TOJELT

Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching

A Triannual Peer-Reviewed Journal of Research in English Language Teaching

Volume: 1 Issue: 3 September 2016

TOJELT

Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching

INDEXED IN:

-MLA

-Türk Eğitim İndeksi

-Google Scholar

-Academia

-ResearchGate

-ERIC (Online Submission)

The journal is also under the indexing process in a number of educational indexes.

TOJELT

Editors-in-Chief

Asst. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selçuk AKDEMİR - Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen University, Turkey
Asst. Prof. Dr. Ali DİNCER - Erzincan University, Turkey

Editorial & Advisory Board

Editorial & Technical Office

TOJELT

CONTENTS   **Page**

Editors' Message

Dear Readers;

The third issue of Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT) is online with a rich content. In this issue, Dr. Sarıçoban and his PhD student Nurcihan Yürük contributed to the journal with their joint work about using films in EFL learning. In addition to the invited article, four articles and a book review have been published with the meticulous collaboration of the editors, advisory board members and the referees. In the articles section, case of vocabulary teaching in Vietnamese context was reviewed by Vo, autonomous learning in Turkish EFL context was researched by Dr. Sönmez, language teaching models was criticised by Aslan, a scale development for researching language anxiety in young learner groups was held by Aydın and his colleagues. In the book review section, Dr. Sugiharto reviewed a very useful book in the field of language learning.

We sincerely thank all board members and the referees for their efforts that increase the quality of the TOJELT and hope that the TOJELT will be a leading international journal.

With regards,

Dr. Ahmet Selçuk AKDEMİR & Dr. Ali DİNCER

Editors-in-Chief of the TOJELT

Invited Article

The Use of Films As a Multimodal Way to Improve Learners' Comprehension Skills in Reading in English Language and Literature Department at Selçuk University[1]

Arif Sarıçoban
Hacettepe University / Turkey
Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching
saricobanarif@gmail.com

Nurcihan Yürük
Selçuk University / Turkey
School of Foreign Languages
nurcihanbasibek@yahoo.com

Abstract: One of the greatest challenges of an English teacher in English as a foreign language context faces is that English is not used authentically in the settings in which students live. Thus, learners do not have many natural opportunities to be exposed to the language or use it in authentic interaction. To fulfil the educational potential of language teaching, learners' language acquisition and knowledge of the target language through foreign language classes can be enhanced by implementing teaching methods such as multimodality as a socio-semiotic approach in language teaching and learning. Film is widely used as a teaching material in foreign language classes as one of the most important ways of multimodality in terms of supplying both social and semiotic features of a target language thanks to its qualities. This paper analyzes the effects of using film in the EFL classroom. It reveals its effects on developing students' comprehension skills in reading. The study was conducted on a sample of two groups: an experimental and a control group taught conventionally. The study was carried out at English Language and Literature Department of Selçuk University. The participants in this study were sophomore students at B1+ level aged 19-21. The results of the study have shown that there were significant differences between experimental and control group of students on using film incorporated in the teaching material. The study concluded that a visual context helps students enhance and improve their comprehension skills in reading.

Keywords: *Multimodality, films, language teaching, reading skill, comprehension skill.*

1. Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Educational frameworks are at present working through the challenge of distinguishing the new learning and literacies that are required to effectively take place in and contribute to 21st

---

[1] The findings used in the study rely on the findings of Yürük's PhD Dissertation in progress supervised by Dr. Sarıçoban.

century society. This requires thought of how best to get ready learners for the technological, social, cultural and political changes they confront with in a world that is progressively portrayed by local diversity and worldwide connectedness. In this manner, notwithstanding building up the abilities to comprehend different communication modes and communicate with various audiences, we should engage learners in observing and evaluating the communication frameworks to which they have contact. For both instructors and educational frameworks, this requires a movement and widening as far as what we esteem as literacy practice. If chosen with proper length and fascinating topics, films, which are purposeful and engineered to students' learning requirements and proficiency levels (King, 2002) can give pleasant language learning chances to EFL students in a non-native teaching environment.

1.2 Literature Review

The world and the type of communication relied upon most within multimodality has shifted away from language based communication to more visual-based communication, but many language courses ignore or downplay the visual and continue to give the language-based texts primacy. It makes sense that there would be resistance to decreasing focus on the word in favor of the visual when it seems that keeping most or all of the focus upon word-based texts is still not producing skilled learners. We definitely cannot afford to stop teaching word-based literacy but need to include within our instruction at least some attention to visual communication to broaden student literacy.

Using the film medium in language instruction, specifically narrative film is a viable way of increasing our students' multimodal literacy without detracting from their instruction in word-based literacy. Although visual communication and persuasion have been utilized throughout history in different ways, current technology has allowed the visual to become the prominent means of communication to which we are exposed.

Indeed, many definitions of literacy have now been intentionally broadened to include multiple types of skills and communication. Lemke (2007) defines literacy as "a set of cultural competences for making socially recognizable meanings by the use of particular material technologies" (71). This definition is not mode-specific at all, but instead rather broad, and George and Shoos (1999) shed light on why such a broad definition is appropriate:

> If literacy is henceforth linked to technology, it is by definition changing and changeable as technologies evolve… If literacy is intimately connected to intertextuality as awareness and understanding of the relationships among texts and between texts and readers, then literacy is never fixed or finished. Instead, it entails an ongoing re-evaluation and reformulation of the cultural and textual terrain as that terrain itself, including the positions of readers, shifts. (124)

It is consequently appropriate that language instruction, if its purpose is indeed increasing student literacy, reevaluate the definition of that literacy that it seeks to in still on a regular basis to account for this changing of technology. Lemke (2007) explains,

> All literacy is multimedia literacy: You can never make meaning with language alone; there must always be a visual or vocal realization of linguistic signs that also carries non-linguistic meaning… Signs must have some material reality in order to function as signs, but every material form potentially carries meanings according to more than one code. (41-50).

As Hill (2004) also describes, because of this shift to visual communication, "many students arrive at the university with apparently little experience with the written word" ("Reading" 107). As Hill continues, "A major goal of the educational system is to help students develop the abilities necessary to comprehend, interpret, and critically respond to the textual forms that they will encounter as members of the culture... Our educational institutions should be

spending at least as much time and energy on developing students' visual literacies as these institutions spend on developing students' textual literacy". ("Reading" 108)

What is needed is a way to increase both types of literacy at the same time, and even better, through an approach that utilizes students' increased experience in visual communication to help them better understand the language-based communication with which they are less familiar. In essence, what is needed is to broaden existing analytical frameworks that are taught to language learners so that they represent the full spectrum of modes of communication. From this perspective, using films and other multimedia instruments are essential and efficient ways to fulfil the needs of learners in terms of creating competent learners in communication.

1.2.1. The Use of Film as an Authentic Material in Foreign Language Classes

The use of authentic materials in teaching English as a second or foreign language has long been the focus of many studies (Aziz & Sulicha, 2016; Koban, 2014; Koban Koç, 2015). Akdemir, Barın and Demiröz (2012) state that "in order to overcome the difficulties of teaching English in a country where it is not the primary language for communication, the best and the easiest way is to enhance teaching with authentic and original materials". (p. 3967).

The utilization of films as teaching material has expanded quickly since the 1970s. Ismaili (2013) calls attention that films expand the scope of classroom teaching strategies and assets furthermore broaden the educational programs. Champoux (1999) underlines that film scenes can make it less demanding to teach abstract themes and ideas on account of their visuality. Likewise inexperienced students can profit by films due to their greater feeling of reality. Allan (1985) likewise highlights the realistic samples that the films empower. Joining both auditory and visuality makes film a thorough tool for language instruction. The visuality likewise supports the students: it helps learners by supporting the verbal message and gives a centre of consideration while they tune in.

Additionally, classroom exercises and methods connected with utilizing films as a teaching instrument let learners go beyond what they can experience in a class with traditional techniques. As far as language learning and teaching, films are fluctuated and adaptable tools since they give learners an assortment of language and cultural experiences. Also, in a confined classroom environment, learners do not have the opportunity of exposing to authentic target language and speech forms.

In addition, film-related activities motivate learners to participate learning process actively because of real-life language usage. To some degree, films give learners legitimate target language that they cannot experience outside the classroom and films incorporate a few components that a course book cannot teach. Learners have the opportunity to investigate the issues of appropriateness and pragmatics while watching likewise phonetic, paralinguistic and nonverbal conduct. At the point when these characteristics of films are contemplated, films might be thought as a superior language teaching aid than a course-book only teaching environment both for instructors and learners.

1.2.2. Advantages of Using Film to Teach Languages

Films may be used in the foreign language education in two ways: first, films can serve as a model of language use, in particular as a vehicle to improve listening comprehension, enrich vocabulary, and develop translingual competence; second, as a model and reflection of the target cultural artifacts, values, and behaviours, and therefore a vehicle to develop students' transcultural competence.

The use of film in the classroom or as an outside school activity can uphold the motivation of the learners, because of its playful component. Using films through specific task activities provides an ideal vehicle for active learning, as well as encouraging interaction and participation. The communicative potential of its use has been commended; it
– facilitates comprehension activities that are perceived as 'real';
– creates a curiosity gap that facilitates the exchange of opinions and ideas about the film;

– helps to explore non-verbal elements;
– improves oral and aural skills (Altman, 1989);
– provides meaningful contexts and vocabulary, exposing viewers to natural expressions and natural flow of speech.
There are many ways of using films in the classroom and it will depend on the film itself:
– Fiction films tell a fictional story or narrative
– Documentary films are a visual expression attempting to 'document' reality
– Short films are generally longer than one minute and shorter than 15 minutes
The versatility of its use allows incorporating film in different types of learning sessions in the classroom (Sherman, 2003). For example:
– It is possible to screen complete films or short extracts of films (clips).
– Films can be used just for enjoyment, creating a positive atmosphere in the classroom, which can enhance motivation.
– Films can provide a stimulus for other activities, such as listening comprehension, debates on social issues, raising intercultural awareness, being used as a moving picture book or as a model of the spoken language.

In short, films make meaning through a powerful combination of different modes of communication such as written text on the screen, spoken language, moving images, music and sound effects. When these features of the film are taken into consideration, films are excellent examples of multimodal texts.

1.3. Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study is primarily concerned in contributing to the quality of the process of teaching and learning through the use of media, particularly using films in English language and literature classrooms. It aims at finding out whether the film as a multimodal way improves learners' comprehension skills in reading. The design of the study is a quasi-experimental one that aims to gather quantitative data about the participants.

2. Method

The design of the study is a quasi-experimental one that aims to gather quantitative data about the participants. A group of participants was formed from regular classes at the department and a survey was conducted for the purpose of making descriptive assertions. Two groups were formed as experimental (n=27) and control groups (n=25). According to the proficiency test results, the level of the participants was B1$^+$ so, the groups were accepted homogeneous.
For the experimental part of the study, the film "Elizabeth: The Golden Age" were used as an extensive reading material as well were chosen for both groups (control and experimental). At the beginning of the experimental study, students who watched the film or read the book were determined and but not included in the study before forming the control and experimental groups. Traditional teaching procedures and classroom activities were used for the control group. The students in control group only read the book. However, the students in experimental group first read the same book with control group then watched the film of the book. Students in both groups were given one-month period to read the book. For the quantitative part of the study, data were collected through a questionnaire. At the end of the implementation, students in experimental group received the questionnaire which aimed to get students' attitudes towards using films in their language class.

2.2 Participants

This study involved 52 sophomore students at English Language and Literature Department of Selçuk University. The students ranged between 19 – 21 years of age. This study was carried out in two groups. First group was chosen as *Control Group* that only read the book included in the study, whereas second group was constituted *Experimental Group* that both read

the book and watch the film of the book. For the study, 52 students from regular classes (M:16 and F: 36) were chosen randomly. 32 of the students in these groups attended preparatory classes at their high schools. The proficiency level of the students attended in the research is $B1^+$ level.

2.3. Sampling Procedures

This study is primarily concerned in contributing to the quality of the process of teaching and learning through the use of media, particularly using films in English language and literature classrooms. This is a quasi-experimental study that aims at finding out whether the film as a multimodal way improves learners' comprehension skills in reading. In the experimental part of the study, the film *Elizabeth: the Golden Age* which was used as an extensive reading material as well was chosen for both groups (control and experimental). In this research, according to participants' interests, educational departments and their proficiency levels, the work (the book and the movie version) named as *Elizabeth: the Golden Age* was chosen as the material for that part of the study. For the experimental part of the study two groups were formed as experimental and control groups. First of all, a survey research was conducted for the purpose of making descriptive assertions about some population. The proficiency level of the participants included in the study was $B1^+$ so, the groups were accepted homogeneous. While creating control and experimental groups, students who watched the film or read the book were determined and not included in the study.

At the beginning of the study, both control and experimental groups were introduced to the book. Both groups were given a short list of vocabulary words and phrases used in the book and the reading class went on with a cover picture of the book and its title for discussion, then to make the students ready to read; they were given pre-reading questions for a brainstorming activity.

Then, both groups were given one month period to read the book. At the end of the reading process, the control group was given post-reading questions as the post-test of the study. One lesson hour (50 minutes) was given the students in control group in order to answer post-reading questions.

After reading the book at the end of one month period, the experimental group students were introduced the movie trailer and the core theme in class. All through film class, students viewed segments (7 segments) of ten-to-fifteen-minute video material. So, four lesson hours (200 minutes) were arranged for the implementation of film viewing section. As the students watched the tape, the teacher stopped occasionally to check comprehension. During this time students had "while-watching" questions, which purpose to check comprehension but also force students to better concentrate on the film. Then, students in experimental group answer the post-reading questions in one lesson hour.

2.3.2. Instruments

In this study, the film *Elizabeth: the Golden Age* was used and as an extensive reading material, the book version was given to the participants. In this research, according to participants' interests, educational departments and their levels obtained from the results relying on the proficiency test, the work (the book and the movie version) named as *Elizabeth: the Golden Age* was chosen as the material for that study. In the experimental part of the study, the control group and the experimental group read the book within the prescribed time and the experimental group watched the film in pursuit of reading the same book. Then both groups were given post-reading questions as the post-test of the study including vocabulary (7 items), ordering the events in the story (9 items), True /False questions (9 items) and multiple-choice questions (14 items) in order to see whether there was a significant difference between experimental and control groups. The post- reading questions used in the study were examined by some experts except from the researcher in order to measure and provide validity.

In the quantitative part of the study, data were collected through a questionnaire. At the end of the film viewing implementation, the experimental group only received the questionnaire

which aimed to get students' attitudes towards using films in their language class. The data for this study were collected through a 15-item 5-point Likert type questionnaire. The format for the questionnaire was inspired from the study of Tuncay (2014) including items related to authentic language usage (Items 1,3,8,12,13,14), grammar and structure (Item 7), perceptive and receptive skills (Items 4,5,6,15), appreciation of target language and filming arts (Items 10,11), vocabulary and authentic expressions (Item 9) and critical thinking skills (Item 2). The reliability coefficient, Cronbach alpha of the questionnaire was 0.86.

2.3.3 Research design

At the beginning of the study, both control and experimental groups were introduced to the book. Both groups were given a short list of vocabulary words and phrases used in the book and the reading class went on with a cover picture of the book and its title for discussion, then to make the students ready to read; they were given pre-reading questions for a brainstorming activity.

Then, both groups were given one month period to read the book. At the end of the reading process, the control group was given post-reading questions as the post-test of the study. One lesson hour (50 minutes) was given the students in control group in order to answer post-reading questions.

After reading the book at the end of one month period, the experimental group students were introduced the movie trailer and the core theme in class. All through film class, students viewed segments (7 segments) of ten-to-fifteen-minute video material. So, four lesson hours (200 minutes) were arranged for the implementation of film viewing section. As the students watched the tape, the teacher stopped occasionally to check comprehension. During this time students had "while-watching" questions, which purpose to check comprehension but also force students to better concentrate on the film.

After watching the film, students in experimental group were given the same post-reading questions with the control group.

In the quantitative part of the study, data was collected through a questionnaire. The questionnaire which aimed to get students' attitudes towards using films in their language class after film viewing section was administered to experimental group only. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher. Subjects received oral instructions about how to complete the questionnaire, and were encouraged to seek clarification of any items they did not understand. This questionnaire took about 50 minutes (a class hour) to complete, including about 5 or 10 minutes' initial explanation. The questions were carefully gauged with this amount of time in mind to ensure that they could be completed.

3. Results

In this part, there are findings and interpretations related to the results of the perception and attitude scale among the students in experimental and control groups. Findings and the interpretations were evaluated according to the data obtained in accordance with the sub-problems of the research.

3.1. Statistics and Data Analysis

In the following table, there are findings and interpretations related to the results of the perception and attitude scale among the students in experimental and control groups.

Table 1.
The Opinions of the Students for "the Attitude Scale for Using Films in the Language Classrooms" in the Experimental Group after the Implementation (N=27)

ITEM	I Strongly Disagree		I Disagree		Neutral		I Agree		I Strongly Agree			
	f	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	$\bar{x}$	**S**
Item 1	6	22.2	5	18.5	7	25.9	6	22.2	3	11.1	2.62	1.36
Item 2	7	25.9	4	14.8	1	3.7	11	40.7	4	14.8	3.03	1.50
Item 3	5	18.5	3	11.1	3	11.1	10	37.0	6	22.2	3.33	1.44
Item 4	5	18.5	2	7.4	8	29.6	7	25.9	5	18.5	3.18	1.35
Item 5	4	14.8	3	11.1	3	11.1	8	29.6	9	33.3	3.55	1.45
Item 6	4	14.8	5	18.5	4	14.8	11	40.7	3	11.1	3.14	1.29
Item7	3	11.1	1	3.7	3	11.1	15	55.6	5	18.5	3.66	1.17
Item 8	3	11.1	1	3.7	4	14.8	13	48.1	6	22.2	3.66	1.20
Item 9	3	11.1	1	3.7	3	11.1	11	40.7	9	33.3	3.81	1.27
Item 10	3	11.1	1	3.7	5	18.5	10	37.0	8	29.6	3.70	1.26
Item 11	2	7.4	1	3.7	3	11.1	10	37.0	11	40.7	4.00	1.17
Item 12	3	11.1	1	3.7	8	29.6	6	22.2	9	33.3	3.62	1.30
Item 13	4	14.8	2	7.4	6	22.2	10	37.0	5	18.5	3.37	1.30
Item 14	6	22.2	4	14.8	6	22.2	6	22.2	5	18.5	3.00	1.44
Item 15	6	22.2	6	22.2	4	14.8	7	25.9	4	14.8	2.88	1.42

According to the results of the study, students think that using film in a language classroom may be beneficial for them in general. The responses of the students to item 3 in the questionnaire related to learners' attitudes towards using film in language classroom showed that using film helped them gain knowledge of how the authentic language is used in various contexts and settings (59.2%). Also 62.9% of the students think that (item 5) using film improved their receptive skill (listening). In addition to improving their receptive skills, to learn more about

grammar and structure, film is very beneficial for them (item 7) because most of the students (74.1%) responded positively to that item.

When the pragmatic features of a film are taken into consideration, 70.3% of the students found using film in a language classroom helpful in terms of improving how TL is used for different functions and purposes within a context. The responses of students gave to item 9 showed that using film helped them not only to learn more about grammar and structure but also vocabulary and authentic expressions (74.0%). The results of item 10 (66.6%) and item 11 (77.7%) showed that students appreciated filming as a branch of art. They think that filming as an art showed them the way to understand and appreciate the life in target language country. More than half of the students (55.5%) could understand the difference between the artificial use of TL in a non-native environment (classroom) and natural use in a native environment because they think that using language in a native environment is more beneficial to learn a language.

Table 2.
The Results of Independent t-Test for the Repeated Measurements Related to the Academic Achievement Scores of the Students in the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	N	$\bar{x}$	S	sd	t	p
Experimental	27	79.61	7.45	51	3.96	.000
Control	25	71.94	8.38			

According to Table 2, it was found that the groups where two separate systems are employed differed from each other between pre-implementation and post implementation and different teaching methods had significant common effects on the academic achievement scores in the repeated measurements ($t_{(51)}$=3.96, p>.05). This finding indicates that the implementation through the method of using films as a multimodal way has various effects on increasing the academic achievement scores of the students.

It was found that the groups where two separate systems are employed differed from each other between pre-implementation and post implementation and different teaching methods had significant common effects on the academic achievement scores in the repeated measurements ($t_{(51)}$=3.96, p>.05). This finding indicates that the implementation through the method of using films as a multimodal way has various effects on increasing the academic achievement scores of the students. It is understood that the implementation of using films as a multimodal way in the experimental group (X=79.61) which gained profit in their academic achievement scores prior to experiment was more effective on increasing the academic achievement scores than the students in control group (X=71.94).

4. Conclusion

Teaching in a foreign language can be challenging in terms of planning. A foreign language teaching environment ought to be flexible, changing and propelling. Learners may have diverse proficiency levels so it might be hard to arrange a lesson as indicated by these distinctive proficiency levels. Right now, utilizing films as a part of language can be considered as an amusing and attractive vehicle. Learners in a non-English speaking environment may profit by utilizing films as a teaching instrument on account of authenticity and real-life language.

Films have been effectively connected to numerous courses in order to offer a wide assortment of learning styles or modalities (Birch & Gardiner, 2005). Learning styles are characterized as cognitive, affective, and psychological behaviours that serve as moderately stable pointers of how learners perceive, cooperate with, and react to the learning environment. Learners feel more relaxed in an environment which mirrors their predominant learning style (Sankey, 2006).

Learners have a preferred learning modality, namely, visual, aural, read/write or kinaesthetic, while numerous learners are multimodal (utilize a blend of these modalities).

Individuals likely utilize distinctive cognitive strategies to process verbal and visual media. Some proof proposes that individuals learn abstract and new concepts all the more effortlessly when displayed in both verbal and visual structure (Champoux, 1999). Other empirical research demonstrates that visual media make concepts more accessible to an individual than text media and assist particularly with later recall (Champoux, 1999: 2-3).

As indicated by Allan (1985) it is essential to attempt to adventure all the positive sides that a film can offer on language teaching. Case in point, multimodality is clearly an awesome piece of films, and it can help additionally the weaker students follow the film and comprehend what is happening. There are non-verbal signs and multimodes in a film, for example gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, posture, proximity, appearance and setting. All these components have essential impact on the film and may help or, on the other hand, also possibly hinder viewing the film.

King (2002) proposed that "utilizing films as a part of education is a reviving learning experience for students who need to enjoy a reprieve from rote learning of unending English vocabulary and drill practices, and replace it with something realistic, a dimension that is absent in text-book oriented instruction" (p.512). In the event that chosen with proper length and intriguing points, films, which are intentional and tailored to students' learning needs and proficiency level can give pleasant language learning chances to EFL students in a non-native teaching environment. Kabooha (2016) explains "well-selected movie materials could enhance students' language learning process and increase their motivation to learn the target language" (p.248).

In spite of the fact that film is a valuable instrument to motivate learners and make the lesson enthralling, there are a few elements that ought to be kept in mind when utilizing films as a part of a foreign language learning and teaching process. These components are deciding on the suitable film, classroom exercises and making full utilization of the film. While selecting the suitable film, the proficiency level of the learners and the intelligibility of the film are essential. The film ought not to be beyond the current level of learners and ought to be adequately comprehensible. Depending on student proficiency levels, instructional and curricular goals and an assortment of various classroom exercises ought to be arranged and sorted out. By doing this, film is helpful for the course or class and it can dispose of the situation, where the film is thought pretty much as a time-filling component with no specific pedagogical goals.

4.1. Recommendations for Further Studies

This study was carried out with the second year (sophomore) students at Selçuk University, English Language and Literature Department who were at B1$^+$ level. The study was applied to only one level of learners. For a further study, other proficiency levels may be taken into account and similar methodological implementations can be applied to those groups of learners. In this study, the film *Elizabeth: the Golden Age* was used and as an extensive reading material, the book version was given to the participants. In another study, the number of materials (film and book) may be increased in order to enhance validity and reliability of the study.

References

Akdemir, A. S., Barın, M., & Demiröz, H. (2012) Broadsheet English: Teaching speaking through newspaper articles. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46, 3967 – 3971.

Allan, M. (1985). *Teaching English with video*. Essex: Longman.

Altman, R. (1989). *The video connection.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Aziz, Z. A. & Sulicha, R. (2016). The use of cartoon films as audio-visual aids to teach English vocabulary, *English Education Journal (EEJ),* 7(2), 141-154.

Birch, D. & Gardiner, M. (2005). Students' perceptions of technology-based marketing courses, paper presented at the ANZMAC Conference: *Broadening the Boundaries, Fremantle, Western Australia*, 5-7 December.

Champoux, J. E. (1999). Film as a teaching resource. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8(2), 206–217.

George, D. & Shoos, D. (1999). *Dropping bread crumbs in the intertextual forest: Critical literacy in a postmodern age.*Passions, Pedagogies, and 21st Century Literacies.Eds. Gail E. Hawisher and Cynthia L. Selfe. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, Print.115-126.

Hill, C. A. (2004). Reading the visual in college writing classes. *Visual Rhetoric in a DigitalWorld*. Ed. Carolyn Handa. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's., 107-130.

Ismaili, M. (2013). The effectiveness of using movies in the EFL classroom – A study conducted as South East European University. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(4), 121-132.

Kabooha, R.H. (2016) Using movies in EFL classrooms: A study conducted at the English language ınstitute (ELI), King Abdul-Aziz University, *English Language Teaching*, *9*(3), 248-257.

King, J. (2002). Using DVD feature films in the EFL classroom.*Computer Assisted Language Learning* 15, no.5: 509–23.

Koban, D. (2014). Fairy tales in language teaching lessons. In H. Coşkun (Ed.), *The Importance of Fairy Tales in Education- Planning, Practicing and Evaluating* (pp. 116-125). Berlin: Dağyeli Verlag.

Koban Koç, D. (2015). Developing Reading skills through a biography of Louis Armstrong. In H. Coşkun, F. Yılmaz & M. E. Aksoy (Eds.), *Planning of Instruction* (pp. 208-222). Berlin: Dağyeli Verlag.

Lemke, J. (2007). Video epistemology in-and-outside the box: Traversing attentional spaces. In, R. Goldman, R. Pea, B. Barron, & S. Derry (Eds.), *Video research in the learning sciences* (pp. 39-52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sankey, M. D. (2006). A neomillennial learning approach: Helping non-traditional learners studying at a distance. *The International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 2(4), 82- 99.

Sherman, J. (2003). *Using authentic video in the language classroom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tuncay, H. (2014). An integrated skills approach using feature movies in EFL at tertiary level. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 13*(1), 56-63.

Towards Building Curricula for Fostering Autonomous Vocabulary Learning: A Case of Vietnamese EFL Context

Hoi Ngoc Vo
Quy Nhon University, Vietnam
vongochoi@qnu.edu.vn

Abstract: Adopting a problem-solving approach to curriculum design, this paper is an attempt to illustrate a case of a Vietnamese university where the vocabulary learning and teaching practices are not satisfactory. Drawing on relevant research literature in the field, it first identified the problems associated with the underachievement of learners in terms of vocabulary learning. Several suggestions would then be made towards integrating into the existing curricula elements of a learner autonomy strand where learners find ways to relate the public and private learning domains.

Keywords: *Curriculum design, learner autonomy, public domain, private domain*

1. Introduction

Vocabulary is an essential aspect of the language learning process. A focus on strengthening vocabulary plays an important role in any stages of the learners' language development (Balcı & Çakir, 2011). Numerous scholars in the field are unanimous that communication can take place without syntax and grammar, but not vocabulary (Folse, 2004; Lewis, 1993; Willis, 1990). Therefore, the teaching and learning of vocabulary should constitute an important component in the designing process of any language curricula. Unfortunately, this is not actually the standard practice at many tertiary institutions in Vietnam including Quy Nhon University (QNU) – the case being explored in this paper. To put it another way, the situation of vocabulary learning and teaching at QNU is not unfolding as expected. This paper, adopting a problem-solving approach, attempted to elucidate this problem by gradually unpacking the underlying reasons and suggesting possible solutions.

2. A brief description of the problem

QNU is currently offering TEFL and general English courses to more than 1000 undergraduate students from 7 provinces in the central and highland areas of Vietnam. The general educational aim is to equip students with sufficient knowledge and skills for seeking jobs in the field of English teaching and translating after their graduation. Therefore, in addition to theoretical subjects underlying second language learning, the language curriculum also includes practical linguistic skills, which adopt a communicative approach with an emphasis on interactional and task-based activities. However, there are no official vocabulary courses for students to choose. Instead, vocabulary learning is implicitly subsumed in the reading course's

objectives and verbally articulated to students from the very beginning of the term that after the course, learners should acquire sufficient amount of vocabulary to be able to comprehend academic reading texts and to function adequately in communicative situations. Over the past four years, the faculty of foreign languages at QNU, as many other English education institutions in the country, has engaged in a comprehensive review and modification of the syllabus in response to the national project of "Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages in the National Education System, Period 2008 – 2020" (Hien, 2015) . Students' feedback was also collected to help inform the curriculum adjustment process and teachers' professional development. Yet, while the effectiveness of the national project is still in question (Anh, 2016), it is evident at QNU that learners are still struggling with their learning English. They are nowhere near to becoming a confident and independent user of English as stated in the objectives of the project (Hien, 2015). Anecdotal evidence suggested that students' failure to improve their communicative skills could be attributed to, among other things, a lack of vocabulary (Balcı & Çakir, 2011). Presumably, due to insufficient vocabulary they are unable to decode the underlying meaning of written and spoken texts and to express their ideas when it comes to interactional activities. A closer look at the whole language program and at teachers and students' critical retrospection on their own teaching and learning practice reveals more specific reasons behind this failure.

3. The vocabulary learning goals

Locke and Kristof (1996) found that specific, difficult goals consistently led to higher performance than did vague goals or goals that were specific but easy. It is conceivable that, unlike specific goals, a general goal like do-your-best has no external referent, which allows for a wide range of acceptable interpretation and performance. The absence of specific and appropriate vocabulary learning goals at QNU probably confused learners and deprived them of the conditions under which the gap of public (learning in class) and private (learning beyond the classroom) learning domains could be bridged, thus rendered their learning ineffective.

4. Motivation

Setting vague and general goals is likely to induce a lack of motivation on the learners' part to put more effort into their learning practice. Locke and Latham (2002) indicated that the more important the value of the goals are and the higher the students' self-efficacy is, the more they are committed to fulfilling the goals. Since the goal is too general and its feasibility is not adequately highlighted, students have low expectancy of their future success, which in turn may demotivate them and ultimately damage their performance. In fact, many students have voiced concerns over their motivation to learn vocabulary. Although they are aware of the importance of vocabulary, they may not be confident that they will be able to gain "sufficient vocabulary" for communicative purposes.

5. Self-regulation and learning opportunity

The teaching practice in Vietnam is depicted as "giving learners the fish" rather than "teaching them how to fish" (Lap, 2005). Teachers are normally considered as " the master of knowledge" (Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996) and their job in the classroom is limited to transmitting this knowledge to their students rather than encouraging them to learn independently. Moreover, the influence of Confucian ideology engenders a traditionally-held belief that learners are not

allowed to challenge their teachers directly as it is an act of disrespect and may cause the teacher to lose face (Nga, 2014). Furthermore, this traditional method of teaching, which assigns teachers the central role and learners the passive roles and which presents an explicit and decontextualized language instruction does not bring about desirable outcomes (Arıkan & Taraf, 2010). A corollary of this teaching situation is the fact that learners appear to be passive receivers of knowledge and "tend not to be supported in developing autonomy during the educational process" (Nga, 2014). The teaching and learning of the reading skill in general and vocabulary in particular at QNU is par excellence an illustration of this situation. A common vocabulary teaching practice at QNU is that when learners encounter a new word whose meaning is unknown to them, teachers normally provide the meaning directly without much reference to its form or use. This is very often followed by students' using the provided meaning to comprehend the immediate reading text or to answer the comprehension questions; then the word may never be seen again. It should be noted, however, that drawing students' attention to word form and use is as equally important as its meaning since these are the three core components of word knowledge (P. Nation, 2001). Additionally, students have a tendency to naturally attend to meaning rather than to form when communicating due to their limited capacity to simultaneously process L2 form and meaning (Laufer, 2006). Therefore, the provision of meaning only may just address the receptive facet of vocabulary learning (P. Nation, 2001), leaving the productive aspect untouched. Moreover, the teachers' practice of directly disclosing word meaning instead of offering strategy-based instruction such as guessing word meaning from context, word parts, word family etc. may deprive learners of the chances to individualize their learning experience and maximize their awareness of the strategies that they can use to learn on their own outside the classroom context (Atay & Ozbulgan, 2007). Another point that is worth mentioning is the time constraints on in-class vocabulary learning. It is unequivocal that class time is not enough to afford students the amount of vocabulary needed for their communication purposes, especially when vocabulary learning is embedded in a reading course. It is too ambitious to believe that students just need to come to class regularly and work hard and then the result will come. Instead, vocabulary learning should take place beyond the language classroom or should be taken into students' private domain so as to produce positive results. Following this line of reasoning, the author would like to take learner autonomy as a foundation on which to bring about the desired transformation to the situation discussed above, namely to improve learners' vocabulary learning at QNU in particular and in Vietnam in general.

6. Suggested strategies

As discussed above, a lack of motivation and self-regulation, teacher-dominant classroom, student-as-passive receivers of knowledge and time constraints on in-class learning all conspire to render vocabulary learning unsatisfactory. A closer look at the nature of these factors suggest that learner autonomy bears some relation to the others and can serve as a basis on which to build strategies for dealing with all other issues.

Firstly, Dickinson (1995) claimed that learning success and enhanced motivation is conditional on learners taking responsibility for their own learning. In other words, higher motivation leads to greater autonomy and vice versa. Therefore, to foster learner autonomy in learning vocabulary, it is important to enhance their motivation. Learners' motivation can be triggered once they are aware of the value of their own learning (including the value of their

learning outcome) and the belief that they are capable of achieving the learning goal (Dörnyei, 1998). These are the basic arguments shared by the value-expectancy theories (Dörnyei, 1998) and goal-setting theory (Locke & Latham, 2002). In the case of QNU, the setting of vocabulary learning goals need to be reappraised and modified as it is too general and vague to ensure goal commitment. As such, instead of the distal goal of mastering sufficient vocabulary, the setting of proximal sub-goals may have a powerful motivating function in that they mark progress and provide immediate incentives and feedback (Dörnyei, 1998). Nation (2006) suggested that in order to achieve an ideal coverage of 98%, a 8000-9000 word-family vocabulary is needed for dealing with written text and that number for spoken text is 6000-7000. Nation and Kyongho (1995) believed that the first 2000 most frequent words of English (K1 and K2) is extremely useful, particularly for those who undertake academic study. Cobb (2007) took a step further and claimed that knowing the first 2000 most frequent words of English plus the 570 words in the Academic Word List (AWL) (Coxhead, 2000) is tantamount to a coverage of 90% of words in any academic texts. These figures may serve as a reference point, together with the language education aims, learners' proficiency levels and available resources, for proposed modifications to the vocabulary learning goals. A possible suggestion may be that:

1. After the first year, learners are able to identify and produce the form, meaning and use of 80% of the first 2000 most frequent words of English.

2. After the second and the third year, learners are able to master the first 2000 most frequent words of English plus 50% of the academic word list

3. After finishing the BA program, learners are able to master the first 2000 most frequent words of English plus the academic word list.

Secondly, teacher's professional expertise plays an important role in fostering learner autonomy in learning vocabulary from within the classroom. This expertise should be reflected in the way they provide learning opportunities for students to bridge the gap between the public domain and private domain. One possible suggestion could be that: Instead of giving students the meaning of unknown words in a reading passage, the teacher may insert a glossary corner under the reading passage. This glossary should be designed to simulate the way the word is presented in the dictionary (with phonetic transcription, part of speech, verb code, meaning, examples, collocations, etc.). This presentation of glossary should be coupled with a dialogue in the classroom to provide detailed explanation and reasons why students have to learn vocabulary that way. This practice serves several purposes. Firstly, according to Crabbe (1993), unlike the public domain where tasks are initiated by teachers to meet supposed common learning needs, the private domain works the other way: It starts by identifying an end and figures out means to achieve that end. Therefore, to foster that mean-end process of vocabulary learning, teacher should sensitize students to the rationale behind the glossary provision by having a dialogue about what vocabulary learning problems that practice intends to address. Secondly, when providing input in the form of word meaning, the teachers only know what words students learn but they have no idea how the words have been learnt, how students' private work is progressing and what strategies they are using to learn vocabulary. Strategies to achieve private work (in this case the learning of vocabulary) are, therefore, not modeled (Crabbe, 1993). For that reason, the presentation of words in the glossary and the learning dialogue enable the teachers to gain more insights into learners' private domain and afford learners the opportunities they need to foster their private learning. Thirdly, glossary is a good way to instruct students how to use a dictionary adequately as many students conceive of dictionary as a tool to look up the word meaning only

rather than other important aspects. It should be noted further that dictionary use is an important component of autonomous vocabulary learning and its effectiveness has been empirically proven by research literature (Knight, 1994; Luppescu & Day, 1993; Summers, 1988). Last but not least, the provision of glossary help learners to cultivate the habit of keeping vocabulary notebook, which is also a way of promoting independent learning (Fowle, 2002; Schmitt & Schmitt, 1995). In addition to the inclusion of glossary, teachers' instruction on the use of strategies such as "mnemonics" (Atay & Ozbulgan, 2007; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 1991) and "guessing meaning from contexts" (P. Nation, 2001; Paribakht & Wesche, 1999) proved to be effective in helping learners deal with unknown words on their own in similar future contexts and has been extensively researched in second language reading and listening.

Finally, in order to develop self-regulation, learners should be able to set personal goals, adopt appropriate strategies to achieve their goals, devise scheme to implement and monitor strategies and evaluate their performance. Literature indicated that setting personal goals boosted self-regulated learning and resulted in higher self-efficacy, intrinsic interest and better performance (Bandura & Schunk, 1981; Manderlink & Harackiewicz, 1984). Personal goal setting is influenced by various factors such as self-beliefs of efficacy, parental goals (Zimmerman, Bandura, & Martinez-Pons, 1992) and assigned goals in the organizational settings (Locke & Latham, 1990). Therefore, to enhance self-regulation in vocabulary learning, teachers can, at the very beginning of a reading course, offer individual discussion sessions on how to set personal goals, which word level they are expected to master at different stages, how to align personal goals with the overall vocabulary learning goals, etc. One possible suggestion may be to offer goal-setting conference (Schunk, 1990) in which learners meet with the teachers on a regular basis and receive a list of words they will encounter in the up-coming reading passages, select those words they would attempt to learn and are given feedback on their previous achievements. In addition, the provision of class time for learning dialogues in which learners have chances to talk about their strategy use and the keeping of vocabulary notebook with an additional column for noting the specific strategies used for each individual word, the difficulty of learning that word and the word level it belongs to may do wonder to help learners keep an eye on their progress. Finally, teachers may familiarize learners with the use of such webpage as Tom Cobb's Compleat Lexical Tutor (www.lextutor.ca/) to give them more control over their vocabulary learning, monitoring and evaluating. This website offers several self-access learning opportunities, interactive tools and various wordlists so that learners can test their vocabulary levels, compare their passive and active vocabulary, test their word grammar with concordances and track their vocabulary learning progress.

7. Conclusion

Upon description of problems associated with the learning and teaching of vocabulary at QNU, this paper attempted to suggest strategies to bring about transformations. The central focus was on enhancing learner autonomy to improve vocabulary learning. It can be seen from the discussion above that various factors and sources need to be taken into consideration when it comes to self-regulation development among which teachers should take an initiative and dynamic role in facilitating autonomous vocabulary learning. Much research effort is needed to dig deeply into this area so as to shed more light on ways in which different stakeholders can use to improve learners' vocabulary learning.

References

Anh, Y. (2016). National foreign language teaching program's effectiveness in doubt. *Vietnamnet*. Retrieved from http://english.vietnamnet.vn/fms/education/162476/national-foreign-language-teaching-program-s-effectiveness-in-doubt.html

Arıkan, A., & Taraf, H. U. (2010). Contextualizing young learners' English lessons with cartoons: Focus on grammar and vocabulary. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2).

Atay, D., & Ozbulgan, C. (2007). Memory strategy instruction, contextual learning and ESP vocabulary recall. *English for specific purposes, 26*(1), 39-51.

Balcı, Ö., & Çakir, A. (2011). Teaching vocabulary through collocations in EFL Classes: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 1*(1).

Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 41*(3), 586.

Cobb, T. (2007). Why & how to use frequency lists to learn words. from http://www.lextutor.ca/research/rationale.htm

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

Crabbe, D. (1993). Fostering autonomy from within the classroom: the teacher's responsibility. *System, 21*(4), 443-452.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation a literature review. *System, 23*(2), 165-174.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language teaching, 31*(03), 117-135.

Folse, K. S. (2004). *Vocabulary myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press

Fowle, C. (2002). Vocabulary notebooks: Implementation and outcomes. *ELT Journal, 56*(4), 380-388.

Hien, P. (2015). Challenges and support needs of native TESOL teachers in Vietnam: An exploratory case study. *Asian EFL journal, 17*(4).

Knight, S. (1994). Dictionary use while reading: The effects on comprehension and vocabulary acquisition for students of different verbal abilities. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 285-299.

Kramsch, C., & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal, 50*(3), 199-212.

Lap, T. Q. (2005). *Stimulating learner autonomy in English Language Education: A curriculum innovation study in a Vietnamese context*. Amsterdam: PrintPartnerIpskamp.

Laufer, B. (2006). Comparing focus on form and focus on formS in second-language vocabulary learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 63*(1), 149-166.

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach*. Hove, UK: Language Teaching Publications.

Locke, E. A., & Kristof, A. L. (1996). Volitional choices in the goal achievement process. *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior*, 365-384.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Eaglewood,NJ: Prentics-Hall.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American psychologist, 57*(9), 705-717.

Luppescu, S., & Day, R. R. (1993). Reading, dictionaries, and vocabulary learning. *Language learning, 43*(2), 263-279.

Manderlink, G., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1984). Proximal versus distal goal setting and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 47*(4), 918.

Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (1991). *Teaching students ways to remember: Strategies for learning mnemonically*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Nation. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes, 63*(1), 59-82.

Nation, & Kyongho. (1995). Where would general service vocabulary stop and special purposes vocabulary begin? *System, 23*(1), 35-41.

Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nga, N. T. (2014). *Learner autonomy in language learning: Teachers' beliefs*. Thesis.

Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1999). Reading and "incidental" L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Studies in second language acquisition, 21*(02), 195-224.

Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (1995). Vocabulary notebooks: Theoretical underpinnings and practical suggestions. *ELT Journal, 49*(2), 133-143.

Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational psychologist, 25*(1), 71-86.

Summers, D. (1988). The role of dictionaries in language learning In R. Carter & M. Mccarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching*. New York: Routledge.

Willis, D. (1990). *The lexical syllabus: A new approach to language teaching*. London: Collins ELT.

Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American educational research journal, 29*(3), 663-676.

How Ready Are Your Students For Autonomous Language Learning?

Görsev Sönmez
Hasan Kalyoncu University / Turkey
English Language Teaching
gorsev.sonmez@hku.edu.tr

Abstract: This study aimed to explore 100 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students' readiness in learning English as a foreign language through a quantitative approach. Data were gathered by means of Learner Autonomy Readiness Instrument (LARI) (Koçak, 2003). Results showed that participants were not only extrinsically motivated but also intrinsically motivated in some cases. They also perceived to apply some metacognitive strategies and their perceptions about taking responsibility were dependent on the task. Finally, they appeared to be willing to engage in outside class activities to learn the language.

Keywords: *Learner autonomy, readiness, language learning*

1. Introduction

Language learner has been placed in the center of language learning process as a result of the alteration in the language learning methods and techniques over the past thirty years. That is, learners' needs and strategies were fore fronted and they became the focus of the process. This change in the field of language learning has given birth to "learner-centered approach" as a new concept which accepts collaboration between teacher and the learners as the main approach instead of dictating rules of language. As Tudor (1993) explained, this approach requires students to be more participatory and responsible during the language learning process in contrast to outdated approaches as a consequence of the switch in the teacher and learner roles.

Additionally, two major aims of learner-centeredness in language learning are stated to be; focus on language content and language learning process (Nunan, 1996). In order to accomplish these objectives, learners have to take the responsibility of decision making. That is, teacher has the duty of planning the content according to the needs of the learners.

This emphasis on the changing role of the language learner is of importance for recent methods in the field of foreign language learning. Communicative language learning, for instance, gives significance to the learners' engagement in authentic language use (Savignon, 2002). This responsibility enables them to be active performers with communicative opportunities. This innovative method has led to some notions. One of them is communicative competence. As claimed by Kumaravadivelu (1993), anything related to language learners (e.g. materials, tests, curriculum guidelines) placed communicative competence in the center of learning process.

Secondly, cooperative learning has been of value by being linked to learner-centered approach. It necessitates social interaction of students during group activities to activate learning from each other (Crandall, 1999). Last but not the least, the concept of learner autonomy has also emerged as a result of the shift towards learner-centered language learning.

Autonomy was first promoted to cover educational contexts and described as "a means of breaking down the barriers that so often exist between learning and living" by Holec (1981). Holec (1981) also defined the concept of autonomy as "the capacity to take charge of one's own learning" as the outcome of self-directed learning. Within the frame of self-directed learning, learners are the only determiners of the learning goals and progress. This focus of self-directed learning affected the definition of learner autonomy in the field of language learning. In other words, learner autonomy as an approach has concerned with enabling learners to think critically, solve problems by the help of necessary skills and strategies, and making decisions during their language learning process.

Autonomy of language learners has been the focus of many researchers in the field internationally (e.g. Benson & Voller, 1997; Cotterall, 2000; Ho & Crookall, 1995; Lee, 1998; Little, 2009; Littlewood, 1999).

The common outcome of all these research is the necessity of learners' being in charge of their learning in language learning context. Littlewood (1999), for instance, investigated the autonomy level of learners in East Asia, and explained the importance of being responsible learners with two reasons; (a) performing learning oneself and (b) being able to continue learning out of formal education settings. In addition, Little (2009) emphasizes the role of taking control in the learning process. In order to help learners take these roles, teachers are claimed to shift some of their roles with their learners. To illustrate, they are suggested to take the role of a counsellor to raise student awareness and facilitate student motivation (Benson & Voller, 1997).

In order to accelerate learner autonomy in language classroom, some researchers investigated the impact of European Language Portfolio (Little, 2009), language course design (Cotterall, 2000) and self-directed language program (Lee, 1998).

Little (2009), found that the Council of Europe's European Language Portfolio is capable of helping the employment of language learner autonomy to a great extent as a result of goal-setting and self-assessment. Moreover, Cotterall (2000) discusses the importance of appropriate language course design to foster learner autonomy and proposes a variety of principles. Similarly, Lee (1998) investigated the role of implementing a self-directed learning program in Hong Kong on students' abilities to be self-directed and autonomous. He concluded that flexibility is significant for students' autonomy since it provides learners with different tasks and objectives depending on their needs.

Apart from these studies, Ho and Crookall (1995) investigated the effect of a traditional language environment on promoting learner autonomy. It was found that large-scale simulation could transform this type of a classroom into a learning context that powerfully facilitates learner autonomy.

In the field, some other studies claimed the necessity of investigation of learners' readiness for this responsibility (Cotterall, 1995; Koçak, 2003; Ming & Alias, 2007; Scharle & Szabo, 2000; Spratt, Humphreys & Chan, 2002; Yıldırım, 2008).

All these studies argued that since perception and practice of autonomous learning change depending on the cultural and educational environments, it is of value to investigate learners' level of readiness for such a responsibility prior to any intervention to curriculum and materials design to facilitate such learning. Otherwise, as were stated in above mentioned studies, problems

regarding learners' motivation level, application of appropriate metacognitive strategies, their perceptions of shared and individual roles in the classroom might occur.

Therefore, in order to take action against these possible problems investigating learners' readiness for autonomous language learning can be beneficial for the language teachers who are investing great amount of energy and receive insufficient response from their students. It can also explain the reasons of student misbehavior such as not listening to each other or not participating in class activities. Therefore, this study examines the readiness of Turkish language learners for autonomous learning.

2. Methodology

Present study investigated whether university level foreign language learners are ready for autonomous language learning, and employed a quantitative approach which helps the researcher to judge the reliability of the findings by the help of suitable statistical methods and generalize the results to other contexts.

Particularly, this study tried to find answer for the following main research question and its sub questions:

1. Are the university level language learners ready for autonomous language learning?
   1a. What is their level of motivation to learn a foreign language?
   1b. To what extent do they use metacognitive strategies?
   1c. How do they perceive their own and their instructors' responsibilities in the process of learning English?
   1d. To what extent do they perform outclass activities to pursue language learning?

2.1. Setting and Participants

In Turkey, students registered to universities with English medium of instruction have to take a language proficiency test. According to their results, they either have the chance to go on with mainstream courses or go on with language courses. Students, whose language proficiency is not high enough, attend language skills courses for one year according to their levels which are decided depending on their scores. This study was conducted in one of these language preparatory schools in the south-east of Turkey in the fall semester of 2015-16 academic year. Students in this prep program attend 24 hours of skills-based courses (e.g. Reading, writing, speaking, listening) in a week. The program applied was an integrated one with task based syllabi.

100 (61 male, 39 female) English as a foreign language (EFL) students participated in the study on voluntary basis. At the time of the study 76 students were pre-intermediate level, and other 24 students were intermediate level.

2.2. Data Collection Instrument and Procedure

In order to gather data Learner Autonomy Readiness Instrument (LARI) was used (Koçak, 2003). It was originally developed in Turkish. This scale consisted of four independent sections with 49 items in total. First section aims to investigate the motivation level of learners to learn English as a foreign language with 20 items. In the second section, there are 8 items to tap the metacognitive strategies employed by language learners. These two sections were on a 6-point likert scale (1: strongly agree – 6: Strongly disagree). Third section aiming at examining the perceptions of learners regarding their own and teachers' responsibilities in language learning process involves 12 items. In this section, participants are required to put a tick in the appropriate

box. The first box indicated the students' perceptions of their teachers' responsibilities, the second box indicated the students' perceptions of not only their own but also their teachers' responsibilities, and the third box indicated the students' perceptions of their own responsibilities. And the last section of the instrument consisted of 9 items to investigate learners' outside class activities to continue their language learning. Students were asked to rate each item on a 5-point Likert type scale. The weight of each response ranges from 5 (always) to 1 (never).

Questionnaire was administered during a class hour to randomly selected five classes and only volunteered students participated in the administration. It nearly took 20 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. In order to prevent misunderstandings, the questionnaire was administered in Turkish which is the original language of the questionnaire and the students' native language.

2.3. Reliability of the Instrument

In the following table reliability values of each section and the overall value of the questionnaire can be seen.

Table 1
Reliability of the Questionnaire

	Cronbach's Alpha
Section 1. Motivation	.67
Section 2. Metacognition	.60
Section 3. Responsibilities	.74
Section 4. Outside Class Activities	.72
Overall	.79

3. Results

To answer the research questions, descriptive statistics were used. In order to investigate the motivation levels of the participants, data came from section 1. Descriptive statistics were used to present the frequencies, means and standard deviations of the items. Table 2 demonstrates the results.

Table 2
Most and least highly rated items about motivation.

Highly rated items	M	F	SD	Least highly rated items	M	F	SD
19. If I learn English better, I will be able to get a better and well-paid job.	5.64	89	.74	31. If I do not do well in this course, it will be because I have not tried hard enough.	2.76	15	1.47
29. The teacher should encourage students to make contributions in the English lesson.	5.55	88	.93	22. I cannot concentrate easily on the English class.	2.92	23	1.78
17. I want to continue studying English for as long as possible.	5.35	84	1.10	23. I am afraid I will not succeed in the English exams.	3.60	37	1.92
18. I believe that I will be successful in the English class.	5.21	81	1.04	27. In the English class, the teacher should be the one who talks more.	3.74	37	1.79

As can be seen in the above table, getting a well-paid job, teachers' encouragement, own desire to continue studying English and to be successful in the class are the items that were most highly rated items. This result shows that students are not only motivated by external factors; besides, their own will as intrinsic factor to learn English facilitates their motivation level. Majority of the participants (N=89) think that they can earn more money when they learn English. Similarly, more than half of the respondents (N=84) have the necessary desire to continue learning English which is very important for self-directed learning. On the other side of the coin, they do not think they cannot concentrate or will not succeed. This shows their self-confidence and belief in their own success. Moreover, the necessity of teacher's talking more is one of the least highly rated items demonstrating their will to participate and take active role in the learning process.

Data came from section 2 were analyzed to investigate the extent that participating language learners' use of metacognitive strategies in learning English. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics regarding the most and least highly rated items in this section.

Table 3
Most and least highly rated items about metacognitive strategies

Highly rated items	M	F	SD	Least highly rated items	M	F	SD
39. I learn better when I try to understand the reasons of my mistakes I have done in English	5.24	85	1.16	40. I arrange time to prepare before every English class.	3.9	29	3.45
38. When studying for my English exam, I try to find out which structures and terms I do not understand well.	5.08	79	1.24	34. When I study for my English course, I pick out the most important points and make diagrams or tables for myself.	4.25	41	1.64
33. When I am learning a new grammar rule, I think about its relationship to the rules I have learned.	5.04	79	1.28	36. I use new English words in a sentence in order to remember them easily.	4.30	47	1.48

It is obvious that learners are well-aware of the strategies they need to make use of during language learning process. To specify, more than three fourth of students (n=89) indicated that they learn better when they try to figure out the reasons of their own mistakes showing self-assessment as a metacognitive strategy (Item 39). Moreover, more than 75 % of the respondents stated thinking about the relationship between new grammar rule and the rules they had learned before (Item 33). Also, item 38 indicate that the majority of the students considered the importance of using self-evaluation and self-monitoring strategies in the language learning process. In other words, data show that respondents were used to identify their problems prior to English exams (Item 38).

On the other hand, less than half of the participants stated making diagrams or tables while studying (Item 34) or make sentences to learn new words (Item 36). Finally, only 29 respondents indicated preparing for the English lessons (Item 40).

Data for the research question aiming to explore preparatory school students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities in learning English were gathered by Section 3. Frequency of each item was given in table 4.

Table 4
Responsibility perceptions of participants

Item	Teacher's responsibility	Both teacher's and my own responsibility	My own responsibility
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
41. stimulating my interest in learning English	19	72	8
42. identifying my weaknesses and strengths in learning English	15	58	26
43. deciding the objectives of the English course	29	43	27
44. deciding what will be learnt in the next English lesson	64	28	8
45. choosing what activities to use in the English lesson	57	39	4
46. deciding how long to spend on each activity	67	30	3
47. choosing what materials to use in the English lessons	71	27	2
48. evaluating my learning performance	34	60	6
49. evaluating the English course	14	75	11
50. deciding what I will learn outside the English class	11	38	51
51. making sure I make progress during English lessons	17	65	18
52. making sure I make progress outside the English class	8	40	52

Results showed that more than half of the students perceived continuing their learning outside the classroom as their own responsibility (Items 50 and 52). However, they thought that deciding what to learn when and how long should be spent on which activity are all teachers' responsibilities (Items 44-45-46-47). Most of them, on the other hand, wanted to share responsibility in stimulating their interest (Item 41), evaluating the course and their performance (Items 49 and 48), and deciding on their progress (Item 65).

In order to investigate what kind of outside class activities are performed by the respondents, date were gathered from 9 items in the last section. Following table shows the most and least highly rated items.

Table 5
Most and least highly rated outside class activities

Highly rated items	M	F	SD	Least highly rated items	M	F	SD
61. I listen to English songs.	4.07	75	1.23	59. I make use of the self-access center to study English	2.93	35	1.42
55. I try to learn new words in English.	4.00	71	1.03	54. I do assignments, which are not compulsory.	3.01	31	1.17
57. I watch English movies or TV programs.	3.93	64	1.16	53. I do grammar exercises though it is not homework.	3.08	36	1.14

Results demonstrate that participants prefer listening to English songs (N=75), learning new vocabulary (N=71), and watching English movies or programs (N= 64) as outside class activities. On the other hand, the least preferred activities are using self-access center (N=35), doing assignments which are not compulsory (N=31) and doing grammar exercises even though it is not homework.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study investigated the readiness of Turkish university level foreign language students for autonomous language learning with regards to learners' motivation level, use of metacognitive strategies, perceptions of their own and their teachers' responsibilities while learning English, and practice of autonomous language learning with activities outside the borders of the class.

Results of the first research question showed that participants have high motivation in some cases. To illustrate, getting a well-paid job in future and teachers' encouragement motivate them extrinsically. Besides, they have necessary intrinsic motivation to continue studying English and to be successful in the classroom. Therefore, respondents can be stated as likely to be involved in autonomous learning depending on their motivation level. As claimed by Dörnyei and Csizer (1998), high level of motivation increases the possibility of being involved in autonomous learning. It is also one of the crucial features to promote autonomous learning (Spratt, Humphreys & Chan, 2002). Moreover, participants designated high level of intrinsic motivation by indicating their own will to continue learning English even after their university education. Having such an intrinsically motivated group of students is a chance for the language instructors and the administration in this specific context. This finding is in line with the claims of Deci and Ryan (1985) that support the effect of intrinsic motivation on learner autonomy. On the other hand, results showed that teacher's talking more is one of the least highly rated items. This finding also supports participants' will to participate and take active role in the learning process which is a parallel finding to Dickinson's (1995), attribution theory which claims the direct relation between learner autonomy and their taking the responsibility of their own learning.

Second research question aimed to investigate the extent of metacognitive strategies used by the participants while learning English as a foreign language. Obviously, respondents indicated they apply some metacognitive strategies during their language learning process which is linked to autonomous learning (Victori & Lockhart, 1995). For instance, more than half of the participants appeared to be aware of the role of strategies such as figuring out the reasons of their mistakes, doing the analysis of the newly learned rules. Furthermore, they indicated applying self-evaluation and self-monitoring strategies. These results are parallel with the findings of Koçak (2003) and White (1995). On the other hand, less than half of the prticipants stated their willingness to take time before language class to make necessary preparation. As stated by Koçak (2003), this finding can be because of the requirement that makes students be exposed to learning English for long hours every day. However, McClure (2001), and Ho and Crookall (1995) state that students' preparation and organization during their language learning process is one of the signs of autonomous learning.

Third research question explored students' perceptions of their teachers' and their own responsibilities for varying tasks in learning English. Clearly, more than half of the students perceived continuing their learning outside the classroom as their own responsibility. Nevertheless, deciding what to learn, when and how long should be spent on which activity were indicated as teachers' responsibilities. These results are parallel with the findings of Yumuk

(2002) who states that Turkish students have to be more responsible in selecting, analyzing, evaluating and applying information for their own purpose. On the other hand, participants indicated that they want to share responsibility in stimulating their interest, evaluating the course and their performance, and deciding on their progress. This finding can be explained with the traditional teacher-centered learning experiences of the students.

Final research question aimed to identify how frequently the participants carry out outside class activities to continue language learning. It is good that majority of the participants preferred extracurricular activities such as listening to English songs and watching English movies or programs. These results are consistent with the findings of Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002). However, participants are neutral to engage in activities such as reading newspapers or magazines, using Internet in English, talking to foreigners. This finding is contrary to the findings of Victori and Lockhart's (1995).

This study has some major limitations. First of all, autonomous language learning in this study is limited to basic concepts such as the motivation level of students, metacognitive strategies used by students, responsibility perceptions of students and their outside class activities. Moreover, the participants of the study are only a group of students in a specific language learning context which makes it difficult to generalize the findings to other contexts.

5. Implications

The results of this study suggest significant implications for practice. First of all, as one of the factors affecting learners' autonomy, raising their awareness is of value. That is to say, language learning environment should be in the form to facilitate learners' decision making. To support learner autonomy, appropriate tasks, group works, engaging them into decision making, planning and evaluation process of the course and their own success can elevate their autonomy.

Secondly, teachers, curriculum designers should be well-informed about the recent and up-to-date teaching methods. In other words, they need to stop learners' dependence on the instructor by the help of appropriate activities, methods and materials. If this can be achieved, learners better learn how to take responsibility of their own learning and become more confident learners. That's why, learners should be supported to engage in outside class activities such as reading newspapers in English, listening to English songs and watching movies with subtitles.

As another implication, language teachers should know how to improve learners' use of metacognitive skills. In order to support learners' application of these skills, effective reading and writing projects and studies can be asked. In this case, Dickinson's (1993) GOAL framework can be applied effectively. In this framework, G refers to "What am I supposed to learn from this?", O stands for "What is the specific objective of the task?", A refers to Act "How am I going to do it?" and L stands for Look to monitor the strategy and self-assessment "How have I done?".

References

Benson, P. & Voller, P. (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning.* London: Longman.

Crandall, J. (1999). Cooperative language learning and affective factors. In J. Arnold (Eds.), *Affect in Language Learning* (pp. 226-245). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cotterall, S. (1995). Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy. *ELT Journal, 49*(3), 219-227.

Cotterall, S. (2000). Promoting learner autonomy through the curriculum: Principles for designing language courses. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 109-117.

Dickinson, L. (1993). Talking shop: Aspects of autonomous learning, An interview with Leslie Dickinson. *ELT Journal, 47*(1), 330-341.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and Motivation: A literature review. *System, 23*(2), 165-174.

Dörnyei, Z. & Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2*(3), 203-229.

Ho, J. & Crookall, D. (1995). Breaking with Chinese cultural traditions: Learner autonomy in English language teaching. *System, 23*(2), 235-243.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Koçak, A. (2003). *A study on learners' readiness for autonomous learning of English as a foreign language*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University,Turkey.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal, 47*(1), 12-21.

Lee, I. (1998). Supporting greater autonomy in language learning. *ELT Journal, 52*(4), 282-290.

Littlewood, W. (1999). Defining and Developing Autonomy in East Asian Contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(1), 71-94.

Ming, T. S. & Alias, A. (2007). Investigating readiness for autonomy: A comparison of Malaysian ESL undergraduates of three public universities.*Journal of Reflections on English Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 1-18.

McClure, J. (2001). Developing language skills and learner autonomy in international postgraduates. *ELT Journal, 55*(2), 142-148.

Nunan, D. (1996). Towards autonomous learning: some theoretical, empirical and practical issues. In R. Pemberton et al. (Eds), *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 14-15). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Savignon, S. J. (2002). Communicative curriculum design for the 21st century. *ELT Forum, 40*(1), 2-7.

Scharle, A. & Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner Autonomy: A guide to developing learner responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spratt, M., Humphreys, G. & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: which comes first? *Language Teaching Research, 6*(3), 245-266.

Tudor, I. (1993). Teacher roles in the learner-centered classroom. *ELT Journal, 47*(1), 23-24.

Victori, M. & Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. *System, 23*(2), 223-234.

White, C. (1995). Autonomy and Strategy use in distance foreign language learning: Research findings. *System, 23*(2), 207-221.

Yıldırım, Ö. (2008). Turkish EFL learners' readiness for learner autonomy. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *4*(1), 65-80.

Yumuk, A. (2002). Letting go of control to the learners: the role of the Internet in promoting a more autonomous view of learning in an academic translation course. *Educational Research, 44*(2), 141-156.

Language Teaching Models in Teacher Training Programs

Alper Aslan
Trakya University / Turkey
Faculty of Education
alperaslan2003@hotmail.com

Abstract: Any language teacher who has gone through some kind of training program for the teaching of English should be familiar with various specific language teaching models that constitute the core of the training process. A language teaching model is a guide that helps the trainee to sequence the activities designed for the expectations and needs of learners in a lesson. This paper reviews the common language teaching models in teacher training programs: Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP); Observe, Hypothesize, Experiment (OHE); Illustration, Interaction, Induction (III); Test, Teach, Test (TTT); Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT); Engage, Study, Activate (ESA); Authentic Use, Restricted Use, Clarification (ARC) and discusses them with deficiencies over each other. The study suggests that if learners′ needs and expectations are known and considered in the pre-planning stages of lessons, any language teaching model may be favorable for teachers.

Keywords: *Language teaching models, teacher training programs, language teacher education, foreign language education*

1. Introduction

Teaching methods and models may vary regarding the needs and expectations of learners in any teaching environment. In teacher training process, the trainee becomes familiar with those methods and models. Such different methods and models are introduced to evoke awareness about how a lesson plan is designed and in what sequence the activities of the plan are proposed. Before reviewing the language teaching models for both trainers and trainees in the relevant literature of this paper, it is necessary to deal with the concept of *sequencing* with reference to instructional contexts. The ordering of activities within a lesson or a unit is related with the term *sequencing*. However, it should not be confused with the concept of *grading*. According to Nunan (1988), grading refers to the arrangement of syllabus content from easy to difficult. It can be concluded that grading refers to difficulty as the parameter of the ordering. On the other hand, sequencing refers to the overall arrangement of that syllabus content by means of several criteria, one of which is difficulty (grading), the other being frequency, learnability, usefulness and learners' communicative needs.

The concepts put forward above explain the terminological and conceptual differences between grading and sequencing. It is now pertinent to examine the presence of sequencing as an activity ordering in foreign language teaching (FLT) literature. Activity sequencing in FLT is usually formed by a *model*. The term 'model' which is directly related with sequencing in FLT literature is "used to describe typical procedures or sets of procedures, usually for teachers in training" (Harmer, 2001, p.79). Many language teaching programs have a teaching model for their understanding of the methodology, and a trainee is almost always trained in accordance with

that model. The models are designed to guide teaching practice. They guide especially inexperienced teachers or trainees in training. According to Harmer (2001), their purpose is pedagogic in terms of training, rather than inspirational as statements of theoretical belief.

Model is labeled differently by various scholars in FLT literature. For instance, Woodward (2001) and Harmer (1996, 2001) use the term *model*, while Scrivener (1994, 1996) calls it a *training model* and a *paradigm*. On the other hand, McCarty and Carter (1995) refer it as a *methodology*. In line with the concepts, D. Willis (1996a, 1996b) also approaches the issue of activity sequencing as *paradigm*, *approach*, *methodology*, *cycle* and *sequence*, while J. Willis refers to it as a *cycle* and an *approach* (1996a, 1996b).

With the help of a model, an inexperienced teacher or a trainee has a chance to select from a wide variety of activities. In this respect, models just guide the order of activities in a lesson or a unit. However, they differ from methods in that a method is a strict procedure for both selecting and presenting the activities in order. In addition to this, there is no more choice to select from, while using a method.

Some models reflect a specific order for a lesson schema such as, PPP, TBLT, OHE, III and TTT; while others are operational and flexible within a cycle such as ESA and ARC. In the next section, these common models will be dealt with.

2. Language Teaching Models
2.1. PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production)

The PPP model is the most common and traditional methodology employed by both professional programs and course books around the world. The three Ps stands for *Presentation* (P1), *Practice* (P2) and *Production* (P3). Harmer (2007) points out that the PPP procedure has been offered to teacher trainees as a significant procedure since 1960s, although it was not then referred to as PPP. However, it can be inferred from literature that the pioneer of the PPP model was Donn Byrne (1976).

While Richards and Rodgers (2001) link the PPP model to Situational Language Teaching, Harmer (2001, 2007) links it to a variation of Audio-lingualism. In fact, the PPP model is a mixture in that it carries the characteristics of Situational Language Teaching especially at presentation stage and behaviorism at practice stage. Interestingly, certain researchers; for instance, Howatt (2004), ascribes the production stage alone to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

As a traditional model of grammar teaching, the PPP model starts with a presentation of a new structure in a situation contextualizing it. In the practice stage, learners practice the structure using accurate reproduction techniques including choral and individual repetition and cue-response drills. Finally, the production stage is more meaning-focused and communication-oriented, where learners are encouraged to use the new language and make sentences of their own (Harmer, 2001, 2007).

The original model has been developed and modified since it was first introduced to FLT literature (Lindsay & Knight, 2006). Evans (1999, p.1) also states that "PPP has evolved over the years, cherry picking the more attractive elements of other approaches, and incorporating them into its basic format". Some scholars think that the PPP model is still appropriate for language classes, and they attribute this to the following arguments:

1. The PPP model correlates with the Anderson's skill acquisition model / Information processing model (Anderson, 1983, 1987, 2005).

2. If well- designed, the presentation stage makes learners notice the new language forms (Hedge, 2000).
3. The output in the practice and production stages makes learners
    a) notice the gaps in their interlanguage.
    b) hypothesize testing
    c) aware of metalinguistic function (Swain, 1985, 1995, 2005)
    d) develop automaticity (Skehan, 1998)

Apart from these arguments for the PPP model, The PPP model came under a sustained attack in the 1990s (Harmer, 2007). The arguments against the PPP model can be summarized as follows:

1. The PPP model is based on discrete items (Scrivener, 1994; Woodward, 1993).
2. It encourages accuracy over fluency (Willis, 1993).
3. It does not allow for recycling or movement between the different stages (Scrivener, 1994).
4. PPP is compatible with a structural syllabus, whereas a skill-based syllabus can be exploited in the units with the basic *pre-*, *while-*, *post-* sequence (Hedge, 2000).
5. It is less workable at higher levels when students need to compare and contrast several grammatical items at the same time.
6. It neglects three very important second language learning principles:
    a) readiness to learn
    b) the delayed effect of instruction
    c) the silent period

In response to these criticisms, many scholars have offered variations on PPP and alternatives to it (Harmer, 2007). The alternatives to the PPP model are *OHE, III, TTT, TBLT, ESA* and *ARC*.

2.2. OHE (Observe, Hypothesize, Experiment)

One of the language awareness-based models of language teaching is the OHE, which stands for *Observe*, *Hypothesize*, and *Experiment*. It incorporates awareness sessions into the teaching process. According to Lewis (1993, 1996), learners should be allowed to observe the language (read or listen to the language), hypothesize about how the language works and experiment to check the correctness of the previous hypothesis. In this respect, language awareness refers to the inductive teaching process.

Lewis (1993, 1996) claimed that language teaching should not be solely based on lexicalized grammar (where the priority is given to a grammar item, while lexis is necessary only to put this grammatical structure into work), but rather grammaticalised lexis, with language consisting of words, multi-word units, lexical chunks, combined into sentences, paragraphs and texts. The consequence was the shift in the types of tasks and the balance between vocabulary practice and grammar practice.

In line with Lewis' claim, Hypothesize and Experiment stages involve activities such as identifying, sorting and matching and their aim is to encourage curiosity about language and among learners. Lewis (1997) points out that the learners' attention should be directed to lexical chunks (words, collocations, institutionalized expressions, sentence frames or heads, etc).

2.3. III (Illustration, Interaction, Induction)

III, which stands for *Illustration*, *Interaction* and *Induction*, is another language awareness-based model of language teaching. McCarthy and Carter (1995) - who are the pioneers of this model - argue the need for a stepaway from the three Ps to what they term the three Is. They believe that accessing real data and teaching aspects of spoken grammar should be incorporated into the lessons in order to make learners aware of the nature of spoken language and written distinctions in terms of grammatical choices.

In the III model, *Illustration* means "wherever possible examining real data which is presented in terms of choices of forms relative to context and use" (McCarthy & Carter, 1995, p.217). In this regard, learners look at real chunks of language, at real data as collected in the different corpora of spoken language available.

Interaction means that learners and teachers analyze the material together and talk about what language item has been noticed. Through observation learners are asked to comprehend and formulate the rules governing linguistic phenomena. In this stage, discourse awareness activities are brought to the fore, e.g. activities which focus on particular discourse patterns in the language under examination (McCarthy & Carter, 1995).

As the last stage, *Induction* takes the consciousness-raising a stage further by encouraging learners to draw conclusions about the features of the language analyzed (McCarthy & Carter, 1995). The induction stage is not followed by controlled practice compared to the PPP model.

McCarthy and Carter (1995) also point out that - with this model - learners will notice that some areas of grammar are probabilistically appropriate rather than absolutely correct, and that there are cases when their choice will be between an informal, interpersonally-orientated form, and a more formal alternative. This means that it is perhaps more proper to talk of tendencies, variable rules and choices than of fixed rules when spoken language is the object of analysis.

2.4. TTT (Test, Teach, Test)

An alternative to the PPP model is the TTT approach to language teaching, which is an acronym for *Test*, *Teach* and *Test*. In this respect, it differs from PPP in that the production stage comes first (Test stage). In *Test* stage, learners are required to perform a particular task (a role play, for example) without any help from the teacher (TTT, n.d.). The teacher assesses the students' level of competency in the particular language area, determine their needs, and proceed with the *Teach* stage (which corresponds to the *Presentation* stage in the PPP approach). The *Teach* stage allows the teacher to discuss the grammatical or lexical problems that has been determined in the activity. In this regard, it may offer exposure to new language or some chances to notice features of language (Woodward, 2001). According to Bowen (2002), the language presented in the *Teach* stage can be predicted if the initial production task is carefully chosen but there is a danger of randomness in this model. The final stage of the TTT model is the second *Test* that aims to check how well students have learned the language item. The learners are asked to do a similar or / the same task again.

In general, the TTT model is useful when the teacher is not sure whether the learners are familiar with a particular item (Lindsay & Knight, 2006). It can be particularly useful at intermediate levels and above, where learners may have seen language before, but have specific problems with it, and also in mixed level classes to help identify objectives for each individual (TTT, n.d.)

2.5. TBLT (Task-based Language Teaching)

TBLT developed early in 1980s as an approach to language teaching within the 'strong' version of CLT. The strong version stresses that students must use their communicative capacities in order to learn the language (Howatt, 2004). In order to realize that communicative capacity, many forms of TBLT have been proposed (Prabhu, 1987; Nunan, 1989, 2004; Pica Kanagy, & Falodun, 1993; Willis, 1996a, 1996b). However, the most well-known model of task implementation in the teacher training programs was devised by Willis (1993, 1996a, 1996b).

In TBLT, students are presented with a task they have to perform or a problem they have to solve. Typically, TBLT consists of three stages: the *Pre-task*, the *Task cycle* and the *Language focus*. In the *Pre-task* stage, the teacher explores the topic with the class. Useful lexical items may be highlighted. In addition to this, a recording of a similar / the same task may be given to the learners to help them understand what they will do with the task itself (Harmer, 2001). The *Task-cycle* can be broken down into three stages, too. The task stage in which learners perform the task, the planning stage as to how they will report to the class and the report stage when they report what and how they did the task orally or in writing. As the last stage, *Language focus* consists of analysis and practice. In the analysis, the learners examine lexical items or structures in the recording or text. In addition to this, the teacher may provide *Practice* for that lexical item or structure (Willis, 1996b).

Although Willis (1996a) claims that TBLT cannot be identified with a PPP upside down - because "it is more flexible and offers students far richer learning opportunities", it can be correlated with the PPP model: Pre-task (Presentation), Task cycle (Production), Language focus (Practice).

TBLT is not without its shortcomings. Ellis (2004) handles the issue as follows:

1. TBLT may not be well-suited to cultural contexts: Task-based teaching implies a particular cultural context that may be in conflict with cultural contexts where learning is not seen as a collaborative and experiential activity.
2. TBLT requires teachers to be proficient in L2
3. It reinforces the stereotypical view that English-language teachers should be native speakers.
4. What is appropriate for a second language teaching context may not be appropriate for a foreign language context.
a) Task-based instruction is seen as impractical in foreign language contexts because of the limited class time available for teaching the L2.
b) Task-based teaching is seen as difficult to implement by non-native speaking teachers whose L2 oral proficiency is uncertain.
Apart from those shortcomings, Ellis (2004) adds the following:

5. The sequencing of tasks are difficult.
6. Published materials are not readily available.

2.6. ESA (Engage, Study, Activate)

A different trilogy of teaching sequence is the ESA, which stands for *Engage*, *Study* and *Activate* (Harmer 1996, 1998, 2001). During the *Engage* stage, the teacher tries to arouse the students' interests (Harmer, 2001, p.84). In this respect, "unless students are engaged emotionally, their learning will be less effective". This contrasts with the traditional PPP model

in that the PPP model has always assumed that students come to lessons already motivated to listen or engage. The *Study* stage involves conscious attention to linguistic forms. Harmer (1996) equates it to the explanation and *Practice* of the PPP model. In this stage, the focus is on how something is constructed, whether it is a grammatical structure, a specific intonation pattern, the construction of a paragraph or text, the way a lexical phrase is made and used, or the collocation of a particular word. As for the *Activate* stage, the activities and tasks are designed to get what the students know and to use the language as communicatively as they can (Harmer, 2007).

ESA offers more flexible lessons allowing the lessons move between different stages. Harmer (1996, 1998, 2001) offers three types of lessons provided by the different ordering of Engage, Study and Activate. The first one is the *straight arrow* in which the lesson sequence is ESA. A *Boomerang* procedure, on the other hand, is equated with the TBLT procedure in which the lesson follows EAS. The last lesson procedure is the *Patchwork* lesson which involves a variety of sequences. An example for this sequence can be EASAES.

2.7. ARC (Authentic Use, Restricted Use, Clarification)

The ARC, model which was put forward by Jim Scrivener (1994), stands for *Authentic use*, *Restricted use* and *Clarification*. A sufficient account of the ARC model can be found in Scrivener (1994):

Restricted use: This stage focuses on form, accuracy and practice. Restricted use involves activities where the language available to the learners is in some way restricted – For example, doing an exercise on a grammatical item, reading a coursebook text, writing in a guided way, listening coursebook tasks etc.

Authentic use: This stage focuses on meaning, fluency and pleasure. Authentic use is the opposite of restricted use, there being no restriction on the language. For example, free communicative activities, discussions, writing stories or poems, reading novels or newspapers, listening radio or TV programs etc.

Clarification: It involves clarification about a language item on its meaning, form and use. The teacher use self or guided discovery to explore the language item, gives examples, analyze learners elicit or repeat things.

Scrivener (1994, p.133) states that "by ordering the A-R-C components in different ways we can describe a wide variety of lessons." The lesson sequences can be CRRA, RCR, ACR, RCA, ACAAC and A.

3. Discussion

When the models are examined, it can be noticed that most of the models (PPP, OHE, III, TTT, TBLT) are forms of recommended sequences for trainees and teachers; however, the other twos (ESA and ARC) are, in fact, used as a labeling system rather than a recommended sequence. In this sense, one can say that labeling systems are for experienced teachers that know an effective activity-ordering in a lesson.

All the language teaching models have advantages over each other in teaching practice, but they also have disadvantages compared to each other. Although PPP is the most common language teaching model, it is firstly criticized with not allowing for recycling or movement between the different stages. Secondly, it is in fact suitable for teaching grammar, rather than, teaching skills. Finally, it is especially suitable for learners at lower levels. Because of these deficiencies, many scholars offered variations on and alternatives to the PPP model.

In addition to the PPP model, there are certain models that imply a reordering of the PPP stages. For example, in TTT model, while the first and second Test stages correspond to Production in the PPP model, the Teach stage equates with the Presentation stage in the PPP model. As for the TBLT, it can also be correlated with the PPP model: Pre-task with Presentation, Task cycle with Production, and Language focus with Practice.

The reordering of the PPP stages in TBLT and TTT makes the lesson more suitable for learners at higher levels. The teacher at these models should be proficient in L2, like a native speaker. In addition to these, the two models - in this sense - forming the lesson's sequence, may not be suitable for every culture where learning is not seen as a collaborative and experiential activity.

Apart from the models that imply a reordering of the PPP stages, some other models do not include all the PPP stages. For example, OHE and III models do not include controlled practice stages compared to the PPP model. Besides this, the two models are stricter in the lesson procedure than PPP in that they must include discovery activities, which may not be suitable for all learners, who are especially at lower levels and whose learning styles mismatch with this kind of activity.

When the aforementioned models are taken into consideration, it can be inferred that there is no perfect and unique model suitable for every student. Learners as individuals prefer various lesson procedures in accordance with their level of language proficiency, culture and learning style.

Scrivener (1994) states that language teaching models are paradigms, as well. Thomas Kuhn (1996) gave *paradigm* its contemporary meaning when he adopted the word to refer to the set of practices that define a scientific discipline at any particular period of time. In line with Kuhn's concept, each of the language teaching models forms a paradigm and each language teaching paradigm has an underlying philosophy in language teaching literature:

The PPP model   : Audiolingualism and Oral Situational Approach
The OHE model   : Lexical Approach
The III model   : Discourse Analysis
The TBLT model   : Communicative Approach and Task-based Language Teaching

It can be inferred that written and spoken interaction has become an important focus of language teaching models with the developments in linguistic science, especially with Dell Hymes' communicative competence. Apart from the influence of linguistics, learning theories has also influenced the language teaching models. The most influential of these learning theories is the constructivist learning theory. As part of constructivism, learner-centeredness took part in language teaching models especially in TBLT and further versions of the PPP model. This change in the approach to language teaching made a paradigm shift in language teaching methodology, in this sense, in language teaching models.

This shift can be pursued in language teaching models with two key components of the learner-centeredness. The first one is placing more responsibility in the hands of the students to manage their own learning, and second, teachers taking roles as facilitators of knowledge to help learners learn how to learn. In this way, teachers can foster learner autonomy by creating and maintaining a learning environment through which students can develop their language and learning skills to become autonomous learners.

It should be kept in mind that it is possible to use all the language teaching models depending on the lesson (skill or grammar), culture, level of language proficiency and learning styles. Swan (1985) advises that when a new approach comes along, we should not ask; 'Is it true?, but What good does it do ?' and urges that we should 'try out new techniques without giving up useful older methods, simply because they have been 'proved wrong'. This seems to be sound advice. Teachers should be open to new ideas and decide for themselves on what works best for their particular students. If so, teachers need to be trained for making decisions about the suitable methods and models during teacher training process. As prospective teachers, they should be familiar with the methodological paradigms in methodology courses in order to choose what works best for their students as well as themselves.

4. Conclusion

In this study, the main aim is to review the language teaching models in FLT literature. Therefore, to highlight the issue, seven language teaching models have been presented and compared with each other (PPP, OHE, III, TTT, TBLT, ESA, and ARC). With this aim in mind, if learners' needs and expectations are known and considered in the pre-planning stages of lessons, any language teaching model may be favorable for teachers. The preferred model/s can be employed in a holistic way in any language classroom environment to yield better results.

References

Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The architecture of cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Anderson, J. R. (1987). Skill ccquisition: Compilation of weak-method problem solutions. *Psychological Review*, *94*(2), 192-210.

Anderson, J. R. (2005). *Cognitive psychology and its implications.* 6th Ed. New York: Worth Publishers.

Bowen, T. (2002). *Task-based learning.* Retrieved from http://www.onestopenglish.com/

Byrne, D. (1976). *Teaching oral English*. London: Longman.

Ellis, R (2004). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Evans, D. (1999). *A review of PPP*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Harmer, J. (1996). Is PPP dead? *Modern English Teacher, 5*(2), 7-14.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. London: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language* teaching (3rd Ed). Harlow: Longman.

Harmer, J (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A. P. R. (2004). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1996). *The Structure of scientific revolutions*, 3rd Ed. Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1996). Implications of a lexical view of language. In Willis, D. & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.

Lindsay, C. & Knight P. (2006). *Learning and teaching English*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

McCarthy, M. & R. Carter (1995). Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it? *ELT Journal* 49/3

Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge.

Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction and research. In G. Crookes & S.M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning* (pp. 9-33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (Second Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scrivener, J. (1994). *Learning teaching*: *A guidebook for English language teachers.* Oxford: Heinemann.

Scrivener, J. (1996). ARC: A descriptive model for classroom work on language. In J. Willis, & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. and Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-256). New York: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In Cook, G. and Seidelhofer, B. (Eds.) *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2005). The Output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed), *The Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp: 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Swan, M. (1985b). A critical look at the communicative approach (2). *English Language Teaching Journal, 39*(2), 76-87.

TTT (n.d.). *Test, teach, test.* Retrieved from http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/test-teach-test

Willis, D. (1996a). Introduction. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching. (*pp.iv-vi). Oxford: Heinemann.

Willis, D. (1996b). Accuracy, fluency and conformity. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching (*pp. 44-51). Oxford: Heinemann.

Willis, J. (1993). Preaching what we practice-Training what we teach: Task-based language teaching as an alternative to PPP. *The teacher Trainer*, *8*(1), 17-20.

Willis, J. (1996a). A flexible framework for task-based learning. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching (*pp. 52-61). Oxford: Heinemann.

Willis, J. (1996b). *A framework for task-based learning*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman.

Woodward, T. (1993). Changing the basis of pre-service TEFL training in the UK. *IATEFL TT SIG Newsletter, 13, 3-5.*

Woodward, T. (2001). *Planning lessons and courses: Designing sequences of work for the language classroom*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Children's Foreign Language Anxiety Scale: Preliminary Tests of Reliability and Validity

Selami Aydın
Balıkesir University / Turkey
English Language Teaching
saydin@balikesir.edu.tr

Leyla Harputlu
Dokuz Eylül University / Turkey
English Language Teaching
leylaharputlu@gmail.com

Serhat Güzel
Balıkesir University / Turkey
serhatguzel@balikesir.edu.tr

Özgehan Uştuk
Balıkesir University / Turkey
oustuk@balikesir.edu.tr

Şeyda Savran Çelik
Hakkari University / Turkey
seydasavran@balikesir.edu.tr

Deniz Genç
Balıkesir University / Turkey
deniz-genc@hotmail.com

Abstract: Foreign language anxiety (FLA), which constitutes a serious problem in the foreign language learning process, has been mainly seen as a research issue regarding adult language learners, while it has been overlooked in children. This is because there is no an appropriate tool to measure FLA among children, whereas there are many studies on the scales that aim to measure anxiety levels among adult learners. Thus, the current study aims to conduct the preliminary tests of reliability and validity of the Children′s Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (CFLAS) and to report on the pilot examination of reliability, validity and factor structure of the CFLAS. The findings of the pilot study show that CFLAS is a reliable and valid tool to measure FLA levels among children who learn English as a foreign language (EFL) within the age range of 7-12 in a Turkish EFL context.

Keywords: Foreign language anxiety, children, scale, validity, reliability

1. Introduction

FLA, a type of uneasiness and an anxious state of mind generally caused by the unique nature of the language learning process which includes various challenges for learners (McIntyre & Gardner, 1994), is a considerable variable that has negative influences on the foreign language

learning process (Aydın, 2008). FLA manifests itself in the language classroom in many ways since the language learning process is a unique situation in that it addresses multiple skills (McIntyre & Gardner, 1994). One of the reasons that causes FLA is that achievement is measured and appreciated based solely on test scores rather than whole performance throughout the learning period. Another reason is that comments of others and the teacher during language learning affect language performance (Kitano, 2001). The last reason is that language learners experience communication apprehension during interaction and communication with native, second or foreign speakers of the target language. In conclusion, it is important to measure FLA, a considerable issue in the language learning process, with valid and reliable tools to have a deep understanding of how to cope with it.

Latest research on the validity and reliability of the scales that aim to measure FLA among adult learners draws attention in the field of foreign language learning and teaching. In this sense, researchers mainly preferred Horwitz's (1986) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) to measure anxiety levels. For instance, several studies focused on the reliability and validity of the FLCAS developed by Horwitz (1986) among adult learners and reached mainly positive results in terms of the validity and reliability of the FLCAS (e.g. Aida, 1994; Paredes, & Muller-Alouf, 2000; Toth, 2008; Yaikhong, & Usaha, 2012). However, while it is possible to trace studies dealing with FLA with the help of FLCAS concerning adult learners, there is a serious lack of study on FLA among children (Aydın, 2013).

As underlined above, over the past years, the number of studies focusing on the role and rate of anxiety among young learners has been fairly sparse (Ay, 2010; Aydın, 2012; Chan & Wu, 2004). In addition, one of the main limitations of those studies was that the FLCAS that was designed for adult language learners was used to measure anxiety among children. Thus, considering the differences, including psychological, cognitive and social developments of children, it is very difficult to collect reliable data and draw conclusions without a scale that is designed specific to young learners. Furthermore, children who are surveyed might feel more anxious provided that they cannot figure out the meaning of items belonging to a survey that has not been intentionally created for young learners. Moreover, in order to identify the sources and extent of anxiety, situations creating anxiety and ways to lower it, it is valuable to prepare and conduct a FLAS among children.

In Turkish EFL context, however, the implementation of the FLCAS on children was conducted in a study that focused on the adaptation of FLCAS into a Turkish version and testing its validity and reliability. In this study, Bas (2013) reviewed the adaptations of FLCAS in related literature, and based on the data, a 30-item scale was developed to measure elementary school children's FLA. After the development of scale, it was tested for both reliability and validity. The reliability of the scale was calculated as 0.93 according to Cronbach's Alpha. Bas (2013) detected three factors in the scale, and total variance percentage was calculated as 52.93%. However, it seems that in the study, all the items were kept unaltered in terms of simplicity and syntactic constructs, which contradict the principles of developing scales for children. That is, to develop an effective scale for children, items must be moderated and simplified as much as possible by taking their cognitive levels into consideration.

To conclude, several reasons guided this study. First, FLA is considered as a research area that is mainly related to adult foreign language learners, while children are neglected. Second, current literature shows that there is not any research tool that aims to measure FLA among children who learn a foreign language. Third, researchers mainly preferred Horwitz' (1986) FLCAS to measure the level of anxiety among children without taking into consideration children's psychological, cognitive and social developments. In conclusion, it can be stated that

scale adaptation and development regarding anxiety among children remains an untouched area. Thus, this study aims to carry out a preliminary study on the adoption of an anxiety scale that can be used to measure anxiety levels among children. In a narrower perspective, the current study aims to present preliminary results of the administration of an anxiety scale that was adopted for children in terms of validity and reliability.

2. Method
2.1. Participants
The participants in the study were 174 students enrolled in one primary and one secondary school in Balıkesir, Turkey. The sample group consisted of 23 (13.2%) second graders, 29 (16.7%) third graders, 24 (13.8%) fourth graders, 37 (21.3%) fifth graders, 32 (18.4%) sixth graders and 29 (16.7%) seventh graders. Of the participants, 89 (51.1%) were girls and 85 (48.9%) were boys. Their mean age was 9.71 in the range of seven and 12.

2.2. Tool
The data collecting tools consisted of a background questionnaire examining participants' age, gender and birth date, the FLCAS (Horwitz, 1986) that involved 33 items that were assessed on five facial expressions that ranged from one to five (1=very unhappy, 2=unhappy, 3=neither happy nor unhappy, 4=happy, 5=very happy).

2.3. Procedure
The study consisted of four main phases: (1) Translation and adaptation of the FLCAS into Turkish, (2) simplification and moderation of the FLCAS for children, (3) the administration of the CFLAS and (4) statistical procedure.

Phase 1: Translation and adaptation of the FLCAS into Turkish
Five translators, one who had a Ph.D. degree, three MA students and one BA student in the field of English language teaching translated the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) validated by Horwitz (1986) from English to Turkish in blind sessions. Then, they compared and unified their translated versions into one and reached a satisfactory equivalence in a panel after focusing on the semantic and conceptual equivalence. Then, the English version of FLCAS was administered to 85 EFL learners at third and fourth grades in the Department of English Language Teaching of Education Faculty of Balıkesir University, Turkey. The sample group consisted of 63 (74.1%) female and 22 (25.9%) male students in the age range of 19 to 27 (x=21.09) at an advanced level of English language proficiency. Four weeks later, the Turkish version of the FLCAS was administered to the same sample group. Both the English and Turkish versions of the FLCAS were found to have internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha for the original version=0.77; Cronbach's Alpha for Turkish version=0.86) and construct validity (67.19 of the variance for the English version; 73.58 of the variance for the Turkish version). It was concluded that there is equivalence between the Turkish and English versions of the FLCAS regarding validity and reliability (Aydın et al. 2016).

Step 2: Simplification and moderation of the FLCAS for children
The Turkish version of the FLCAS that was appropriate for adults and proficient learners of English was simplified and moderated for children. For this purpose, first, each item in the Turkish FLCAS was simplified in accordance with conceptual and linguistic developments of the related age group by the panelists in a blind session. Second, they discussed each item in panels

and reached a consensus in terms of intelligibility and respondency among children. Several activities such as group, peer work and individual drama, process drama strategies and interactional role-plays were used to see how children perceived the items. The sample group that participated in the process consisted of 174 primary and elementary students at two state schools. The participants were from second to seventh graders in the age range of seven to 12. After examining the audio and visual recordings by the panelists, each item was restructured. The panelists reached a consensus regarding the intelligibility and respondency of the scale by children.

Step 3: Administration of the CFLAS
The CFLAS was administered to the participants in the fall semester of the 2015 – 2016 academic year.

Step 4: Statistical procedure
The data gathered was analyzed using SPSS software. First, participants' gender and grade frequencies in percent were computed. Then, mean score for age was calculated. Second, Cronbach's Alpha was computed to see the extent to which items in the CFLAS represent reliability. Third and last, an exploratory factor analysis was used to compare and to understand the extent to which the CFLAS reflects the construct validity. For this purpose, a principal component analysis and the Varimax method were carried out. After this procedure, eight items in the scale that were not functioning and not related to any factor were removed from the scale, leaving 25 items in the CFLAS (See Appendix A).

3. Results
3. 1. Descriptive data
The range of scores for the data set was from 30 to 87 with a mean score of 74.36. The standard deviation was found to be 13.22.

3.2. Reliability
Values demonstrate that the reliability level of the CLAS is acceptable. That is, the internal consistency was .85 in Cronbach's Alpha and .85 in Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items.

3.3. Validity
As previously underlined, the CFLAS was analyzed by an exploratory factor analysis. In the analysis, principal components with Varimax rotation was used. The items and their loadings on each factor given in Table 1 and 2 showed that the rotated factors explained 59.83% of the variance. In the CFLAS, eight items loaded on the first factor which explained 22.28%, whereas four items loaded on the second factor explained 39.85%. For five items loaded on the third factor, cumulative % was 46.05, whereas, for four items loaded on the fourth factor, cumulative % was 51.50. In addition, two items loaded on the fifth factor explained 55.74%, whereas two items loaded on the sixth factor explained 59.83%. In sum, a six-factor solution was identified that accounted for 59.83% of the variance. The eigenvalues, amount of variance explained and scree test showed that the CFLAS obtained an optimal factor solution.

Table 1. Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.57	22.28	**22.28**	5.57	22.28	**22.28**	4.13	16.51	16.51
2	4.39	17.57	**39.85**	4.39	17.57	**39.85**	2.90	11.58	28.09
3	1.55	6.21	**46.05**	1.55	6.21	**46.05**	2.47	9.89	37.99
4	1.36	5.45	**51.50**	1.36	5.45	**51.50**	2.22	8.88	46.87
5	1.06	4.24	**55.74**	1.06	4.24	**55.74**	1.93	7.71	54.58
6	1.02	4.09	**59.83**	1.02	4.09	**59.83**	1.31	5.25	**59.83**

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 2. Rotated Component Matrix

Items	Component					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
17	**.791**	-.007	.205	.029	.134	.120
1	**.774**	.020	.019	-.049	.103	-.079
20	**.772**	.167	.053	.150	-.011	.028
5	**.718**	.147	.230	-.037	.116	.040
8	**.596**	.116	.070	-.232	.268	.425
3	**.577**	-.230	.244	.012	-.198	.111
14	**.561**	-.022	.236	.139	-.138	-.040
30	**.404**	.381	.238	-.109	.368	.190
7	.046	**.807**	-.162	.035	.061	.147
23	.057	**.794**	.097	.021	.124	.100
10	.025	**.503**	-.185	.292	.157	.003
2	.191	**.478**	-.018	.358	.293	-.379
13	.162	-.221	**.717**	-.023	.034	-.024
22	.272	-.078	**.699**	-.116	-.245	.048
21	.211	-.076	**.677**	-.165	-.058	.326
19	.037	.428	**.515**	.179	.203	-.109
24	.348	.125	**.502**	-.039	.014	-.106
11	-.087	-.011	-.040	**.795**	.073	-.086
9	.314	.114	-.210	**.629**	.161	.061
4	.036	.406	.115	**.604**	.128	.270
12	-.187	.319	.004	**.459**	.420	.398
33	.075	.093	-.021	.124	**.804**	.142
31	.056	.289	-.125	.263	**.705**	-.122
25	.405	.257	.195	.119	.045	**.508**
15	.041	.416	-.192	.340	.122	**.464**

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

4. Conclusion

This pilot study was designed to develop and examine Children's Foreign Language Anxiety Scale. First conclusion was that the scale obtained a high level of internal consistency. Second conclusion was that the scale resulted in a six-factor solution based on communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, test anxiety, fear of making mistakes, peer approval and course content. These conclusions provide evidence for the potential utility of the CFLAS as a developmentally appropriate measurement tool for foreign language anxiety among children aged 7-12. However, it should be noted that these results are tentative, as the current research includes the pilot study of reliability and validity of the CFLAS. In addition, the study is the first examination of factor solution and reliability analysis. Thus, it is necessary to perform an additional examination of the factors complexity in more diverse and larger samples to provide evidence on the relationship with variables found in the current study.

Note

An earlier version of this paper was presented at *the Conference of Glocalisation of Professional Development in ELT: Think Global, Act Local* on 3 – 4 June, 2016 in İzmir, Turkey.

References

Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(2), 155-168.

Ay, Y. (2010). Young adolescent students' foreign language anxiety in relation to language skills at different levels. *The Journal of International Social Research*, *3*(11), 83-91.

Aydın, S. (2008). An investigation on the language anxiety and fear of negative evaluation among Turkish EFL Learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, *Teaching Articles*, *30*(1), 421-444.

Aydın, S. (2012). The effects of young EFL learners' perceptions of tests on test anxiety. *Education*, *40*(2), 189-204.

Aydın, S. (2013). Factors affecting the level of test anxiety among EFL learners at elementary schools. *E-international Journal of Educational Research*, *4*(1), 63-81.

Aydın, S., Harputlu, L., Güzel, S., Savran Çelik, Ş., Uştuk, Ö. & Genç, D. (2016). A Turkish version of Foreign Language Anxiety Scale: Reliability and validity. Paper presented at GlobELT 2016 Conference: An International Conference on Teaching and Learning English as an Additional Language, 14 – 17 April, 2016, Antalya, Turkey.

Bas, G. (2013). Foreign language learning anxiety scale: Validity and reliability study. *Turkish Journal of Social Research, 17*(2), 49-68.

Chan, D. Y. C., & Wu, G. C. (2004). A study of foreign language anxiety of EFL elementary school students in Taipei County. *Journal of National Taipei Teachers College*, *17*(2), 287-320.

Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(3), 559-562.

Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 125-132.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning, 44*(2), 283–305.

Paredes, P. F. P., & Muller-Alouf, H. (2000). A Spanish version of the foreign language classroom anxiety scale: Revisiting Aida's factor analysis. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, *14*(1), 337-352.

Tóth, Z. (2008). A foreign language anxiety scale for Hungarian learners of English. *WoPaLP*, *2*(1), 55-77.

Yaikhong, K., & Usaha, S. (2012). A measure of EFL public speaking class anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation and reliability. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(12), 23-35.

Appendix A: Items in the CFLAS

1. İngilizce dersine girince ne hissediyorsun?
2. Derste İngilizce konuşurken ne hissediyorsun?
3. İngilizce derslerinde öğretmen sana seslendiğinde ne hissediyorsun?
4. Daha fazla İngilizce dersine girsen ne hissedersin?
5. İngilizce dersinin sınavlarında ne hissediyorsun?
6. İngilizce dersinde sana söz hakkı verildiğinde ne hissediyorsun?
7. Bir İngiliz'le konuşsaydın ne hissederdin?
8. İngilizce konuşmak için öğrenmen gereken çok kural olduğunu gördüğünde ne hissediyorsun?
9. Arkadaşların İngilizcede senden daha iyiyse ne hissedersin?
10. Arkadaşların İngilizceyi senden daha iyi konuştuklarında ne hissediyorsun?
11. İngilizce derslerinde başarısız olursan ne hissedersin?
12. İngilizce dersinde hata yapınca ne hissediyorsun?
13. İngilizce derslerinde parmak kaldırdığında ne hissediyorsun?
14. İngilizce dersine çok iyi hazırlanınca ne hissediyorsun?
15. İngilizce dersinin sınavına çok çalıştığında ne hissediyorsun?
16. İngilizce öğretmenin yaptığın her hatayı düzeltmeye hazırsa ne hissedersin?
17. Arkadaşlarının önünde İngilizce konuşurken ne hissediyorsun?
18. İngilizce dersinde arkadaşların mutsuz olunca ne hissedersin?
19. İngilizce derslerinde hazırlık yapmadan konuşman gerekince ne hissedersin?
20. Öğretmenin İngilizce söylediklerini anlamadığında ne hissediyorsun?
21. İngilizce derslerinde bildiğin şeyleri unutunca ne hissediyorsun?
22. İngilizce öğretmenin çalışmadığın yerden soru sorunca ne hissedersin?
23. İngilizce konuşurken diğer öğrenciler sana gülecek olursa ne hissedersin?
24. İngilizce derslerinde konular hızlı ilerlediğinde ne hissedersin?
25. Öğretmenin düzelttiği şeyi anlamadığında ne hissediyorsun?

Book Review

Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations

Setiono Sugiharto

Atma Jaya Catholic University - Indonesia
Faculty of Education and Language
setiono.sugiharto@gmail.com

This book unveils the vital notion of translingual practice, the premise of which is the dexterity of multilingual speakers and writers to negotiate language differences so as to assert their agency and positionality. It offers a thought-provoking discussion about how the richness of one's language repertoires, cultures, and rhetorical traditions can be a useful resource for meaning-making and negotiation in a global contact zone. Drawing a perspective from critical pedagogy, this book also deconstructs the much extolled current linguistic models such as multilingualism, World Englishes, global Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and English as an international language, showing that they are ideological constructs which ought to be critically interrogated. The book adopts an orientation that language is a dynamic, protean and emergent entity.

1. Book Review

Scholars in the field of applied linguistics has assiduously invested in researching the role of the English language as a language of education, politics, and economy, often bludgeoning teachers and students with such theoretical models as World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and global Englishes. While these models have helped generate useful insights for the English language pedagogy, they have been alleged of operating under the monolingualist paradigm (see for example, Pennycook 2014).

This book attempts to redirect our attention to a more egalitarian linguistic practice known as translingual practice –an orientation that acknowledges and respects one's agency and personal knowledge in negotiating language diversity. Under this orientation, the construction of linguistic knowledge from one's positionality and agency is highly encouraged.

Divided into ten chapters, this book adheres to the tenet that diversity is "the norm in the study of English" (p.75). In the first chapter, Canagarajah clarifies the new-fangled notion of translingual orientation by distinguishing it from the dominant monolingual orientation. What is so distinctive between these two orientations, as he further elucidates, lies in the fact that the

former sees communication as both "transcends individual languages...and words and involve diverse semiotic resources and ecological affodrdances" (p. 6). Some important constructs used throughout the book such as *community, native/non-native, practices, products,* and *shared norms* are also explicated.

Chapter two *Thoerizing Translingual Practice* offers an assessment of the limitations of monoligual orientation, and then continues to theorize the emergent perspective –translingual practice. Unlike the monolingual orientation which sees language as a set of predetermined and autonomous entities, translingual practice views language as the by-product of peoples' engagements in everyday communicative practices. In their engagements, they align themselves with other people, objects, and ecological resources. Thus, translingual orientation is grounded on the practice-based perspective.

Chapter three *Recovering Translingual Practice* provides a historical persepctive of the translingual traditions that had long been in existence in precolonial East and premodern West. This chapter provides evidence that translingual practices are not contemporary activities carried out by modern people.

In chapter four *English as Translingual*, the author revisits the current prevalent models such as World Englishes, English as an International Language, and English as a Lingua Franca, and offers a critique of their underlying assumptions. Accusing these models as still clinging to the norms that promote uniformity and sharedness in communicative practices, Canagarajah calls for the redifinition of English as translingual, suggesting that success in communication does not depend on the unified perspective of language norm, but rather on the diversity of the norm.

Chapter five *Translingual Negotiation* Strategies describes several strategies employed by translinguals to co-construct meaning in interactions where there is an absence of shared understanding among the participants. Using a conversation analysis method, the author manages in unraveling different strategies of translingual negotiation. They include *envoicing, recontextualization, interactional*, and *entextualization*.

Chapter six *Pluralizing Academic Writing* addresses issues related to the possibilities of mixing (or as the author terms it "code-meshing") diverse linguistic codes in academic writing with the production of hybrid texts as the eventual goal. To convince the readers that meshing the codes is possible in academic writing, the author provides a compelling illustration of a writing penned by a multilingual scholar Geneva Smitherman, who was able to represent her voices and agency in academic writing. Such a code-meshing practice, as the author passionately argues, does not reflect a dysfunctional practice.

In chapter seven *Negotiating Translingual Literacy*, the author begs for difference in conceiving the notion of literacy. Instead of understanding literacy as self-standing and autonomous, we are under the translingual practice orientation compelled to view literacy as always subject to negotiation. Such an orientation "treat the texts as co-constructed in time and space" (p.127). To illustrate the importance of such a shift, the author, drawing from classroom ethnography, shows how a multilingual student negotiated the code-meshed texts in academic writing in their attempt to make meaning.

Chapter eight *Reconfiguring Translocal Spaces* centers on translingual practices from a macro-level context by taking into account the import of such constructs as power, identities, and language ideologies, all of which are always negotiated in translocal spaces. Drawing from the Blommaert's model of scale, the author analyzes the use of English resources brought by the multilingual migrants in the contact zone, and reveals that these migrants adopt different strategies for voice and intelligibility in their interaction.

In chapter nine, *Developing Performative Competence*, the author redefines the notion of proficiency from the translingual perspective, arguing that what makes translinguals able to achieve communicative success is not their grammatical competence as has been theorized in the Chomskyan model, but their *performative competence*. The latter competence includes the ability of translingual in aligning themselves with diverse semiotic resources surrounding them.

The final chapter *Toward a Dialogical Cosmopolitanism* addresses the implications of translingual practice for cosmopolitan relations. Canagarajah asserts that translingual orientation is in tune with the *dialogical cosmopolitanism* model in that both are not "given, but is achieved in situated interaction, is based on mutual collaboration, with an acceptance of everyone's difference" (p. 196).

With the dominance and power of the English language ideology seeping into literacy pedagogy and scholarship, this book is a must read. It casts light into how translinguals employ diverse appropriating and resistant communicative strategies to bring their voices and agency. It also reflects an intellectual movement that promotes what Horner, NeCamps, and Donahue (2011) calls "translingual norm". Evidence drawn from case studies help to strengthen the arguments put forward by the author. More importantly, they can inspire readers to challenge linguistic and cultural determinism.

One reservation about this book is despite the author's claim that translingual practice is not an esoteric concept, it takes a great feat to fathom it, let alone applying it academic writing classrooms where the English monolingual ideology is still pervasive. Further, without solid background knowledge in studies related to post-modernism and critical pedagogy, the reader has to wrestle with technical terms and metaphors the author employs in illuminating his analysis.

References

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

Horner, B., Ne Camp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63, 269-300.