adoption and widespread use of tablets, involved the use of iPads in language teaching and engaging learners. Students

actively used the iPads for their own language learning and social interaction, for study and play, and through their reflections it was possible to change the nature of activities and the amount of time devoted to classroom exercises. For purposes of illustration, learners were rewarded for their participation in vocabulary quizzes by being allowed to use the iPad for educational games. At other times, the iPad could be passed around from student to student, which was quite unlike other classroom technology at that time, mainly desktops and laptops. One of the key findings was that the classroom as a social learning space was reclaimed for and by the students: Kress (2010) refers to the mobile convergence device which replaces the clutter of books, materials, CD players and VCRs with the iPad serving as a video recorder, camera, MP3 player, and computer. Furthermore, technology which was unavailable or prohibitively expensive in Indonesia, such as the IWB with its multiple functions, can be cheaply and easily replicated using a projector, whereby the iPad desktop serves as a virtual IWB creating a dynamic interactive space (Palmer & Septina, 2013). By projecting writing frameworks on to the board, learners can complete and edit them, while gaining the focus and involvement of the whole class. Moreover, videos and still shots of the class are a core component, being instantly uploaded to a class YouTube account for later viewing. Student texts are captured as images and immediately displayed for comment, corrective feedback, discussion and evaluation. The realtime feedback allows students to monitor and reflect on learning. The capture of class moments allows the instructor to reflect on multiple aspects of the class which might otherwise have been hidden away.

The world of tablets is categorically different from the world which existed before their invention. Classroom behavior is shaped just as much as other social behavior is changed by the smartphone. What emerges from the research (Palmer & Septina, 2013) and teaching practice is that visual work (capture and transformation of images) is foregrounded by the affordances of the hardware. Removing the keyboard from the iPad is a design decision that has social consequences, guiding the user to make

different decisions which emphasize more visual cues and fewer typed words (creating written texts). Ultimately, the new pedagogy and the new literacy go hand-in-hand with the new technology.

Personal, multifunctional, convergent mobile devices (Kress, 2010) such as smartphones are all around us, impacting on the lives of university students in their social lives as well as inside the classroom where they are expected to perform a range of language learning tasks. Working with a researcher based in Malaysia, I drew up a series of questions for a survey to ask students in Japan and Malaysia about their preferences in e-learning contexts. They submitted their responses to a Google Form via their mobile devices (Palmer & Tann, 2015a). Results revealed that little attention was being paid to voice, video, blogs, and bookmark functionality in classroom learning, whether directed by the instructor or not (Palmer & Tann, 2015b). Though many respondents claimed to be proficient in using applications that assist with learning, in fact no positive correlation was detected among them about actually coping well with the demands of digital literacy. One of the key shortfalls was in the explicit instruction of how to use the particular technology, the main focus being on the software or application. As for the hardware, it is not evident how teachers are using the specific affordances of tablets for improving the pedagogy. Frequently, the specific skills that are brought into the foreground by mobile devices are left undefined. Thus there is a need to understand that the life lived online and offline are merging, that a slice of life is experienced, captured and immediately uploaded and broadcast, and that mobility and multiple uses in multiple modes take precedence over a single-purpose, high quality device (Kress, 2010).

Action Research

Recordings of classroom interactions often tend to be audio, but this brings with it a number of limitations. If the technology is endeavoring to capture voice and sound, then audio may suffice. However, if the aim is to observe the engagement of the

students in the pedagogy, then the recording ought to take into account a range of modalities. Conversational exchanges involve not only the spoken word but also the written word, visual cues, gestures, and others (Rose, 2014). The social space of the classroom is difficult to encapsulate in a few recorded words, for eye contact may precede or accompany the word. Students who are already the least engaged may become overwhelmed by the various sensory inputs, which the instructor may mistakenly ascribe to lack of effort to understand, or low ability in the target language or certain skills. One way to move beyond teaching missteps, such as an over-reliance on one's own experience or intuition, is to harness technology to help us to view the classroom through all the modes that impact on it. Without video recordings, for example, it is impossible to observe different pairs of groups simultaneously.

A further consideration in engagement is that audio recordings help researchers to capture those who are participating the most, but they ignore the ones who are left out and are not participating or who are less able to or are more constrained. By observing the students who are involved in the casual classroom chat, not only who is speaking and how they are speaking but who is listening and who does not listen (Rose, 2014), we think much more about how we assess them and how well we set them up to succeed in class. Listening back through an audio recoding or decoding a transcript of it will only inform us about 'student voices' (de Silva Joyce, 2000); but it will not help us with the voiceless, the disempowered, the students who are least engaged. Posing a question to a whole class may easily reinforce stereotypes, in which the highest-performing student answers the question, and the instructor's impression of that student in relation to the others is reinforced and becomes an entrenched position.

Using the research pioneered by Banks (2000), I attempted to circumvent some of these issues. Since the students who do not regularly participate are invisible in transcripts of classroom discourse, I set up pairs to talk and to be observed by other individuals and pairs all around the classroom at the same time. Within the pair,

everyone talks on an equal footing, while another person observes and evaluates them in turn. Analyzing peer discussions in group work enables us to see participation as it unfolds (Rose, 2014).

The following schematic gives an overview of the development of a casual conversation and the teaching points. Each part of the conversation was practiced in sequence, so that if the greetings handout was introduced in week 1, then the opening gambits would follow in week 2.

A casual conversation

Conversation flow
Objective: practise the language you need to have a casual conversation with someone you know

[Stage]	[Description]		[Handout]
Start	Greeting (saying hello)	*Hi/Hello/How are you?/What's up?*	Greetings
	Opening gambit	*The traffic/weather is good/poor tonight.* *How often do you come here?* *How do you know John?* *How long have you belonged to...?* *What do you think about...?*	Opening gambits
	Talk about a shared experience or situation	*Me too* *The same thing happened to me* *I know that place!*	
↓			
Continue	Ask each other questions	*So what's new?/What have you been doing recently?*	
	Seek clarification	*I'm sorry. Could you repeat that please?/Pardon?*	Clarification
	Encourage	*Really!/Were you?/How awful!/What makes you say that?*	
	Tell an anecdote or recount	(Anecdote: orientation, remarkable event, reaction) (Recount: orientation, record of events)	Anecdote & Recount
↓			
Finish	Say you have to go Give a reason why Say when you will meet again Greeting (saying goodbye)	*Well, I must be going./Oh, is that the time?* *I have to meet my friend./I'm late for my next class.* *See you next class./I'll meet you in PE class.* *Nice seeing you!/Bye/See you later*	Greetings

Adapted from: Banks, Peter (2000). 1 Measuring student performance in casual conversation. Section Two: Taking a close look at student performances. In de Silva Joyce, Helen (ed.). Teachers' Voices 6: Teaching casual conversation. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University

The overview was distributed to the students as a road map to guide them through the research. It showed them where we were going from as a starting point, what we were doing at any one time, and where we would be ending up. It also helped me to predict which areas students might struggle with, such as opening gambits or icebreakers: Japanese students are sometimes loathe to initiate small talk with strangers, even in their L1. The group focused on in the research was made up of students who were

Japanese management majors in the bottom level, fresh from high school, 18 years old, largely monolingual, who had to take my class even though they are not language majors.

The next excerpt is taken from a handout to practice greetings. Interestingly, in the content-based program in which I work we rarely teach greetings explicitly unless they are part of the context-specific target vocabulary. This results in greetings being something we assume the students are proficient in, even though they are culturally specific and hard to master. This is why they were worked into a class activity in a study skills course where learners have to discuss the graded readers they have read recently with a partner. As part of any class activity, there has to be a lead in - greet the partner, make small talk, and go from there.

Greetings

In casual conversations with people we know, we use informal greetings to start and finish conversations.

Starting	***Finishing***
Hi / Hello	*Nice seeing you!*
How are you?	*Goodbye / Bye*
How are you doing?	*See you later*
What's up? (very informal)	

Practice

Find a partner and choose roles. When you have finished, switch roles. After trying both roles, make your own conversations.

Anna: *Tom, what's up?*

Tom: *Hi Anna. Nothing much. I'm just hanging out. What's up with you?*

Anna: *It's a good day. I'm feeling fine.*

Tom: *How is your sister?*

Anna: *Oh, fine. Not much has changed…*

Tom: *…Well, I have to go. Nice seeing you!*

Anna: *Later.*

Maria: *Oh, hello Chris. How are you doing?*

Chris: *I'm well. Thanks for asking. How are you?*

Maria: *I can't complain. Life is treating me well.*

Chris: *That's good to hear.*

Maria: *…Good to see you again. I need to go to my doctor's appointment.*

Chris: *Nice seeing you.*

Maria: *See you later.*

The practice can be modeled, demonstrated in front of the class, and carried out in a few minutes. Every member of the class is standing up and talking throughout. It is efficient and effective and allows the instructor to notice if any students are unable to complete the task. For opening gambits, by contrast, it was important to spend more time role-playing the situations. The students rarely strike up conversations with strangers in public, so without instruction they find these scenarios awkward, embarrassing, and unnatural as they cannot imagine behaving in such a way. Once they are proficient in them, they find it liberating and empowering.

Opening Gambits

1 The traffic/weather is good/poor tonight.

(This works in any situation.)

2 How often do you come here?

(Useful in a public place, like a cafe or library.)

3 How do you know John?
(This is a good at a party or even in a new school class.)

4 How long have you belonged to…?
(It is especially effective at a meeting or club.)

5 What do you think about…?
(This works well in the immediate context, such as when attending a talk or presentation.)

Source: http://busyteacher.org/14169-5-conversational-openers-shy-student.html

Even advanced students benefit from increasing the range of their expressions and linguistic repertoire. It is generally the case that language learners remain within their comfort zone, making excellent use of one part of language while avoiding another. This is equally true of clarification and encouraging, parts of language that disappear from casual talk unless a conscious effort is made to include them. Regular recycling involving peer observations can help enormously to ensure students are using them properly. Awareness of the conversation strategies that learners already use or may know from their L1 helps to build generic knowledge. Students come to realize that each stage is an integral part of casual conversation and should not be omitted.

*How to Ask for **Clarification***

There are many ways to let someone know that you don't understand. The right response depends on where you are, the situation, and the relationship between the speakers.

I'm sorry. Could you repeat that please?

I'm sorry I didn't hear you. Could you please say that again slowly?

You said…. ?

Did you say X or Y?

Pardon?

Excuse me?

What was that?

Say that again please?

I'm sorry, I don't understand what _____ means.

Huh? (Only with close friends!)

Adapted from:

http://busyteacher.org/14911-how-to-teach-students-ask-for-clarification.html

*How to **Encourage** the Speaker*

Make a comment	*Really!*
Ask a short question	*Were you?*
Repeat a word or phrase	*A: It can be **minus 50** in winter.B: **Minus 50**!*
Rephrase	*A: Yes, it can be pretty **awful**.B: **Horrible**.*
Ask for more information	*What makes you say that?*
Ask for an explanation	*What do you mean?*

Adapted from: Geddes, Sturtridge & Been (1994). Advanced Conversation. Macmillan: UK

Even native English speakers who have not been trained may struggle to differentiate an anecdote (a simple record plus a remarkable element) from a recount (a simple

record) in daily conversational settings. Students in our program learn through the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) to reading and writing, which helps them to build knowledge through the teaching of whole texts. They come to understand how to apply their background knowledge to casual conversations. For new students in our program in the current study, there was no L1 or L2 experience of the GBA and hence they required detailed scaffolding and explicit instruction. One outcome of this research is that the anecdote and recount as spoken discourse require systematic, staged instruction over a number of classes, just as if they were texts on the page. Casual conversation can be broken down into its generic functions: as such, those functions need to be taught.

Modeling is not easy: an anecdote has to be a true happening in the past containing a remarkable event, to differentiate it from a simple recount, but as a model it tends to become artificial since it lacks the spontaneity of a real life situation:

Anecdote

S1 *How was your day?*

S2 ***[Orientation]*** *Oh, you won't believe what happened to me!*

S1 *Really? What*

S2 ***[Remarkable event]*** *Well, I took the bus as usual, and there was an empty seat next to me. When we stopped in the next town, an actress got on who I had seen on TV and sat down next to me. I really wanted to ask her something, but I don't know her name. I was so excited, but you know, I just couldn't think of anything. Anyway, it was the most amazing experience. I've been thinking about it all day long.*

S1 ***[Reaction]*** *Wow!*

Recount

S1 *How was your day?*

S2 ***[Orientation]*** *Oh, it was pretty good, thanks.* ***[Record of events]*** *I took the bus to work, and fortunately it was on time. Just as I got to school it started raining, but fortunately I didn't get wet…*

S1 *…that was lucky…*

S2 *…yeah, and* ***[Record of events]*** *our biology class was quite interesting because we learnt about classifying the tropical plants that grow well at this time of year, and I'd been wondering about that. It's going to be on the test.*

S1 *Right.*

S2 *Anyway, how about you?*

S1 *Yeah, my day was OK too: a bit tiring though.*

Recounts need adapting to the real life context of the students or they soon become contrived and students lose their engagement in the task.

In view of the research implications concerning inclusion and exclusion in the pedagogy (Rose, 2014), students were called upon to carry out a peer assessment via an analogue sheet based on the research of Banks (2000). Their actions throughout the conversations were recorded using multiple audio and video recorders, with the assistance of classmates. What is left is a record of not only what was said, but who was participating in the different modes at any one time.

The peer assessment has a pair of students talking and a pair of students recording what they say. The instructor can observe and record what they say, and how they smile, and who they look at. In meetings with students, it is possible to play the recording back to them and ask them to assess how much they participated, and elicit from them what they have accomplished so far, as well as what they hope to work on

and improve. Using a (functional) grammar reference enables instructors to analyze the language used by the students, to apply what is known about written recounts to their spoken recounts, thus breaking down precisely how the students are performing and track their language development.

In the peer-assessed task, students are directed to talk about something real that actually happened to them in the recent past. They practice doing this in class the week prior to being recorded, to build confidence, check understanding, and ensure they know what is expected of them. Reading back through the student-generated notes, a pattern emerges in which the retelling of real-life occurrences in the recount presents challenges, as does a basic grasp of grammatical structures. Yet within the parameters of the task for this class, it is apparent that the casual conversations are structured, do have a good flow, and are a vast improvement on the long pauses and incomplete chats that preceded the research intervention.

Conversation skills

Objective ~ To practise the language you need to have a simple conversation with an acquaintance

Instructions ~ Listen to each conversation: did the two speakers:

		S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
Start	~ say hello? ~ use an opening gambit? ~ talk about a shared situation or experience?								
Continue	~ ask questions? ~ seek clarification? ~ encourage? ~ tell an anecdote/recount?								
Finish	~ say they had to go? ~ give a reason why? ~ say when they would meet again? ~ say goodbye?								

The conversation should be at least one minute long.
Each speaker should be easy to understand, even though they may make a few grammatical and pronunciation mistakes.

Adapted from: Banks, Peter (2000). 1 Measuring student performance in casual conversation. Section Two: Taking a close look at student performances. In de Silva Joyce, Helen (ed.). Teachers' Voices 6: Teaching casual conversation. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University

A typical completed observation sheet of a classroom dialogue reveals how much (or how little) students have come to understand the structure of casual conversations.

Frequently, a student observer would fail to check off the anecdote or recount, which is challenging to identify in real time and still hard to notice for students even when analyzing the script. They were generally highly accurate in noticing when a classmate missed one of the stages in the conversation. The record of multimodal participation is of course still incomplete, but even so it is evidence of the genre-based pedagogic discourse, with students not only learning to improve their casual conversations but also the ability to break down the language and structure. Together with the literacy is the application of the technology to capture the engagement of the students.

Conclusion

The complex semiotic landscape of the classroom has huge implications for the pedagogic function of texts, whether written down or spoken in casual conversations. Multimodal semiotic approaches supported by emerging technologies appear to engage students more and offer promising descriptions of the world around us. There is still so much more to be investigated and work to be done, especially when we realize that a classroom full of unique individuals cannot reach its language learning potential simply through instinct and our teaching experience. Explicit teaching of casual conversations does seem to represent a fruitful research direction.

REFERENCES

Banks, Peter (2000). 1 Measuring student performance in casual conversation. Section Two: Taking a close look at student performances. In de Silva Joyce, Helen (ed.). *Teachers' Voices 6: Teaching casual conversation*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University

Bezemer, J., Diamantopoulou, S., Jewitt, C., Kress, G., and Mavers, D. Using a Social Semiotic Approach to Multimodality: Researching Learning in Schools, Museums and Hospitals. *NCRM Working paper* (March 2012). Institute of Education: London, UK

Derewianka, B. (1996). *Exploring the writing of genres*. Royston: United Kingdom Reading Association.

de Silva Joyce, Helen (ed.). (2000). *Teachers' Voices 6: Teaching casual conversation*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University

Kress, G. (2010). Multimodality: *A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. UK: Routledge

Palmer, R. & Septina, N. (2013). Reflections on Using iPads for Teaching and Learning. *ETAS Vol. 30 #2*, Spring 2013. pp.71-73

Palmer, R. & Tann Yin Yann, R. (2015a). How can a mobile device be effectively utilised for studying in an e-learning context? *Hirao School of Management Review (Konan University) Vol.5*, 2015, pp.81-97

Palmer, R. & Tann Yin Yann, R. (2015b). Learner Use of Personal Learning Environments in Education. *Konan University, Education and Research Center for Information Science, Bulletin No. 14*, 2015, pp. 1-36

Rose, David. (2014). Analysing pedagogic discourse: an approach from genre and register. *Functional Linguistics 2014 1:11*

Introduction of researchers（Order of writing）

Keiko Yoshida　Associate Professor
Institute for Language and Culture
Konan University

Brent A. Jones　Professor
Hirao School of Management
Konan University

Mayumi Asaba　Fixed-Term Instructor
Hirao School of Management
Konan University

Roger Palmer　Associate Professor
Hirao School of Management
Konan University

2020年（令和2年）2月28日　発行

甲南大学総合研究所

神戸市東灘区岡本8丁目9番1号　（〒658-8501）

（非売品）