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From the Editor

Welcome to the fifth issue of Saitama Journal of Language Teaching. Five JALT Omiya Chapter members share results of their thinking, their research, or their experiences with you.

Jason White describes an academic speaking course design which imitates a trial. Takeshi Ishikawa suggests home-based assisted repeated reading as a method to enhance students’ reading skills. Masa Tsuneyasu investigates teachers’ corrective feedback types and students’ feedback preferences. Leander Hughes introduces LLEX, his new online tool for locating and studying unfamiliar vocabulary in a text. Mitchell Goodman recommends using physical movement in the classroom to motivate students and improve learning.

I hope that you will find SJLT of practical use in your classroom, or of theoretical interest in your research. However, SJLT has another goal: For all of us involved in this journal, be it as authors, reviewers, or editors, SJLT is an opportunity to develop professional, personal, or social skills. Writing, reviewing, giving feedback to authors, receiving constructive criticism from reviewers and dealing with it, editing, mentoring authors at early stages of their teaching or research career, networking – all these activities give us a chance to learn by doing and to develop ourselves and each other. With SJLT, we hope to create a stronger sense of community at JALT Omiya Chapter and to stimulate good communication and lively interaction between members.

I would like to remind prospective authors that SJLT editors are not only interested in papers on research or activities, but in other text types as well. How about submitting a book review or an interview? If you are wondering whether that unusual and creative type of text you are planning would ever be accepted by SJLT, please don’t hesitate to talk to us about it!

Ruth Kambartel

SJLT Chief Editor

rkambart@mail.saitama-u.ac.jp
Putting Truman on Trial: An Academic Speaking Course Plan

Jason White
Saitama University
gilalion@gmail.com

Material needed
1. Laptop computers or a computer lab.
4. Writing utensils.
5. Hand-held voice recorders.

Instructor preparation
1. Familiarize yourself with the historical context.
2. Study up on all the personalities listed in Appendix B.
3. Familiarize yourself with the basic tenets of the Geneva Conventions, accessed most easily at icrc.org.
4. Print out the handouts.
5. Recommended: prepare overheads or Power Point presentations to introduce the scenario and the key points of the course.

Further suggestions
1. Access to the Internet in the classroom.
2. Willingness to send and receive emails outside of class time.

Age group, language level
This course is designed for at least intermediate-level classes. At Saitama University, where this class was conducted, we judge academic speaking competence by a TOEIC score of 500 or higher. Ideal conditions for this course include wireless Internet access in the classroom, email, and students willing to engage in role-playing.

Objectives
The purpose of this course is to put American President Harry Truman on trial for crimes against humanity for his involvement in dropping two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, respectively. This topic immediately sparks interest in the students, for this is not a normal speaking course in which one simply prepares for a final debate or speech, nor is it a
class that runs over the same ground of hobbies or places to visit in Japan. For the students specifically, objectives include expanding general knowledge about and key vocabulary of the atomic bombings, as well as the speaking points of synthesis, extrapolation, inference/implication, and persuasion.

**Structure of the Course**

This course plan is broken into 8 sessions of 90 minutes each, following the university model. For instructors not teaching university, I would recommend breaking each session into two, thus making a total of 16 classes.

**The sessions**

*Overview*

Define the scenario as a military tribunal. Students adopt their roles and defend or prosecute Harry Truman. Truman also is given the chance to speak. Outline the general-knowledge facts of the case: the atomic bombings and President Harry Truman’s role in them.

1. Introduce key vocabulary. Use Appendix A or create something new. Practice pronunciation with them. Break the class into small groups and have them speak generally on the issue *before* expressing their own opinion. This teaches good rhetoric: being able to speak intelligently on an issue encourages an audience to pay more attention to later opinions.

2. Define the roles. Choose the tribunal judges, preferably an odd number. Recommended personalities are in Appendix B. Pass out to the tribunal Appendix B, handout 2. Compile information about war crimes from http://www.icrc.org. The tribunal makes a short speech explaining these crimes. The other personalities make short self-introductions. These impromptu speeches should be no more than two minutes.

3. Encourage students to bring books on the topics or a laptop so that they can access information from the Internet. Students consider their positions (i.e., for or against Truman), and the tribunal researches the Geneva Conventions. Break the class up into small groups for discussion time. Choose a leader for each group, and have them engage in mini-debates. Have them adopt their personas and consider these key questions: Was the bomb necessary? Did the ends justify the means? The tribunal should discuss how the Geneva Conventions apply to this case. What is the spirit of the Conventions? Make the outdated language of the Conventions easier to understand, using Appendix C.

4, 5, 6. Speech writing. Have the tribunal members break their opening speeches into (1) first Geneva Convention, (2) second Convention, (3) third Convention, and (4 & 5) facts of the case.
The witnesses prepare three-minute persuasive speeches. Focus on three key academic speaking techniques: implication/inference, persuasion, and extrapolation. Go beyond simply stating an opinion. Have them ask rhetorical questions in the opening of their speeches. Teach them to persuade by not simply reciting a list of facts. The students should use powerful, colorful, specific language. Some students’ personalities have limited information, so help the students extrapolate personality from available data.

The students should be emailing their drafts to the instructor so that s/he can help correct grammar and usage mistakes. In class, practice with the students, focusing on pronunciation, stress, and pacing. Allow other students to listen in, thus eliminating redundant mistakes.

7. The trial. Students are allowed to use note cards and no more. The tribunal gives opening remarks, and then the witnesses give their speeches.

8. The verdict. The tribunal gives one-paragraph speeches outlining their reasons, synthesizing the testimonies they had heard. The witnesses prepare reactions of at least two sentences for both possible verdicts.

9. Keep notes during the trial so that, during the wrap-up, you can point out specific examples of synthesis, extrapolation, inference/implication, and persuasion.

Conclusion
My students had a lot invested in this course, more than I expected they would. In my class, Truman was found not guilty by a vote of 3-2. Those supporting Truman cheered; those prosecuting him gasped. One student, playing Yamaguchi Tsutomu, stood up and yelled at the tribunal. With the amount of work the students put into their roles, their reactions reflected their sense of vindication and frustration, respectively. When a class pulls together to create such an in-depth project, they cannot help but take the verdict personally. With this success in mind, I would recommend this course for any instructor who has motivated students or is looking for a way to motivate the students.
Online Resources

4. The Decision to Drop the Atomic Bomb: <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/bomb/large/index.php>
Appendix A

Today’s Key Vocabulary: military, political, and scientific terms

Key military, political, and scientific vocabulary given to students in 1st session:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atomic bomb</th>
<th>World War II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire-bombing</td>
<td>Pacific Theater of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detonate / detonation</td>
<td>Scientific research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear weapon</td>
<td>Blast radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military importance</td>
<td>Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation</td>
<td>Civilian casualties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallout</td>
<td>Psychological weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash burns</td>
<td>Ultimatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrender</td>
<td>Ethical justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Powers</td>
<td>Victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis Powers</td>
<td>Invasion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions

Discuss with a partner or in a small group your knowledge of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, i.e., present another point of view. Then express your opinion about whether the bombings were necessary to bring an end to World War II, and explain why you think so.
Appendix B

*Roles: the important people of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings*

Harry Truman

- President of the United States, took office in 1945
- Artillery officer in World War I
- Gave executive order to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki
- Gave executive order to begin desegregation of the military
- Helped found the United Nations, enacted the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe

Self-introduction
Albert Einstein

- Theoretical physicist, father of modern physics
- Won 1921 Nobel Prize in Physics
- Did not directly participate in invention of atomic bomb but instrumental in facilitating its development
- Atomic bomb illustrated the E=mc² principle
- Promoted peace but not absolute pacifist

Self-introduction

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Robert Oppenheimer

- Theoretical physicist
- Scientific director of the Manhattan Project
- Developed world’s first atomic weapons
- Father of the Atomic Bomb
- Remembering the *Bhagavad Gita*: “Now I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds.”

Self-introduction
Paul Tibbets

- Pilot of the *Enola Gay*, the aircraft that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima
- Interviewed for documentary films in 1974, 1995, and 2005
- Said he sleeps peacefully every night
- Said he would drop the bomb again given the same circumstances

Self-introduction

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________
_______________________________________


Niels Bohr

- Won Nobel Prize in 1922 for contributions to understanding atomic structure and quantum mechanics
- Part of the Manhattan Project team
- One of the most influential physicists of the 20th century
- Collaborated with many top physicists at institute in Copenhagen

Self-introduction
Henry Stimson

- American Secretary of War during World War II
- In charge of atomic bomb development
- Advised Roosevelt and Truman on every aspect of the bomb
- Removed Kyoto from the military’s targeting list

Self-introduction
Yamaguchi Tsutomu

- Survived both the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings
- Only person officially recognized by Japanese government as being a double survivor
- Resident of Nagasaki, traveled to Hiroshima for business when bomb detonated
- Returned home, experienced second bombing

Self-introduction

__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________


Sasaki Sadako

- Resident of Hiroshima
- Contracted leukemia, what her mother called “an atom bomb disease”
- Folded 1000 paper cranes in order to be granted a wish, according to the Japanese saying
- Exhibit at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum stated she had completed 1000 cranes
- Died in hospital ten years after the bomb

Self-introduction

__________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
__________________________
Matsubara Miyoko

- One of the Hiroshima Maidens, a group of 25 young Japanese women disfigured by the atomic bomb
- Scars caused by severe burns marred faces and hands
- Brought to U.S. to undergo multiple reconstructive surgeries
- Outspoken advocate of nuclear disarmament
- Wants to see a world without war

Self-introduction

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

.
John Siemes

- Wrote a detailed eyewitness account of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima
- Until August 6th, only occasional bombs were dropped on Hiroshima, causing no great damage
- Other cities around destroyed, but Hiroshima was protected and people wondered why
- A flash of light, like a photograph; ten seconds later a wave of heat and shockwave that shatters windows
- Lived on the outskirts of Hiroshima

Self-introduction

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

______________________________
Konoe Fumimaro

- Three-time Prime Minister of Japan
- Believed he had a promising peace treaty with the U.S. before the bombs
- Helped bring down the Tojo government in 1944
- Advised the Emperor to begin negotiations to end World War II
- Recommendation rejected

Self-introduction

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________
_________________________________________
Tōjō Hideki

- Prime Minister of Japan, General in the Imperial Japanese Army
- Army Minister position held concurrently with office of Prime Minister
- Encouraged militaristic and nationalist education
- Approved of various eugenics measures
- Popular during early years of war, but Battle of Midway stole his support in government and military

Self-introduction

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suzuki Kantarō

- Prime Minister of Japan, Admiral in the Imperial Japanese Navy
- Key voice in favor of Japan's acceptance of the Potsdam Declaration and the end of World War II
- Called two unprecedented imperial conferences to help resolve split in Japanese Imperial Cabinet over terms of surrender
- Opposed military faction of cabinet which desired continuation of war

Self-introduction

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
Douglas MacArthur

- American general, prominent role in Pacific Theatre
- Fled Japanese invasion of the Philippines
- Awarded Medal of Honor
- After two years fighting in Pacific, returned to Philippines
- Accepted Japan’s surrender
- Oversaw the occupation of Japan

Self-introduction
Anami Korechika

- General in the Imperial Japanese Army
- War Minister at Japan’s surrender
- Believed Americans had only one bomb
- Wanted to continue war, despite destruction to cities and industrial capability
- Opposed talk of surrender, even after atomic bombings
- In favor of mainland invasion, cause massive casualties to evade surrender

Self-introduction
Tōgō Shigenori

- Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs
- Doubted Japan could succeed in war with U.S.
- Announced Japan would uphold Geneva Convention, even though they did not sign it
- One of the chief proponents for acceptance of the Potsdam Declaration

Self-introduction

________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________
Types of War Crimes

Class A: Crimes against peace
* planning, preparation, initiation, or waging of wars of aggression
* a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances
* participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing

Class B: War crimes
* violations of the laws or customs of war
* the murder, the ill-treatment or deportation of civilian residents of an occupied territory to slave labor camps
* the murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war
* the killing of hostages
* the wanton destruction of cities, towns and villages
* any devastation not justified by military or civilian necessity

Class C: Crimes against humanity
* particularly odious offences in that they constitute a serious attack on human dignity or grave humiliation or a degradation of one or more human beings
* not isolated or sporadic events but are part of a government policy or of a wide practice of atrocities tolerated or condoned by a government or a de facto authority
* murder, extermination, torture, rape, and political, racial, or religious persecution and other inhumane acts reach the threshold of crimes against humanity only if they are part of a widespread or systematic practice

Explanation
Appendix C

Small Group Work: discussions

Witnesses

Directions
In small groups, discuss whether your persona thinks the bomb was necessary or not. Decide if your persona believes the ends justified the means. Use vocabulary from Appendix A. The students had wireless Internet access in the classroom and were able to research their persona’s opinion. If the opinion was not clear, the student had to make a judgment call based on available evidence.

Tribunal Judges

Directions
In small groups, discuss how the Geneva Conventions may apply to the Truman case. Keep in mind that, in this mock scenario, the trial is taking place is 1945 or 1946.

1st Geneva Convention (1894)
- Wounded and sick and those who care for them, as well as places of said care, protected

2nd Geneva Convention (1906)
- Everything in 1st Convention
- Sanitary formations and volunteer aid societies protected

3rd Geneva Convention (1929)
- Everything in 1st and 2nd Conventions
- Prisoners of war to be protected and not mistreated
- Civilians attached to military protected as non-combatants (e.g., reporters)

4th Geneva Convention (1949)
- Everything in 1st-3rd Conventions
- Protection of all civilians and non-combatants
  - A direct effect of the atomic bombs?
  - Valid for the timing of our tribunal?
**Jason White** has lived and taught English in Japan for 14 years. He received his Master of Arts from California State University and has been employed at Saitama University since the spring of 2007. He is responsible for TOEIC preparation, academic speaking, academic writing, and academic lecture courses. His interests lie in mythology, rock music history, poetry, musicals, Medieval philosophy, and ancient Rome. Under the pen name *Adonis Devereux*, he is the co-author of a novel available from Evernight Publishing. Under his real name, he has co-authored a short story available from Nemesis Publishing. Jason lives in Saitama City with his wife and six daughters.
Repeated Readings as a Remedial Aid for Students

Takeshi Ishikawa

Rikkyo University

itakesh@opal.plala.or.jp

I have witnessed quite a few Japanese students with improper reading strategies, such as applying Japanese word order to English sentences. Their eyes constantly and busily move forward and backward just like board game pieces being advanced and pulled back before reaching the goal. This paper investigates how home-based assisted repeated reading enhances students’ reading skills. The study took place in a university TOEIC course in the metropolitan Tokyo area in 2010. The students were assigned a series of monologues to listen to and then scripts to read aloud at home over a three-month period. The analysis of the data shows that not only did their reading rate improve dramatically, but so did their attitude toward learning English as well as their confidence.

Introduction

According to Chall’s (1996) stages of reading development, after developing automaticity in decoding, we need to unglue ourselves from print and make use of prosodic features such as
stress and intonation while reading. Kuhn and Stahl (2003) also cite prosody as a primary component of fluency along with accurate decoding and automatic word recognition, and explain that it "includes appropriately chunking groups of words into phrases or meaningful units" (p. 4). If we keep struggling at this stage, paying too much attention to decoding, very little attention will be paid to comprehension of the text (Allington, 1983), and consequently, we cannot proceed to the next stage where we start reading for the new (Chall, 1996), which is what most readings are for. A lot of students spend years struggling with decoding and chunking, and are trapped in the vicious circle that Nuttall (1996) mentions: Those who are poor at reading are not willing to read much, and because they do not read, they do not find reading enjoyable. Day and Bamford (1998) say that you improve your reading skills only through actual reading where you learn various pieces of knowledge prerequisite to being a fluent reader. What can teachers do to help students develop suprasegmental or prosodic features of language and increase fluency, leading them to the point where they can enjoy reading?

Two methods designed to help those struggling readers are assisted reading (Heckelman, 1969) and repeated reading (Dahl, 1979; Samuels, 1979). Assisted reading, formerly called the neurological impress method (Heckelman, 1969) was a remedial strategy for disfluent readers, in which a teacher and a student read the same passage orally. Hollingsworth (1970) found that assisted reading is quite useful to help remedial readers improve fluency. Repeated reading, on the other hand, is a newer method where learners read a given passage repeatedly in order to develop fluency as well as accuracy. Dowhower (1987) found that repeated reading led to greatly improved speech pauses and intonation, and Herman (1985) found that repeated reading transferred to materials that learners had not read previously. Dowhower (1987) compared the effects of two applied repeated reading methods: assisted and unassisted repeated reading. Readers read materials repeatedly with help from the tape-recorded model, or they read independently. The result shows that both approaches are effective in improving reading rate, accuracy, and comprehension, and that the gains are transferable to similar but unrehearsed reading material. The study also found out that assisted repeated reading facilitated more
prosodic development. Rasinski (1990), having found no significant difference between the two interventions, maintains that since assisted repeated reading is easier to implement, it seems to be a more efficient measure in helping readers improve fluency. Kuhn and Stahl (2003) also support the assisted version as it can help learners become independent because the model (e.g. recorded material) provides scaffolding that enables them to go up to the next stage. In Blum, Koskinen, Tennant, Parker, Straub and Curry’s (1995) study dealing with home-based assisted repeated reading (using audio cassettes), they found that the training prompted students to be able to read fluently and accurately and that the participants of the survey mentioned they found the activity motivating. In Taguchi, Takayasu-Mass and Gorsuch’s (2004) 17-week study, ten Japanese students engaged in 42 repeated reading sessions in which they read the same passage five times and moved on to a new passage in the next session. The result shows that "learners' fluency increased not only within RR sessions, but also over the course of the RR treatment" (Taguchi, et al., 2004, p. 87) and "the reading gains from practiced passages were transferred to new unpracticed passages" (p. 87). According to the questionnaire administered after the final session, 6 out of 10 participants said that each activity helped them enjoy reading English. Eight said that reading while listening enhanced their comprehension, and four said repeated reading improved their listening skills (p. 86).

In the case of Japanese learners of English, beside the difficulties in decoding and suprasegmentals, they have another big problem to overcome: their heavy reliance on Japanese language and its word order. Some strongly believe reading is nothing but translating, and as a result, they cannot read text from left to right. This explains, for some part, why many Japanese learners find it difficult to listen to monologues (such as part four of the TOEIC test). They apply Japanese word order (I ran into an old friend the other day.→I / the other day / an old friend / ran into), and in worse cases, employ a more complicated version of the reading (I / the / other / day / an / old…). Bad habits such as these understandably hinder their listening skills.
Study

Method

In this university TOEIC course, one of the course requirements to pass is to accomplish weekly homework assignments; listen, repeat, and copy. The students are required to listen to a monologue (part four of the TOEIC test), then read the script aloud, and then copy it down in a notebook three times a day, five days a week, for a period of three months. The assigned monologue changes weekly. At the beginning of the course, the teacher gave the students a handout explaining various ways of reading aloud such as repeating, overlapping (reading aloud while listening to an audio recording), eye-shadowing (reading aloud, following the rhythm and intonation of the audio recording), shadowing and looking-up-and-say (you hold a script, memorize a manageable chunk, look up at a mirror or wall, and say it). With the hope to help the students keep track of their submission progress and motivate them, the teacher also gave them a fancy hand-made card (with twelve boxes on it for stamps) that looked like the ones used in a stamp rallies. At every class meeting, the students handed in their notebooks and got stamps. A questionnaire about their reading habits with 6 items to be evaluated on a Likert scale (in Japanese, see Appendix A) was administered to 22 sophomores (2 males and 20 females) at the first class meeting with the aim of assessing the overall trends of the class. Then, four students (1 male and 3 females), who circled the “okay” sign in the questionnaire indicating that they could participate in this qualitative study, were selected. (These four were the only students who volunteered for this study.) The teacher promised a reward (a book gift card) as a token of gratitude. The students e-mailed a weekly journal for a period of three months. At the end of the course, the same questionnaire was administered to the four students. Also, the teacher tape-recorded the readings of the four at the beginning and the end of the semester using the same script (a 100-word passage from part four of the TOEIC test). During the semester, the four did not have a chance to read and prepare this script.
The teacher, also being an interviewer for the Step Test, The Society for Testing English Proficiency, employed its scoring system. A student’s score is evaluated based on accuracy and fluency including the following: pronunciation of individual words, accent, rhythm, intonation as well as whether you read in sentence groups and understand what you are reading. As Kuhn & Stahl (2003) state, having students read the text aloud is one way to make visible what is otherwise invisible: students' comprehension of the text. If learners can utilize appropriate phrasing, intonation, and stress, it seems to indicate that they are fluent readers (Chomsky, 1978; Samuels, Schermer, & Reinking, 1992). Along with phrasing, intonation, and stress, chunking is an important feature of prosody. A number of researchers including Cromer (1970) and O’Shea and Sindelar (1983) found that learners using text segmented by phrase units improved comprehension. One of the aims of utilizing audio materials as assistance in this study is to get the students to realize where to place a pause, and to be aware of chunking.

**The Overall Trend of the Class**

Two major findings were obtained from the questionnaire at the beginning of the course. First, approximately 77% of the 22 students only sometimes, rarely, or never read English from left to right without their eyes moving back for translation (See Appendix B Table 1). Second, approximately 50 % of the students sometimes, rarely, or never read chunk by chunk (See Appendix B Table2). This trend seems to provide legitimate reasons for the teacher to implement assisted repeated reading into his class. If students get familiar with the text by reading repeatedly, they can increase automaticity in decoding, and with an audio CD, they can learn prosodic features of the language, which is a component of reading fluency. What is also expected is that repeated reading instills in students a proper cognitive strategy because while listening and reading aloud, you cannot possibly move your eyes forward and backward trying to translate.
The Case Studies

Listening to, reading aloud, and copying down English on a daily basis seemed to have prompted the four students (Yuka, Noriko, Koji, and Emma, all pseudonyms) to improve their ways of reading English.

The Change in Yuka

Yuka almost always read chunk by chunk, but did not read in proper order. In response to the questionnaire item 1 (I read English from left to right without my eyes moving back for translation), the answer was a surprising “never,” in April, but for the second questionnaire in July, the answer was “sometimes.” She struggled at first, but spent a lot of time on the assignment. Yuka’s journal entry for April 27: “At first, I was wondering if I would be able to finish my daily homework of reading-aloud, but once I got used to it, I felt I could continue doing it.” May 31: “My reading speed is getting faster and faster even when I am reading something other than the TOEIC textbook.” Yuka’s final journal entry included the following: “This homework gradually revealed my problem; my inefficient way of reading.” The comparison of the 1st (April) and 2nd (July) reading-aloud exam shows that Yuka’s reading has improved. In April, Yuka’s speech was a little halting, and she was not able to articulate “15” different from “50”. The reading time was 33 seconds, and the point score was 4 out of 5 in the Step Test scale. In July, Yuka’s reading left nothing to be desired. The reading time was 30 seconds and the point score was 5 out of 5.

The Change in Noriko

Like Yuka, Noriko read chunk by chunk, but was not in the habit of reading in the proper order. In response to the questionnaire item 1 (I read English from left to right without my eyes moving back for translation), the response was “sometimes” in April, but “often” in July. Noriko’s journal entry for April 27: “I noticed that if I learn correct pronunciations of words, I can memorize the words with ease.” May 10: “I find learning English using sound attractive and effective. It helps me foster a better understanding of the English language.” June 22: “I
became aware of linking sounds in audio English.” June 30: “The speed with which I read English became faster.” Noriko’s final journal entry included the following: “One of the remarkable changes I had through this activity is that I became less fearful of listening to English. I took the TOEIC test the other day, and I didn’t lose concentration midway. I can say that nothing is more pleasing than being able to comprehend what is spoken in English” (July 13). The comparison of the 1st and 2nd reading-aloud exam shows that Noriko’s reading has gotten better. In the first exam, Noriko’s reading was far from satisfactory and there were a lot of mistakes (1. “May 3rd” was read as “May three”; 2. “two thirty” was read as “two o’clock thirty”; 3. “your” was read as “you”). The reading time was 39 seconds, and she got 2 points out of 5 (not up to the mark) in the Step Test scale. In the second exam, Noriko’s reading was still a little clumsy, but showed some improvement. The reading time was 34 seconds and the point score was 3 (a pass mark) out of 5.

The Change in Koji

In contrast with Yuka and Noriko, Koji was in the habit of reading in proper order, but was not used to reading chunk by chunk. The response for the first questionnaire shows that Koji “sometimes” read chunk by chunk, but for the second one, “often.” Koji’s journal entry for April 24: “The longer a sentence is, however simple it is, the more difficult it is for me to listen to it.” It seems that Koji’s word-by-word reading habit prevented him from listening to long utterances. During the course, Koji devoted himself to reading aloud, especially using look-up-and-say, which is thought to be useful for improving chunk-by-chunk reading. Koji wrote, “Today I was able to do look-up-and-say with longer sentences than before.” (May 17). May 25: “The sentences I studied during reading-aloud popped out of my mouth in other English classes.” He was beginning to understand the usefulness of reading-aloud. About copying a script down and reading aloud simultaneously, Koji wrote, “By looking at the text and reading aloud at the same time, I began to get a feel for English and became more capable of listening to English” (June 2). Koji’s hard work started to pay off in the area of writing, too. June 22: “Now I have become able to write complex sentences thanks to this activity.” The
June 6 journal entry brought another piece of good news: “I started reading for pleasure, and surprisingly, I can comprehend well what is written even if I read 20% faster than before. Also, it has become easier for me to hear English and I do not get tired much. It used to be that I was able to comprehend about 50% of what the recorded speaker said, but now I hear with the accuracy of 80%.” The final journal entry included the following: “Look-up-and-say helped me read chunk-by-chunk and more smoothly. It was fun, because it felt as if I was actually saying what was on my mind.” (July 13). Here is the comparison of the 1st and 2nd reading-aloud exams. In the April exam, Koji was not able to read time expressions (“two thirty o’clock”), and he read in a singsong manner. The reading time was 48 seconds, and the point score was 3 out of 5 in the Step Test scale. In the July exam, Koji made no mistakes and his reading was smoother. The reading time was 38 seconds, and the point score was 4 out of 5.

The Change in Emma

Like Koji, Emma always read English in proper order, but read word by word. In response to the questionnaire item 2 (I read chunk by chunk instead of reading word by word), for the April questionnaire 1, the answer was “sometimes,” but “very often” for the July questionnaire. Shortly after beginning to read aloud, Emma realized the pleasure and usefulness of reading chunk by chunk. Emma’s journal entry for April 27: “Because I read aloud English chunk by chunk, the meaning of each chunk came into my brain smoothly.” Journal entry for May 26: “Now I can hear function words that receive little stress which I failed to hear before.” Emma’s final journal entry included the following: “I have more confidence in listening than before. I took the TOEIC test the day before, and I think I did better on the listening section. Reading-aloud and copying-down helped me memorize spelling too. Also, as information gets into my brain through my eyes and ears, I can relearn English sentence patterns with much effectiveness.” The comparison of the 1st and 2nd reading-aloud exams shows that Emma’s reading has changed for the better. In the first exam, Emma read clumsily and was not able to read a date properly (“May three”). The reading time was 45
seconds, and the point score was 3 out of 5 in the Step Test scale. In the second exam, Emma’s reading was perfect. The reading time was 33 seconds and the point score was 5 out of 5.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Repeated reading to increase fluency seems to be effective, but what causes its effectiveness is not clear. One possibility is that it is the amount of reading and not the repetition that leads learners to improve. Some research has found that increasing the amount of text learners read leads to an improvement in their reading ability (Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988; Berliner, 1981; Taylor, Frye, & Maruyama, 1990). Homan, Klesius, and Hite (1993) found that as long as a learner reads the same amount of text, whether it be a small number of texts read repeatedly or a bigger number of texts read once, there is no significant difference in the improved reading rate of the students. In the research I have carried out, the reading skills of the students improved a lot through repeated reading.

In baseball, it is unclear which has a greater effect on a batter, doing swing practice every day or having a tough duel with a pitcher in a real game. It is similarly unclear what is the main contributor to improved reading ability. What I can say is that reading repeatedly is much easier than constantly finding new material of the right level. On top of that, what is important, especially when it comes to Japanese learners of English, seems to be how teachers can help students take it to heart that bad reading habits can block their growth as readers, and to lend them a helping hand. An assisted version of repeated reading strikes me as a practical form of training in that it enables learners to train themselves independently.
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Appendix A

The Questionnaire (translated from Japanese)

1. I read English from left to right without my eyes moving back for translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I read chunk by chunk instead of reading word by word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

The Overall Trend of the Class

Table 1. Questionnaire item No.1 “I read English from left to right without my eyes moving back for translation.”

Table 2. Questionnaire item No.2 “I read chunk by chunk instead of reading word by word.”
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Teachers’ tendencies and learners’ preferences regarding corrective feedback types
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This study, conducted in a university in Japan, examines the types of feedback used by a teacher in one EFL classroom, and her students’ feedback preferences. After discussing effective communication and corrective feedback in EFL classrooms, this paper explains the classroom observation in this study. It is aiming at: (1) acknowledging the tendencies in the teacher’s error correction, and (2) understanding the students’ corrective feedback preferences. This research uses Yucel’s class observation framework (2000) for quantitative data for (1), and a questionnaire for (2). The results reveal that the teacher used an indirect type of feedback. Students, however, expressed an interest to receive direct types of feedback. Finally, the paper makes some suggestions for error correction in response to the results.

Introduction

Communication is achieved with a variety of resources and undertaken for a purpose. In the language classroom setting, the primary purpose of communication is a pedagogic one. Usually, the teacher knows the language; the learners do not (Brown & Rodgers, 2002). Therefore, classroom communication is clearly in the control of the teacher (Ellis, 2011). Nunan (2003) adds that teachers play an important role in shaping classroom discourse and in maximizing opportunities for learning. Students, however, learn best in their preferred class atmosphere (Brown & Rodgers, 2002). In a classroom with lots of laughter and a comfortable atmosphere, learning can occur successfully. Good communication between teachers and students leads to effective learning.

Brown and Rodgers (2002) point out that every communication situation has a potential for conflict. To avoid negative interaction with students, teachers should pay extra attention when they give feedback, especially when they deal with students’ errors. Corrective feedback is one of the features that teachers need to be very aware of and possibly modify (Ellis, 2011).

Ellis (1997) points out three good reasons for focusing on errors: (1) It is important to ask “Why do learners make errors?”, (2) it is useful to know what kind of errors learners produce, and (3) errors may help students’ language acquisition. For Chaudron, corrective feedback is “any
reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvements of the learners’ utterance” (1977, p. 31).

Corrective feedback options can be divided into two types: implicit and explicit (Ellis, 2008; 2011). Also, Ellis (1990) claims that some errors should be ignored but others ought to be corrected:

1. Distinguish mistakes from errors and treat them differently.
2. Correct global, not local errors.
3. Correct errors that affect the overall comprehensibility of an utterance.
5. Correct errors relating to the learner’s next stage of development.

Concerning 1, Ellis distinguishes errors and mistakes as follows:

“Errors reflect gaps in a learner’s knowledge; they occur because the learner does not know what is correct. Mistakes reflect occasional lapses in performance; they occur because, in a particular instance, the learner is unable to perform what he or she knows” (1997, p. 17).

Concerning 2, Ellis (1997) explains that global errors violate the overall structure of a sentence, whereas local errors affect only a single constituent in the sentence.

Corrective feedback can be explained from the perspectives of sociocultural theory (SCT). Ellis elaborates on the importance of scaffolding: “Learners use the discourse to help them produce utterances that they would not be able to produce on their own” (1997, p. 48). According to SCT, corrective feedback is the process from other-regulation to self-regulation through scaffolding (Ellis, 2008).

It is also worth noting that teachers’ beliefs about corrective feedback play an important role. On the other hand, it is crucial to acknowledge students’ preferences. Tsui (2004) mentions that establishing and sharing common ground between teachers and students is effective for classroom interaction. Yoshida (2008) found a difference between teachers’ and students’ preferences: teachers have a tendency to correct students using recasts, whereas students prefer to have the chance to self-correct. To seek for successful corrective feedback, mutual effort and understanding are crucial factors for teachers and students.
Method
This study explores teachers’ tendencies of error correction in an adult EFL classroom and students’ error correction preferences. The research questions are:

1. Which types of error corrections did the teacher use frequently?
2. Do students and teacher have similar error correction preferences?

Observation is an effective way to monitor interactions in order to create better classroom settings. It is important for teachers to examine their own language input by audio- or video-taping lessons for self-critique (Walsh, 2002). When reviewing the recorded data, teachers can evaluate their use of language in the exchanges and grow professionally towards better communication with their students. Thus, in this small study, one class was video-taped and the transcribed data were analyzed depending on categories based on Yucel’s (2000) framework. In addition, participants answered a questionnaire regarding their favorite types of corrective feedback (n=36).

Participants
The participants in this study were 36 first-year students (30 male, 6 female) of engineering at a university in Japan. They were all Japanese and were about 19 years of age. With respect to their English proficiency, previous test results confirmed that they excelled in receptive skills (listening and reading), but performed poorly with regard to productive skills (speaking and writing). They had studied English from junior high school, and their average TOEIC test score taken in April 2011 was about 330 out of 990.

The teacher was the author of this paper, a Japanese female with 7 years of experience in teaching English at tertiary levels. She was curious about classroom interaction with her students, especially corrective feedback. During the audio-recording session, she interacted with students naturally and did not pay extra attention to her utterances. The audio device was placed at the back during a normal class session.

Tasks
This class was designed mainly for communication and improving learners’ speaking and listening abilities. It also aimed at raising the TOEIC score. An additional objective of this class was to achieve a fair degree of grammatical competence and vocabulary development.

For the lesson in this study, students had been asked to do TOEIC grammar exercises as homework, and a check of the results was conducted during the class. Since this was a feedback session for form-and-accuracy contexts, the teacher overwhelmingly reacted to the student
results and explained grammatical mistakes. The main sequence in the lesson was: (1) learner errors, (2) teacher feedback, and (3) learner uptake with repair.

**Data collection and coding**
In June 2011, the class was audio-recorded during a normal class session, and the several minutes of recording were transcribed (see Appendix 1). Using Yucel’s observation data (2000), types of correction were analyzed: in-class instances based on type of correction and percentage for each category (see Table 1). Yucel used this framework, an adaptation of Chaudron’s typology of teacher talk (1988), to compare learners’ preferences with teacher practices. Yucel identified the following 12 types of corrective feedback: negation, repetition with change, prompt, explanation, question, transfer, disapprove, repeat (explicit), repeat (implicit), altered questions, ignore, and provide and expand.

To answer the second research question, a questionnaire was administered in June 2011. Students were asked to choose the best corrective feedback among 12 types (see Appendix 3). The original Yucel system was changed and the teacher explained each item in Japanese. The questionnaire was distributed to the participants and completed by them during the same class session.

**Results and discussion**
The first research question was: Which types of error correction did the teacher use, and how often did she use them? To calculate the frequency, the number of the teacher’s utterances was counted. Table 1 presents the teacher’s error-correction behavior. Of the twelve types of feedback, the teacher had an inclination to use the question type of correction quite a few times, for example:

S: …
T: Flight is ~, the flight leaves ~. You have to have a present tense. 両方, 現在形ですね。Leave ではなく、Leave
に けませんね。Please focus on the third person, present, and singular form. So the answer is? (question) Kou, number

5. Give me your answer.
S: C.

The explanation type came second, for example:

S: Pardon? … Ah, pardon? I beg your pardon?
T: OK. Please give me one verb to express “make a reservation.” We have three, two more ways to say 「予約をする。」
(explanation) The answer is book. Book means to make a reservation. One more?
S: Reserve.
The prompt type followed, for example:

S: C.
T: C is wrong. Arrive…(prompt)? “Arrive to” is mistake so what do you put after arrive?
S: …
T: “Arrive at” or you can say “arrive in.” Either one is fine. Arrive at or arrive in. So starting from number 1, so the answer is “arrive …..”(prompt)?

Further details about the teacher’s error-correction behavior are provided in Appendix 2.

A possible interpretation of these results is that the following beliefs of the teacher mean a lot: (1) people usually prefer to put their own errors right rather than to be corrected by someone else (Seedhouse, 2004), and (2) friendly discourse and friendly environment are important when monitoring students’ output (Foster & Ohta, 2005). Following SCT, this teacher wants to focus on the process of learning: assisting students in order to have them notice their errors (Ellis, 2011). The teacher also chose to avoid potentially face-threatening and discouraging detours from the subject of the interaction.

The results above are similar to Lyster & Ranta (1997) and Yoshida (2008). According to these researchers, teachers have a strong tendency to use types of correction in the following order of frequency: recasts, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction and finally repetition. Ellis (2011) argues that the most frequent types of error correction are being used by teachers to make learners feel less offended. From sociocultural views, scaffolding – teacher’s assistance – helps learners with self-correction. Learner uptake and creating a Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), one of the key constructs in SCT, lead to successful acquisition (Ellis, 2011). According to Ellis, ZPD refers to a site of potential development where learners are helped to perform a skill collaboratively.
Table 1: Teacher error-correction behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of correction</th>
<th>In-class instances</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition with change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat (explicit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat (implicit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered questions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide and expand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Yucel 2000, p. 150-1)

Table 2 represents questionnaire data on error correction preference. The answer to the second research question is that there were significant differences in error correction preference between teacher and students. Table 2 shows that 27 students were in favor of the explicit type of correction, that is, negation. This finding supports that adult learners expect and want to be corrected directly (de Bot, 1996; Walsh, 2006). In form and accuracy contexts, most students expressed that a clue with no correction is not helpful. Instead, students need more specific advice. This result is similar to Seedhouse (2004). Explanation, prompt, and repetition with change followed respectively (see Appendix 3 for more details).

Table 2: Types of correction and number of students (n=36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of correction</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition with change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Yucel 2000, p. 150-1)
To summarize, there is a huge gap between the teacher and the students. This study shows that the teacher personally did not have a preference for the negation type. This is supported by the idea of undesirability of explicit corrections (Ur, 1996), and the concept of Humanistic Approach (Ellis, 2011). On the contrary, direct feedback is popular among students. Indirect error correction provides some ambiguous and confusing interpretations to students, and they may not understand their errors. Learners think that indirect ways of correction take more time. The author remembers that one student freely commented during a casual conversation: “I just need correct answers and explicit explanations from the teacher.”

**Conclusion**

There are some limitations to this study. Only one researcher got involved in reviewing and coding all data, so it does not ensure research validity and reliability. This should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of the questionnaire. Also, proficiency level greatly influences classroom interaction. Low-intermediate students probably need more support and input from teachers than advanced ones. Generalization from this study is therefore difficult.

However, the present data produced the following tentative conclusion regarding error treatment. First, it is important for teachers to formulate their own policy for correcting students’ errors. Every teacher has their own beliefs regarding corrective feedback (Folse, 2006). It would be ideal if teachers’ beliefs made corrective feedback more effective. Error correction is a complicated interaction and it requires a lot of effort and expertise (Ellis, 2011). Ellis continues that no type of corrective feedback is superior to other types. It seems that a balance, using different types of feedback rather than overusing particular types of feedback, is one of the successful points for classroom interaction.

Second, classroom observation is a powerful tool to recognize a teacher’s typical oral tendencies. Walsh (2002; 2006) suggests that teachers need to be more proactive in their self-observation of teacher talk. Classroom observation would provide teachers with useful information about how to develop communicative interaction and to ensure that their students learn better in the classroom. This way, teachers can monitor their use of language to optimize learners’ learning experiences.

Third, sharing comfortable classroom interactions provides effective learning. An important issue is how much common ground is shared between the teacher and the students in the classroom (Tsui, 2004). Furthermore, teachers need to openly discuss the use of corrective feedback with students. Teachers will not hesitate to correct students’ errors directly if they know students would like to get explicit feedback.
References


------------- (2011, June). Classroom interaction and second language learning. Distinguished lectures at Showa Women’s University, Tokyo, Japan.


**Appendix 1**

*Extract from a lesson recorded at a university in Japan, June 2011.*

Task: Checking the homework – grammar exercises for TOEIC

1 T: I would like to check your homework. I gave you, ah, four-page homework which was page 32. Please open your textbook to page 32. Can anybody tell me the number, ah, the number one, the answer of number one?

S1: B

T: B. The number one is B. Yoshihiro, number two is…

5 S2: C

T: Very nice. The number two is C. Marina, number three?

S3: A.

T: Good. A. Number four, Atsuki.

S4: Number four?

10 T: Page 32, number four.

S4: Number four, number four is B.

T: B? The answer is B.

S4: あ、当たり。

T: Akinori, number five.

15 S5: A

T: Very nice. The answer is A. Number six is, Ryo?

S6: B

T: Say it again?

S6: B

20 T: The answer is B. One more time, starting number one, D, C, A, B, A, D. Number seven, Takayuki

S7: B.

T: Ok, B. Chicago. The answer is B. Number eight, Tomohiro?

S8: A

T: Very nice. The number eight, the number eight is A. Number nine, Yoshihiro.

25 S9: B
T: Very nice. The number nine is B. Hiroko, number ten?

S10: A

T: A. Good job. Number eleven, Takashi.

S11: C

30 T: Very nice. The answer is B. Number twelve, Ryo.

S12: …

T: The answer is …

S13: B

T: Very nice. The answer is B. Number thirteen, another Ryo.

35 S14: D

T: D. One more time, starting from number seven, D, A, D, A, C, B, D.

T: Next page, I also give you homework. Tomohiro, page 34, number 1. Where did you find a mistake?

S15: C.

T: C. How did you correct this mistake. C is not necessary so please take out will. will は要りませんね。これは、もう does が入っているので加簡して will を取って下さいね。will が無しですね。What time does the train for Jamestown leave?

T: Number 2. Anybody?

S: …

T: Number 2 is Idiom. 「予約がある」っていうのは take a reservation ではなくて、「予約を持っている。」 have a reservation. Have a reservation is an idiom so please remember. Taichi, can you give me other verbs to say “make a reservation”. Two verbs?

S16: Pardon? … Ah, pardon? I beg your pardon?

T: Ok. Please give me one verb to express “make a reservation.” We have three, two more ways to say 「予約をする。」 The answer is book. Book means to make a reservation. One more?

S17: Reserve.

50 T: Reserve. Make a reservation, book, and reserve mean the same meaning. すべて「予約をする」という意味ですね。Number 3. Where is mistake? Daiki.

S18: …

T: PM 9:30, they do not usually say 9:30, 9:30 PM. PM or AM come after the time. 9:30 PM or 9:30 AM. How about number 4? Wataru, give me your answer.

55 S19: …

T: Flight is ~, the flight leaves ~. You have to have a present tense. 両方、現在形ですね。Leave ではない、Leave に S けますね。Kou, number 5. Give me your answer.

S20: C.

T: C is wrong. Arrive…? “Arrive to” is mistake so what do you put after arrive?

60 S20: …

T: “Arrive at” or you can say “arrive in.” Either one is fine. Arrive at or arrive in. So starting from number 1, so the answer is arrive …..?.

C: Students read sentences after the teacher.
Appendix 2

**Teacher error-correction behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of teacher error correction</th>
<th>Type of correction</th>
<th>In-class instances</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not say PM 9:30, say 9:30 PM</td>
<td>1. Negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be arriving at 9:30 PM</td>
<td>2. Repetition with change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be arriving at ...</td>
<td>3. Prompt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM and AM come after time in English.</td>
<td>4. Explanation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you say 午後9時半？</td>
<td>5. Question</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students?</td>
<td>6. Transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mmmmmmm</td>
<td>7. Disapprove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please repeat the sentence.</td>
<td>8. Repeat (explicit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td>9. Repeat (implicit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again. When will you be arriving?</td>
<td>10. Altered question</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really? Where will you be staying?</td>
<td>11. Ignore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After you will be arriving at 9:30 PM at Tokyo, where will you go?</td>
<td>12. Provide and expand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher error-correction behavior (context: university-level English class in Japan) (Adapted from Yucel 2000, p.150-1)

Appendix 3

**Learner error-correction preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of teacher error correction</th>
<th>Type of correction</th>
<th># of Ss</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not say PM 9:30, say 9:30 PM</td>
<td>1. Negation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be arriving at 9:30 PM</td>
<td>2. Repetition with change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be arriving at ...</td>
<td>3. Prompt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM and AM come after time in English.</td>
<td>4. Explanation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you say 午後9時半？</td>
<td>5. Question</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students?</td>
<td>6. Transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mmmmmmm</td>
<td>7. Disapprove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please repeat the sentence.</td>
<td>8. Repeat (explicit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td>9. Repeat (implicit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again. When will you be arriving?</td>
<td>10. Altered question</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really? Where will you be staying?</td>
<td>11. Ignore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After you will be arriving at 9:30 PM at Tokyo, where will you go?</td>
<td>12. Provide and expand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Error-correction preference of 18-19 year-old English language learners (Context: same as Appendix 2.) (Adapted from Yucel 2000, p.150-1)
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The following investigates 50 university English students’ study habits after being introduced to LLEX, a new online tool for locating and studying the unfamiliar vocabulary in a text. Results of a questionnaire administered to students at the end of the semester following the introduction of LLEX indicated that the majority of students frequently used the program to prepare for their weekly textbook vocabulary quizzes despite only minimal initial encouragement to do so from the instructor. This finding, in addition to moderate significant and near significant partial correlations between LLEX use and cumulative vocabulary quiz scores (after controlling for base English proficiency), indicates the potential of LLEX as an efficient means for learning new vocabulary in preparation for reading a text.

Introduction

Mastering a foreign language requires using it to comprehend meaning, and learners will only do this if the meaning they are attempting to comprehend is enjoyable or otherwise useful enough to warrant the effort required to comprehend it (Krashen, 1997). Language learning further requires encountering the same words again and again in different contexts before they can be fully acquired (Nation, 1990). Thus derives the current widespread interest among language teachers in extrinsic reading, or the reading of a large quantity of longer texts for pleasure.

Unfortunately, for EFL learners whose vocabulary is less than 5,000 words, most authentic texts in the target language are simply too difficult to enjoy enough to sustain the effort needed to comprehend them (Hirsh & Nation, 1992). Graded readers represent one attempt to solve this problem by offering learners popular content that has been lexically and syntactically adapted to learners’ current level of proficiency. In theory, learners can gradually move from lower to higher graded readers until they are finally able to read un-simplified texts well enough to sustain their interest in completing them.

However, graded readers have their own drawbacks. First, they are costly, especially if one truly wishes to offer the variety of books necessary to satisfy the often diverse interests and proficiency levels of one’s students. Although there are now more graded reader versions of popular texts on the market than ever, there are still many more popular texts which have not been and may never be converted to graded readers. Of course, teachers could always attempt to
write their own graded readers, but this involves an immense investment of time and effort with no guarantee of a pay-off in student readership.

Alternatively, teachers can attempt to make authentic texts more accessible through scaffolding them with glosses or even simply teaching students how to use a dictionary so that students can provide their own scaffolding. Both strategies have been shown to improve the learning of new words over simply encountering them in a text and guessing their meanings (Hulstijn & Greidanus, 1996). However, glosses still require a large amount of teacher investment while limiting the texts available to students to whatever the teacher is able to prepare prior to class. Although dictionary use allows students greater freedom in selecting texts, it risks turning the enjoyment of a text into a dull language learning exercise as students take time away from the flow of the story to look up words or otherwise note the words so that they can be looked up after reading. Pre-teaching difficult vocabulary is also recommended (Hulstijn & Greidanus, 1996), but this carries with it the same teacher work load and limitation of text choice as adding glosses.

**LLEX**

Leander’s Lexicon Extractor (LLEX) resulted from my struggle to sidestep the above roadblocks to promoting extensive reading among EFL learners. LLEX is a free online tool to assist learners in reading authentic texts for pleasure. The light, browser-based program extracts the words from any digital text and groups them according to their estimated level of difficulty from easy/common to difficult/rare, turning each listed word into a link leading to that word’s translations, English definitions, pronunciation, synonyms, or Wikipedia entry. LLEX can also display the word-links in context, color-coding them according to their estimated difficulty levels. LLEX estimates each word’s level of difficulty primarily based on that word’s frequency: essentially, the more infrequent a word is, the higher its difficulty level. LLEX currently features six levels. Users can display all levels of the words from their text or choose only the levels they think need the most attention.

LLEX can be used in a variety of ways, but its ultimate intended purpose is to allow EFL readers to find and study unfamiliar words in a text they wish to read before they actually attempt to read that text. In other words, LLEX takes on the role of the instructor in pre-teaching the words from authentic texts, thus freeing the student from their reliance on teacher-made word-lists or modified texts, while eliminating the need for looking up words, guessing their meanings from context, or otherwise taking time away from the focus on and enjoyment of a text’s meaning.
The Present Study
Although LLEX is still undergoing constant modification and improvement, a working version of the program is currently available free to the public at http://www.leanderhughes.com/llex. In April 2011, I introduced LLEX to students in several of my classes. The current study looks at the study habits of two of these classes to infer students’ attitudes regarding the program’s usefulness. Specifically, this study investigates whether students given the chance to pre-learn textbook vocabulary with LLEX actually choose to do so and to what extent they use LLEX for this purpose. In addition, this study investigates the relationship between time spent using LLEX to study and weekly in-class vocabulary quiz scores.

Sample
Two of my Preparation for the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) II classes at Saitama University (N=50) participated in this study. On the first day of class, I explained to students that before they came to class each week, they were to find and learn all of the unfamiliar vocabulary in the unit of the textbook we would be covering during that lesson. Every class, before beginning our work with the textbook unit for that day, we would have a two-question graded vocabulary quiz, with one question testing for knowledge of Japanese or English equivalents of important words from the unit and another testing the ability to use unit vocabulary in context (see Appendix A for examples). Next, I showed students how they could access a digitalized version of their textbook units which I had made available exclusively to them online (after first making sure that they had all purchased the actual textbook), and then demonstrated how they could use LLEX to quickly locate and learn unfamiliar vocabulary from each unit.

During the rest of the semester, the weekly homework assignment was to “study the vocabulary [for the next unit] using LLEX.” However, beyond the wording of this prompt, I did not put any pressure on students to actually use the program and had no way of confirming who used it and who did not, short of asking students directly. In fact, by the third class, I had made it a point not to mention LLEX outside of the weekly homework assignment prompt.

Measures and Data Collection
Under the assumption that students would only use LLEX if they found it useful in helping them study textbook vocabulary and do well on their weekly quizzes, I created a simple questionnaire to be given to students on the last day of class with one question asking how frequently (if at all) students had used LLEX to study for our course as well as with several other questions about our class that were unrelated to LLEX. However, after collecting the responses of the first of the two classes and seeing that the majority of students had used LLEX for all or most of their assignments and that frequency of use was significantly correlated with
cumulative daily quiz scores (see Results for details), I decided to add three further questions to gain more detailed information on students’ study habits in my second class. Specifically, I added a question asking students how often they studied for our class, how long on average they studied, and how much of that time (if any) they spent using LLEX (see Appendix B for the actual questions and scales used). Responses to the frequency questions were quantified as follows: Every Week = 8 (eight weeks), Most Weeks = 6.5, 4-5 Weeks = 4.5, 2-3 Weeks = 2.5, Once = 1, Never = 0. Daily vocabulary quizzes consisted of two questions per quiz and totaled 16 questions for one class and 14 for the other.

**Analysis**

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the frequency and average duration of study using LLEX. Partial one-tailed correlations were employed to investigate the relationship between the use of LLEX and daily quiz scores controlling for base English proficiency as measured by two previous TOEIC tests taken prior to the course. In the case of the first class, “use of LLEX” was operationalized as students’ reported frequency of LLEX use, while in the case of the second class, both reported frequency of use and estimated total study time using LLEX (reported frequency of use multiplied by the reported average duration of each study session) were considered. With regard to the second class, the relationship between quiz scores and reported total study frequency as well as estimated total study time was also investigated through partial correlation analysis.

**Results**

An independent, two-tailed t-test revealed no significant difference in frequency of LLEX use between the first class ($M=4.95$, $SD=2.66$) and the second ($M=5.02$, $SD=1.87$); $t(48)=.117$, $p=.91$. Given this homogeneity, the two classes were combined for descriptive analysis. *Figure 1* depicts the percentages of the different responses given regarding students’ frequency of LLEX use over the semester.

![Figure 1: Students’ Frequency of LLEX Use](image-url)
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The majority of students used LLEX more than five of the eight weeks in which vocabulary study was assigned, and nearly three quarters used LLEX at least half of those weeks.

Further descriptive analysis was possible with the second class (n=20) because of the additional data collected from them. Altogether, students in this group spent an average of 71 percent of their total study time using LLEX (SD=0.32), with eight of the 20 students using LLEX for the entire duration of their study sessions.

Partial correlation analysis showed moderate positive relationships between the variables investigated after controlling for base proficiency. In the first class in which 24 of the 30 students were present for all weekly vocabulary quizzes, frequency of LLEX use correlated significantly with cumulative vocabulary quiz scores at \( r(21)=.468, p= .008 \). In the second class, only 10 of the 20 students were both present for all weekly vocabulary quizzes and possessed the TOEIC score records necessary to complete the partial correlation analysis. The correlation between frequency of LLEX use in this class and cumulative vocabulary quiz scores approached significance at \( r(7)=.491, p=.09 \), while quiz scores and total estimated time spent using LLEX had a slightly weaker correlation at \( r(7)=.41, p=.14 \). Finally, the correlation between frequency of study (including other activities besides using LLEX) and quiz scores nearly attained significance at \( r(7)=.56, p=.06 \), while the correlation between total estimated study time and quiz scores approached significance at \( r(7)=.50, p=.09 \).

**Discussion**

The results indicate that despite the lack of emphasis placed on LLEX in class, the majority of students used the program to study textbook vocabulary more than five of the eight weeks in which vocabulary study was assigned, and nearly half of the students in the second class used only LLEX for their study sessions. This widespread employment of LLEX among students suggests that they find it an efficient means of pre-learning unfamiliar vocabulary from assigned texts.

In addition, the significant and near-significant partial correlations between quiz scores and frequency of LLEX use and between quiz scores and total estimated time using LLEX suggest that LLEX has a substantial effect on vocabulary learning. Still, the higher correlations between overall study frequency and quiz scores as well as between total study time and quiz scores indicate that LLEX is not the sole reason for the variation on vocabulary quizzes. Including time spent on other means of study better explains the variation of quiz scores than just considering time spent using LLEX. However, because most students spent most of their time using LLEX (at least in the second class for which overall study frequency and duration data was available), it was statistically impossible to compare the relative benefits of LLEX to other means of study.
Thus, further studies are necessary to determine whether using LLEX is more worthwhile than, for example, scanning texts for unfamiliar words and looking them up in a dictionary. Future studies should focus on the different ways in which students might be using LLEX and empirically test which of those ways, if any, is most efficient for vocabulary learning. Finally, LLEX needs to be tested in the context of helping students read texts of their choice for pleasure, as this is the main purpose for which the program was designed. Such future studies should not only look at whether LLEX strengthens vocabulary knowledge, but more importantly, whether LLEX significantly improves comprehension and enjoyment of authentic reading materials.

**Conclusion**

This pilot study offers evidence that students find LLEX an efficient means for pre-learning the vocabulary in a text, as the majority of them used the program frequently despite little pressure from the teacher to do so. The moderate significant and near-significant relationships between LLEX use and cumulative vocabulary quiz scores further provide evidence for the efficacy of the program in promoting vocabulary gain. Although further research is necessary, this study represents a solid first step in exploring the potential of this new tool for autonomous reading and vocabulary learning.
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**Appendix A**

*Two Examples of Daily Quizzes*

**Example 1**

1. Which of the following is NOT correct?
   a. resume = 履歴書
   b. electrician = 面接
   c. identification = 身分証明書
   d. receptionist = 受付係
e. copier = 複写機  
f. applicant = 求職者  
g. a raise = 昇給

2. She is ___ her nails.
a. training  
b. leaving  
c. networking  
d. concentrating  
e. bending  
f. drilling  
g. filing

**Example 2**

1. Which of the following is NOT correct?  
a. terminated = created  
b. policy = set of rules  
c. impressive = looks great  
d. high performer = someone who does well at their job  
e. shareholders = people who own stock in a company  
f. promotional campaign = major advertising effort  
g. exceed = go beyond

2. If we do not receive ___ within 15 days, we will be forced to cancel this account.  
a. pay  
b. paid  
c. pays  
d. to pay  
e. paying  
f. payment

**Appendix B**

**Relevant Questionnaire Items Used with the Second Class**

1. How often did you study for this class (How often did you do your homework)?  
   Every Week – Most Weeks – 4 to 5 Times – 2 to 3 Times – Once – Never

2. How many minutes did you study each time?  
   About ________ minutes each time / I did not study at all
3. How often did you use LLEX to study for this class?
   Every Week – Most Weeks – 4 to 5 Times – 2 to 3 Times – Once – Never

4. How many minutes did you use LLEX each time?
   About ______ minutes each time / I never used LLEX
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Among the basic aims of an EFL instructor are goals like improved communication skills, and also the psychological and social goals of increasing motivation and creating rapport among the students. It can be frustrating for new teachers in the Japanese tertiary setting when students do not readily exhibit the desired levels of motivation and rapport, and when communication skills do not improve. This paper discusses ways of alleviating these problems by focusing on physical movement in the classroom. It will review supporting research, discuss the author’s experience of using movement, and examine how inserting elements of movement into lessons and being sensitive to the role that movement plays, can help teachers achieve these basic EFL goals.

Introduction
Basic aims of an EFL instructor include language goals such as improved listening and speaking skills, pronunciation, and vocabulary usage. However, goals also include psychological and social goals such as increasing motivation and creating rapport among the students. It can be frustrating for new teachers in the Japanese tertiary setting when the students do not readily exhibit the desired levels of motivation and rapport, and when communication skills do not improve. Some teachers may resort to immersing their students in a textbook and giving up on the basic goals of improved communication skills, rapport and motivation. Others may blame it on the “passive nature” of Japanese university students. This paper will examine the use of movement in the classroom to alleviate these problems. By inserting elements of movement into lessons and being receptive to the role that movement plays, students and teachers may achieve better rapport and motivation, and students may learn easier and better and improve their communication skills.

A definition of movement
For the purposes of this paper, “movement” means all non-verbal body movement: non-communicative action such as picking up a pencil, as well as communicative body language –
including posture, facial expression, eye contact, gesture, touch, and the distance between people, which is a function of movement.

**Why should teachers include movement in lessons?**

With the above definition of movement in mind, I will briefly discuss research from four disciplines: psychology, philosophy, neurology, and pedagogy. This research links movement with cognition, learning, motivation, and rapport, based on which I want to recommend a broad use of movement in language lessons.

**Psychology**

Psychologists have long studied the delicate interplay between a person’s movements and the world at large. The developmental psychologist Piaget wrote that the expansion of sensorimotor interaction was the first stage in childhood cognitive development (Huitt & Hummel, 2003). Certain movements can predict a person’s success or failure on cognitive tasks (Shapiro, 2011). Slightly out of sync physical mimicry generates empathy (Carey, 2008), so physical mimicry can be a potent tool for motivating students and creating better teacher-student rapport.

In the realm of movement, gesture is unique and universal. I first became aware of the innateness of gesture from research done by psychologists Iverson and Goldin-Meadow (1998) in which they observed congenitally blind people conversing. They noted that the blind speakers used gesture with approximately the same degree of frequency and variety as sighted people, even when they were aware they were speaking to other congenitally blind people. From this, the researchers deduced that human beings are hardwired for gesture much in the same way as they are for language (Chomsky, 1988). In fact, as McNeill foresaw, the two communicative systems work together seamlessly to integrate information, with gesture taking place in a kind of stealthy manner (as cited in Goldin-Meadow, 2003). People are generally unaware of the information they are gleaning from each other’s gestures, hence the stealthiness. Movement in the form of gesture is thus intimately connected with communication.

**Philosophy**

Philosophers have long pondered the mind-body dichotomy to determine our true nature. Are we our thoughts and words or our senses and movements? Language as a system of coded representations has long been regarded as existing in the realm of the “mind”. Recently, embodied cognition, or the idea that the mind and language itself flow from the interaction of our bodies with the world, has become so influential that it is beginning to challenge traditional cognitive science (Shapiro, 2011).
Neurology

“It wasn’t my arm but it was my brain, my thoughts. I was moving something. I don’t have one single word to give you what I felt at that moment. That word doesn’t exist.” This declaration by Tim Hemmes, a paralyzed man taking part in a recent thought-controlled robotic prostheses experiment (Neergaard, 2011), testifies to the progress of neurology. Previously, neurologists had mapped the brain’s motor, visual, and language centers, and found that speech develops on both sides of the brain early in life, but then settles on the left side. Around the age of five, the part on the right that had been concerned with language is taken over by gesture, spatial skills, and musical perception (Carter, 1998). Thus, these brain structures have a developmental and overlapping relationship with the language structures. Furthermore, the amygdala, the brain’s emotion center, reacts very sensitively to facial and vocal expression as we interact, indicating that eye contact and vocal tone are intrinsic to communication (Carter, 1998).

A more recent neurological discovery is mirror neurons which fire in the premotor cortex, not only when we move, but also when we watch someone else perform a transitive action (meaning that there is an object of the action). In the clause “she combed her hair”, the object is her hair. Interestingly, just the sound of the combing action will cause the mirror neurons to fire. Some researchers believe this is a direct physical link between action and perception (Shapiro, 2011). When watching someone stroke their arm, the viewer’s mirror neurons fire and attempt to mimic the feeling. We don’t actually feel our own arm being touched because our real arm vetoes the sensation, but if our arm were anesthetized, we would feel it being stroked. Ramachandran (2009) refers to these neurons as “empathy” or “Gandhi” neurons.

Pedagogy

Quinlisk (2008) discusses the deep impact on a student’s status, motivation, and confidence that the movements of the teacher (e.g., the power figure in the classroom) have. Sousa (2001) states that, when emphasized in lessons, movement has a beneficial effect on a student’s cognitive functions, learning, and memory. In addition to the standard language and mathematical intelligences, Gardener has identified the kinesthetic and spacial intelligences and described lessons which activate them (Armstrong, 2000). Capper (2000) has decried the past lack of non-verbal communication exercises in textbooks. Gradually however, movement has garnered increased representation in mainstream EFL/ESL four-skills (Richards, 2005), engineering workplace (Hollett, 2003), and presentation (Harrington & LeBeau, 2009) textbooks.

My discovery of movement

I first came to consider movement as being important at a time when I was having trouble motivating my students and creating rapport. When I asked my students to do a role-play in English, an all too common response was for them to speak without much feeling or body
language. Poor eye contact and a lack of movement were common. The timbre of the students’ speech was dull. One day, as I was walking past another teacher’s classroom, I looked in and saw the students laughing and speaking English enthusiastically. This was eye-opening for me because so many of my students at that time seemed to show little enthusiasm. I found out later that the class was role-playing a short skit. They were not using textbooks but were moving and acting with their bodies while speaking dialog. Although their English was not perfect, it was clear that they understood what they were saying because the words and the movements worked in tandem to create meaning. They seemed to be “feeling” the language as they spoke. I began to realize that movement was something powerful, and I started inserting elements of movement into my own lessons. This helped me to motivate students, to create rapport, and to improve their learning. Here are a few examples of what I did.

**Ideas for using movement in lessons**

**Moving without speaking**

In my classes, I needed to figure out how to motivate my students to interact meaningfully, using non-verbal communication in tandem with words. Since the students tended to do role-play using just words without body movement, it occurred to me to ask them to do role-play using movement only and no words at all. The students reacted very exuberantly to this, provided they received proper guidance. Guidance meant encouraging eye contact, meaningful contemplation of their partner’s movements, and appropriate movement responses. Why did they respond so well? The activity was novel, challenging, and fun, as indicated by their laughter and enthusiasm. They had to interact in a way they had never experienced before. That forced them to process the content in a new way. Later, when they “replayed” the dialog using speech and movement, they interacted more meaningfully and spoke more convincingly. The enthusiasm of the previous movement exercise had carried into their speaking and general interaction.

During the non-verbal student interaction mentioned above, it was important for me to give plenty of direction so the students understood what was expected. After that, it was crucial for me to step back and let the students interact autonomously. Discussing the process and how accurate or meaningful the results were had to take place before or after the interaction. If this discussion occurred during the interaction, it had to be only between myself and small groups of students. If I began speaking to the whole class about the process or results, the action stopped.

**Total physical response (TPR)**

TPR is a language teaching approach which was developed by James Asher. Stephen Krashen calls TPR an efficient method for exposing students to “comprehensible input” (1998). TPR is related to the concept of embodied cognition or, put another way, that we think through our
bodily interactions with our environment (Thelen, 1995). TPR involves an instigator who gives commands and a responder who performs an action. Two classmates may work together to produce the speech-movement matches, or the teacher can be required to produce movements that match the spoken commands of the students. Conversely, it can be the students who are obliged to perform actions based on the teacher’s commands, or speak based on the teacher’s actions. When the students tell the teacher what to do, the teacher could periodically produce a mismatch, and wait for corrections. If necessary, the teacher can warn the students that mismatches might happen. Once students are accustomed to these variations, they can then do TPR exercises autonomously.

This works exceptionally well when teachers have their students play games. If the games already have an element of movement, some TPR ideas can easily be applied. Instead of players making their own moves, one player can tell her partner what moves to make, for example “take three pieces from the second row”. Before the partner moves, he might announce it by saying, “I’m going to take...”, or while moving he could say, “Now, I’m taking ...”. After moving, he could announce his past move. In this way, basic grammar tenses can be practiced in a real setting within the context of the game. In a competitive board game, the players could try to command their opponents to make losing moves, adding to the interest and fun.

**Managing the classroom through movement**

From an EFL teacher’s perspective, the main purpose of a class usually is for students to express themselves and interact in English. However, from the students’ perspective, the overriding purpose and motivating factor might be of a social nature: to make friends and enjoy a memorable university life (van Lier, 1996). Managing the classroom through movement can satisfy both goals. For example, teachers can divide their students into pairs, groups, concentric circles, or lines facing each other which change or rotate regularly. Likewise, the students can pass their textbooks, compositions, and even their test papers to other students who, in turn, continue working on them in a “round robin” fashion (Goodman, 2003). Furthermore, materials can be produced which require students to interview other classmates for pieces of information they possess, and to synthesize them, thereby gaining a complete understanding. Students could also form starting base groups, and then be required to go find information from students in other groups, bring it back, and report it to their base groups. These simple classroom management techniques help create a motivating sense of community and friendship in the classroom.

**Eye contact**

English teachers often use textbooks, and sometimes rely on the books too much to do all of the work for them. Not surprisingly, students react to the textbook in much the same way, relying
on it for too many ideas about what to say. A common classroom scene shows the students speaking with their heads buried in their books, essentially interacting more with the books than with their classmates. On the other hand, teachers want their students to interact with each other, and eye contact is a prime vehicle for getting this to happen. Try this simple rule; tell your students that while looking at the textbook, they mustn’t speak. They can only speak while looking at the faces of the people they are talking to. Likewise, students who are “listeners” should listen attentively and look at the person who is speaking to them, and avoid staring at their textbooks.

Eye contact helps speakers regulate their speech, and is a prime mode for expressing emotions. However, it can be difficult for students who are culturally unaccustomed to it. Shy Japanese students or others who wish to show deference may look down (Capper, 2000). In addition, student speakers who are trying to remember words tend to look away from their listeners, as facial recognition seems to interfere with word retrieval. Regardless of this, students should be lightheartedly reminded to make eye contact when speaking English. In a real-life situation when English communication is required, there will be no textbook and a lack of eye contact could be misconstrued as fear or rudeness, so students need to try and communicate independently of the textbook while making eye contact.

**Gesture**

Gesture is a universal system which has many communicative and psychological functions and works effortlessly in tandem with language (Golden-Meadow, 2003). Gestures turn out to be comparable and occasionally superior to language for certain communicative purposes, for example expressing sizes, shapes, positions in space, or changes in speed or direction. They are commonly used for emphasis and expressions of emotional state, and correspond with various suprasegmentals such as stressed syllables and intonation. In fact, language and gesture are said to be co-expressive by using different modes of communication, one being linguistic and the other visual (Goldin-Meadow, 2003).

Role-play is most animated and successful when it integrates language, body language, and regalia (Meyerhoff, 2006; Wiley, 2006). Therefore, it would seem that gesture should be taught. However, gesture use is something which does not need to be taught since our students already instinctively know how to gesture. Nevertheless, as with eye contact, when students have their heads buried in their textbooks which are gripped firmly in hand, gesture is minimal. Even though gesture need not be taught, teachers can and should prompt their students to use it. Instruct them to put their books down on the table and emphasize the key points of whatever they are saying with gesture. Urge them to gesture when expressing things they are having trouble with communicating in words. According to Goldin-Meadow, Nusbaum, Kelly, and
Wagner, using gesture can help others understand meaning more easily (Goldin-Meadow, 2003). In the case of second language learners gesture helps them gain control of meaning and directionality in their discourse (McCafferty, 2002).

**Speaking and teaching with the whole body**

English utterance is very challenging for Japanese students because of pronunciation, prosody, and orthography variations. Stevens (2011) argues prosody especially should precede reading instruction. Generally, focusing on prosody over syllabic pronunciation before reading practice is beneficial because the students get to work with meaningful chunks of language (phrases and clauses) as opposed to only syllables or phonemes. Then, when they read, they begin to read in chunks. Many teachers would also agree that classroom pronunciation and prosody practice benefits listening comprehension (and visa versa).

What then is the best way for us to teach prosody? Teaching the sounds and “musical feel” of the language is paramount, but teaching it only through linguistic terminology, such as linkage (e.g., She work *Si Na No office*), diminishment (*wader* instead of *water*), and enunciation, although helpful at times, is not very effective, so why not use movement when teaching how to produce language?

When practicing a text, the instructor should think of herself as a symphony conductor. Mouth, tongue, and lip demonstrations together with gestures and subsequent student mimicry are excellent for emphasizing phonemic and prosodic sounds, and the more exaggerated the teacher’s physical expression is, the better. Prosody, even more than phonemic utterances, lends itself to the analogy with music because of its fluctuations of pitch and rhythm of stressed-timed beats. Indeed there are many shared aspects between prosody and music. There are pauses for emphasis, and some parts of phrases are spoken quickly, whereas other key words are elongated. Teachers should develop an evocative and creative repertoire of gestural movements and facial expressions which they can use to conduct such a pronunciation and prosody class symphony orchestra.

**Emotion**

Emotional expressiveness is too often absent in the students’ voices and body language. Although neither gesture nor emotional tone is necessary for a spoken passage to have emotional impact, as the words alone may suffice, it would, for example, seem unnatural to give a motionless monotonic description of an action-filled scene, such as a shipwrecked tanker spewing oil into the sea while floundering on a reef in a storm with panicked seamen on deck. Emotion is best expressed not only through the words one chooses, but also through one’s body
language, vocal style, and tone, so teachers should encourage their students to express themselves appropriately in their voices and gestures when speaking. E-motion is movement.

Conclusion
This paper advocates adding elements of movement into lessons through various means including: using movement without speech, Total Physical Response, managing the students in the classroom through movement, and focusing on eye contact, gesture, and expressive movement in general. Of course, how we use movement in the classroom must depend on both our own and our students’ beliefs and culture, and the context or institution in which we teach (Richards, 2011).

I hope that this information is of use to new teachers, and a reminder to experienced ones of the viability of using movement to interact with students and to inspire them in the classroom.
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