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INTRODUCTION

The focal themes of my teaching philosophy are 1) teacher’s instruction and feedback to meet students’ learning needs, 2) factors that affect learners’ motivation, and 3) authentic materials, which support communicative and task-based instruction. These themes form the foundation of my beliefs and practices as a Chinese teacher by using communicative methods. Additionally, three artifacts support my teaching philosophy along with a further explanation of certain aspects of my teaching and academic research.

In support of my teaching philosophy, I present additional artifacts intertwined with my teaching experiences. The first artifact is a discussion of factors that affect biliteracy development in Chinese and English, which allowed me to understand learners’ difficulties that they might confront. The second artifact reveals that cultural norms govern the language of apologetic styles in Chinese and English. The final artifact addresses essentials that help language learners overcome learning difficulties and what effective ways can be used to obtain learning goals.

The portfolio was developed gradually over time. Its completion required careful reflection and frequent revisions. This process helped me grow professionally in three ways. First, reading lots of research is essential to formulate a framework and decide what further papers should be included. Secondly, questions about effective teaching frequently took me much time to figure out. Thirdly, each paper is mutually influential, so organizing them well is difficult. In all, it has been both a challenging and a rewarding process to articulate my beliefs about effective language teaching.
TEACHING PHILOSOPHY
THE APPRENTICESHIP OF OBSERVATION

The most important teacher of my life was my beloved mom. When I was little, she was the best tutor, and assisted me with my homework and writing assignments. She corrected my words, modified my sentences, and suggested better ways of describing things. Although she was never trained as a teacher, she helped me write things that were sometimes published in school magazines. It brought me a sense of accomplishment and made me want to be a teacher in the future. Even though she passed away several years ago, I know she is with me at all times.

When I was eleven years old and still in elementary school, my mom told me that I needed to start learning English to prepare for junior high school. At that time, I had been learning how to play the piano for two years. With my English studies, I no longer had time to practice the piano, which I was reluctant to give up. However, my mom convinced me that learning English would be more important than playing the piano. Thus, I gave in to my mom’s wishes and began taking English classes at the Hess International Education Organization. My first English teacher, who was from the US, planted a strong seed in my heart. She elicited my enthusiasm for English by teaching with games, individualized instruction, and great patience. I still remember her adorable smile when she instructed us in practicing pronunciation or conversation individually. Because of her kindness, I didn’t feel embarrassed when I made mistakes. She established a comfortable atmosphere for learning. She always encouraged every student to speak the target language by offering praise. Therefore, I liked her very much and
always looked forward to attending her class. Her passion for teaching inspired me and motivated me to want to become a great teacher like her.

Two years later, I graduated from elementary school and entered junior high school. My busy junior high school schedule prevented me from taking English at the Hess International Education Organization. Therefore, I had to quit the English classes I enjoyed so much. From then on, I took English classes at my Junior high school, where my English teacher was also wonderful and inspired me even more to become a teacher. She taught us with great dedication, not only explaining every basic grammar rule but also giving us many supplementary reading materials such as English songs, novels, and poems. Although I couldn’t understand all of the readings, I did immerse myself in English learning. I often looked for other English songs or poems after class to pick up more vocabulary. Beyond being great at teaching, she was also a thoughtful person. She cared personally for every student in class. When she knew that my mom was seriously ill, she often wrote me cards to console me. That meant a lot to me because it helped me get through that hard time. She was an inspiring example of a compassionate teacher. I was deeply influenced by her, and I hope that I will be able to become a teacher who not only teaches well but has genuine empathy for students.

My third English teacher, who influenced me to work with pre-school or elementary children, taught Introduction to Western Children’s Literature in my college. She introduced the class to wonderful children's story books. She asked us to think about what messages those pictures and sentences in the story books would convey to readers. Reading those books, I found it amazing that these authors wrote about children’s creative imagination or thoughts I never had before. I was brought into a fantasy world in
which I could leave behind the hustle and bustle of this world. Since then, I have maintained a love of children's story books. I believe this motivated me to want to teach children.

These three teachers all played pivotal roles in my life. However, there was one additional teacher who played an important role in my life as well. She was my piano teacher. When I was in college, I decided to refresh my piano skills and found a new piano teacher at the YAMAHA institute in Taiwan. Actually, she was an English major in college but she taught piano excellently. She briefly explained the history of the song or the life of the composer history before we started a new piece. I loved that part of her teaching. Those beautiful stories about songs or composers helped me to interpret classical tunes with my own emotions. Additionally, she encouraged me to face failure positively. She said, “You are bound to succeed if you stick with your work.” I eventually passed my piano examination although I failed the first time. Her encouragement came in handy when I became a teacher because she helped me know that I could do it even if I met with failure sometimes.

To sum up, I am grateful for these wonderful mentors. It would be impossible for me to be here to further my studies without them. I will do my best to emulate their superior examples in my teaching career.
PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The primary goal for my professional environment is teaching Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) in a pre-school or elementary school in the United States. My previous experience with special education students in elementary schools inspired me to teach children Chinese. Through studying language teaching theory in the MSLT program, I realized that both students with special needs and foreign language learners need to learn how to communicate appropriately in real-life situations. Furthermore, children keep me humble and motivated to learn continuously. Their fantastic imagination helps me to have creative ideas for designing interesting lessons.

In the near future, more public schools around the world will implement immersion programs for students learning foreign languages. I believe that will offer me good opportunities to combine my knowledge of child-hood education and language pedagogy. I will also draw on my previous experience of teaching students with special needs to teach younger learners. This will aid me in dealing with students who have behavioral problems.

Whether instructing general language learners or students with special needs, I believe that continuing to learn is the most important requirement for becoming an effective teacher.
PERSONAL TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Learning a new language is a continuous effort requiring many essentials for good results. According to Artelt, Mc-Elvancy, and Peschar (2003), students who have positive behaviors and attitudes toward learning tend to enjoy good learning results. In addition, Thomas and Collier (1997) claim that students who exhibit greater academic and cognitive development in their first language are more proficient and have better academic development in the second language. Actually, motivation of second language learning affects the outcomes of language acquisition (Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008). Therefore, in the journey of language learning, teachers play the most important role to motivate and guide students to learn and success. According to Lee and Van Patten’s (2003), students are like builders guided by their architect’s (the teacher’s) instructions. If there is no teacher, learners are like a ship drifting through the boundless sea without a navigator guiding them to their destination. Thus, a teacher’s verbal and nonverbal behaviors affect students’ learning (Allen, Witt, & Wheeless, 2006; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Frymier, 1994). The ways a teacher thinks, behaves, and speaks should be encouraging to lead students to enjoy a promising learning journey. Since I have been on the journey of learning English for many years, I have come to realize how hard it is to learn another language. For example, I still have trouble with pronouncing ‘l’ and ‘r’. Besides, sometimes people cannot understand what I say even when I think I express myself clearly. From my personal experiences as a teacher and a learner, I have come to see that learning is by doing. According to Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro and Mandell (2001), “They [students] learn to do what they practice doing” (p. 15).
My previous language teachers helped me acquire a second language by using learner-centered approaches and being a facilitator of student learning (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001; O’Dwyer, 2006). Therefore, in light of my prior language learning experiences, I shall explore the role of the teacher in the classroom, teaching methods that improve the learners’ proficiency, student motivation, and teacher feedback (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). My personal teaching philosophy rests on these four intertwining themes.

Teacher and Learners

Teacher’s role

The teacher is like an architect who designs a blueprint to help students build their proficiency (Lee & Patten, 2003). Together, architect and builders (students) are a team in the classroom (Lee & Patten, 2003). For the team to function well, teachers need to develop a comprehensive understanding of students and their needs. Shrum and Glisan (2010) also claim that “as the student population continues to grow in diversity, teachers will need to gain an understanding of the various needs that these learners bring to the foreign language classroom” (p. 349). Actively exploring students’ learning needs and being flexible to modify instructional types should be a teacher’s consideration.

Lawrence (1996) states that “a sign of a good teacher is the ability to flex one’s teaching style to better fit the needs of those being taught” (p. 74). To meet students’ different learning needs, I will choose appropriate materials and design interesting activities to support students’ learning. The purpose is to engage students in class and help them understand that acquiring knowledge of another language opens the door to
another culture and paves the way for enhancing their career opportunities (Berman, 2012). However, I would rather teach by personal modeling than by lecturing only. I try to be a good model for students as they acquire patterns of communication. For this reason, in addition to promoting learners’ language competencies, I will guide my students in becoming humble learners as well (Meetu, 2010). Being humble in learning allows people to self-reflect frequently and improve their language ability by correcting errors.

When I worked in special education, students’ psychological needs were my prime concern. This should also be the case in language teaching (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). A student’s distinct learning style is usually influenced by individual psychological needs. Psychological needs in Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs refer to students’ “belongingness and love needs” (Poston, 2009, p. 348). For instance, students who have been blamed by their own parents while making mistakes would have difficulty developing self-confidence. Undoubtedly, these students will need more encouragement to build confidence in learning. Hence, teachers’ encouragement and praise allow students to feel that they are valuable and precious. When students receive positive feedback on their academic achievement or their behaviors, such as giving a good presentation or helping to clean the classroom, self-esteem is enhanced.

However, teachers do not always need to cater to each student’s needs. Sometimes teachers need to help students change learning habits that result in negative learning efficiency (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). For example, if a student looks up every other word in the dictionary, that is not conducive to reading fluency. To be a superior teacher, I strive to learn the latest teaching theories and professional methodology to
provide students with the latest knowledge to help them improve their learning efficiency. Additionally, no one is expected to be error-free in my class (Lee & Van Patten, 2003). Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro and Mandell (2001) claim that “errors are a natural and necessary part of acquisition, and [...] error-free learner language is simply not attainable” (p. 25). Making mistakes is inevitable and it should be viewed as a part of the learning process (Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2006). Moreover, errors should be corrected in a meaningful way (Lee & Van Patten, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2010). I hold this expectation not only for students’ learning but also for my own teaching. If students and teachers learn from their mistakes, better learning and teaching qualities can be developed.

Teacher’s feedback

Teacher’s feedback can influence language learners’ response and second language (L2) development (Sheen, 2004). The relationship between students’ learning progress and teacher’s feedback is mutually influenced. When a teacher always gives correct answer to students’ errors, they might have immediate response, but not necessarily acquire L2. According to Sheen (2004) and Yoshida (2008), teachers most frequently use recast for corrective feedback, but it is the least effective feedback to elicit learners’ uptake, which refers to students’ immediate utterance following teachers’ feedback. Yoshida (2008) states that “allowing learners more time for learners’ self-correction is better learning” (p. 89). Therefore, teachers should provide students time to work out questions. I believe that only through the process of figuring answers out, students acquire the knowledge they need. Additionally, Sheen (2004) and Yoshida
(2008) also demonstrate that teachers’ feedback of clarification requests and elicitation are more effective to help students achieve actual comprehension and language acquisition.

Hence, feedback is the stepping stone of improvement because it helps students know their weaknesses and strengths. When students answer questions in class, I always give positive feedback by expressing my appreciation for their response to my question. Students’ responses should be admired because doing so promotes their self-confidence and motivates them to respond again in future. In terms of students’ wrong answers, I correct them through asking questions or inducing them to get closer to the key point. However, depending on students’ different learning styles, I may vary my corrections or comments. For instance, to students who are afraid of making errors, I usually elicit them to speak correct answers with tender ways without pointing their mistakes directly. For correcting students’ homework, I circle students’ incorrect words or put questions toward their errors, which is a hint to help students be able to think and figure answers out.

Because learning is not just receiving everything (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001; Lee & VanPatten, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2010), students should think, question, and discover answers. That is the process of learning.

Therefore, the teacher’s feedback is a vital part of influencing students’ learning motivation and improvement. To make learning meaningful for students, effective feedback is needed (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). In my view, “IRF” is an effective approach for giving meaningful feedback. According to Wells (1993), “IRF” stands for the sequence in which the teacher initiates, the student responds, and the teacher provides feedback (as cited in Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Crucially, in IRF, the teacher provides
feedback that encourages students to think and perform at higher levels. Asking assisting questions encourages students to speak the target language (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991, as cited in Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Additionally, IRF is an effective enhancement of interpersonal communication in the classroom. First, I select interesting topics and contexts which anchor interpersonal communication. Second, I strengthen the connections among tasks for meaningful interaction and ask assisting questions to move the discussion forward. Third, I provide opportunities for learners to acquire new information and engage in activities featuring topics important to them (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Finally, my positive attitude and demeanor toward students will be an important element of my teaching.

I hope to instill in my students the spirit of learning which is ‘never give up.’ Thus, I always try to give feedback which will encourage students to face learning difficulties, overcome them, and not give up. Furthermore, students’ motivation for learning will be enhanced as well.

Learners’ motivation

In language teaching, intriguing materials and activities will facilitate students’ learning and comprehension (Dörnyei & Schmidt, 2001; Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008). I once had students do a role play about a couple fighting. Each student was deeply engaged in this activity. When each pair finished their presentation, I would show a picture with a question which is ‘Did they break up?’ Students really liked this and looked forward to seeing one another’s acting. When students enjoy learning, their language acquisition unconsciously occurs and they consciously see their own
improvement (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001; Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Additionally, students’ awareness of improvement boosts their learning motivation. Dörnyei and Schmidt (2001) claim that “in the classroom context, motivation can be seen as a continuous interaction process between the learner and the environment” (p. 29). I believe students who feel comfortable in a learning setting will have higher learning efficiency than those who feel uncomfortable. People with lower self-esteem have higher anxiety (Krashen, 1982; Young, 1991). Additionally, students with low self-perceived proficiency in a foreign or second language are potentially anxious language learners (Young, 1991). This highlights the importance of students’ psychological condition for their language learning. Therefore, I put helping students establish positive feelings and attitudes as a top priority in my classroom to enhance students’ ability to learn. To achieve the goal of motivating students’ learning interests, it is crucial for teachers to provide effective teaching in the classroom.

Students’ motivation is a mental process which cannot easily be observed directly. Yet, it has great influence on students’ learning ability. L2 learners’ motivation is a crucial factor that determines their L2 achievement (Dornyei, Csizer, & Nemeth, 2006; Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008). When learners have interests in class, their learning efficiency is enhanced. Dornyei, Csizer and Nemeth (2006) indicate that school instruction is one of the factors that affect learners’ motivation. Thus, teachers’ instruction should be focused on engaging students in learning, which means motivating students to learn. Teachers can provide cultural products related to the target language, such as songs, foods, or movies, which are in order to promote students’ learning interests and support their language achievement. Dornyei, Csizer and Nemeth (2006)
further claim that learners’ target language proficiency can be promoted when they are immersed in an environment in which the target language is spoken all around. Teachers should offer effective instruction and show much enthusiasm in teaching to maintain students’ learning desire and motivation.

**Effective teaching methods**

1. *Communicative classroom*

Language learning is for communication not for learning itself (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). Lee and Van Patten (2003) explain that people communicate orally for different kinds of reasons. Thus, establishing a need and a goal for communication in the classroom is crucial for language learning. According to the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (2010), the first standard, *Communication*, is composed of three modes: Interpersonal, Interpretive, and Presentational. Promoting all three modes, my teaching will require students to express themselves and exchange opinions with each other. In addition, diverse materials enhance students’ comprehension and interpretation of written and spoken messages. Encouraging students to present information and relate their own thoughts to interlocutors or audiences on a variety of topics is also important (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001).

1-1 *Negotiation of meaning*

Communicating for clarification and making inferences will enhance learners’ attempts to interact. When students use the L2 to communicate as much as possible in learning settings, negotiation of meaning occurs (Long & Porter, 1985). Since negotiation of meaning serves as an important part of communication, I will design activities in
which students have opportunities to negotiate for meaning in order to reach authentic communicative goals.

1-2 Communicative activity design

Interview, jigsaw activity, or role play will help students get engaged in a communicative classroom. These activities help teachers to create “a pleasant and supportive classroom atmosphere” and allow students to cooperate in order to complete tasks within a “cohesive learner group” (Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008, p. 58). For example, I have students work in pairs to role play a situation of renting a house. This requires students to obtain information by asking each other questions, such as how much for the rental? or is cable TV or internet is available? When a student does not understand the word ‘rental’, another student might explain it by saying ‘the monthly payment of renting’ to make ‘rental’ meaningful. Through meaningful information exchanging with partners, students’ ability to communicate, clarify, and negotiate meaning will be enhanced.

Lee and Van Patten (2003) define communication as the “expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning in a given context” (p. 60). Therefore, negotiation of meaning plays a pivotal role in learners’ communication, because interactive approaches that teachers develop can help students enhance their communication abilities (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). When students are involved in cooperative activities, they are encouraged to help each other through exchanging information or ideas. For example, when students learned the difference between ‘會 (capacity)’ and ‘能 (physically be able to…)’, they were confused. However, there was one student in class just made an example, which was about asking for going to the
restroom. The student explained that going to restroom is not a capacity but more about physical action. Therefore, it should use 能 not 會. Through his explanation, the rest of students had better understanding how to use the two characters in different situations.

Hence, when each student reads a sentence with each other by using ‘會 (capacity)’ and ‘能 (physically be able to…)’, they also try to clarify what they want to express with asking questions or using body languages. In addition to meaning of negotiation, authentic materials and interaction are crucial to allow students to be involved in real-life dialogues.

2. Authentic materials and interaction

Students’ communication can be made meaningful through authentic interaction in realistic conversation, which includes turn-taking, hesitations, repetition, and pausing (Gilmore, 2004). Authentic interaction relies on authentic materials (Shrum & Glisan, 2010), which are important for assisting students in applying the target language in the real world. Authentic materials are taken from the real world and used without editing or rewriting (Xing, 2006). For example, news, reports, restaurant menus, TV shows, and movies are authentic materials that allow students to learn natural language use as well as the target culture. One day, after watching a clip about the importance of peace in the family, my students spontaneously imitated the way characters spoke in the clip.

Speaking norms are embedded in cultural patterns. For example, Americans usually ask ‘how are you’ but Chinese usually ask ‘have you eaten?’ when seeing people. Culture knowledge should not be viewed simply as an attachment to language (Xing, 2006) but as an essential element of language learning (Arnold & Ducate, 2011; Moran,
Moran (2001) claims that “language is the product of culture and language also reflects the practice of the culture” (p. 48). Native speakers can communicate without difficulty because they share cultural knowledge about the society in which they live. When language learners have insufficient cultural knowledge, their proficiency will not be further developed (Xing, 2006). Therefore, it is vital to teach language through culture (Robinson, 2008).

2-1 Appropriate authentic materials

In language teaching, it is crucial to use appropriate authentic texts and tasks tailored for learners. For example, beginning Chinese language learners could access comic books to learn natural conversation. Comic books will be helpful for engaging students because they are usually interesting and short. Students will easily acquire Chinese words and authentic conversational routines.

2-2 Authentic interaction through technology

To increase their understanding of the target culture, learners can also use technology for intercultural exchange (Sung, 2010). Shrum and Glisan (2010) also claim that learners can use technology to interact with the target culture. Hence, my students will be encouraged to use e-mail, Skype, Wiki or blogs to interact with native speakers. Technology enables learners to use their linguistic skills to interact with peers and to learn about the contemporary target culture (Arnold & Ducate, 2011; Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Thorne (2008) claims, participation in open and thematically oriented Internet communities support the very process L2 education ostensibly seeks to provide, such as the use of language in the service of goals that extend beyond ‘practice’ or ‘learning’ in the restrictive
senses associated with institutional settings (p. 434).

According to *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: preparing for the 21st century*, technology also supports the goals of the Five Cs: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. None of the Five Cs can be separated from the other nor is any one goal more important than another (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). For instance, preparing to present a Chinese song, making a Chinese video clip, or doing Chinese celebrations helps students delve into Chinese cultures. Most students expressed that they really appreciate Chinese cultural events that they go though, such as ‘Moon Festival’ and ‘Chinese New Year’. These events help them better understand Chinese cultures. Additionally, through experiencing Chinese cultural events, they can establish connections between American and Chinese cultures to compare similarities and difference.

It is impossible to learn the target language without connections with the target culture. Without cultural understanding, students are less likely to engage in effective interpersonal communication (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). If students want to develop their ability to interact with others in the community of the target language and culture, they need to expand not only linguistic knowledge but also pragmatic understanding (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001; Lee & Van Patten, 2003). For example, ‘哪裡哪裡’ (năli năli) in Chinese means ‘thank you for your compliment’ but literally means ‘where? where?’ in English. Therefore, if a learner does not understand its true meaning, s/he might be confused when s/he receives the question after praising someone. Teachers can help students comprehend contexts through story-based pedagogy. When students read a story, they learn the structure of sentences at the same time.
3. Story-based approach to teaching grammar

3-1 Meaningful discourse

Grammar plays a supporting role in communication (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). Grammar should be taught and embedded in meaningful discourse. When grammar is learned in a meaningful context, learners can come to use grammar for their own communicative purposes (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002; Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). This also allows learners to use grammar naturally in real life communication. Grammar is not for grammar’s sake but for communicating effectively (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). Thus, I utilize a story-based approach in teaching grammar. A story-based approach focuses on encouraging students to learn from meaningful texts (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002; Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Especially when teaching beginning learners, the teacher needs to connect discourse to help students comprehend and experience the meaning and function of grammar (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). A story-based approach to teaching grammar invites learners to interact with content and become aware of what grammar they really need to learn in order to understand the texts (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002; Shrum & Glisan, 2010).

Furthermore, teachers should correct grammar errors to improve learners’ communicative ability, not focus on correction itself (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). For example, in Chinese and English, ‘with someone’ is put in a different place in a sentence. Take the English sentence, ‘Mom goes to the supermarket with her friends.’ In Chinese, only ‘Mom with her friends go to the supermarket’ is allowed. Therefore, the sentence in Chinese is always in this way, ‘Mom and her friends go to the supermarket.’ However, my students often exhibit errors in using this grammar
detail in reading or writing. Students often put ‘and me’ at the end because it fits English grammar. Thus, I correct them by saying a complete sentence and pointing out what they read in the story book. Students have to practice using this in conversation after my correction to grasp the Chinese grammar.

3-2 The PACE model

The PACE model helps language learners understand “relevant and meaningful form” from teacher’s grammar explanation. (Shrum & Glisan, 2010, p. 223). A teacher can emphasize the critical grammar which is embedded in context when presenting a whole text (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002). For example, when introducing a story about family members, a teacher can highlight the way of expressing what members he/she has in his/her family. Furthermore, the PACE model includes four steps developed for “integrating focus on form in the context of a story-based unit of study” (Shrum & Glisan, 2010, p. 223). They are presentation, attention, co-construct, and extension, which will be explained more below.

The first step is ‘presentation of meaningful language’, which means a story is presented orally with pictures, gestures, or facial expression provided. This is to make language understandable to leaners (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002; Shrum & Glisan, 2010). The oral presentation also facilitates students’ comprehension in listening and their acquisition of meaning and structure (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Additionally, a thematic way to present the whole text is primary to help students have a complete concept without seeing the written scripts. Furthermore, the presentation should be interactive (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Thus, interactive tasks and activities such as asking questions and pair work are needed to help students engage and have opportunities to use
key vocabulary and phrases (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). This is followed by the second step ‘attention’.

Attention is the emphasis on students participation in some important language presented that they do not notice. The purpose is to help students focus on a “grammatical element” that will be discussed to better understand the text (Shrum & Glisan, 2010, p. 224). In the discussion, teachers and students are co-constructors, which is the third step in PACE model. The teacher and students have a “collaborative talk” to “create understandings about the form, meaning, and function of the new structure in question” (p. 225). The teacher helps students develop the target structure and compare it to their prior-knowledge of similar or different structures (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). This process allows students to integrate the new structure into their existing knowledge and to prepare for extensive use at a later time. Therefore, the fourth step is extension activities in which learners will apply new structures they learn to real-life situations.

The teacher can design activities, such as role-play, information gap, or authentic writing projects to support them in expressing themselves well in the target language in ways that fit the target culture. Shrum and Glisan (2010) claim that “the extension activities can address cultural perspectives embodied in the story” and connect students into a community of target language speakers (p. 229). According to these four steps, the PACE model is a process of connecting learners’ grammatical knowledge with language use in the real world. Hence, task-based instruction is one of the critical approaches in my teaching.
4. Task-based instruction

The goal of each lesson should be that learners have “a reason for doing something” (p. 76) with the target language (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). Furthermore, learners need to have opportunities to carry out a particular task by using the target language (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). Lee (2000) explains that a task is a sequence of activities that are carried out to complete a goal. In task-based activities, students are like builders when building a house together. For example, when students compose a dialogue script together, it is like positioning individual logs one by one to build a house. The process of writing (building) takes time to lay the foundation (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). Three components, “learner-centered, meaning exchange and predetermined steps,” (p. 76) are incorporated in task-based instruction which focuses on communication and negotiation of meaning (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). To put it clearly, a teacher designs activities which are completed through student-to-student interaction with the target language. By interacting in the target language with classmates, learners have opportunities to exchange ideas and information with others. Through a series of predetermined steps, various subtasks culminate in an end goal which applies to real life. Role play is a good way to help students experience the process. I like my students to write short skits in small groups because they can always gather ideas from different members. After integrating these ideas, they write down their skits and then present in front of the whole class. During the process, students notice what they do not know but wish to know and what errors they need to correct.
The purpose of task-based activities is to help involve students in communicative tasks. According to Sung (2010), “a communicative task is a key element in Communicative Language Learning (CLT)” (p. 706). Nunan (1989) defines the communicative task as “classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form” (p. 10). Nunan also identifies six components: input, teacher roles, learner roles, settings, activities, and goals. According to Nunan (1989), input refers to authentic materials that are meaningful for learners and not just for language teaching and learning purpose. In doing communication tasks, teachers participate in activities as “facilitator and observer” (p. 87), while learners are participants in a learner-centered classroom, gradually moving from being dependent to becoming independent learners. Students need to work in different grouping patterns such as pairs or small groups to establish relations with others through exchanging concrete information and intangible feelings (Nunan, 1998). With these guidelines, task-based instruction enables students to communicate in realistic scenarios with the target langue and achieve communicative goals. I frequently use information gap and interview activities to foster integration of listening, writing, and speaking skills in interaction. Through interaction, less-proficient and more-proficient learners communicate with each other, utilizing the Zone of Proximal Development in order to co-construct meanings (Vygosky, 1978). The interaction between the experts and novices in a problem-solving task is what Vygotsky refers to as scaffolding. The novices’ abilities can be improved immediately by the assistance of the expert (Vygosky, 1978). People who have more-proficient ability can serve as the role of expert to help less proficient learners toward a
greater proficiency. Therefore, language teachers, native speakers, and more-proficient students can be the experts who scaffold the learning for less-proficient students (Lee, 2004). In a classroom, pair work and small groups offer students many opportunities to interact and learn in a more engaging and less stressful way. Also, teachers can detect what common mistakes students often make and correct those. I believe integrating task-based instruction and communicative tasks in class promotes learners’ communicative competence as well as their learning motivation.

Conclusion

Teaching, as Igoa (1995) states, is an art. At the same time, teachers are researchers. In the process of teaching, teachers search for relevant information, select useful materials, plan short-term and long-term goals, and care about students’ learning needs. Finally, teachers produce good works (students) by effective techniques. Every single work is unique to the artist; likewise, each student is unique to a teacher due to her or his different characteristics. Teachers help students to keep climbing to arrive at the top of the mountain of learning. Therefore, teaching is not a one-way process. Teachers work together with students and help them reach academic goals. Hence, instructional goals must match learning objectives. What students should know and be able to do is the central part of my teaching. That is the student-centered environment I will establish. To me, teaching is interacting with students, rather than lecturing to them. My purpose is to help students enhance their learning efficiency and attain their goal of using the target language to communicate in the real world. Furthermore, as a teacher, I believe that my students are my learning partners, not to be controlled by me. Their different life
experiences and thoughts allow me to broaden my worldview and invite me to be
humble. I believe each student is unique and creative and their achievements will surpass
that of their teachers one day.
LITERACY ARTIFACT

Factors that influence Chinese/English bilingual children’s biliteracy development
INTRODUCTION

This paper, originally written for Dr. de Jonge-Kannan’s LING 6010 class, is a proposal to investigate the biliteracy skill development of bilingual Chinese/English children raised by bilingual parents living in the USA. As I wrote this artifact, I came to better understand what factors influence Chinese language learners’ learning process. In addition, I have a clearer concept about the importance of literacy in the first language, which lays the foundation for developing second language literacy.

Additionally, this paper allows me to have better knowledge of how phonological and morphological awareness, cross-language transfer, motivation, and sociocultural factors affect the extent of learners’ comprehension. These factors allow me to choose strategies to help my students acquire Chinese. Due to this research, I have challenged myself to use multiple strategies and to meet diverse learning needs. It is a process of incorporating instruction to appeal to different learning styles and motivation in order to facilitate their learning efficiency.

Furthermore, the aforementioned crucial concepts in second language learning will prepare me for future teaching in a Dual Immersion Program. With this foundation, I will be able to discern students learning needs and provide effective instruction according to research-based theories.

Hence, I chose this artifact to be included in my portfolio to serve as a practical resource for teaching application and improvement.
Abstract

The primary objective of this study is to investigate the biliteracy skill development of bilingual Chinese/English children raised by bilingual parents living in the USA. The method used to analyze children’s reading fluency (in English and in Chinese) will be to record their utterances when they are engaged in story book reading out loud. Through this analysis, children’s biliteracy ability and its impact on reading comprehension will be examined (McBride-Chang et al., 2010; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005).

There will be two data analysis procedures for this study. The first will measure children’s utterance rate while they read aloud a story of 10-15 pages. The Chinese utterance rate will be compared to the English utterance rate in order to identify the children’s reading fluency in both languages. This measures word recognition in Chinese and English. Second, reading comprehension will be tested by asking children “what,” “why,” and “how” questions related to the content of the story.

Introduction

Literacy ability is viewed as a process that includes reading, writing, and thinking about print-based or electronic texts (Wood & Blanton, 2009). In terms of biliteracy, it is interpreted as reading, writing, and thinking in two different languages (Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). However, literacy development is not limited to developing text interpretation; social factors play a pivotal role in children’s literacy development as well (Pérez, 2004). Social factors are related to interaction with people and therefore the influence of teachers, classmates, and parents is explored in this study, as these social
factors are known to shape children’s literacy development (Pu, 2010). In addition to sociocultural factors, several other factors which might influence bilingual children’s biliteracy ability are also discussed. These factors are 1) shared phonological similarities and 2) children’s motivation. A detailed discussion of these factors is presented in the following sections.

**Literature Review**

*Phonological awareness*

Researchers have suggested that phonological awareness is the sine qua non for young children’s literacy development due to the primary link to word recognition (Anthony & Lonigan, 2004; Chen, Anderson, Li, Hao, Wu, & Shu, 2004; Mcbride-Chang, Bialystok, Chong, & Li, 2004; Mcbride-Chang, Tong, Shu, Wong, Leuag, & Tardif, 2008; Shu, Peng, & Mcbride-Chang, 2008; Ziegler & Goswami, 2005). Chen et al. (2004) claim that “phonological awareness refers to the insight that spoken words consist of smaller units of sound” (p.142). To clarify, children need to detect a word’s intonation pattern and phonemes to recognize its meaning, which are thus related to children’s reading comprehension. According to Ziegler and Goswami (2005), reading is the process of comprehending written language and accessing its meaning in context. During the reading process, children must decode a series of visual symbols and try to understand the meanings.

Reading involves visual-acoustic cooperation whether the reader reads aloud or silently. Even when readers are silent while they are reading, they still read aloud in their mind (Mattingly, 1972). However, decoding skills are no guarantee of a child’s reading
comprehension (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005). For example, a child may know that the symbol “D” or “d” is almost always pronounced [d], but the pronunciation of “D” or “d” cannot tell the child anything about a word’s meaning (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005). Despite the differences in Chinese and English phonological coding systems, young Chinese children’s phonological awareness might be as important for their Chinese literacy development as for English literacy development (McBride-Chang et al., 2010; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005).

However, unlike English, Chinese is not an alphabetic language; therefore, phonological awareness while reading in Chinese is a different skill. Characters are the basic unit of the Chinese writing system, which starkly contrasts with alphabetic writing systems such as English (Li, 2006; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). In English, written words consist of letters corresponding to speech sounds, like ‘t’, ‘a’, etc. For example, when reading ‘dog’, readers can pronounce it by combining every single letter’s sound. For instance, ‘d’ is pronounced [d], ‘o’ is pronounced [a] and ‘g’ is pronounced [g]. Thus, combining the three sounds, ‘dog’ is pronounced [dag].

Conversely, Chinese characters consist of radicals and strokes (Shen & Ke, 2007). The smallest and most basic unit of a character is a stroke (Sung & Wu, 2011; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). For example, the Chinese character /妻(wife)/ consists of different directional lines, which are called strokes. These strokes, which are not connected with phonological properties (Sung & Wu, 2011), combine to make radicals. For example, ↑ is one of the radicals in Chinese, it combines /丿/and /丣/ with /丨/ in the middle to form ↑. Therefore, /丿/丣/ and /丨/ are strokes to form the radical ↑.
According to Wang, Perfetti, and Liu (2005), “the radical is the most basic unit of Chinese character” and “radicals are then combined to form characters” (p. 68). For example, 忄 and 白 are combined to from the character 怕 (pronounced /pà/) which means ‘scared’.

In addition, there is an assistant tool, called pinyin, to help people know how to pronounce characters correctly (McBride-Chang et al., 2010). Pinyin is similar to the International Phonological Alphabet (IPA), in that both employ symbols corresponding to speech sounds (Johnson & Demuth, 2010). Pinyin consists of letters from the Roman alphabet and lexical tone superscripts which convey pronunciation (McBride-Chang et al., 2010). For example, [dā] [dá] [dǎ] and [dà] have individual lexicon tones above the [a] which are [̄] [ˊ] [ˇ] [ˋ]. Syllables with different tones have different meanings, so depending on tone, [da] could mean: [dā](take), [dá](answer), [dǎ](hit), and [dà](big).

However, due to the large quantity of Chinese homophones, it is hard to infer a character’s exact meaning by relying on pinyin. For instance, /妻(wife)/ is pronounced /qi/, but /七(seven), /漆(paint), / and 欺(deceive) are also pronounced /qi/. Thus, a word’s pronunciation does not automatically signify word meaning. Readers of Chinese need to access the word’s context to infer word meaning when reading pinyin. Actually, pinyin consists of two elements. Pinyin codes the pronunciation of characters in onset and rime (Chen et al. 2004). Onset is the initial sound and rime is the final sound of pinyin. The character 看 /kàn/ (look at) is transcribed in pinyin by putting /k/(initial) and /an/ (final) together (/kan/), with the lexical tone [‘] on the top of [a], finalizing the pinyin as /kàn/. Tone refers to voice inflection and includes four types: high [̄], rising [ˊ], low then
rising [ˇ] and high then falling [ˋ] (Chen et al., 2004; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). The character /看[kàn] (look at)/ with [´] represents high then falling tone. When the tone is changed from [kàn] to [kǎn], the meaning changes from ‘look at (看)’ to ‘hew (砍)’. If children lack the ability to distinguish tones in characters, they cannot distinguish homophones (Chen et al., 2004). Hence, pinyin, which includes tone markings, is an important tool to aid pronunciation for both Chinese as a first language (L1) and Chinese as a second language (L2) readers. Therefore, it could be hypothesized that pinyin forms a common ground between English and Chinese for bilingual children.

**Learning settings**

It is known that phonological awareness is the foundation of literacy development of bilingual (English/Chinese) children (Chen et al., 2004; McBride-Chang, Tong, Shu, Wong, Leung, & Tardif, 2008; McBride-Chang et al., 2012; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). However, it is important not to overlook other factors that might influence Chinese American children’s literacy development in English and Chinese (Pu, 2010). Many Chinese immigrants in the USA hope that their children can maintain the heritage language while acquiring English, but it is a challenging task (Li, 2006; Pu, 2010). Within the American education system, all children receive literacy instruction beginning with kindergarten (or earlier). However, Chinese-American children learn Chinese at home or at a weekend school (Koda, Zhang, & Yang, 2008). According to Pu (2010), some Chinese as Heritage Language (CHL) children attend community-based CHL schools to receive Chinese literacy instruction, which means L1 and L2 literacy development occurs in physically and socially divided learning contexts. While CHL
Children receive Chinese literacy instruction at weekend schools, outside of this context there are insufficient Chinese literacy resources for them. They are unlike students who develop biliteracy in bilingual programs within the American education system. Children who attend CHL schools are likely to receive unbalanced amounts of linguistic resources in English and in Chinese (Hall, Smith, & Wicaksono, 2011). Notably, children who enter a monolingual American school receive more formal English instruction than Chinese instruction.

In fact, the asymmetry of the linguistic resources might result from teachers’ attitudes. Some teachers are concerned that spending time learning another language might impede children’s English proficiency (Pu, 2010). Thus, CHL children receive more English resources than Chinese. Koda, Zhang, and Yang (2008) claim that more Chinese resources should be available for CHL children to improve the balance between the two languages. Parent support is particularly helpful for balancing the asymmetric resources. For example, parents who help CHL children read Chinese stories at home and interact with children in Chinese increase children’s exposure to Chinese input. Based upon this, parental support is an important social factor that influences children’s literacy development. This discussion must include Vygotsky’s childhood development theory, which is addressed in next section.

Sociocultural factors

Vygotsky (1978) emphasizes that humans construct knowledge through social interaction within their cultural and social groups. Thus, social and cultural factors are impossible to separate from human development and learning. Therefore, children’s
literacy development and learning are also influenced by cultural and social practice (Pu, 2010). Moll and Greenberg (1990) claim that interconnections among different social environments, which indicate school, home, and other community that students are involved, are important to students’ learning and cognition development. These environments include cultural and cognitive resources which help students establish social knowledge, skills, and labors (Moll, 1990; Moll et al. 1990, 1992). For example, Pérez (2004) also claims that “a view of literacy from sociocultural theory of learning considers and seeks to understand the cultural context within which children have grown and developed” (p. 4), which means that literacy development involves sociocultural beliefs and values. These beliefs and values are formed in a community where children live or are immersed. Li (2006) mentions that language and literacy learning is part of the process through which novice learners acquire cultural values and relationships from experts in the social context where learning occurs. Thus, children’s literacy development is embedded in sociocultural contexts from home or school (Pu, 2010).

At home, the extent to which children receive biliteracy instruction from parents influences children’s biliteracy achievement. As Li (2006) claims, the home environment is a crucial factor which results in children’s success or failure in achieving biliteracy. Parents’ attitudes toward heritage and mainstream language or beliefs and values toward the two cultures influence children’s social and individual identities (Li, 2006). Hence, parental beliefs and practices contribute to children’s biliteracy development. However, Li and Rao (2000) demonstrate that the amount of bilingual and biliteracy instruction that children receive influences their biliteracy development. Therefore, a biliteracy-rich environment has impact on children’s early biliteracy development (Li & Rao, 2000).
In terms of Chinese literacy development, Li (2006) indicates that support from institutions inside and outside of the Chinese community help individuals shape positive attitudes toward Chinese language and culture. Children’s positive attitudes are formed when they are involved in receiving formal Chinese instruction along with a variety of Chinese cultural and literacy activities (Li & Rao, 2000). In non-Chinese communities (e.g., American public schools), children should be taught to respect all cultures and languages, so that positive values towards the Chinese language are cultivated. Thus, assisting children to establish a positive attitude towards biliteracy development is crucial.

**Cross-language transfer**

According to the research summarized above, phonological awareness, learning settings, and parental influence are clearly significant factors that impact bilingual children’s biliteracy achievement. Additionally, cross-language transfer has also been identified as playing a pivotal role to establish children’s literacy ability in reading two languages.

Cross-language transfer emphasizes the differences and similarities between two languages and can be used to explain how children build dual language literacy. Melby-Lervåg and Lervåg (2011) state that instruction delivered in L1 and L2 can facilitate cross-language transfer. They also point out that transfer between the alphabetic writing system and the ideographic writing system is more difficult than between two alphabetic systems. The difficulty of transferring between ideographic and alphabetic systems is due to the lack of common ground between the two (Melby-Lervåg & Lervåg, 2011).
Although there is obvious difficulty of cross-language transfer between Chinese and English, the child’s home life, before school, has a great impact on their biliterate success.

Bowman-Perrott, Herrera and Murry (2010) state that children’s prior schooling experience and their level of first language literacy are key factors in literacy development as well. This supports the hypothesis that children’s level of Chinese and English would have a mutual influence on the development of their biliteracy. Koda, Zhang and Yang (2008) define transfer as “not static transformational rules as traditionally conceived, but rather, the internalized form-function relationships which have evolved gradually through input processing experience” (p. 139). Based upon this definition, when bilingual children go through a similar literacy experience in two languages, their biliteracy ability is successfully developed. For instance, one child might read story books every day with parents, but another one seldom reads story books. Comparing the two children, the child who reads more story books would have a different literacy experience than the child who reads far less.

**Morphological awareness**

Reading behavior is embedded in two interrelated systems: a language and its writing system which encodes the language (Koda, Zhang, & Yang, 2008). Thus, learning to read is essentially learning to map between a writing system and the spoken form of the language (Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). This involves connecting spoken language elements and visual symbols (Koda, Zhang, & Yang, 2008).
To connect spoken language with visual symbols, children need “the ability to analyze a word’s morphological structure” (Koda, Zhang, & Yang, 2008, p. 140). Such morphological awareness allows children to extract partial information from familiar components and then develop lexical inference, which means readers not only interpret the meaning of a sentence but also comprehend the main idea of a paragraph or a whole story. Reading comprehension is then followed by lexical inference. When children lack the ability to infer vocabulary, their reading comprehension is impaired (Koda, Zhang, & Yang, 2008). Chinese-English bilingual children develop biliteracy ability by decoding two different systems. In English, the meaning of some words can be inferred through prefix or suffix identification. For example, the word /recycle/ contains the prefix “re”, which means “again” indicating that the word is related to doing something again. In Chinese, the radical can predict a character’s meaning. For example, in the character, /喝 (drink)/, the radical is /口 (mouth)/, which implies using the mouth to do something. Therefore, morphological awareness can help children infer word meaning in English and Chinese. Furthermore, the ability to infer word meaning directly influences reading comprehension. However, reading comprehension is more complex than pronunciation and knowing every single word’s meaning. In the next section, research on reading comprehension will be examined further.

Reading comprehension

Reading comprehension involves decoding skills and linguistic comprehension, which are essential for reading mastery (Hoover & Gough, 1990). Mattingly (1972) claims that “reading is ordinarily learned later than speech; this learning is therefore
essentially an intermodal transfer, the attainment of skill in doing visually what one already knows to do auditorily” (p. 23). Reading is a task involving visual and auditory processes simultaneously.

(1) **Decoding skills**

Decoding skills refer to understanding how phonemes are represented by written words (Melby-Lervåg & Lervåg, 2011). Beginning readers decode word meanings by phonology and access their mental lexicon to figure out unfamiliar words (Hoover & Gough, 1990). Furthermore, successful readers have achieved a high level of reading comprehension, which involves complicated internal transfer processes. They can rapidly derive phonemes and graphemes into meaning in mind (Hoover & Gough, 1990).

(2) **Linguistic comprehension and syllable awareness**

Linguistic comprehension means readers “take lexical information and derive sentences and discourse interpretations” (Hoover & Gough, 1990, p. 131). Reading comprehension, a sub-task of linguistic comprehension, involves decoding written language and understanding the meaning simultaneously. When readers truly comprehend what they are reading, they confront syllable difference, which is especially necessary in reading Chinese. Previous research has shown that syllable awareness is strongly associated with character recognition (McBride-Chang, Bialystok, Chong, & Li, 2004). For beginning readers, syllable awareness helps them map the spoken language to written language across orthographies, including both Chinese and English (Chen et al., 2004; McBride-Chang et al., 2004). According to McBride-Chang et al. (2008), “English is a relatively unreliable alphabetic orthography in which larger sized units must sometimes be learned in addition to (smaller) phoneme units” (p. 187). Therefore,
syllable awareness is important to English word recognition at an early stage. In addition, “Chinese, which only represents sound in large units, the syllable is particularly strongly salient, both in language and in print” (McBride-Chang et al., 2008, p. 187) Thus, for young children, syllable awareness is strongly associated with early reading in Chinese and English.

(3) Tone detection

Some previous researchers have found that word recognition in Chinese and English is relative to tone detection (McBride-Chang, Tong, Shu, Wong, Leung, & Tardif, 2008). Tone is integral to lexical processing in Chinese but not in English, thus tone detection is uniquely related to Chinese word meaning (Chen et al., 2004; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). Chinese includes four different tones to indicate different words and different tones result in distinct meanings. For example, the word /睡覺 [shèijiào] (sleep)/ has a completely different meaning in comparison with /水餃 [shěijiǎo] (dumpling)/ because of the different tones.

From the section above, it can be concluded that decoding skills, linguistic comprehension, syllable awareness, and tone detection are all important for children to achieve reading comprehension. One final factor which influences children’s reading should be considered. It is not related to skills or strategy, but rather an internal engine that propels children’s reading behavior: motivation.

Reading motivation

In addition to the internal process factors which influence children’s biliteracy development, intrinsic reading motivation should be considered as well (Wang &
Guthrie, 2004). Reading motivation is seen as the engine that drives readers to read. When children have a curiosity to learn about certain topics and gain pleasure from engaging in reading materials, we may say that this is children’s intrinsic reading motivation, which means children read because of internal curiosity or desire (Wang & Guthrie, 2004). This intrinsic motivation is an important force for children to become proficient readers (Wang & Guthrie, 2004). Lau (2004) correlated Hong Kong seventh grade students’ reading motivation with their Chinese reading comprehension and academic achievement. Lau’s findings indicate that intrinsic reading motivation “is positively highly relevant to students’ strategy use, reading comprehension and academic achievement” (p. 845). Thus, reading motivation could be the most basic factor influencing children’s literacy development (Wang & Guthrie, 2004). Even if children have good phonological awareness, syllable awareness or learning abilities, their literacy development may not be good if they lack motivation to read.

According to the different aspects of children’s literacy development, we know that phonological, syllable, and morphological awareness are important whether in Chinese or English. Besides, learning settings, sociocultural factors, and cross-language transfer influence children’s reading comprehension in Chinese and English as well. Hence, how Chinese-English bilingual children develop their early biliteracy ability and how to instruct them to lay a firm foundation of biliteracy ability will be the focus of this study. Based on this purpose, the following research question has been formulated: To what extent do Chinese-English bilingual children in the USA develop biliteracy in their early school years?
Method

Participants

Chinese-English bilingual children from Chinese-speaking families residing in Utah will be selected as participants for this study. Participants will be children from the ages of five to seven. They were born in the United States, China, or Taiwan.

The Chinese-English bilingual children will be recruited from immigrant Chinese families residing in Salt Lake City, Utah. All of these children have been exposed to Mandarin Chinese since birth. They attend preschool or an elementary school in the United States, where their instruction is in English. They will have received Chinese input from their parents at home from birth. Ideally, the majority of parents will engage their children in reading activities such as reading Chinese or English story books during the week. Additionally, some children attend CHL schools to receive Chinese literacy instruction two days per week as well.

Tasks and procedures

The researcher will become familiar with participating children and their parents before conducting all procedures. As a result of becoming familiar with the researcher, the children will behave naturally when the researcher is present, which will help when they are being recorded by the researcher (Ruan, 2004). The researcher, who is Chinese-English bilingual, will contact the children’s parents in advance, and inform them that their children will be asked to read a 10-15 page bilingual story book with pictures (Chen & Pan, 2009; Chen & Yan, 2011). However, the name of the story book will not be given in advance. These bilingual story books have the same content in Chinese and in English. There will be no more than twenty words per page. The children will be presented with
two tasks: text reading and text comprehension (McBride-Chang, Bialystok, & Li, 2004). To minimize the effect of prior learning, the researcher will ask these children’s parents what books they had read and bring a book that the child is unfamiliar with (Leong, Hau, Tse, & Loh, 2007).

**Text reading**

All participants will be asked to read a bilingual story book aloud first in Chinese and then in English (Chen & Pan, 2009; Chen & Yan, 2011). Chinese can be written in traditional or simplified characters. In China, people read and write with simplified characters, but in Taiwan, people use traditional characters. Therefore, Chinese texts with either traditional or simplified characters will be provided, depending on what each child is used to.

**Text comprehension**

The Chinese text reading task will be followed by three questions in Chinese. These questions will focus on “who” “why” and “how”, which are directly related to the story. For example, they will be asked, “Who was in the story?” “Why did the rabbit sleep in?” and “How did the turtle win the race?” Likewise, the same questions in English will be asked after English text reading.

**Transcription**

All oral tasks will be tape-recorded using a portable recorder (Chen & Pan, 2009; Chen & Yan, 2011). The stories children read will then be transcribed verbatim. A professional language teacher who is an English native speaker will help the researcher transcribe the recording of children’s English reading (Chen & Pan, 2009; Chen & Yan, 2011).
Instrument

While the researcher works with the children, the parents will fill out a questionnaire. The questionnaire will be a modified version of Baker and Wigfield’s (1999) Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) (Lin, Wong, & McBride-Chang, 2011). When the text reading and text comprehension tasks are completed, the researcher will interview the child’s parents. The interview will be similar to a natural conversation and include questions about their child’s literacy instruction in both languages. In addition to the MRQ, the researcher will adopt a background survey designed by Sung and Wu (2011), which elicit basic information about the children’s background such as birthplace, years in the United States, years in the home country, etc. (Sung & Wu, 2011).

Analysis

Children’s utterances both in reading and answering questions will be examined by their word selection and sentences patterns. From the coded data, three measures will be calculated in Chinese and in English, which are (1) words pronounced correctly in reading, (2) words recognized in reading, and (3) numbers of words used in answering questions. Thus, when the children read story books, the percentage of correct pronunciation and word recognition in Chinese and in English will be counted. Additionally, the children’s percentage of words used in Chinese and English, when answering the researcher’s questions, will be calculated (Chen & Pan, 2009; Chen & Yan, 2011). Ultimately, the researcher analyzes the children’s correct pronunciation, word recognition, and utterance length in Chinese. Another English native speaker who is a language teacher analyzes the three elements that the children produce in English.
Following the independent parsing in Chinese and in English, the researcher and another language teacher will compare results. Based on comparing the percentages of children’s correct pronunciation, word recognition, and utterance length in Chinese and English, the researcher will infer children’s literacy ability in both languages. Data will be presented in summary form in a table to show the percentage of correct pronunciation, word recognition, and utterance length in Chinese and in English. Therefore, there will be results from six measures for each child. Finally, parents’ responses towards the MRQ and the researcher’s interview will complement the investigation of children’s literacy acquisition (Lin, Wong, & McBride-Chang, 2011).
CULTURE ARTIFACT

Apologies in English and Chinese
INTRODUCTION

I wrote this artifact for Dr. de Jonge-Kannan’s LING 6900 class, in which I learned about pragmatics. As I mentioned in my literacy artifact, social and cultural factors influence people’s development and learning. Thus, for this artifact, I have compared different apologetic styles between Chinese people and Americans. The original reason that motivated me to do this comparison was that I wanted to discover different apologetic words I can say in English in addition to ‘I’m sorry’. Therefore, this study allowed me to research cultural apologies in more depth and to become more aware of appropriate apologies in real life that minimize misunderstanding and harmonize relationships.

This paper is chosen as one of artifacts in my portfolio because culture and language learning are never separated. A fluent language learner may cause misunderstanding or fail to communicate successfully because of cultural barriers. Efficient communication is based on a person’s well-developed language proficiency and cultural understanding. Therefore, as a CFL instructor, I want to help learners understand the difference between Chinese and American culture and have appropriate attitudes towards different cultures and languages to avoid miscommunication.
Abstract
This paper focuses on different apologetic styles in Chinese and American English and the cultural norms governing the different apologetic styles in the two languages. Through comparing apologetic expressions in Chinese and English, the relationship between politeness and language can be determined (Lee, 2008; Zhang, 2001). Furthermore, some specific apologetic strategies frequently used in Chinese will be presented, such as expressing an apology with a regretful attitude and admitting one’s error when humbly asking for punishment.

In addition, the influence of intercultural competence influences apology expression and some interesting factors influencing apologetic acts will also be covered (Chang, 2008).

Introduction
Communication is the most basic element in interaction. It includes verbal and non-verbal language and speech acts (Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2008). In interpersonal communication, what people say and how people speak and behave are shaped by culture (Moran, 2001). Cultivating appropriate communicative behavior in real life has been a challenge for language teachers and learners (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). Thus, for appropriate communication, cultural concepts must be learned in order to facilitate meaningful interaction and to minimize misunderstanding (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). Speakers with good grammar and vocabulary in the target language do not necessarily master intercultural competence (Lange & Paige, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2010; Tatsuki & Houck, 2010).
From a social perspective, Chang (2008) claims, “since apologizing is a crucial element of maintenance of social and relational harmony, an act of apologizing thus enacts an important role in the social practice of politeness” (p.60). In our daily social interactions, apologies are used frequently to harmonize mutual relationship (Chang, 2008; Guan, Park, & Lee, 2009; Lee, 2009). Thus, an apology is like glue for piecing broken glass back together. Aaron (2005) states that offering and receiving apologies is one of the most profound human interactions. The author also mentions that “apologies have the power to heal humiliations and grudges, remove the desire for vengeance, and generate forgiveness on the part of the offended” (p. 1). For offenders, apologies lessen their guilt or fear resulting from wrongful action. Thus, “the result of the apology process, ideally, is the reconciliation and restoration of broken relationships” (p. 1).

Literature Review

1. Apology definition

Apologies involve two parties: (1) offenders who try to express their apologetic intentions and (2) recipients who may or may not expect an apology from offenders (Chang, 2008). Aijmer (1996) claims that “semantically, apologies are strategies (also called semantic formula) which people use as a means to obtain their communicative goals” (p. 81). When offenders notice that what they have done has bothered or hurt others, an apology is a tool for expressing regret and requesting forgiveness. The intention of the one apologizing and the recipient’s perception that an apology should be given could influence their mutual relationship as well (Chang, 2008; Guan, Lee, & Park, 2009). If the offender and the recipient have the same expectation for an apology, the
relationship can be repaired with an apology (Guan, Lee, & Park, 2009). However, the relationship might not be reconciled when offenders do not notice that the potential recipient expects an apology (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006). Different strategies used by offenders also reflect different degrees of apologetic intention. When the degree does not match the recipients’ expectations, the equilibrium between them might not be restored (Lee, 2008).

According to Suszczynska (1999), “…the act of apologizing is face-saving for the H [hearer] and face-threatening for the S (speaker)…” (p. 1056 quoted from Olshtain, 1989, p. 156). From this perspective, apologies play a pivotal part in maintaining social harmony (Chang, 2008; Lee, 2008). Since the “social practice of politeness” in interaction (Chang, 2008, p. 2) is diverse in different cultures, different interpretations of politeness may result in distinct apologetic expression and may require dissimilar apology strategies across languages.

2. Apology strategies

Expressing an apology means the offender feels regretful and takes the responsibility for repairing the relationships with the recipient (Chang, 2008; Lee, 2008). To enhance the likelihood that the recipient accepts the apology, apologizers can use various strategies (Chang, 2008). These strategies help the offenders mitigate their offence and the recipients’ irritated feelings (Chang, 2008). Additionally, different strategies are chosen depending on the apologizer’s sense of the severity of damage felt by recipients (Chang, 2008). One interesting thing is that apologizers frequently use more than one strategy to minimize the degree of damage (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006; Chang,
2008; Chang, 2010). According to some researchers’ findings, the following are apologetic strategies apologizers frequently used (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006; Chang, 2008; Chang, 2010; Lee, 2008; Zhang, 2001).

1. announce apology (I’m sorry, I apologize)
2. describing the offender’s obligations to apologize with words such as I must apologize.
3. expressing regretful feelings and use intensifiers (really, so, such) (Eslami-Rasekh & Mardani, 2010)
4. providing reasons or further explanations to convince the recipients and imply the intention of requesting for forgiveness.
5. offering compensation condition to “balance the offence” (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006, p. 1904).
6. promise to never “repeat the offence” (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006, p. 1904) in the future.
7. Showing concern with sincere attitude.

Rose (2000) classifies these apologetic strategies as Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) and adjuncts. IFIDs include (1) vocalized regret and apology and (2) request for forgiveness, while adjuncts include:

1. providing reasons or further explanations (external factors)
2. offenders’ responsibility
3. offering compensation condition
4. promising never repeat the offence
5. showing concern
6. using intensifiers

Some of these strategies are exhibited in an e-mail example in Lee (2008), which contains a message written by a student to a teacher:

I am so sorry (IFID) that I missed two Wednesday lessons (responsibility). It is because I had my original lesson at the same time I couldn’t leave my class, otherwise I would fail the tutorial exercise (explanations). So (intensifiers) sorry about that. I really like to attend the class and improve my English (sincere attitude) (p. 10).
In the example, we find the student combined IFID and served adjuncts in the apology. We can also identify the steps the apologizer follows. The steps begin with internal thoughts which drive external acts for apology.

Step 1: Feeling regretful and acknowledging fault. (internal thoughts)
Step 2: Expressing the regretful feeling, uttering apologetic words (*sorry*). (internal thoughts drive external acts)
Step 3: Providing reasons and explanations to convince the recipients. (external factors and internal thoughts)
Step 4: Using intensifiers (*so*) and emphasizing apologetic intention. (external acts)

Research has demonstrated that apoloizers combine strategies to show their purpose of apology (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006; Chang, 2008; Chang, 2010). Fixing a relationship between two people is sometimes difficult if the damage is serious. Although a window can be seen through, with many cracks are always there. We can try to repair the cracks, or buy a new window. An apology is like tape for fixing the cracks between interlocutors (Chang, 2008; Guan & Park, & Lee, 2009; Lee, 2008). Apoloizers will say or do something more to mitigate the tense situation. Maintaining equilibrium of a relationship is the ultimate purpose for apologizers (Chang, 2008).

From my perspective, ‘time’ could be a crucial component in an apology. However, research in discussing ‘time and apology’ seems to be limited. I found that among researchers who discuss apology, only Aaron (2005) touches upon the issue. Therefore, I plan to probe into the degree to which time lapse may interact with severity of offense based on Aaron’s “nonpersonal” and “personal” offenses theory (p. 173). Nonpersonal offence refers to “the incident could have happened to anyone” such as spilling a beverage on someone’s clothes. This action has no purposeful intent and should
be apologized for immediately. The offender has to clearly express that “the offense was accidental, and offer meaningful reparation when feasible” (p. 173).

Contrarily, when one offends another deliberately, it already strains the relationship. Also, serious personal offenses hurt others badly like cheating on friends, betraying others’ trust, or “humiliating someone in public” (p. 176). When a nonpersonal offense is not immediately followed by an apology, the offender is usually considered rude or uncaring. But, it takes more time to successfully offer and accept apologies for personal offenses because the offended person might resolve their hurt only after days, weeks, or even years. This is likely when the damage is extremely harmful making it difficult to offer forgiveness soon. In such cases, the offenders’ apologies need to be part of an ongoing process. They apologize, offer reparation, and provide explanation to repair the relationship with the offended.

Sometimes, different personalities influence the time of accepting apology (Exline, Worthington, Hill, & McCullough, 2003). Some people cannot accept an apology even if the damage is little, but some people just forgive the offender in a short time whatever hurt they experience. However, apologetic strategies could help the recipients decrease their hurtful feeling and not go through permanent psychological damage. For example, when people view the offender’s word or behavior as “an empty threat” (p.53 ), they forgive offender’s wrong doings soon. In addition, different cultural norms might influence how much time people need to forgive various types of offenses, too. Thus, through comparing Chinese and English apologetic language, some different cultural or social perspectives may be uncovered.
3. Chinese versus English apology

Based on Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989), Lee (2008), and Zhang (2001), I developed the following table to compare Chinese and English apologetic language (see Table 1).

Table 1. Chinese and English apologetic language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese (putonhua) /style</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Literal meaning of the phrase</th>
<th>Degree of regret, responsibility &amp; remedial actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dui bu qi (IFID)</td>
<td>Sorry</td>
<td>Expressing regret towards someone</td>
<td>Least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bao quian (IFID)</td>
<td>Be sorry, feel apologetic, regret</td>
<td>Regret (assuming and embracing regret)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhi qian</td>
<td>Apologize (assuming responsibility)</td>
<td>Making an official self-criticism, admitting fault and showing an apologetic feeling to someone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dao qian</td>
<td>Apologize, make an apology (assuming responsibility)</td>
<td>Making an official self-criticism, admitting fault and showing an apologetic feeling to someone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei li</td>
<td>Apologize, offer an apology (for inappropriate behavior or mannerism)</td>
<td>Making an apology to someone, offering compensation. (e.g. pay for the damage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qing zui</td>
<td>Admit one’s error and ask for punishment; humbly apologize.</td>
<td>Admitting one’s sin and asking for punishment. (remedial action)</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on Blum-Kulka & House, & Kasper, 1989; Zhang, 2001; Lee, 2008).

From the table, we can find that Chinese people use “quian” to express regret. Also, the last two “Pei li” and “Qing zui” elicit “penance acts” which refer to the action of bowing to admit guilt and requesting punishment to compensate for offenders’ sins. In Chinese culture, people focus on being very polite. Chinese people are taught to humbly self-criticize after making mistakes (Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005). Therefore, from the surface meaning of “Pei li” and “Qing zui,” asking for punishment does not necessarily
mean that one will be punished. It just conveys offenders’ high extents of regret. In Chinese culture, people live more closely and are used to shoulder each other’s burdens. For them, showing restraint and sincerity in interaction is very important. This traditional norm reflects Chinese people’s personality and apologetic nature. Thus, a distinct cultural background might cause people to enact different “productions of speech acts” (Chang, 2008, p. 60).

To convey sincere regret, Chinese people usually express the hope of doing something to compensate for the person whose feelings are hurt. In contrast, *I’m sorry*, *sorry*, and *apologize* are three American words used often for expressing regret (Chang, 2009; Lee, 2008). This identifies that American social culture emphasizes personal independence and autonomy (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1996).

4. Factors influencing apologies

4.1 Culture and propensities toward apology use

According to past research on apologies, culture is the most vital factor influencing apologetic patterns used (Chang, 2008; Guan, Lee, & Park, 2009; Zhang, 2001). Cultural comparison between the USA and East Asia shows differences in apologetic expressions (Gua, Lee, & Park, 2009). For example, compared to Americans, Japanese people apologize more frequently and explicitly in private interaction, but Americans tend to apologize in a public setting (Guan, Lee, & Park, 2009). Besides, “Americans have stronger intention to apologize than Chinese people” (Park & Guan, 2006, p. 183), but apologize with less positive attitude and normative perceptions than
Koreans do (Park & Guan, 2006). This suggests that culture influences people to have different tendencies toward apology used.

Actually, according to Guan, Lee and Park (2009), there are four aspects of tendency toward apology using: “Desire, intent, feel obliged, and may consider it normal to apologize in given situations” (p. 34). Desire is about motivation to “engage in act and intentions” reflects expectation or decision to perform the act” (Perugini & Bagozzi, 2004, p. 70). An individual may have a stronger desire to apologize to friends or family members than strangers but more likely intends to apologize to strangers than friends or family members (Guan, Lee, & Park, 2009). In Guan, Lee and Park’s (2009) study, in-group and out-group apologies are different. ‘In-group’ refers to people in a community and their relationship is close, such as friends or family members. They are concerned with each other’s pain or welfare. Contrarily, “out-group includes strangers, whose welfare is not much of concern to an individual, or opponents whose welfare can even conflict with that of in-group members” (p. 33). Guan, Lee and Park (2009) conclude that in “cultures where people separate in-group and out-group members to a greater degree” (p. 34), in-group people may put greater emphasis on keeping accordant relationships than out-group members. Thus, apologies as a function to “smooth predicaments and restore relationships” (Guan, Lee, & Park, 2009, p. 34) may be more valued and employed by in-group members in such cultures.

According to Park and Guan (2006), in-group versus out-group relationships influence the type of apology used. In-group people put greater emphasis on keeping accordant relationships than out-group members. The view of apology as a function to “smooth predicaments and restore relationships” (p. 186) may be more valued and
employed by in-group members. In Chinese culture, people attach importance to honesty and trust with family or close friends (in-group) compared with those they do not concern themselves much (out-group). For Chinese, trust between in-group people takes a long time to develop (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998). Because developing intimacy is time-consuming yet required to build a solid relationship, they tend to expect more apologizing acts from offenders who belong to the in-group. Therefore, this might cause Chinese to be afraid of apologizing toward in-group members right away. For example, when one man’s girlfriend was his best friend’s wife, the man will fear to talk to his friend. He thinks that his friend will feel hurt or mad. Therefore, it might take the man a long time to meet his friend again or just avoid seeing him. Likewise, his friend might avoid seeing this man and his previous wife as well. This is a factor that influences why Chinese people take more time to consider accepting an apology when they are hurt by in-group members. This could be associated with “delayed apology” which will be discussed in the next section (Aaron, 2005, p. 185).

4.2 Time and apology

Apologies are offered or requested some times after years, decades, or even centuries. Aaron (2005) calls them “delayed apologies” (p. 185). Such apologies, whether years, decades or centuries after the offense, are the result if an intolerable “sense of guilt that accompanies the realization that we have caused harm” (p. 185). According to Aaron (2005), people often receive these “delayed apologies” (p. 186) with forgiveness and generosity, sometimes even accepting the blame themselves. People choose to forgive because they feel respected by the offender’s apologies. A “delayed apology” example can be found in Aaron (2005, p. 185). Twenty five years after the offense, an assistant
writes to his Professor. The assistant admits that he changed the Professor’s study results on purpose. He wrote the letter to apologize for “jeopardizing the Professor’s reputation and professional standing which might have occurred had the study been published or presented by the professor.” The apology is given unusually late but the time elapsed did not lessen the assistant’s guilty. However, the professor’s response conveys that he really understands the assistant’s feeling. He also accepts the apology and expresses his empathy for the situation.

Nevertheless, for some reason, time does not automatically make it easier for people to forgive. For example, a friend of mine received a phone call from her ex-boyfriend a year later after they broke up. He called her from Australia and said “sorry!” in the beginning. But only “sorry” did not make the woman inclined to accept his apology. Perhaps, only saying “sorry” could not compensate for the harmful things he had done to her. She had suffered from those bad memories regardless of his further explanations. In addition, maybe one year was either not long enough or too late to accept the apology. Their relationship was more complex and closer than that between assistant and professor. The deeper relations could influence the intent for accepting apology right away. Therefore, sometimes time may not necessarily influence the recipient’s inclination to forgive the offender.

4.3 Forgiveness and apology

Forgiveness is a psychological process. Many factors influence whether a person accepts an apology or forgives the offender. From my perspective, the severity of offense might most influence whether forgiveness is extended. Aaron (2005) claims that “the degree of forgiveness may be related to the seriousness of the offense, the quality of the
apology, and the forgiving nature of the victim” (p. 231). Generally speaking, for more serious mistakes the offended needs more time to forgive. Therefore, there might be a time gap between the apology offered and forgiveness given. Aaron (2005) states that, we experience forgiveness as a gift that releases us from the twin burdens of guilt and shame. In addition, if we are the ones doing the forgiving, we are proud of our generous behavior in forgiving the offending party (p. 228).

Aaron (2005) also claims that people tend to forgive the offender while remembering the offence. Since the degree of forgiveness can be variable, “remnants of anger and bitterness” (p. 231) may remain in a forgiving person’s mind. From an age perspective, growing older might help a person mature enough to forgive. According to Younger, Piferi, Jobe, and Lawler’s (2004) findings, older adults tend to think “there were no unforgivable acts” (p. 849). As people’s age increases, they accumulate experience. This might help people to become more mature and forgiveness may become easier (Younger et al., 2004).

**Conclusion**

From the preceding sections, it can be concluded that cultural aspects influence apology strategies used. In comparing Chinese and English apologetic language, it can be seen that politeness expressions are based on different cultures, time, inner desires, and intentions. Chang (2008) indicates that the views of an (im)polite apology are culturally distinct. Cultures influence people’s behaviors and every culture is formed by people’s doing and saying. People identify with multiple specific cultures (Bataineh, 2006; Guan, Park, & Lee, 2009). Chinese people usually apologize by regretting and would like to put
all mistakes to the side (Lee, 2008; Park & Guan, 2006; Zhang, 2001). This might surprise Americans who might think that the offense was not that serious and there is no need to apologize overly. Therefore, misunderstanding may occur between two people who are from different cultures (Bataineh, 2006; Guan, Park, & Lee, 2009; Maddux et al., 2011). That is why it is crucial to understand cross-cultural influence on the function and meaning of apology in order to re-build trust (Bataineh, 2006). In addition, time, relationships, and situations influence people’s determination toward apology and forgiveness.

Apology is viewed as a difficult task because two parties engage in an interaction which might trigger uncomfortable feelings (Aaron, 2005). Hence, apology is the avenue of negotiation to reduce the conflict and repair mutual relationships (Aaron, 2005). According to Maddux et al., (2011), “apologies are an effective means of re-establishing trust in negotiations and dispute resolution” (p. 418). However, the relations between attitudes and effective apology should be further researched. Because some people apologize with anger or a cold shoulder, such apology doses not facilitate negotiation and nothing to say being forgiven by offended. In that situation, apology does not reduce misunderstandings but exacerbate conflict. Furthermore, the expression of apology also shows cultural variation in its function. If an apology is not acknowledged explicitly between two people from different cultures, it will be viewed as low integrity and misunderstanding may occur (Maddux et al., 2011). For example, when there is a car accident, which involves a Chinese and an American driver, and it is the Chinese driver’s fault. The Chinese apologizes very sincerely. Actually, Chinese people usually hope to receive soft words, which help them to feel they are forgiven. However, American people
might not realize this and just ask the Chinese person pay for the damages without saying anything about forgiveness. The Chinese driver will feel hurt and reluctant to pay even if he knows the accident was caused by him.

Therefore, forgiveness should be taken into account as well because it is viewed as the following response toward apology addressed in some circumstances (Chang, 2010). Whether forgiveness is extended varies based on social expectations, time, personality, inner desires and intentions. Cultural pressure to be nice and good influences whether forgiveness is offered automatically or is forced (Sharon & Jeffrie, 2002). Thus, apology and forgiveness are mutual psychological processes and sometimes negotiation for explaining clearly identifies what is needed when apology is not accepted (Aaron, 2005; Maddux et al., 2011). The ultimate goal of the process is to mend the relationship and rebuild trust between the offender and the person who is offended.
LANGUAGE ARTIFACT

Learning English: A case study of one Chinese speaker
INTRODUCTION

This paper was initially written for Dr. Thoms in Linguistics 6510 class. It is a case study of a Chinese-speaking student who learned English in secondary school and later moved to the USA to pursue a graduate degree. As I mentioned in my teaching philosophy, since I have been an English language learner for many years, I have come to realize that many difficulties made me frustrated while learning English. Through conducting this research and writing this paper, I found that linguistic knowledge, sociocultural factors, and learning motivation influence learners’ L2 achievement. However, these three essentials are also crucial to help L2 learners conquer the difficulties and promote L2 language proficiency.

I chose to include this paper in my portfolio because it helps me transfer a person’s learning experience in English to my Chinese teaching upon theoretical and practical basis. Additionally, this paper is my first time to conduct a complete study and analyze the results. This precious experience allows me to grasp the fundamental concepts of carrying out a research study and practice using my analytical skills to interpret the results. The results reveal that an adult learner’s motivation, purpose, learning experiences, and cultural understanding influence the outcomes of her English acquisition.
Introduction (should be clearer)

In applied linguistics, second-language proficiency is one of the primary concepts (Iwashita, Brown, McNamara, & Hagan, 2008, Schurm & Gulisan, 2010). However, it is not an easy task to analyze a second-language learner’s proficiency effectively (Foster, 2000). Foster claims, “the analysis of spoken language requires a principled way of dividing transcribed data into units in order to assess features such as accuracy and complexity” (p. 354). In this study, following Foster’s (2000) admonition, I utilize three analytic methods, which focus on syntactic complexity. Each method has its own principle to assess the complexity of the participant’s utterance. These three methods include (1) the order of acquisition of English morphemes in L2, (2) AS-Units (Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000), and (3) the percentage of dependent clauses. Both AS-unit and the percentage of dependent clauses (Iwashita et al., 2008) are extracted from Ellis and Barkhuizen’s (2005) CAF model, which includes complexity, accuracy and fluency.

Foster et al. (2000) claim that “An AS-Unit is a single speaker’s utterance consisting of an independent clause, or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with either” (p. 365). Thus, the AS-Unit (amount of subordination) is used by the researcher to analyze the participant’s utterances. The AS-Unit is extracted from Ellis and Barkhuizen’s (2005) CAF (complexity, accuracy and fluency) method.

Only syntactic complexity measure are used to show what level of clause complexity the English learner can use in speaking (Iwashita, Brown, McNamara, & O’Hagan, 2008). The ‘complexity’ is the feature of analyzing a speaker’s syntactic complexity (Ahmadian, 2012; Foster et al., 2000). For example, ‘One class has two
missionaries’ is an independent clause because only one verb in this sentence. ‘I want to (independent clause) practice my English (sub-clausal).’

The AS-Unit and the ‘Order of Acquisition of English morphemes’ are focused on the speaker’s grammatical complexity and therefore the percentage of dependent clauses is also calculated (Iwashita et al., 2008). The categories and numbers of dependent clauses can be seen in Table 3. ‘Because’ and ‘if’ are conjunctions the participant most frequently used. These three methods of analysis are explained as the following:

1. The order of acquisition of English morphemes in L2

The English morphemes order in L2 are adapted from Dulay and Burt (1974) and Bailey, Madden, and Krashen’s (1974) studies. Dulay and Burt conducted their research by investigating Chinese children and Spanish children. Bailey et al. (1974) “generalized the results of Dulay and Burts’ child studies to adults” (Kwon, 2005, p. 5) and report a similar order of acquisition of English morphemes. A comparison of the percentage of the participant’s utterances to the order of acquisition of English morphemes will demonstrate what morpheme the participant has acquired.

2. AS-unit

Forster et al. (2000) claim that “an AS-unit is a single speaker’s utterance consisting of an independent clause or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with either” (p. 365), which stands for amount of subordination. It will be used to evaluate the speaker’s level of proficiency.

3. The percentage of dependent clauses

The percentage of dependent clauses (Iwashita et al., 2008) is calculated to determine the complexity of the participant’s sentences with regard to the length and
Hence, to determine what factors influence English language learning by an adult, I collected data through two semi-structured interviews (see Appendix A) and analyzed the data via the three analytic methods. Following the transcription of the interview (see Appendix B), I examined the internal and external factors that influence the English language learner’s learning outcomes. Internal factors relate to the learner’s motivation toward English achievements while the external factors refer to the participant’s learning environment. The results are summarized in four tables and descriptive results will be discussed from social-cultural perspectives. At the end of the study, some limitations and further research directions are also delineated.

**Literature Review**

*The purpose of learning English*

Language does not always stay in the same condition. It changes as time goes on. Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006) claim, “Languages change over time. They change as a result of use” (p. 567). We are living in a multilingual world due to globalization (Hall, Smith, & Wicaksono, 2011). For a multitude of reasons, such as studying abroad or doing business, people move to countries where English is the dominant language (Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006). Additionally, English is also learned by many people who live in a country where English is not the dominant language. For many learners, the purpose of learning English is for work, study, or travel. Some require higher English proficiency.

Based upon these reasons, English is learned and spoken by diverse groups of people. Graddol (2006) points out the major reason for language evolution is the
movement of people. Thus, a vital question could be asked, how does the movement of people sway a certain language to become a global language, like English (Graddol, 2006). Crystal (2003) states, “a language achieves a genuinely global status when it develops a special role that is recognized in every country” (p. 3). Currently, English is viewed as a global lingua franca (Crystal, 2003; Hall, Smith, & Wicaksono, 2011). There are two main contexts in which English is recognized as having achieved this status. The first context includes societies where people require mastering English as early in life as possible, such as Ghana, Nigeria, India, Singapore, etc. (Crystal 2003). Because these countries authorized English as an official language, it is used in the government, in the law courts, in the media, and within the educational system.

In addition, English is viewed as a second language that complements a person’s mother tongue in these communities (Crystal, 2003). The second type of context where English is recognized as a global lingua franca includes countries in which English is taught as a primary foreign language (Crystal, 2003). However, several factors influence the extent to which English learners develop their English abilities. This is discussed in the following sections.

*English learning difficulties*

The process of learning an additional language other than our first language is intensive and time-consuming (Ellis, 2006, 2012). According to the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), foreign or second language learners need to spend 700 to 1,320 hours of full-time instruction to achieve proficiency. This statement illustrates how much time English learners must invest to reach a high level of fluency. Nevertheless, individual development of second language acquisition is variable due to different learning styles
Additionally, Larsen-Freeman (2006) mentions, “learners do not progress through stages of development in a consistent manner” (p. 593). According to Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006), language is built by using it in different social contexts, such as asking the price when shopping in the grocery store or asking questions to a dentist.

Learning an additional language takes time and much effort. However, Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006) claim that some languages are easier for adults to learn. As an adult English learner, I know from experience how difficult English is for Chinese learners, due to the vast difference between the two languages. It is difficult to transfer language skills from English to Chinese and vice versa due to significant differences in pronunciation, spelling, listening, reading, and writing. Chinese has much simpler syllable structure than English. For example, ‘狗 (gou)’ in Chinese means ‘dog’ in English. For native speakers of Chinese, it is very hard to pronounce ‘l’ and ‘r’ syllables. Thus, the word ‘world’, is difficult for Chinese of English learners to pronounce, because the consonant ‘l’ is usually skipped over and becomes ‘word’. Clearly this causes a misunderstanding in communication when saying ‘I like the world’. It becomes ‘I like the word’ to the listener.

Moreover, the grammar in English is more complex than in Chinese. This influences Chinese people’s lexical frequency when they learn English. It refers to the frequency “individual lexical items occur in spoken or written language” (Trofimovich, 2011, p. 139). For instance, in Chinese, there is no ‘past tense’, but there are regular and irregular past tenses in English. When Chinese people say ‘I went to the zoo yesterday’ in English, they only use present-tense verbs to express past tense such as, ‘我 (I) 前天
(yesterday) 去 (go to) 動物園 (the zoo). According to Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006), the lack of tense marking is the transparent characteristic of Chinese learners of English, who learn English as a second language. Another example is when Chinese learners of English say ‘my mother doesn’t (不) buy milk last Saturday.’ They always and only use the present tense of the negative auxiliary ‘doesn’t’, instead of ‘didn’t.’ For Chinese learners of English, the negative auxiliary concept is particularly difficult, because there are two words in Chinese which represent negation (不 and 沒 <no or not>). Yet another frustrating aspect for Chinese learners of English is the verb morphology. The Chinese language uses the same verb form for each pronoun. During second language acquisition, one of the most important things is listening comprehension (Gottlieb, 2006).

For Chinese learners of English, it is challenging to comprehend when liaison occurs, such as the phrase ‘not at all.’ Native English speakers combine the ‘t’ with the word at, becoming ‘ta’ and then combing ‘t’ with the word all, becoming ‘tall,’ which is something impossible for Chinese people understand. Additionally, listening comprehension goes beyond listening to each vocabulary word. It represents the listener’s ability to understand context and respond immediately. For example, booking a ticket by phone can be a nerve racking experience. One is expected to provide all personal contact information immediately, which is more challenging than face to face or online. In fact, spelling is related to listening because detecting English syllables by listening helps English learners infer the letters of vocabulary. For instance, when one hears the word ‘desk’, the listener might guess whether the word is ‘dask or desk.’ If English learners have difficulty decoding the pronunciation of each letter, it would be hard to guess the word correctly.
Social-cultural Factors

In addition to linguistic difficulties, a lack of appropriate social-cultural experiences could be an obstacle to English learners’ acquisition (Muñoz, 2011; Pérez-Vidal, & Juan-Garau, 2011). For example, while mowing the lawn is a common thing in the U.S., many people from China or Taiwan do not have these experiences. Therefore, they cannot understand what ‘mowing the lawn’ means when they hear that for the first time. Vygotsky argued that humans use symbolic tools, signs to mediate relationships between people. People use these symbolic tools or signs, like ‘traffic sign,’ ‘deer xing sign,’ ‘slang’ or ‘idioms’ which are artifacts created by human cultures over time, to communicate or transmit messages in daily life (Vygotsky, 1978).

For English learners, the less often they have access to these cultural products, such as opening an account at a bank or having one’s hair cut at a barbershop, the less they learn to interpret socio-cultural contexts (Muñoz, 2011). Thus, English learners may understand what native-speakers say but fail to understand what they do. For example, when Americans ask ‘How are you?’, it does not mean that they care about the listeners’ health or feeling (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). It is simply a greeting. However, many English learners don’t understand this hidden meaning which has been shaped by American culture. Thus, some English learners might have the illusion that Americans are usually emotionless. Csizér and Kormos (2008) demonstrate that interaction with native speakers impacts learners’ disposition to the target language and attitude towards the process of learning language.

If English learners have negative experiences with their limited English ability, they may refuse to speak English. For example, when a native-speaker says, ‘I just fly by
the seat of my pants most of the time’, an English learner is not likely to understand. If the speaker does not explain, the learner may become frustrated. When students feel no need to use the second language either within or outside their community, most will probably develop a negative attitude and have no interest in learning the language (Baker, 1988). As a consequence, the English learner might have self-doubt and lose motivation for learning, which is addressed in the following section.

Motivation and language achievement

Motivation is commonly viewed as an inner desire that prompts people to take effort and time for doing something to satisfy their psychological needs, which also affect a person’s learning behavior (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005; Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008).

When a learner is eager to join different cultures of other languages, s/he will research related resources and study the language seriously. This is the performance of motivation. Li and Pan (2009) claim that motivation plays a pivotal role in the success of language learning, however, Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006) claim that motivation is not consistent during the process of mastering one certain subject. Most learners’ motivation to learn fluctuates. Dörnyei and Skehan (2005) and Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) indicate that motivation is associated with mental processes. This is related to learners’ desire for learning and taking actions.

According to Bidin, Jusoff, Aziz, Salleh, and Tajudin (2009), the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has no direct impact on students’ English performance. Gardner and Lambert (1972) define intrinsic motivation as integrative motivation that a person’s interest in learning to communicate with people who belong to the target language community. Contrarily, extrinsic motivation is instrumental
motivation that learners hope to acquire some advantage by learning a second language.

Deci and Ryan (1985) demonstrate that people who engage in learning a second language for their own sake (intrinsic) and not for rewards (extrinsic) are more successful. Hence, internal or external motivation can enhance learners’ learning efficiency, but learners with more internal motivation will achieve more. Additionally, they can gain self-esteem and confidence through their improvement and attain the goals they set (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Perhaps, intrinsic motivation could be learners’ encourager when they confront obstacles. It means learners with stronger intrinsic motivation might be more persistent in the face of frustration and predicaments. Based upon this, the following questions will be discussed in this paper:

1) What error patterns are found in this ELL’s utterance?
2) In what ways does this ELL overcome her difficulties and reach her learning goals?

Method

Participant

The participant had learned English for six years in Taiwan. In Taiwan, in addition to receiving English instruction in a formal educational system, she also attended church English classes once per week. Every class lasted for half an hour and was conducted by native speakers of English. Her motivation to learn English is to help her father run the business in Taiwan and to make more money. Two years prior to the interview, she came to the United States to learn English in a language center located in Provo and then transferred to Utah State University a year later to be enrolled in the ESL program. At the time of testing, she was studying for the GRE exam because she planned to apply to graduate school at Utah State University. She took several pre-graduate
classes at USU to learn some fundamental knowledge to prepare for graduate school. To improve her English listening comprehension, she listened to local news on the radio and used an online dictionary to improve her English ability in Utah. Besides, she attended church two days a week for worship, study, and social activities. Most of the people at church were native-speakers of English. In addition to some friends who were Americans and spoke both Chinese and English, she had many friends who were Chinese native speakers. However, even though she was immersed in an English community, she did not have consistent exposure to daily English. The major reason was that she had no opportunities for speaking English when she socialized with friends who spoke fluent Chinese.

Data collection and analysis

A semi-structured interview included the collection of personal background information and academic experiences learning English. During the interview, I recorded the conversation, which I later transcribed. To have a deeper understanding of how much English the participant knows, I used Dulay and Burt’s (1974) and Bailey, Madden, and Krashen’s (1974) morpheme order studies. Dulay and Burt’s (1974) research included 55 Chinese children and 60 Spanish children. Based upon Dulay and Burt’s research, Bailey et al. studied 73 adults who learned English as the second language. When they “generalized the results of Dulay and Burts’ child studies to adults”, they were able to demonstrate similar order of acquisition of English morphemes (Kwon, 2005, p.5). The results of these studies are summarized in Table 2.
Table 2. Order of Acquisition of English morphemes in L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Articles (<em>a, the</em>)</td>
<td>Present progressive (-<em>ing</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copula</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Progressive (-<em>ing</em>)</td>
<td>Contracted copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Simple plural (-<em>s</em>)</td>
<td>Articles (<em>a, the</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Auxiliary (<em>be, can, do, does, should, must, may, will</em>)</td>
<td>Past irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Past regular (-<em>ed</em>)</td>
<td>Possessive (<em>’s</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Past irregular</td>
<td>Contracted Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Long plural (-<em>es</em>)</td>
<td>3rd person present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Possessive (<em>’s</em>)</td>
<td>Possessive (<em>’s</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3rd person singular (-<em>s</em>)</td>
<td>3rd person singular (-<em>s</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Kwon (2005).

Furthermore, the AS-Unit (amount of subordination) is used by the researcher to analyze the participant’s utterances. The AS-Unit is extracted from Ellis and Barkhuizen’s (2005) CAF (complexity, accuracy and fluency) method. I used only the ‘complexity’ feature, which analyzes a speaker’s syntactic complexity (Ahmadian, 2012; Foster et al., 2000). According to Foster et al. (2000), “An AS-Unit is a single speaker’s utterance consisting of an *independent clause*, or *sub-clausal unit*, together with any *subordinate clause*(s) associated with either” (p. 365). For example, ‘One class has two missionaries’ is an independent clause because only one verb in this sentence. ‘I want to (independent clause) practice my English (sub-clausal).’ Thus, the AS-Unit and the ‘Order of Acquisition of English morphemes’ are focused on the speaker’s grammatical complexity and therefore the percentage of dependent clauses is also calculated (Iwashita et al., 2008). The categories and numbers of dependent clauses can be seen in Table 3.

‘Because’ and ‘if’ are conjunctions the participant most frequently used.
Table 3. Speaker’s use of dependent clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The categories of dependent clauses</th>
<th>Speaker’s utterance (Correct usage/total usage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. when</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. while</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. until</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. after/before</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. since</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. as soon as</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. once</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. every time</td>
<td>3/3 (every Monday, every Sunday, every moment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. because</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. so that/in order that</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. so…that</td>
<td>5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. such…that</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. if</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. as long as</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. unless</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. although</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. even if</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. whether…or not</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. no matter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct usage/total usage</td>
<td>40/49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) CAF (complexity, accuracy and fluency)

According to Table 3, the speaker uses dependent clauses correctly in forty out of forty-nine utterances, which represents her ability to produce grammatical complexity. When the speaker used ‘because’ dependent clauses, ‘because’ was often followed by ‘so’. Therefore, the correct usage/total usage means the speaker made nine errors in terms of ‘so’ in dependent clause. Meanwhile, she also used ‘so…that’ and ‘if’ more than other dependent clauses in sentences.

Despite the lack of complex grammar in the speaker’s utterances, she has the ability to produce sentences that involve complexity. The syntactic complexity of the participant’s utterances is shown in Table 3. Analysis of the transcription reveals that she can use appropriate verbs to describe her thoughts. This allowed the interviewer to easily
understand what she tried to say during the interview. Table 3 shows some dependent sentences the participant produced.

**Table 4. Examples of speaker use of dependent clauses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker’s utterance of syntactic complexity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He want&lt;sup&gt;$\text{e}$&lt;/sup&gt; to sell his products to another country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I will go back to Taiwan to help my father.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He introduced me to come to USU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think USU’s ELC program is very professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel &lt;i&gt;feel&lt;/i&gt; they are not very professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. they combine the idea with what we will learn about…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. they give me a some clue&lt;sup&gt;$\text{s}$&lt;/sup&gt; to help us…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. they just teach taught whatever they want……</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. what the skill we will use to take the notes, to catch the point that professor emphasize&lt;sup&gt;$\text{s}$&lt;/sup&gt;….</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. notive(native) English speaker&lt;sup&gt;$\text{s}$&lt;/sup&gt; to help you practice your English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. you will improve a lot about your listening and speaking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. We don’t have chance to talk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I just have one writing class left.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I don’t need to take extra time to listen to news.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I want to practice my English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I use like online dictionary to search the vocabulary that I don’t know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I can help my father do his business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. they don’t have patience to listen to me but not very often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I don’t have any factors to stop me to speak English with them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. they will go back to their family from everywhere to celebrate New Year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. That is better way and faster way that you can learn English or another language faster.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The letters that are highlighted were omitted by the interviewee in the sentences.  
2. The highlighted words show the correct tense the interviewee should use or the vocabulary she omitted.

From Table 4, Sentence (20) ‘they will go back to their family from everywhere to celebrate New Year’ or sentence (16) ‘I use like, online dictionary to search the vocabulary that I don’t know’, both are long and make sense. Several sentences shown in Table 4 consist of 1 clause and 1 AS-unit. However, the participant produced more complicated sentences that involve 2 clauses with 1 AS-unit or 2 AS-units. The following examples are some sentences extracted from the transcription.

- 2 clauses, 1 AS-unit (/ means a clause)

1. He wants to sell his products to another country/ and cannot speak English./
2. …if I cannot get a job here/, I will go back to Taiwan to help my father/
3. … I met the missionaries, so I went to the church to learn English/ and I like the way they teach./
4. …because my father’s friend, he know professor in USU/, so he introduced me to come to USU learning English./
5. …if we going to University,/ they give me some clue to help us include…improve our English./
6. …so you know what that mean/ and they will give you example and sentence/. 
7. I just go to the class/ and that help me learn English…
8. They don’t really be your friend/, they hid their really mind./

- 2 AS-units (/ represents a AS-unit)

1. … we will have the friends’ party for Christmas. Chinese New Year, every family must be together, so if you leave out of your hometown, the city, in Christmas Eve,/ they will go back to their family from everywhere to celebrate New Year./

2. I think if you want to learn the language, you just go to the community to learn. That is better way and faster way that you can learn English or another language faster.

The participant produced some complicated sentences that consist of independent sub-clausal units and subordinate clause, although there are some grammatical errors in sentences. This demonstrates that the participant produced syntactic complexity in her spoken English. According to Foster et al.’s research, “subordinate clauses within an AS-unit can realize the following functions: (a) subject, (b) verb complementation, and (c) phrasal post-modifier or complement” (p. 367).

(a) subject (initial or postpone)

1. He wants to sell his products to another country..
2. …they give me some clue to help us include…improve our English.

(b) verb complementation
1. I just go to the class and that help me learn English.
2. they will go back to their family from everywhere to celebrate New Year.

(c) phrasal post-modifier or complement
1. When I conversation with her, so, I can speak English, so that is also help me learn English.
2. …when Americans ask you “how are you?” and then they just go away and don’t care about your answer. …

Hence, from these sentences, the participant’s utterances include subject, verb complementation, and phrasal post-modifier or complements. The syntactic complexity of the participant’s English in speaking is not missing. Additionally, there is a linkage between adjective clause and the main clause in the participant’s sentences to express her main idea. Sometimes, the participant made a pause to think about what she was going to say and try to do vocabulary-selection before speaking. Following this analysis of the participant’s syntactic complexity, the morpheme order of her utterances is analyzed and the percentage is shown in Table 5 and Table 6.
Table 5  Participant’s Order of Acquisition of English morphemes in L2, compared with Dulay & Burt (1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original order</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Correct usage/total (percentage)</th>
<th>The participant’s rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Articles (<em>a, the</em>)</td>
<td><em>a</em> class, <em>the</em> church</td>
<td>9/13 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copula (to be)</td>
<td><em>I am</em> happy. <em>He is</em> tall.</td>
<td>25/25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Progressive (-ing)</td>
<td><em>Learning</em></td>
<td>2/3 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Simple plural (-s)</td>
<td><em>Balls</em></td>
<td>14/21 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Auxiliary (<em>be, can, do, does, should, must, may, will</em>)</td>
<td><em>She will</em> go to the church.</td>
<td>39/46 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Past regular (-ed)</td>
<td><em>Talked</em></td>
<td>4/8 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Past irregular</td>
<td><em>Go-went, come-came</em></td>
<td>14/17 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Long plural (-es)</td>
<td><em>Churches</em></td>
<td>4/9 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Possessive (<em>’s</em>)</td>
<td><em>my father’s</em></td>
<td>5/6 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3rd person singular (-s)</td>
<td><em>Means</em></td>
<td>1/18 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data, it can be inferred that the participant’s English acquisition order is different from Dulay and Burt’s (1974) and Bailey et al.’s (1974) in major ways. Comparing the participant’s rank to Dulay and Burt’s (1974) order of morpheme (Table 5), the (10) 3rd person singular (-s) is at the same order. This shows that the participant has developed her 3rd person singular like Dulay and Burt (1974) found. Furthermore, according to Table 4, the participant’s (2) Copula (to be) is very close to Dulay and Burt’s (1974) order because she uses copula in English 100% correctly. Additionally, the auxiliary is up to 84% (see Table 5), which means the participant almost exactly acquired the grammar in speaking. However, similar results are shown in Table 6 regarding to the
‘3rd person’ and ‘copula (to be)’. In Table 5, Contracted copula is ranked 3 and the participant’s order is 1.

Table 6  Participant’s Order of Acquisition of English morphemes in L2, compared with Bailey, Madden, and Krashen (1974) Order of Acquisition of English morphemes in L2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original order</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Correct usage/total (percentage)</th>
<th>The participant’s order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Present progressive (-ing)</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>2/3 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plural (-s/-es)</td>
<td>balls /churches</td>
<td>18/30 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contracted copula</td>
<td>Bob’s sad. &lt;&gt; Bob is sad.</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Articles (a, the)</td>
<td>a class, the church</td>
<td>9/13 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Past irregular</td>
<td>Go-went, come-came</td>
<td>4/8 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Possessive (’s)</td>
<td>my father’s</td>
<td>5/6 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contracted auxiliary</td>
<td>Dad’s eating dinner &lt;&gt; Dad is eating dinner</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3rd person present</td>
<td>he talks</td>
<td>1/18 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the participant did not produce any (7) contracted auxiliary, the rank of (8) 3rd person present in Bailey’s et al. (1974) order of morpheme is still the last one. The percentage of correct regular third person is only six percent, indicating that the participant still struggles with both forms, as reflected both in avoidance and in errors.

The findings demonstrate that the participant’s development of copula is better than others and does not follow Dulay and Burt’s (1974) and Bailey’s et al. (1974) order of morpheme. From the percentage shown in Table 5 and 6, ‘possessive’ are over eighty percent, which represents that the participant acquired these forms well but not perfectly yet. Therefore, it can be concluded that the participant’s acquisition of grammatical morphemes does not match to any significant degree the patterns found by Dulay and
Burt’s (1974) and Bailey et al. (1974). Of course, the data came from only one participant, which might not represent the same trends as those that can be found for larger groups.

It is interesting that the participant’s ‘irregular past tense’ is better than her regular past tense; this is the opposite of Dulay and Burt’s (1974) or Bailey et al.’s (1974) findings. It is most likely because the voice ‘ed (/t/)’ for past verb is hard to say clearly and therefore more difficult to be heard. Additionally, the participant did not produce any ‘(7) Contracted auxiliary’ (see Table 6); it cannot be known whether she had not yet acquired it or had not had any opportunities to use it.

**Conclusion**

Comparing the participant’s data with Dulay and Burt’s (1974) and Bailey et al.’s (1974) order of morpheme acquisition, it can be concluded that her order if morpheme acquisition is not the same as theirs. The results are perhaps influenced by the participant’s English learning experiences. In Taiwan, students learn English to pass required tests or exams. Many English teachers are focused on having students memorize grammar but pay little attention to communication. Students are taught how to write and read without much focus on listening and speaking skills. This kind of teaching style confines students to limited English exposure. In a true communicative classroom, the four skills should be developed. Although the participant already learned some grammar, she did not really acquire all grammar concepts due to a lack of opportunities to use them in real life. However, the participant mentioned that while she attended her church’s
English class, she enjoyed the way the native-speakers taught. They helped her to think like Americans and therefore allowed her to understand the culture and language better.

The participant also mentioned that she dislikes American food, so most of time, she cooks at home or eats in Chinese restaurants. Besides, she has many Chinese friends and talks to them in Chinese. Thus, eating at home or in Chinese restaurants, and talking to Chinese friends result in rarely using social aspects of the target language. Hence, communicating with Chinese people in Chinese means not 100% of immersion in the English community which impacts her English expressions. For example, she often combined ‘because’ with ‘so’, the reason is due to Chinese grammar, in which they should be used together.

However, the bright side is that she has a strong desire to learn English, so she always asks professors questions after class. She also listened to local news on the radio or via online resources and used an online dictionary to improve herself. Thus, she received English instruction from a formal classroom and from other resources. After the interview, she told me that she was optimistic and positive for confronting difficulties in learning English. However, it is hard to know exactly how much English she has really acquired, due to restrictions that I did not consider and the limited data which have been categorized in the tables. Those restrictions were not considered due to limited analytic results such as more appropriate questions could be asked to elicit more utterances from the participant.

**Limitation and further research**

The purpose of this study is to know what essentials help ELLs overcome
learning difficulties and what effective ways can be used to attain learning goals. In the study, I analyzed the data via Dulay and Burt’s (1974) and Bailey et al.’s (1974) order of morphemes (Kwon, 2005), AS-Unit (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) and syntactic complexity (Iwashita et al., 2008). Although the results help us understand how much English the learner knows, there are some limitations. For instance, it is hard to see the participant’s intrinsic motivation (Li & Pan, 2009) from only two interviews. The questions the participant was asked might have influenced her utterances and restricted her usage in terms of other grammatical structures. Besides, the participant did not mention much about how she interacted with native-speakers and what topics they usually talk about.

Therefore, the results might not directly answer the three research questions for this study. The participant was also an acquaintance of mine and that could therefore affect/influence the interviewee’s answers. This might misguide the interviewee’s perspectives or comprehension. Thus, further research can be focused on the learning motivation and not so much on the linguistic usage or different social contexts.

Further problems concern the analytic methods employed. The AS-Unit from CAF complexity part is currently deemed to be in need of further refinement of testing instruments and measures (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). To completely answer the research questions of the study, we may need to know how much focus to place on linguistic forms and how this should be understood (Ellis, 2006). In fact, insufficient research has been done in terms of second language learners’ beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction (Loewen et al, 2009). Therefore, future research can be more focused on how English teachers provide effective grammar instruction and error correction to enhance students’ learning efficiency as well as their motivation (Loewen et al., 2009).
Ellis (2006) claims, “grammar instruction could contribute to learning but this was of limited value because communicative ability was dependent on acquisition” (p. 85). Thus, whether learning motivation is affected more by linguistic usage or different social contexts is a topic worthy of investigation. Such a study might reveal how an English teacher can effectively help English learners overcome their learning difficulties and develop effective learning strategies (Loewen et al., 2009). According to Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, (2001), students who have a higher language level can be provided more grammatical explanation to achieve more effective communicative goals. For example, an English language learner can use ‘the present perfect tense’ accurately, the learner will be able to describe themselves more clearly than people who have not acquired this. However, Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001) also claim that students need to be reminded of prior knowledge of grammatical features. With reminders, they will be able to master the second language and to minimize possible communicative problems. Moreover, when language learners feel they improve, they have a sense of accomplishment and their learning motivation will be enhanced (Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008). Thus, when learners can be taught effective learning strategies, they will have fewer misunderstandings in communication and have a greater desire to overcome difficulties.
ANALYSIS AND REFLECTION OF TEACHING VIDEO
During my first semester in the Master of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) Program in the Linguistic 6400 course, I was required to record myself while teaching a class. In order to fulfill this requirement, I recorded myself teaching a Chinese 1010 class for two weeks. The Chinese 1010 class is for beginners and lasts for 50 minutes. Based on these video recordings, I will examine to what extent my teaching reflects my beliefs about effective teaching.

As I watched and listened to these recordings, I realized that I struggled to provide comprehensible input and to embed the communicative approach in the classroom. Even though I tried to do the lesson in Chinese as much as possible, I offered too many translations, rather than allowing students to be immersed in Chinese. For example, I sometimes said things in English, which I then followed with Chinese instruction, especially in the case of commands, such as turning in homework or forming a small group. While I tried applying the communicative approach to teach grammatical knowledge, this did not always involve natural communication. This is one thing that I am concerned about; I do not want to cause students to rely on grammar too much, because this is contrarily productive for acquiring a language naturally.

I also noticed in my teaching that I paid attention to students’ learning needs and their desire for feedback. First, in terms of students’ learning needs, a good balance between catering to their learning needs and leading them to adjust their learning style was hard to achieve. For example, after a certain point, I stopped supplying pinyin, which is alphabetic letters to help pronounce characters for characters that students should have learned, but some students still asked me to provide pinyin. In this situation, I met their needs sometimes. However, this prevented them from recognizing characters. I learned
that students do not all progress at the same pace and my scaffolded instruction may at times become an obstacle for students’ improvement.

Secondly, my feedback played a pivotal role in students’ learning motivation and improvement. Although I tried to provide different types of corrective feedback according to students’ current level of comprehension, it frequently resulted in ambiguous feedback that made the students confused. For instance, when students used inappropriate vocabulary to make sentences, my corrective feedback lacked further explanation to help them comprehend the exact meaning. Hence, my feedback neither served as a stepping stone of improvement, nor truly helped students know their weaknesses or strengths. Although students are motivated to engage by my positive feedbacks along with my appreciation, my tender ways without clearly pointing students’ mistakes caused some confusion. Students felt confused about what is the accurate correction for their errors.

Despite these shortcomings, the implementation of my lessons reflected my teaching philosophy in several ways. First, students needed to work in small groups frequently for carrying out some tasks that require communication with each other, such as creating a dialogue, and interviewing different people. I listened in on each group to resolve different problems or give more instructions to help students complete tasks. Group work helped to lower students’ anxiety as they learned from one another.

Secondly, authentic materials were presented in my lesson. I played different videos before starting a lesson, such as Chinese movies, songs, food, and so on to invite students to go on a Chinese journey. These videos were coordinated with the lessons. Useful vocabulary from these videos was always introduced to students or related to their
projects. For example, when the moon festival was approaching, one video about making moon cakes was presented to help students know what moon cakes are and how they relate to Chinese culture. Finally, I created an environment in which making errors was not a big deal. As students made errors, my feedback started with encouraging words, such as ‘good’ or ‘I like what you are saying’ before I supplied accurate answers. I allowed students to know that errors actually served as the stepping stone of improvement, rather than obstacles.

Overall, watching the video recording allows me to reflect on how closely my teaching coincides with my teaching philosophy. Through this reflection, I have the opportunity to see my weaknesses as well as strengths in teaching. Frequently re-evaluating my teaching and observing students’ responses and interviewing students will be another helpful way to adjust my teaching style and enhance my skills. I need to re-evaluate how I introduce grammar or vocabulary to provide the most effective teaching. Finally, I will try to review my classroom practices by periodically observing other instructors’ classes, doing self-assessment and peer-assessment, and reading current research, to make my classroom practices truly reflect my teaching philosophy.
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY
INTRODUCTION

In the process of developing this portfolio, which includes my teaching philosophy as well as supporting artifacts, I read countless books and journal articles. The following is an annotated bibliography of valuable articles and books that have had a great impact on me. The bibliography is organized thematically: teaching methods, communication-based teaching, teacher’s feedback, learning motivation, culture, and literacy. Each annotation contains the bibliographic reference, a summary of the article or book, and my reaction.

**Summary:** The author presents foreign language teachers’ and students’ perceptions about effective teaching. Brown believes that disillusionment might set in when the expectations for effective teaching are mismatched between teachers and students. This study identifies the features of an effective foreign language teacher, according to teachers’ and students’ beliefs about facilitating second language acquisition. Teachers tend to favor a communicative way which focuses on meaningful information exchanges and having students use the second language (L2) frequently. However, students’ opinions show that they have less enthusiasm about using the second language in classrooms than teachers. Students prefer teachers’ immediate correction for their speaking mistakes and more formal grammar instruction. Thus, there is disagreement about grammar practice between teachers and students. Teachers tend to blend grammar practice into students’ real-life experience because they think grammar instruction should be embedded in various actual contexts by means of interactional activities. Additionally, two interesting findings in terms of students’ expectations are mentioned. The first is that German and Spanish students mostly view second language learning as English translation. Secondly, learners at the beginning level believe they can acquire L2 proficiency in less than two years. This demonstrates that beginning learners embrace unrealistic goals for L2 progress. Comparing L2 teachers’ and learners’ concepts about L2 learning, the author emphasizes that understanding the difference is crucial to address
successful teaching in L2 classrooms. The ultimate goal of efficient teaching is to improve students’ learning achievement and success.

**Reaction:** This article presents teachers’ and students’ voices about how L2 teachers can be effective. By listening to the voices from both sides, I can prepare in advance to confront future students’ impractical expectations towards language acquisition. Students’ perspectives help teachers establish connection between teachers’ effective teaching and students’ successful learning. Appropriate beliefs about teaching effectiveness allow students to form realistic hopes for learning, which in turn affects students’ learning efficiency.


**Summary:** The authors summarize critical essentials that dual-language educators need to know. They offer an in-depth look at dual-language programs alongside examples that illuminate dual-language school models such as 50/50 and 90/10 programs. Presenting research in literacy, bilingualism, and second language acquisition, the authors demonstrate that dual-language schools offer the most effective educational setting. They emphasize that students in dual-language schools receive instruction in two languages simultaneously. The book focuses on four core topics, which are school, administrator,
and teacher essentials, curriculum essentials, literacy essentials, and planning essentials. These four pillars support language-majority and language-minority students to develop proficiency in two languages successfully. The authors argue that the orientation of language-as-a-resource is the preferred foundation of dual-language programs. With this perspective, language is viewed as a resource to help students learn content areas. They claim that learning academic content in two languages enables students to use two languages proficiently in communication and learning. This book draws on the authors’ experiences, their understanding of second language teaching and learning, and the academic research literature to offer educators effective instruction in planning dual-language programs. The primary purpose of the book is to help school professionals develop the most promising dual-language programs.

**Reaction:** This book offers teachers clear insight into effective methodology to teach academic content areas and literacy in two languages. I learned that teachers should focus on student-centered and meaning-centered teaching. Students need to have opportunities to discover knowledge by themselves not serve as passive receptors. Additionally, using materials which are related to students’ life experience enhances comprehensible input and learning efficiency. Moreover, the emphasis on integrating meaningful instruction into standards is the primary teaching goal. These perspectives allow me to ponder what teaching methods I still need to develop to help students reach high academic achievement in two languages.

**Summary:** The book introduces many practical theories for teachers. The main idea is focusing on effective teaching by using authentic materials, meaningful correction and feedback, and appropriate assessments to encourage students to develop their life-long learning. Each chapter of the book assists language teachers in cultivating a contextualized approach. The authors emphasize that second or foreign language acquisition relies on the approaches teachers use to aid students speak the target language (TL) in classroom. The purpose for using the TL in classroom communication is to improve students’ foreign or second language proficiency. There are many excellent teaching examples and case studies at the end of each chapter. Those practical examples are rooted in renowned research and teaching methodologies. Sound instructional principles are evident in each teaching. Research-based and practical theories allow teachers to develop effective teaching methodologies. Diverse helpful charts, graphs, and diagrams, which teachers can apply in the classroom, are included. In addition, interesting and useful hands-on activities are provided to help teachers generate ideas for promoting students’ learning efficiency. This book, with its research-based theories and authentic teaching examples, helps teachers better understand successful methods for language teaching.
**Reaction:** This book is the teachers’ bible for teaching. I like this book because each chapter offers new principles which help teachers reflect on their own teaching. Self-reflection allows teachers to adjust their teaching style and approaches. After reading this book, I realized that every theory should be reviewed again and again to keep progressing. Furthermore, the principles in this book are very useful and practical. Therefore, I will utilize this book throughout my teaching career to further improve my teaching skills.


**Summary:** This dissertation consists of in-depth research on the effectiveness of an immersion program. The author demonstrates that students can successfully attain academic achievement and second language acquisition in immersion education. From a pedagogical perspective, using effectual teaching strategies, delivering content-based discourses, using the target language for instruction, doing diversity group work, and connecting students’ living experiences are crucial for success in immersion classrooms. Regarding effective teaching strategies, the author’s findings show that content-based instruction broadens students’ interaction with the target language and therefore helps them achieve proficiency in the target language. Easing students’ learning anxiety is another important point that the author emphasizes. To lower students’ learning difficulty in the immersion classroom, teachers should implement suitable immersion strategies to
retain students’ learning motivation and interests. Additionally, creating a communicative environment plays a pivotal role in allowing students to use the target language as much as possible and reach proficiency. Finally, Wang incorporated this study into the application of Chinese/English immersion school to elicit task-based instructional strategies and teacher-student interactions, which are the methodology that teachers can implement in Chinese/English immersion classroom. Hence, the study verifies the advantages of leaning the second or foreign language in immersion learning settings with theoretical and practical research.

**Reaction:** I like this article for its theoretical foundation and practical evidence. On both sides, the author’s perspectives and research draw a picture of applying effective teaching strategies in an immersion classroom. Also, this study provides me with clear guidelines for future teaching in a Chinese immersion program along with some realistic examples. Through reading of other teachers’ experiences, I obtain valuable references in terms of effective teaching. Furthermore, this research can serve as a handbook for teachers.


**Summary:** This book is a valuable tool for Chinese teachers and Chinese language learners. The author explains Chinese teaching and learning based upon research and personal teaching experience. There are many effective methodologies and strategies that
teachers and learners can apply to Chinese teaching and learning. The author points out that tones and the writing system are the two main challenges most Chinese language learners confront. To help learners overcome these two difficulties, the author outlines the process that learners will go through and offers useful approaches. Some examples are presented to help learners connect the alphabetic system to the character system. There are tables showing specific vocal positions that help people pronounce Chinese with the help of pinyin. Additionally, several worthwhile techniques and strategies are shown in this book. The author’s clear explanations are followed by many practical examples. Furthermore, associating Chinese acquisition with Chinese culture, the author addresses the relation between culture content and language proficiency. In addition to discussing the relation, the role of culture in Chinese teaching and learning is described as well. At the end of this book, rich resources for Chinese teaching and learning are provided to assist readers with easy and convenient access.

**Reaction:** Although I am a Chinese native speaker, I am no expert in Chinese teaching. However, this book serves as a great resource for teachers developing hands-on activities to aid students in acquiring Chinese proficiency. Additionally, for Chinese language learners, it is a useful resource for practicing tones and characters with superior methods. The cultural concepts covered help me have a deeper understanding about my own culture. I realize now the importance of reflecting on Chinese culture in order to incorporate it in the Chinese classroom. I am inspired by the author’s experience and view of Chinese culture which I have learned for a long time in Taiwan. Being
empathetic to students allows me to understand difficulties that students confront and ponder some strategies I can offer.


**Summary:** The author investigates the frequency of discourse features that are shown in natural conversation and in the dialogues of textbooks. Through comparing dialogues that occurred in real-life with those in textbooks, the author also discusses the reason why textbook writers omit or avoid some natural discourse features that are common in real conversation. The researcher collected data from coursebooks published between 1981 and 1997 to extract transcripts. Furthermore, in dialogues that occurred outside of the classroom, speakers reformulated questions from the textbook. Those dialogues are transcribed after being recorded. According to the findings, (1) length and turn-taking patterns, (2) lexical density, (3) false starts and repetitions, (4) pauses, (5) terminal overlap or latching, (6) hesitation devices, and (7) back-channelling are factors in authentic interaction (real conversation). The findings show that dialogues in textbooks are more artificial and less effective toward learners’ language development and acquisition. The author discovered that the length of conversations is almost twice as long in authentic interactions as in textbooks. Additionally, more complex structures and more interruptions are shown in authentic interactions than in textbook dialogues. The shorter and simpler conversation in textbooks is probably intended to help learners easily achieve
listening comprehension and notice new structures and functions of the target language. Moreover, about lexical density, which refers to “an expression of the percentage of lexical words within a text” (p. 367), textbooks use more explicit vocabulary. The author thinks this will lower learners’ listening skills to identify the “referents of pronouns” (p. 368). The results also show that hesitation devices, such as ‘erm’ or ‘er’ are used commonly in natural conversation, but scarcely in textbooks. Furthermore, pauses, terminal overlap or latching (interlocutors speak simultaneously), and back-channelling (incomplete words) are all absent in textbook dialogues, however, are spoken frequently in real-life conversation. The researcher concludes that textbooks and language teachers should present information and knowledge that match real-world situations to support efficient language acquisition.

**Reaction:** This article allows teachers to ponder how to adapt textbooks into teaching in order to help learners acquire real-life language usage. Real-life conversation is never “simple and straightforward” (p. 366) and students should be aided to develop and acquire natural speaking language. Textbooks are not bible of language learners and I believe learners’ communicative ability can be promoted when teachers carefully incorporate textbooks into real-life dialogues. I also think that teachers’ modeling can increase students’ oral-language ability when teachers use the target language as native-like as possible. In addition, students should be encouraged to practice language with native speakers as much as they can.

**Summary**: The book covers many basic concepts of teaching and learning second or foreign languages. The primary emphasis is on the importance of communicative approaches in teaching languages. The authors indicate that “negotiation of meaning” plays a pivotal role in language acquisition. Negotiation of meaning allows learners to produce more target language, enhance their understanding, and become aware of their errors in the process of exchanging information. Furthermore, the authors claim that grammar learning and student assessment should support language acquisition, not kill students’ motivation. The authors’ views overturn traditional bottom-up teaching methods which focus on grammar explanation. Many practical examples are provided to assist teachers in promoting learners’ internal motivation. An innovative metaphor the authors use is about teachers’ and students’ roles. They claim that teachers are architects and students are builders in language learning. Teachers are shown how to use the task-based approach to help students carry out a series of tasks to input and output the target language more naturally. Implementing appropriate evaluation which should be focused on communication is emphasized in the last chapter of this book. The authors claim that the purpose of assessment is to enable students to use the target language in the real world, not just for ranking them.
**Reaction:** The book is a good resource for professional development in the area of teaching methodologies. The author emphasizes that a communicative classroom must be the center of language teaching. Alongside research-based theories and practical pedagogies, the teaching of communication skills which can apply in real-life is much emphasized by the authors. Therefore, teachers should not focus on grammar proficiency in language teaching anymore. This book presents useful approaches which allow teachers to develop effective teaching skills.


**Summary:** This article examines Taiwanese students’ perceptions in terms of the communicative approach in their English classes. The findings show that most students think that practicing more English communication in class helps them learn more. Thus, the authors emphasize that meaning-centered teaching is the primary approach that teachers should implement. However, many Taiwanese English teachers still focus on language structure in teaching. The authors mention that the inconsistency between students’ perception and teachers’ real teaching is because of the educational system in Taiwan. Most teachers in junior high school explain grammar to help students produce English in writing because all students have to pass an exam to enter senior high school. Therefore, teachers and students are learning English for tests. From a college students’
perspective, the authors find that they prefer the communicative approach in order to participate in everyday conversations. Additionally, an interesting piece of evidence indicates that most Taiwanese learners have the expectation that teachers correct their errors. Finally, the authors recommend that communicative competence guidelines and benchmarks should be established for teachers and students who want to reach communicative goals. In addition, Savignon and Wang emphasize that the responsibility of implementing the communicative approach in school is based on the whole society, not the teachers or learners alone.

**Reaction:** This article helps me reflect on my Chinese teaching. I realized that I had been instructed to do form-centered teaching and I also transmit form-centered teaching to my students. This study restates the importance of communicative ways in teaching. I thought that I should address the communicative approach with the actual class I’m teaching because I easily lose sight of the teaching objectives and lead students toward grammar-centered learning. Thus, the study allows me to reflect on the most fundamental and crucial teaching practices.


**Summary:** This book holds up communicative competence as an achievable goal. The contributors emphasize that communicative language teaching (CLT) is a useful
pedagogy. CLT, which focuses on meaningful teaching, is an approach that language teachers use to develop learners’ communicative competence. The author claims that meaningful teaching conveys comprehensible instruction to learners in order to promote their understanding. In addition, learners can achieve meaningful communication in the real world through the CLT approach. The roles of a teacher and students are clarified in this book. Teachers should offer learner-centered teaching in a classroom. Therefore, interaction between peers and between teachers and students should occur frequently through realistic activities. Teachers can use authentic materials which can be retrieved from print-based texts, such as newspapers or novels, or online resources. Thus, computer-mediated communication is further claimed to help teachers provide authentic materials through technology, which is useful for promoting learners’ proficiency. This book provides both theoretical and practical principles for language professionals. Some case studies are provided to show how language learners acquire the target language. Furthermore, these case studies allow teachers to know that communicative goals are vital and they can be achieved when CLT is applied in the language classroom.

**Reaction:** Because it has close connection with other textbooks I have read, this book helped me further clarify my understanding of CLT. The analogy of learning approaches and features are my favorite parts. For example, “Theater art is the fourth component of a communicative curriculum” because the communicative approach involves performing in front of diverse audiences. Additionally, in the familiar words of Shakespeare, “all the world’s stage” which demonstrates that embedding communication with teaching helps
students connect with the world. With its many useful ideas, this book serves as a helpful reference for language teachers.


**Summary:** This article is about how to use the communicative approach in Chinese teaching to enhance students’ abilities in Chinese in real life. There are four sections. The first part introduces related language teaching theories. In the second part, teacher roles, students’ roles, activities, and settings are defined. The third section is about how to apply those theories into one’s teaching practice and how to develop communicative tasks. The last part is the author’s reflections based on students’ feedback for a Chinese class. Based upon the communicative approach, the author asked the students to do ‘blog writing’ ‘story-making’ and ‘video-making’ to promote their communicative skills in real life. These three tasks offer students opportunities to develop creativity and interact with native speakers in Taiwan. Before starting this project, students were taught the necessary grammar and vocabulary. Moreover, the teacher serves as “observer and facilitator” (p. 706) to assist students in improving their grammar correction in this project. According to students’ performance in terms of these three tasks, teachers discover what errors students have in common and design related activities to help students notice their own grammar errors in a natural way. Finally, based on students’ feedback on this Chinese class, the author urges teachers to take into account students’ different learning needs.
Students also indicated that they needed help developing their technology skills before they started to do ‘blog writing,’ ‘story-making,’ and ‘video-making.

**Reaction:** As I had observed Dr. Sung’s class for one semester, I was pleased to read her article. Dr. Sung has implemented the theoretical principles described in this article in her classroom. Through the students’ responses in her classroom, I can see that they are engaged in every lesson. Similarly, the student in the article reported that they enjoyed learning Chinese through the projects they were assigned. These projects not only allowed them to engage in Chinese learning but also stimulated their desire to learn. I believe that life-long learning development is the crucial foundation to students. This motivates me to implement the same approach in my teaching.


**Summary:** This study investigated the effectiveness of different types of written corrective feedback (WCF) on students’ second-language (L2) or Foreign-language (FL) writing. The authors probed into the students’ perspectives and the teachers’ intention regarding types of WCF used to facilitate students’ improvement in writing. The findings reveal that both teachers and students agree with the repetition of corrections, every time the same error(s) occur. Students as well as teachers believe that consistent corrections
allow students to revisit patterns of frequent writing errors. Additionally, students and teachers also place value on providing clues or directions for correcting mistakes. The purpose of giving tips and direction for feedback is to help students develop self-correction and remember their mistakes. However, teachers are also reminded not just to give single indication or direction; student should receive more specific advice or detailed WCF to obtain sufficient information for self-correction. Furthermore, teachers’ overt feedback and comments assist student to better understand how to revise their writings because they have more clues to help them know why they make certain errors and how to fix them. The effectiveness of WCF may be impaired by discrepancies between students’ and teachers’ beliefs, therefore the authors recommend that open discussion of the usage of WCF is crucial. Hence, teachers need to make their own and students’ expectations congruent to contribute to the improvement of students’ writing.

**Reaction:** This article gave me clear concepts in regards to students’ perspectives towards teachers’ written feedback. Being a Chinese teacher, it is difficult to know what feedback is really helpful for students’ improvement. I think feedback is part of teaching and the study helped me to have greater understanding of how to provide effective feedback to students. In addition, I thought that feedback could assist students in further developing self-correction skills. The article allowed me to consider that I should develop effective ways of providing feedback to aid students in producing their best writing.

Summary: This study investigates what second language (L2) learners’ beliefs are regarding grammar learning and error correction. The authors claim that knowing learners’ beliefs may allow teachers to predict learners’ L2 learning behavior and influence “teachers’ classroom activities” (p. 91). Furthermore, four factors are interwoven with significant correlation, which are learners’ beliefs, foreign language achievement, perception of language course, and the amount of grammar instruction. Participants were recruited from thirteen different FL/L2 classrooms at a University in the United States with English, German, Arabic, Japanese, and Chinese the most commonly chosen languages by students. The data reveal that diverse beliefs toward ‘grammar instruction’ and ‘error correction’ are found among L2 learners. The strongest expression of dislike of error correction came from English learners, which is contrary to students who learn the less commonly taught languages (LCTL) such as Urdu, Thai, or Nepali. In terms of grammatical accuracy, English learners have the least concern, while Arabic, Chinese, and LCTL learners’ attitudes are positive. However, English, LCTL, Italian/Portuguese learners favor communication, whereas Japanese learners are the least inclined toward communication. The research points out those L2 learners who have positive attitudes for grammar believe that grammar learning is beneficial for their language learning and helps them to improve reading, writing, and speaking skills. However, learners express that grammar learning should be through contextualized
examples, explanations, and interactions. They tend not to learn grammar knowledge by relying solely on memorization and figuring out grammar by themselves.

**Reaction:** This article caused me to ponder how I, as a teacher, convey grammatical knowledge to students and understand what my students’ preference for grammar learning might be. Therefore, this article is a useful application for my teaching due to its discussion of students’ perspectives for error corrections. Hence, through reading this research, I realize that appropriate grammar teaching by clear explanation and proper corrective feedback should be an important part of effective teaching.


**Summary:** This study examines how four different instructional settings influence teachers’ corrective feedback (CF) and how learners respond to it. These four language classrooms are French immersion, Canada ESL, New Zealand ESL and Korean EFL, which all involve communicative teaching. The first three settings were previously published by others; only the Korean EFL study was conducted by the author. The learners’ ages range from nine to thirty-six. The teachers’ teaching experience varies as well. The author categorizes teachers’ CF as explicit corrective, clarification requests,
metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, multiple feedback, and recast. The result shows that teachers use ‘recast’ most frequently in these four cross-instructional settings. However, the result also shows that recast “lead to the lowest rate of uptake” (p. 286). Uptake refers to students’ immediate utterance toward teachers’ feedback, which help students repair their initial answers to be correct. The findings reveal that students in Canada ESL and Canada immersion have a lower rate of uptake and repair than in the other two settings. From the research, the author demonstrates that elicitation leads students to uptake all the time in the four different settings. Additionally, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, and repetition lead students to uptake at a high frequency. The results reveal that to elicit students’ uptake, clarification requests are more effective than recasts in all settings. The researcher concludes that different pedagogical focus, learners’ ages, proficiency and educational background will influence the effectiveness of recast to motivate learners’ uptake. Therefore, future research should focus on investigating how CF influences language learners’ immediate response and their L2 development.

Reaction: This article indicates that teachers most frequently use recast for corrective feedback, but it is the least effective feedback to elicit learners’ uptake. This result helps me to change my corrective feedback toward students’ errors in speaking. I have found myself using recast unconsciously because it leads students to repeat the correct answers more quickly than other feedback types. However, using more clarification requests or metalinguistic feedback is more effective to help students understand. I have learned that teachers should provide students time to work out the answers and therefore, teachers’
patience is an important element for students’ uptake. I believe that only through the process of figuring answers out, students acquire the knowledge they need.


**Summary:** This study investigates the relationship between teachers’ corrective feedback (CF) and learners’ preference. The purpose of the research is to determine what type of CF teachers provide the most and how effective it is toward students’ understanding. According to results from previous studies, ‘recast’ is the most used type of CF by teachers. The author recruited participants from three second-level Japanese classes at a university in Australia. Through observing and audio-recording these three classes and doing stimulated recall (SR) interviews with learners and teachers, the author found ‘recast’ is used most frequently by teachers to correct students’ errors, which is the same result as previous studies demonstrated. Furthermore, the researcher categorizes learners’ errors from audio-recordings in five types: errors in morphosyntactic, lexical, semantic, and kanji reading (Japanese characters). These types of errors triggered teachers’ use of CF in nine categories, which are (1) recast, (2) incidental, (3) explicit correction, (4) metalinguistic feedback, (5) repetition, (6) elicitation, (7) re-asks, (8) clarification, and (9) delayed recast. The findings reveal that teachers provide CF most frequently toward students’ ‘morphosyntactic errors’, which are also made most frequently by students. Additionally, the results show that 51% of teachers’ CF led learners to uptake, which
indicates students’ responses. Finally, the study shows that while teachers choose ‘recast’ for providing CF toward learners’ errors, this contrasts with learners’ preference. Learners prefer to figure out correct answers by themselves, making clarification or elicitation more suitable for their needs in CF. Thus, the author concludes that “allowing learners more time for learners’ self-correction is better learning” (p. 89).

**Reaction:** This article caused me to think about the reason for the difference between learners’ preference and teachers’ choices in terms of corrective feedback. This also helps me ponder whether the CF that I provide to my students is effective for their learning. It is easy to assume that giving students correct answers immediately is the most useful for their comprehension. However, adult students who have better cognitive ability and literacy ability in their first language are able to figure out answers by themselves. Thus, what language teachers have to learn for giving feedback is providing students ‘time’ and ‘wait’ to let them go through the process of searching for answers. I believe that will be more effective for their language acquisition.


**Summary:** This research indicates how intercultural contact through tourism influences learners’ learning attitudes, especially in regards to their motivation to learn a second language (L2). The authors conducted the study by investigating approximately 8500
Hungarian teenagers whose ages were between thirteen to fourteen years old. The longitudinal and repeatedly administered survey examined the extent of intercultural contact that contributed to the increase of L2 Hungarian learners’ learning motivation. The study also examined how “contact-flood” (p. 328) affected Hungarian school children with five different target languages, which were English, German, French, Italian, and Russian. The results reveal that the participants’ attitudes toward meeting foreign visitors decreased from 1993 to 1999. The same decreasing attitude is shown in the participants’ perceptions toward foreign visitors as well. Furthermore, the findings reveal that people who live in a country with fewer foreign visitors or tourists have a more positive attitude to tourists. Therefore, the relationship between contact and attitude is inverse, which means that the highest contact group is associated with lowest attitude and motivation toward foreign visitors and tourists. Dörnyei and Csizér (2005) did not expect this finding, but they still demonstrated that intercultural contact plays an important and influences people’s attitudes regarding to foreign languages. In addition, the connection between intercultural contact and language learning behavior was inferred from Hungarian learners’ attitudes and perceptions to foreign languages. Finally, the authors think that further research can be conducted by measuring tourists’ perceptions, too. Through measuring and comparing mutual perspectives, the effect of intercultural contact on learners’ motivational disposition can be determined.

**Reaction:** This is an interesting article that emphasizes that L2 learning or acquisition is significantly influenced by learners’ motivation. The authors demonstrate that highly contacting groups have the lowest motivation to contact with tourists. There are much
more tourists in small places than in larger city, so residents in smaller places are more intergroup. This “intercultural contact” (p. 29) decrease their motivation of contacting foreigners. Thus, to enhance L2 learning and acquisition, motivation and intercultural factors are woven together to improve learners’ L2 proficiency. The result also reveals that L2 learners’ motivation is strongly affected by community atmosphere and sociocultural norms. This leads me to think that addressing my teaching or providing materials to students should be appropriate to reduce students’ bias or misconception.


Summary: The exact nature of the complex relationship between motivation and second language (L2) learning is explored in this book. The authors claim that L2 learners’ motivation is a crucial factor that determines their L2 achievement. The study was conducted by investigating Hungarian high school students’ motivation. These students in Hungary are 13-14 years old and need to learn five foreign languages, which are English, German, French, Italian and Russian. The authors provide a ‘motivational flow-chart’ to show how sociopolitical changes influence learners’ motivation toward learning the five different target languages. Additionally, the authors point out that differences in gender, geographical distribution, and school instruction are the three factors that affect
learners’ motivation. First, the gender difference reflects that boys and girls have
different preferences in language learning. Respondents claimed that French and Italian
are more “feminine languages” while German has a more “masculine nature” (p. 56).
However, English is a neutral language for everyone because it is the first L2 that people
choose to learn. Thus, gender differences do not exist in English learning. Secondly,
although a certain location might prefer to use a certain language, globalization breaks
the boundaries of geography. Thirdly, school instruction should be focused on engaging
students in learning, which means motivating students to learn. When students have an
interest in class, their learning efficiency is enhanced. In the last part of this volume,
intercultural factors are discussed. Target language proficiency could be promoted when
learners are immersed in an environment in which the target language is spoken all
around. Furthermore, cultural products, such as songs, which are related to the target
language, support learners’ language achievement as well.

**Reaction:** Students’ motivation is one of the parts I am most concerned with in my
teaching. I believe motivation is a mental process which is not necessarily seen just
through observation. I think our mental processes have a great influence on our learning
ability. However, the most difficult part in teaching is how to maintain learners’
motivation. This book helps me to understand interconnected factors which impact
motivation. These must be addressed in effective instruction. Through this book, I am
reminded that a teacher’s motivation plays an important role as well because teachers’
motivation can transfer to students unconsciously and influence their perspectives.

**Summary:** The author of this book explains her philosophy of educating immigrant children, which serves as the foundation for her teaching methodology. Central to the teaching of immigrant children is an emphasis on listening to children with patience, which is the primary stage in uncovering children’s feelings and needs. The author shares her insights gained from working with immigrant children and struggling with school systems. Her experiences provide current teachers a clear model of observation, reflection, and inquiry to develop effective teaching methodology. The author also emphasizes that literacy should be the central focus of curriculum to raise children’s self-empowerment and promote their learning motivation. The author claims that immigrant students need to become active learners and develop educational responsibilities. In this book, the point of respecting students’ diverse cultures is discussed. Students build self-reflection through social mirroring, which means that people’s social attitude toward students influences the way they think about themselves. Thus, social foundations of education and content-area methods are addressed. The author states that “teaching, […] is an art” (p. 1). The teacher invests time, patience, and effort to educate each whole learner not just part of the learner. The author claims it is vital to discern and validate immigrant children’s inner feelings. She emphasizes that teaching in a cheerful and tender way brings immigrant learners’ valuable spirit out. The goal is to facilitate immigrant students’ successful transition into the mainstream curriculum.
**Reaction:** This book inspired me to pay attention to students’ inner world by observing their behaviors. Students’ behaviors usually reflect their feelings toward people or things surrounding them. These feelings also reflect their learning needs. This book reminds me of the proverb “teaching is learning.” Teachers must learn what is appropriate to meet students’ inner feelings and learning needs, since teaching is a reciprocal process between teachers and learners. Furthermore, many students’ art work and descriptions in this book allow me to have a different view of being a good teacher.


**Summary:** The authors state that comprehensible input for second language (L2) learners could be attained by simplifying texts. When texts are simplified, learners’ reading comprehension can be promoted due to the reduction in cognitive work. However, text simplification tends to be focused on the patterns not on the quantities. Therefore, eleven linguistic features typically found in simplified texts are examined in this research. Beginning simplified texts and advanced simplified texts are discussed, with the former consisting of more comprehensible input and more cohesive devices than the latter. Based upon this, the authors state that as the difficulty levels of texts decrease, the linguistic comprehension of texts also increase. Because simplified texts produce similar structures across sentences, readers easily acquire their meanings. However, two linguistic modifications make simplified texts less understandable: predominance of
verbs and the difference in polysemy values. Predominance of verbs is an abstract concept that refers to verbs that readers find difficult, such as ‘factor’ or ‘dimension.’ Polysemy values refer to words that are ambiguous due to having multiple meanings. Therefore, the two linguistic features (abstract and ambiguous) make it difficult for readers to acquire these words and reach text comprehension. Ultimately, using statistical analysis, the authors demonstrate that linguistic effects of intuitive text simplification do have a positive influence on reading comprehension.

**Reaction:** This article demonstrates that simplified texts can be useful in providing comprehensible input for learners. For second or foreign language learners, comprehensible input is the most important factor in acquiring meanings. Through reading this article, I learned that simplifying texts can be efficient as long as certain pitfalls are avoided. The authors clearly point out that different levels of learners need a different extent of simplified texts to improve their comprehension. Eleven linguistic features of simplified texts that are mentioned in this study gave me deep insight into how to apply them to provide more comprehensible input in my Chinese teaching.


**Summary:** This article addresses the contribution of orthographic processing to reading abilities of young second-language learners. The study reveals that orthographic
processing is not language-specific for reading outcomes as previous researchers thought.
The authors advocate that the relationship between orthographic processing and reading ability is a pattern both within- and across-language. The study is conducted by testing native English speaking children in a French immersion program. The data show that in reading two similar languages, there is a bidirectional contribution of orthographic processing to reading. According to this finding, it proves that orthographic processing transfer occurs at least across two similar pattern languages, such as English and French, which share several features, including the alphabetic system. This also further predicts that orthographic processing transfer is alphabet specific or shared features specific. For example, the authors point out that “English and Finnish share some letter patterns, but not word forms” (p. 224). Therefore, among other intermediate contrast languages, transfer might happen due to shared features. However, the specific shared features in languages which drive transfer and how it occurs need to be further researched. Another issue will be how to demonstrate transfer performance or ability. In summary, the results suggest that bilingual children’s second-language reading development is focused on orthographic skills used for reading either language. Investigation of children’s development of processing abilities to comprehend meaning is open to further research.

**Reaction:** The article offers ideas about how orthographic processing transfer works in two languages, especially for young bilingual readers. The authors helps teachers reconsider how transfer occurs in two similar/different languages and demonstrates that orthographic processing skills are important to language learners’ reading achievement. This research is useful for teachers who wish to help children cultivate effective reading
skills in two languages. This article also causes me to think that if I help young learners find the shared features of two languages they are learning, orthographic processing transfer might still occur between two very contrasting languages.


**Summary:** The authors examine how cross-linguistic transfer occurs between L1 linguistic skills and L2 comprehension. Their findings show that younger learners use primary L1 and L2 decoding skills for L2 reading comprehension, whereas older learners’ oral language skills in L1 and L2 have more influence on L2 reading comprehension. Since decoding skills are highly correlated to children’s reading comprehension early on and decoding plays a pivotal role in comprehension in L1 and L2, it must be concluded that phonological sensitivity, which is at the core of decoding skills, is also important for comprehension. Indeed, the study reveals that cross-linguistic transfer happens as children go through the decoding process and utilize phonological awareness to understand the meanings of words. Nevertheless, when L1 and L2 have few shared structures and writing systems, cross-linguistic transfer will be weaker than when two similar languages are learned. For example, two alphabetic languages are more easily transferred than alphabetic and ideographic languages. Additionally, Melby-Lervåg and
Lervåg demonstrate that for oral language in L1 and L2, there is cross-linguistic transfer but it is weaker than reading. In speaking, learners still use decoding skills and phonological awareness to promote comprehension. Melby-Lervåg and Lervåg claim that including both languages in instruction will enable students to implement cross-language transfer of decoding meaning.

**Reaction:** This article is very interesting because it posits that decoding skills and phonological sensitivity are predictors for L2 reading and speaking comprehension. Based upon this, I learned that if students receive instruction in both languages, their comprehension can be facilitated due to the cross-linguistic transfer that occurs in their brain. This just clarified my confusion about whether my teaching might be wrong, because I was not using one-hundred percent L2 in the classroom. This also reminds me that the target language should be used at least ninety percent of the time in a language classroom. Therefore, I will try to balance L1 and L2 instructional language to maximize students’ comprehension.


**Summary:** This survey study investigates what strategies Chinese language learners most frequently use to facilitate their character-learning. The students are enrolled in
first-year Chinese as foreign language classes in the United States. The authors indicate that three challenges cause difficulty in learning Chinese characters: (1) the number of characters required for functional literacy, (2) unclear relationships “between a character and its pronunciation” (p. 685), and (3) many characters having similar pronunciations. For example, the sound ‘shì’ includes the following words and each one represents a different meaning, 是(is or are), 事(things), 視(see), 試(try or test), and 室(room). Thus, following Stewner-Manzanares (1985), the authors believe that learning strategies facilitate second language learners’ acquisition of new skills, critical concepts, and vocabulary. The researchers used Oxford’s (1990) taxonomy of language learning strategies, which are (1) memory, (2) cognitive, (3) compensation, (4) metacognition, (5) affective, and (6) social strategies, to analyze participants’ strategies. Additionally, factors of gender, home background, and previous foreign language learning experiences were investigated. The authors found that (1) practicing naturalistically, (2) associating, (3) paying attention to the characters, (4) using mechanical techniques, (5) grouping, and (6) paying attention to the pronunciation are frequently used by students. The findings reveal that students tend to use metacognitive (3,6) and memory (1,4,5) strategies simultaneously. In addition, learners use cognitive strategy for character learning (2) as well. The findings also support Oxford’s (1990) and Shen’s (2005) results. Additionally, gender significantly influences strategy usage among Chinese Heritage Language participants. Females tend to use memory strategies while males tend to use metacognitive strategies for character learning. In addition, male learners who have studied logographic language at least one year use the strategy of paying attention to characters least frequently. This is contrary to female learners’ tendencies.
**Reaction:** This article serves as a greatly useful tool for Chinese language teachers and learners. It allows teachers to provide students helpful strategies for practicing characters. In addition, teachers can better understand learners’ struggles and what difficulty learners confront in character learning. This understanding helps teachers adjust character teaching to meet students’ learning needs. Moreover, these effective strategies are from prior learners’ experiences, which help current leaners reduce their struggles and acquire characters more efficiently.


**Summary:** Linguistic elements that support Chinese-English bilingual children’s biliteracy in English and Chinese are addressed in this study. As Chinese immigrant children completed phonological tasks in English and Chinese, the researchers discovered in the children’s cognitive system that the Chinese pinyin system is correlated to the English alphabet system. The tasks involved the pronunciation of Chinese characters, Chinese pinyin, English pseudowords, and real words. The pinyin system, like English words, uses alphabet letters, which aids children to learn and read characters. Thus, the research reveals that these bilingual children establish phonological linkage between English and Chinese. This association is established on the shared phonological-level in English words and Chinese pinyin. However, according to the researchers’ findings, the orthographic processing skills in English words and Chinese characters are not correlated.
Thus, the cross-language transfer occurs between alphabetic systems, not between an orthographic and an alphabetic system. In accordance with previous research findings, the results indicate that, compared to English reading, Chinese reading needs more brain areas to work to coordinate ideographic characters which are related to spatial concepts. Furthermore, the findings suggest that children’s sensitivity to Chinese tone changes “might be a good pre-literacy predictor of reading English” (p. 82). Hence, the authors think that further research might test whether Chinese tone training helps dyslexic children improve English reading skills.

**Reaction:** This article provides an in-depth look at how the shared phonological similarities in Chinese and English help children develop biliteracy. It also allows me to consider the importance of helping Chinese immersion school students build their prior knowledge in terms of the relations between English and Chinese. This will be helpful for teachers to develop appropriate teaching skills for improving students’ biliteracy abilities. I particularly like the researcher’s further discussion, in which it is hypothesized that Chinese tone training supports children with reading difficulties and assists them with English reading because the researchers claim that “tone detection might be a good pre-literacy predictor of reading English” (p. 82). Hence, I believe that helping children establish a firm foundation in literacy ability at an early age is crucial.

**Summary:** This research-based book reveals factors that influence children’s multilingual literacy development, which is explained for children’s developmental stage. The primary element for well-developed multilingual literacy is cultivating different knowledge in terms of diverse cultures around the world. The author claims that multicultural knowledge can be fostered, which helps children learn multiple languages from early ages to adolescent period. To address effective principles of teaching children two or more languages and cultures, the author provides many real-life examples to discuss the possible challenges and offers recommendations for enhancing children’s multiliteracy development in different languages. This author also claims that helping children develop multiliteracy ability brings many benefits to children, which include expanding opportunities to communicate with culturally diverse background people, promoting cognitive thinking and academic learning, and supporting literacy development in the first language. Additionally, cultivating multiliteracy ability benefits children’s oral language and other language development, reduces the barrier of accessing to heritage cultures, and establishes heritage self-esteem and confidence. To achieve these benefits, parents need to create a comfortable home learning environment and a relationship with their children, to be flexible for selecting contents, and learning locations and time. These learner-centered methods allow parents to adapt instruction to fit individual learning needs and keep their learning motivation.
**Reaction:** This book serves as a great tool for teachers and parents to use effective pedagogies for children’s multiliteracy development. The author weaves real-life examples together with multilanguage learning theories, which greatly draws readers’ attention and interests. The real-life examples also guide readers through principles that support multiliteracy and multilingual development. Therefore, I really enjoy reading this book and it helps me to obtain more knowledge about teaching children’s literacy development.


**Summary:** Basing their claims on professional research, the authors discuss various issues related to adolescent literacy acquisition. Before going into each chapter, readers are asked some questions to help them navigate in-depth perspectives toward adolescents’ literacy instruction. The factors which impact adolescents’ literacy development are also presented in this book. The authors assert that adolescents have unique psychological and learning needs. The concept of meaning-centered and content-based literacy cultivation for adolescents is emphasized the most. The authors claim that literacy instruction should be focused on content-area reading which means there are several related themes associated in a literacy lesson. In this book, some effective approaches are introduced, such as CSR and IRIS modules, which are designed to prevent students from having low academic achievement. Various interventions are
provided for improving students’ reading capacity. The authors claim that differentiated instruction for enhancing adolescent and English language learners’ literacy ability is the foundation of effective literacy teaching.

**Reaction:** Literacy development has been fervently discussed in the field of second language acquisition. Therefore, I was eager to read this book. “Every teacher [is] a teacher of reading” (p. 77). This aphorism confirms that teaching literacy is not confined to teaching reading skills. Through this book, I realize that literacy teaching is a broad concept that I need to develop. Serving as a good mentor for each teacher, this book covers research-based theories and practice-based experiences regarding the literacy development of adolescents and English learners. I believe that this book is worthwhile to read for teachers who wish to promote literacy for different levels of students.

**Xiuli, T., & McBride-Chang, C. (2010). Developmental models of learning to read Chinese words. Developmental Psychology, 46(6), 1662-1676.**

**Summary:** The focus of this study was children’s ability to learn to read Chinese characters. The study investigates kindergarten children (beginners) and second (intermediate) and fifth grade (advanced) students’ aptitudes for learning to read Chinese in Hong Kong. The authors examined children’s reading patterns by using four different measures, which represent phonological awareness, morphological awareness,
orthographic processing, and subcharacter processing. Subcharacter processing refers to the connection between radical and phonetic pars of a semantic-phonetic compound character, such as ‘河水’ (river) /hé/’. ‘氵’ is the radical and ‘可/kě/’ is the predictor for pronunciation. The findings of the study reveal that beginning readers tend to recognize characters both visually and auditorily, which means they read printed texts or associate the pronunciation with characters when listening. More advanced readers have more tendency of phonological sensitivity and expanded lexical morphological-orthographic processing toward reading. The aptitude for character recognition is based upon a reader’s level. Thus, this suggests that children’s reading skills will be improved along with their increasing reading experience. However, the authors indicate that word recognition is related to cultural factors which are embedded in environments. In distinct environments, students are taught phonetics or meaning interpretation in different ways. For example, Chinese students’ literacy learning relies on frequent repetition, which influences them to learn Chinese by using visual-orthographic skills to memorize. Additionally, the study reveals that Chinese word teaching is a consistent process throughout developmental stages. The process includes phonetic coding, morphemic structure analyses, and subcharacter awareness strategies conveying. Based on this, the authors claim that teaching kindergarten children Chinese words should start with focusing on spoken patterns and introduce the, character “as a whole unit” (p. 1672) rather than analyzing components of a character. To promote more advanced learners’ literacy ability, multiple sources are appropriately provided. They learn sound, structure, and meaning-centered literacy. For them, Chinese learning is shifted from ‘learning to read’ to ‘reading to learn’. Thus, phonology, semantics, and orthography are the basic
essentials for reading, and all three affect reading comprehension. The authors end by concluding that ‘theories of character reading’ and ‘coordinated view of word reading’ are worthy of further research to explore different linguistic skills which are covered in cross-level Chinese readers.

**Reaction:** This study presents current information about Chinese word recognition in children and provides statistical evidence to demonstrate that Chinese reading includes different reading strategies across levels and ages. According to the results, the authors provide practical strategies that teachers can utilize in Chinese literacy teaching, which is very useful to teachers. This allows me to adjust my teaching style and approach in teaching Chinese characters. In order to promote students’ reading comprehension in Chinese, those principles for character recognizing and writing in this research are helpful for me to incorporate in my teaching.
LOOKING FORWARD
The learning journey in MSLT program had been challenging but inspiring. I have been taught and mentored by deeply caring professors. Their every effort for each student is an excellent example to me. Additionally, I have learned that continued research on new pedagogical information is indispensable for being an effective teacher. Frequent reflection on others’ feedback is critical to enhance my teaching skills and strategies as well. Hence, I hope to keep receiving professional training and learning in my teaching not only for my own academic pursuit but also for my students’ improvement in the future.
REFERENCES


Foreign Service Institute (FSI). Retrieved from http://www.state.gov/m/fsi/


Doi: 10.1515/iral.2011.007


Ziegler, J. C., & Goswami, U. (2005). Reading acquisition, development dyslexia, and skilled reading across languages: A psycholinguistic grain size theory.

_Psychological Bulletin, 131_(1), 3-29.
Appendix A: Modified motivation for reading questionnaire

Self-efficacy

1. My child knows s/he can do well in reading. □ True (是) □ False (否)
   Please describe how you can tell. (我的孩子知道自己擅於閱讀，請描述你的觀察。)

2. In comparison to other activities, my child engages more in reading.
   □ True (是) □ False (否) Please describe how you know.
   (相較於其他休閒活動，我的孩子較喜歡閱讀。請描述你是如何知道的)

Curiosity

1. When I talk about something interesting, my child will ask to read more about it.
   □ True (是) □ False (否) If true, please provide an example.
   (當我談到有趣的事物時，我的孩子會進一步閱讀相關的主題。若是，請舉實例說明之。)

2. When my child reads a new story, s/he usually feels excited. □ True (是) □ False (否)
   If true, please provide an example.
   (我的孩子通常對閱讀新的故事感到很興奮。若是，請舉實例說明之。)
3. When my child is reading about an interesting topic, s/he sometimes loses track of time. □ True (是) □ False (否) If true, please provide an example.

(當我的孩子閱讀到有趣的主題時，她/他往往會忘了時間。若是，請舉實例說明之。)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. My child enjoys reading books about people in different countries.

□ True (是) □ False (否) If true, please provide an example.

(我的孩子喜愛閱讀談到來自不同國家族群的故事。若是，請舉實例說明之)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Involvement

1. My child reads adventure stories. (我的小孩閱讀探險性的故事)

□ True (是) □ False (否)

2. My child reads stories about fantasy and make-believe. (我的孩子閱讀奇幻故事)

□ True (是) □ False (否)

3. My child likes mysteries. (我的小孩喜歡帶有神秘色彩的推理性故事)

□ True (是) □ False (否)

4. My child enjoys a long (above 30 pages), involved story or fiction book.

(我的孩子喜愛長篇的故事或小說<超過三十頁>) □ True (是) □ False (否)

Recreation

1. During the holidays, my child often chooses to read for pleasure.

(放假時，我的小孩通常選擇閱讀當作休閒娛樂活動) □ True (是) □ False (否)
2. When my child is reading, s/he feels happy. (當我小孩閱讀時，她/他會感到心情愉悅） □ True (是) □ False (否)

3. Reading is one of my child’s interests. (閱讀是我孩子的興趣之一)
   □ True (是) □ False (否)

4. I believe reading is a relaxing and delightful activity to my child. Please describe how you know that. (我相信對我小孩而言，閱讀是既輕鬆又愉快的休閒活動，請舉實例說明你是如何知道的。) □ True (是) □ False (否)
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

*Instrumentalism*

1. My child reads books in order to get the school’s reading award.
   (我的孩子是為獲得學校表揚而閱讀) □ True (是) □ False (否)

2. My child believes reading allows her/him to be a person with abundant knowledge.
   □ True (是) □ False (否) If true, could you describe how your child shows the belief?
   (我的小孩相信閱讀可以使人學識淵博，若是，請舉實例說明之。)
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

3. My child thinks that reading can contribute to his/her future career.
   □ True (是) □ False (否) If true, could you explain how you know that?
   (我的孩子認為閱讀有助於未來的職涯發展，若是，請舉實例說明之。)
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
Social-family

1. Reading books is one of the family requirements for my child.
   (閱讀書籍是我對小孩的要求之一) □ True (是) □ False (否)

2. I sometimes/usually/always read with my child.
   (我/有時候/通常/總是/與我孩子一起閱讀) □ True (是) □ False (否)

3. My child likes to visit the library with me.
   (我的孩子喜歡跟我去圖書館) □ True (是) □ False (否)

4. My children will read together. (if you only have one child, please skip this question)
   (我的小孩們會一起閱讀，若您目前只有一位小孩，請跳過此題)
   □ True (是) □ False (否)

5. My child likes to tell me about what s/he is reading.
   (我的孩子喜歡向我描述她/他閱讀的內容) □ True (是) □ False (否)

6. My child likes to read along with his or her friends in the same place.
   □ True (是) □ False (否) If true, could you take an example?
   (我的孩子喜歡與她/他的朋友一起閱讀，能否有實例說明呢？)

7. My child likes to tell friends about what s/he is reading. □ True (是) □ False (否)
   If true, could you describe?
   (我的孩子喜歡與朋友一起分享她/他所閱讀的內容，能否有實例說明呢？)
Appendix B

Questionnaires:

(1) personal background questions:

1. Where is your hometown?

2. How old are you?

3. How long have you been in U.S.?

4. How long have you been learning English?

5. Did you ever learn English other than U.S.? If yes, for how long? Where did you learn? Why do you want to learn English?

6. Did you ever learn English from native speakers? Do you like the way they teach? Why or Why not?

7. How do they teach English?

8. Are you learning English at USU now? Why did you choose USU?

9. Is there any difference between USU ESL lessons and other institutes where you learned English?

10. According to your English learning experience, what techniques or activities do you think were effective to help you improve? Why? What techniques or activities are not helpful to you? Why?

11. How much practice do you have every single day? And how do you practice?

12. How much practice do you have each day interacting with native English speakers?

13. Do you use technology to learn English? Why or why not?
(2) social/contextual/cultural issues affecting the acquisition of English

1. What motivates you to learn English?

2. Has being immersed in an English-dominant culture helped or hindered your acquisition of English?

3. Have you felt marginalized by native speakers due to your English abilities? If you have, how many times have you been frustrated?

4. (Question3) If your answer is yes, how do you overcome your frustration?

5. What factors do you think help you acquire English in daily life?

6. What factors hinder your learning of English?

7. Have you experienced any kind of culture shock which may have a negative impact on your motivation to learn English?

8. Do you have any impressive experiences interacting with native English speakers that have motivated you to learn English?

9. Do you have any experiences of being proud of your English proficiency when interacting with native English speakers?

10. Do you think learning English should be in English speaking community? Why? Or why not?
Appendix C

Transcription:

The first time interview:
Researcher: Where is your hometown?
Interviewee: My hometown is in Taiwan.
Researcher: How old are you?
Interviewee: I’m thirty-three. (she is a little unwilling to say her ages)
Researcher: Ok, hm….How long have you been in U.S.?
Interviewee: I have been here about two years.
Researcher: Wow, two years...have fun?
Interviewee: Yes!
Researcher: OK, how long have you been learning English?
Interviewee: I have been learning English about six years.
Researcher: Six years?
Interviewee: Yeah! Six years.
Researcher: Okay. Hm.. In Taiwan or in U.S.?
Interviewee: In Taiwan. I learned English in Taiwan about like four years and I learned English here about two years.
Researcher: Oh, Okay! It’s good! Hm.. so, did you learn English other than in the U.S?
Interviewee: Yes, my country, Taiwan.
Researcher: You mentioned that you learned English in Taiwan for four years, and why do you want to learn English?
Interviewee: Hm...because I want to help my father’s business. He wants to sell his products to another country and he cannot speak English. So, I learn English for him, for his business.
Researcher: Oh, really, for your family’s business?
Interviewee: Yes!
Researcher: What kind of business?
Interviewee: Like, we make electronic stuff, like switches and microphone.
Researcher: Oh...you mean like, if you learn English here and after you graduate or you finish your class, you will go back to Taiwan.
Interviewee: Maybe.. and.. I will try to apply a job here first and if I cannot get a job here, I will go back to Taiwan to help my father.
Researcher: Ah.. okay. It sounds good. Did you ever learn English from native speakers? Do you like the way they teach? Why or Why not?
Interviewee: Yes, I learn English from the native speakers in Taiwan and in the America. Ah.. in Taiwan, I met the missionaries, so I went to the church to learn English and I like the way they teach. Because we usually use Chinese logic to speak English, but they teach me America logic, so I can understand more how to speak English.
Researcher: So, you think your English is improved?
Interviewee: Yes!
Researcher: OK! So, how many missionaries in the church, for teaching English?
Interviewee: How many? Like one class have two missionaries.
Researcher: Which class for you attend, hm..like medium, basic or…
Interviewee: Hm.. in the beginning, I went to basic classes, but..hm…three months late after, after three months, I..
Researcher: Are you learning English at USU now? Why you choose USU?
Interviewee: Yes, I learn English in USU, right now. Ah…because my father’s friend, he knows a professor in USU, so he introduced me to come to USU learning English.
Researcher: Oh, so your father’s friend is a professor here?
Interviewee: Yes!
Researcher: Oh!? Wh…I mean which department?
Interviewee: Ah.. I am not sure because I didn’t (laughing). because I didn’t ask him very clear. Actually, my father’s friend.
Researcher: OK!
Interviewee: Yeah!
Researcher: OK! So, your father’s friend. Ok, she or he?
Interviewee: He.
Researcher: That’s good. Ah.. so did you meet him when you come here, or..?
Interviewee: No, I nemer (she tried to say never) him.
Researcher: OK.
Researcher: Is there any difference between USU ESL lessons and other institutes where you learned English?
Interviewee: Yes, last year, I was in Provo in the just language center to learn English. I feel they are not very professional. Yeah! I think USU’s ELC program is very professional.
Researcher: Why?
Interviewee: Ah… because they combine the idea with what we will learn about if we are going to University, they give me a some clue to help us include.. ‘improve’ (she corrected herself) our English. But when I was in Provo, the language center didn’t teach me a lot, they just teach taught whatever they want. So, they are not very professional.
Researcher: OK! You mentioned that you learn English in Provo and USU now, right? And, you think USU is better because USU can teach you ah.. more things about America?
Interviewee: Ah. Yes! They can teach me about hm.. like.. If we go to take really academic classes. What we will.. what the skill we will use to take the notes, to catch the point that professor emphasized so I can learn better.
Researcher: Wow! So, it sounds really good. I think I should go. OK!
Researcher: According to your English learning experience, what techniques or activities do you think were effective to help you improve?
Interviewee: Ah.. I think if they have more native s.. American or (I am not sure if she said the word) notive (native) English speaker to help you practice your English, like American student to have the conversation with you, you will improve a lot about your listening and speaking.
Researcher: And you mentioned that ESL teacher teach you how to take notes and how to write down what professor said, right?
Interviewee: Yes!
Researcher: That’s good! And then, what techniques or activities are not helpful to you? Why?
Interviewee: Ah.. this. Here, I have to say first, not just for USU…for general. If the professor just teaches you.. just let us take notes, just write, just reading, that will not improve your English. So, I don’t like professor just.. ah… just he talk to us. We don’t have chance to talk. I don’t like
Researcher: You mean chance to talk, what does that mean?
Interviewee: Like, we have conversation or talk about each other.. talk about the.. ah.. all class, talk about our lesson with professor and we can discuss.
Researcher: So, you mean discuss can help you, right? OK!
Interviewee: Hm!
Researcher: How much practice do you have every single day? And how do you practice?
Interviewee: Now, because I almost finish my USU ESL English program, so, I just have one writing class left. So, I ..and I also I take three management classes. So, almost every moment, I practice my English, write a paper or speak two my classmates. Yes.
Researcher: So, you mean every second. OK! It is good! And.. Ok, let me think.. how do you practice? I mean you said you discuss with your classmates for class and you conver.. you have conversation with them. So, is there any other ways you practice your English?
Interviewee: I talked with my classmates and also, sometimes I talked with my professor and sometimes I listen to the news but not very often. Just..just a little.. a little time to listen to news. Because when I was in class, I already have.. I already listen the lesson a lot, s I don’t need to take extra time to listen to news.
Researcher: Wow! So what kind of news? CNN or BBC?
Interviewee: Just like local news.
Researcher: It’s good! Really, I didn’t listen to news or local news. OK, so, I will have another question to you, okay?
Interviewee: Ok.
Researcher: You said that you talk to your professor in class and outside of class? or just in class?
Interviewee: I…always try to talk to my professor out of class because I want to practice my English, but and also, I embarrass to tal.. speak English in whole class because I’m not a native English speaker. I usually talk to professor about the what’s he his what the point about the class. What will he give us.. will he give us a quiz or what is the context about the our middle-term or final exam and how to write the paper.
Researcher: So, the professor always answers your whole questions?
Interviewee: Yes, they are very nice.
Researcher: OK, it is good. It is good news. And next questions is How much practice do you have each day interacting with native English speakers?
Interviewee: Like fifty and fifty. If I have a class, I usually talk to them, but I don’t have any classes. When I was studying, I didn’t talk to any people. So, it’s about fifty and fifty.

Researcher: So, you mean fifty percent you talk to native speaker and fifty percent you talk nothing.

Interviewee: Yes. Like, yeah, nothing or Chinese.

Researcher: OK, or Chinese, so, you have Chinese friends here?

Interviewee: Yes, I have a lot of Chinese friends here.

Researcher: So, you talk to them with Chinese or English?

Interviewee: I usually talk *speak* Chinese with them because that is my language.

Researcher: Yes, good! Me, too. So, do you use technology to learn English?

Interviewee: Yes, I use like online dictionary to search the vocabulary that I don’t know, and use computer to search some papers, to search some news to write my papers.

Researcher: So, you use online dictionary. So, what kind of online dictionary?

Interviewee: Like if you input English word, they will show the Chinese characters, so, you know what that means and they will give you examples and sentences.

Researcher: So, it will help you to how to write sentence and how to speak English?

Interviewee: Yes!

Researcher: OK, so you use Yahoo or other?

Interviewee: Yahoo!

Researcher: Yahoo, good! Yeah, I use the same one.

*The second time interview:*

Researcher: What motivates you to learn English?

Interviewee: Because I want to make money so I learn English. So, I can do help my father do his business.

Researcher: So, you mean if you learn English, you can make more money?

Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: So, in here or in Taiwan?

Interviewee: I think both.

Researcher: Oh, you think both. OK! So, money is the motivation for you to learn English.

Interviewee: Yes, that is very important.

Researcher: Yes, it is very important. Has being immersed in an English-dominant culture helped or hindered your acquisition of English?

Interviewee: I think that is helping me a lot because in Taiwan, I didn’t.. nobody speaks English in life *lives*, in your general life. But, here, I can hear a lot of English in every moment. So, I can learn a lot to improve my listening and speaking because I with him (I am not sure what she said…), I need to have English conversation with the people.

Researcher: Yes, I have the same feeling like you. OK, so you really enjoy your life, I mean in U.S. now?
Interviewee: Yeah, kind of not including food.
Researcher: Not including food, ok. So, you cook by yourself?
Interviewee: Yes.
Researcher: OK! So, have you felt marginalized by native speakers due to your English abilities? If you have, how many times have you been frustrated?

Interviewee: Sometime, because I need.. when I speak English, I need to think about it. So, maybe my…response is very slow and sometimes they don’t have patience to listen to me but not very often. Yeah, and like.. yeah, actually, I didn’t feel a lot of time, just hm.. not very much.

Researcher: So, if they just lose their patience to wait for your response, you feel frustrated?
Interviewee: Yeah, sometimes kind of.
Researcher: How to overcome your frustration?
Interviewee: Just..think I need to improve my English.
Researcher: And can push you to learn oral English, right?
Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: And, what, what factors do you think help you acquire English in daily life?
Interviewee: Because I have the class in U.. I take the class in USU right now, so that.. I just go to the class and that helps me learn English and my roommate is an American. So, she.. when I have conversation with her, so, I can speak English, so that.. is also helps me learn English.

Researcher: So, you mean …take classes in USU and live with a native speaker.
Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: Yeah, hope I can have that experience to live with native speakers. Ok. So what kinds of factors hinder your learning English?
Interviewee: Because sometimes, I don’t have a lot of confident confidence about my speaking ability. So, sometimes, I just don’t want to speak with…talk to Americans. So, that helps that …. Stops me have some action to learn English.

Researcher: So, you mean it is kind of hard to learn English.
Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: So, it will stop you…
Interviewee: hm.. no, I still continue.

Researcher: You still continue, ok, it is good. Ok, so do you like English?
Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: Do you like to learn English?
Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: Ok, it’s good. So, next question is have you experienced any kind of culture shock which may have a negative impact on your motivation to learn English?
Interviewee: Yes, because the culture is different from in…form Taiwan. In Taiwan, everyone is very kind. If they ask you “how are you?” they…that is means they really want to know “how are you?” what how are you doing? But, in here, when, sometimes, when Americans ask you “how are you?” and then
they just go away and don’t care about your answer. Sometimes, I feel a…very strange and in the beginning, they don’t really be you are good friend, they hide their really real mind. So, I.. sometimes, I afraid of to talk talking to them.

Researcher: Yes, I have kind of the same… feeling. Ok, I can tell you my experience. Ok, so, do you have any impressive experiences interacting with native English speakers and these experiences can help you motivate your motivation to learn English?

Interviewee: Yes, sometimes my American friends, they will invite me to go to his or her family to have traditional holiday, like Thanksgiving or Ameri… or Christmas or Easter and when I went to their family, their family are very friendly. So, I can.. I don’t have any… I don’t have any factors to stop me to speak English with them, because they are very friendly and I can enjoy the traditional holiday.

Researcher: Wow, it’s good experience. OK. Ah.. you mentioned that you went your friend’s house celebrating Thanksgiving or Christmas or Easter day. And, how …many times you went?

Interviewee: Like….many times…like last year, I went to my friend’s…that is my boy friend’s…ex-boyfriend’s family to have Christmas and I really like and like Easter, I u...I went to my friend’s house, and we were finding the egg. Easter we.. we… they hid ed the egg and we needed to find the egg. That is a very like interested experience and Thanksgiving, I like Thanksgiving because we will eat big turkey and I like turkey wing and turkey leg.

Researcher: Oh, turkey wing and turkey leg. Wow, it’s really good. So.. hm…what difference between Taiwan and U.S. to celebrate like Christmas or New Year?

Interviewee: Ah.. because we. ..in Taiwan, like we don’t really celebrate Christmas just church member. So, maybe.. and.. in my parents’ generation, they don’t care about Christmas but in my generation, we will have the friends’ party for Christmas. Chinese New Year, every family must be together, so if you leave out of your hometown, the city, in Christmas Eve, they will go back to their family from everywhere to celebrate New Year.

Researcher: OK, so, Christmas in U.S. like Chinese New Year.

Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: Ok, so do you have any experiences of being proud of your English proficiency when interacting with native English speakers?

Interviewee: Yeah, because I am a Mormon, so sometimes I went to the church, I go to the church, I will have testimony in front of whole church member, so that makes me have a lot of confidence. And after they all come come to me said, “Your English is very good.” That makes me a proud of and make me a lot of confidence about myself.

Researcher: so, it’s also improve your English to learn more.

Interviewee: Yes.

Researcher: Yeah, so did you go to church one time per week?

Interviewee: Ah… sometimes I go to the church have twice a week.
Researcher: Twice a week. Ok. What kinds of activities in your church you attend?
Interviewee: Like we have family home evening every Monday, that is every member. We have are divided to into several small group, so we talk about gospel and we talk about our life. And after this meeting, we will have play the game or eat some treat. So, that is about activity.
Researcher: Ok, so you like it?
Interviewee: Yes, I like it.
Researcher: Ok, so what else?
Interviewee: And, every Sunday, we went to the church… we go to the church.
Researcher: For what?
Interviewee: For to…worship (I gave her a hint) the God.
Researcher: Ok, I think you are a faithful member?
Interviewee: Yes.
Researcher: It’s good. So, according to your experience, do you think learning English should be in English speaking community? Why?
Interviewee: Yes, I think that is better. Because if you are in .like in hmm Taiwan, everybody just speak Chinese, they go to buy something or in your family, they don’t speak English. But in here, everybody speak English, that will stimulate you to think English and speak English and you speak English word and …yeah.
Researcher: Ok, so you are in English community now?
Interviewee: Yes.
Researcher: OK. OK, so eve though you have some…… culture shock and you still think you can improve your English.
Interviewee: Culture shock?
Researcher: Yeah, culture shock, it means that’s so different with in Taiwan. Ok, so you think you have culture shock, right?
Interviewee: Yes, I have. About, I miss Chinese food so I cook Chinese food every day.
Researcher: Yeah, I think you are a good cooker. So, you still think English is.. if you want to learn a language, you should be in a.. I mean a community…community is English or belong to the language.
Interviewee: Yeah, I think if you want to learn the language, you just go to the community to learn. That is better way and faster way that you can learn English or another language faster.
Researcher: Ok, yes, good. Ok, so our conversation, I mean interview is done! YA!!

1. I put $\text{s}$ in the end of a word, which means the word should be $\text{s}$, but the interviewee did not put. For example, speaks and talked.
2. Words with highlighted, italic and underlying represent that the researcher’s correction. For example, the church or talk talking.