

Deprogramming Passive Learners: Designing and Introducing a Participation Point System in a Compulsory “Intensive English” Program

Sarah Haas
Neil Birt

*Tottori University of
Environmental Studies*

Reference Data:

Haas, S., & Birt, N. (2005). Deprogramming Passive Learners: Designing and Introducing a Participation Point System in a Compulsory “Intensive English” Program. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2004 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper examines the participation system at Tottori University of Environmental Studies Intensive English Program. For the past four years, we have been building a compulsory “Intensive English” (IE) program for low-level, non-English major, university students. A basis for the system is established, as well as an extensive examination of the reasons behind implementing such a system. In-depth information regarding the methodology and practice of the participation scheme are also presented. Additional material in the form of video was also created in order to facilitate a quicker understanding of abstract ideas, and this information is also presented and discussed in the paper.

この論文では、鳥取環境大学において実施している参加型システムであるインテンシブイングリッシュプログラムについて述べる。過去4年間、必須科目としてインテンシブイングリッシュを低レベルで専攻科目でない英語を大学生に押し付けることに基礎をおいてきた。このシステムの根本は、上記のようなシステムを実施することにおける広範囲にわたる理由の調査を行い、構築することである。方法論に関するものと参加型講義の実施についても紹介する。加えて、ビデオのような教材を用いることで、より早く概要の理解を促進できたことを紹介し議論する。

In this paper we will describe a participation point system that is used systematically across an integrated “Intensive English” (IE) program at Tottori University of Environmental Studies (TUES); we will also describe the in-house video made for the purpose of introducing this system to the 600-some students and 16 teachers who would be using the system.

Although the IE program and this point system have been the team effort of three coordinators, the labor has been divided, with Sarah Haas working on the design and modification of the point system, and Neil Birt directing creation of the video. Hiroki Uchida, the head of the IE program, has been the driving force behind the system, providing support, understanding, and willingness to give the system a try even though it is somewhat unconventional.

The Program and the Learners

TUES is a new university, established in 2001. There are three majors offered: Environmental Design, Information Systems, and Environmental Policy. All students, regardless of major, are required to take IE classes for two academic years.

Each academic year is broken down into four six-week grading periods called “quarters.” There are three 90-minute classes a week (18 classes per quarter), totaling

144 classes of IE in two years. Learners are tested at the beginning of the first year, and placed, according to level, into groups of 33-36 learners. The first quarter of the first year is the “orientation quarter,” in which we introduce learners to the program, and generally get them ready for their two years of IE.

There are three content-based “courses” within the IE program: Vocabulary and Reading (V&R); Critical Thinking and Discussion (C&D); and Writing and Presentation (W&P). Each course meets for one of the 90-minute periods each week, with a different teacher teaching each course, thus each group of learners meets with three different teachers a week.

The program is standardized, meaning that the same curriculum, same course materials, and same grading scheme must be used for all 632 learners by all 16 teachers.

Our students are low-level (average TOEIC score less than 250) non-English majors, most of whom have had six years of English instruction before entering TUES. However, like many Japanese learners, the focus of their previous English education, especially in the three years of high school, has been on being able to pass university entrance exams (Lovelock, 2002). Interaction in English had not been a big part of their high school picture, and active participation on the part of the students had neither been required nor expected (Peters, 1990). If there is spoken language, it is usually in the form of structured exercises and drills, for which there are “right” and “wrong” answers. If a student does not know the “right” answer, it is best to keep quiet (Horio, 1988, p. 299); “wrong” answers mean failed exams (Fujii, 1993).

With the emphasis on exams, and on right and wrong answers, comes the emphasis on *linguistic competence*, the “knowledge of lexical items . . . rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology” (Brown, 2000, p. 247). Linguistic competence is emphasized at the expense of *communicative competence*, the “knowledge that enables a person to communicate functionally and interactively” (Brown, 2000, p. 247). Since they are pressured to help their learners pass exams, there is little time for high school teachers to encourage spontaneous discourse in English, and even though “conversation” classes have recently been added to high school curricula, these also end up focusing on linguistic competence (Foreman-Takano, 1997) rather than on learners using English to communicate with one another.

Since our students have thus far had little exposure to English as a medium for communication, and the emphasis of their English education thus far has been on linguistic competence, we decided that our program would, while not ignoring the importance of linguistic competence, emphasize communication and communicative competence.

The aim of the program is to “teach through communication [rather than] train for communication” (Prahbu, 1980, p. 16). By conducting the classes in English, and requiring active learner participation (participation is 3/8 of learners’ IE grade), we hoped to create an English environment within the classroom, making it a “communicative setting” (Long & Crookes, 1993, p. 189), where even the lowest-level students were, to the extent of their ability, functioning in English for 270 minutes a week.

The Problem and Our Response

Within the first year of IE, it became apparent to the faculty that our aims were not being achieved. We had visions of IE classrooms that were very different from the high school classrooms, with learners actively participating in class, asking questions, and interacting with each other and the teacher—all, or mostly, in English. The reality, however, was that very little had changed from their high school classes. Although we told them that they would be expected to use English, interact, and participate, learners were still sitting passively in class, expecting the teacher to do most of the talking, and waiting to be told what was going to be on the exam, and what the “right” answers were.

We decided to address this problem by using, across the board, a participation point system that had been part of the grading scheme for the Writing and Presentation classes. The system was one that had been used for several years in other schools (Haas, 1999). It is basically a 5-point scale assessing learner classroom participation. The point scale is explained in both English and Japanese (Appendix 1). We decided to make students more involved in this process by having the system be self-assessing (Appendix 2).

Some Concerns about Point Systems

While we decided to use a point system, we did not do so without some reservations. There are concerns with using point systems like this, the main one being the use of instrumental, or extrinsic, motivation techniques. If, as Bruner notes, “the most effective way to help [people] learn is to free them from the control of rewards and punishments”

(1966, cited in Brown, 2000, p. 165), point systems really should not be used, as they are nothing if not a system of rewards/punishments. The first time someone contributed to “My Share” in *The Language Teacher* about successfully using a point system for grading learners on participation (Gainer, 1988) some readers immediately protested that it “smacked of animal training...and [could never be] justifiable in a university” (Levi, 1988, p. 47).

Levi’s complaint may indicate that he fell on the “intrinsic” side of the “intrinsic vs. extrinsic” motivation debate of the 1970’s and 1980’s (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 4). In this debate, the research of behaviorists showing that extrinsic “reinforcement makes behavior more, not less, likely to occur” (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 4) was countered by research showing that “extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation” (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000, p. 2). Intrinsically motivated people engage in activities even when there “is no apparent reward except the activity itself” (Deci, 1975, cited in Brown, 2000, p. 164). Promoting this kind of motivation is desirable, as intrinsic seems to be a more powerful type of motivation, especially for long-term retention (Brown, 2000, pp. 164-165). If extrinsic rewards undermine this intrinsic motivation, the researchers argued, rewards should not be used.

More recently, however, researchers have agreed that human motivation cannot be explained by purely extrinsic or intrinsic factors, but rather that the two can coexist, and might actually complement each other (van Lier, 1996; Lepper & Henderlong, 2000; Hidi, 2000).

Although extrinsic rewards do seem to undermine intrinsic motivation when learners are rewarded for something *they were planning to do anyway* (Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000; Lepper & Henderlong, 2000), rewards might be necessary to get learners moving *if they do not have a high initial interest in the activity, or would not engage in it of their own accord*. Using extrinsic rewards in this case might actually enhance intrinsic motivation (Lepper & Henderlong, 2000).

We believed that a point system might be worthwhile for us, because, as our experience with our first year at TUES made painfully clear, most our students had very little intention of using English in class of their own accord. Further, research has demonstrated that if extrinsic rewards “provide salient information about one’s competence” (Lepper & Henderlong, 2000, p. 274), this extrinsic information can also enhance intrinsic motivation. The competence for which a point system may provide informational rewards is “classroom communicative competence.” Classroom communicative competence is learners “know[ing] how, when, why, and with whom to speak in the classroom” (Johnson, 1995, p. 161).

In addition to informing learners of their classroom *communicative* competence, point systems also inform students of their classroom *conduct* competence. Classroom conduct competence could be used to describe learners knowing how to conduct themselves in the classroom. Since both the classroom communication expectations and classroom conduct expectations of the IE program are different from what our students are used to, we deemed it appropriate and motivating to use a system of rewards and

punishments to inform our learners of their competences in these areas.

Another way extrinsic and intrinsic motivation have been found to work together is when learners “internalize” rewarded behaviors, making “externally imposed goals part of their own system of goals and values” (Lepper & Henderlong, 2000, p. 296). Although when or how this internalization happens is the “missing link” in motivational research (Lepper & Henderlong, 2000, p. 296), it does happen, and initially using a point system might actually promote attitude changes in learners that would in the long run enhance intrinsic motivation.

Another concern with using point systems is the concern that there is too much “control” over students, giving them too few choices, and thus too little autonomy. While facilitating learner autonomy is also something that we all strive for, having some initially rigid structure, or control, for learners who are being thrown head-first into a completely different system than they are used to, might not be a bad thing. Stevick proposes that “at the beginning stages of courses...control should reside entirely with the teacher in order to create a secure, stable environment for students...in time, the responsibilities can be shared with the students...” (Stevick, 1980, cited in Taylor, 1983). Although, eventually, it would be advisable to cut back on the controlling element of a point system (or eliminate the system altogether), too much autonomy too soon is not necessarily good for learners, and having the controlling structure of the system might be necessary for getting learners used to their new English class environment, which is drastically different from the one from which they came.

Although we recognize that there is some debate over the use of point systems, we thought that in the case of our low-level learners who are used to being passive in class, and who had demonstrated that they would not use English on their own, a point system would have more advantages than disadvantages.

The Need for Adjustments

After using the system for one year, it became clear that the system needed modifications. We found that with the current structure of the system, there was too much ambiguity (learners were still not really sure what they were supposed to do), there were too many students “cheating” (some students who were sleeping in class were giving themselves 4 points for classroom participation), and students complained that there was too much inconsistency among teachers on how the point system was used (what was acceptable for a score of 3 in one teacher’s class, was not acceptable in another teacher’s class).

We revised the system so that it would be clearer to learners what was expected of them, so that it would cut down on the ambiguity that allowed for students to “cheat,” and so there could be more consistency among teachers on how the points were used. The resulting system (see Appendix 3) is very detailed and structured, and while we were concerned about the complexity of the system, we thought that having such details was the only way we could maintain consistency, and systematically achieve the goals while working with such a large student body and faculty.

The Goals of the Point System

In using this point system as part of the grading scheme for all the courses in the IE program, we have some long-term hopes as well as some more immediate pragmatic goals. The immediate pragmatic goals for using the system are as follows:

- 1) increase positive class participation (especially use of L2)
- 2) decrease negative class participation
- 3) have the increase in positive class participation and decrease in negative class participation be consistent across all 24 student groups and 16 teachers
- 4) have both learners and teachers accountable for participation grades
- 5) have the method for arriving at participation grades be consistent (as much as possible) across all 24 student groups and 16 teachers.

We hoped to take steps toward these goals, by 1) making clear statements of what behaviors we expect in class (Johnson, 1995; Wadden & McGovern, 1991), and by 2) making clear guidelines for how teachers and students should calculate grades (Elbow, 2000; Lee, 1989). This aim for clarity is manifested in the detailed structure of the current participation point record sheet.

Less concrete than the pragmatic goals are the hopes we have for long-term outcomes of using the system. In emphasizing the following learner behaviors we are hoping to start students on the road to self-directed learning:

- 1) copious use of English over accurate use of English
- 2) student-student interaction
- 3) student initiative
- 4) self-assessment.

While we think this goal of developing self-directed learners is an intrinsically valuable one, in our case it is also practical: Our students come to us with very low English proficiency—90% of them have a score of less than 250 on the TOEIC test; the average for Japanese university students is 419. Four hundred fifty is the score that most Japanese companies set as a minimum requirement for hiring new employees (ETS, 2003). Additionally, although the course is named “Intensive” English, realistically, 216 hours, spread out over two years, is not very intense, certainly not enough time to improve students’ TOEIC scores by over 200 points. Instead of aiming to directly improve student test scores, then, we rather aim to help learners develop the attitudes they will need for continuing their studies on their own in a self-directed way.

Self-directed learning is “a process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, to diagnose their learning needs, formulate learning goals, identify resources for learning, select and implement learning strategies, and evaluate learning outcomes” (Knowles, 1975, cited in Lowry, 1989, p. 1). We believe that the mindsets our learners need for self-directed learning of English (corresponding to the learner behaviors that the point system emphasizes) are those of

- 1) self efficacy
- 2) sense of ownership of English
- 3) autonomy
- 4) self-awareness.

While realizing that the new structure of the system is somewhat cumbersome, we made it as such in hopes that our goal of starting learners off on the right foot for life-long learning will be more likely to be met.

The Structure of the System

The *Participation Point Record Sheet* (Appendix 3), which outlines our current system, has two separate parts: On the front side of an A3 page is the main participation scale where students can earn from 0-4 points each class. On the reverse side is the *Bonus Point* section. We will describe each of these in turn.

The Main Participation Scale

The main part of the participation point record sheet has five sections:

- 1) record of the date of the class, and absence or tardiness
- 2) starting point
- 3) plus points
- 4) minus points
- 5) daily point total.

Absence and tardiness do not directly affect the participation score, but points are subtracted (-5 for absence, -2 for tardiness) from the final IE score.

The *Starting Point* (see Fig. 1) is worth two of the four possible daily points. This section is meant to deal with learners coming to class unprepared, one aspect of “negative class participation” (Wadden & McGovern, 1991).

Starting Point	Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Absent <input type="checkbox"/> Late
Did you finish all your homework, and have any necessary printing done before the chime?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (+1) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0)
Did you bring all necessary items to class?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (+1) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0)
Starting point total	

Figure 1. Starting Point section of participation point record sheet

If students come to class prepared, having finished all homework, and bringing all necessary items to class (pens, notebooks, textbooks, dictionaries, etc.), they start the class with 2 points.

From the starting point score, the students can either *maintain* the starting point score, *gain* more points, or *lose* points. To maintain the starting point score, neither gaining nor losing points, students need to “positively participate” (Wadden & McGovern, 1991) in class by doing everything the teacher asks of them, and by doing it as the teacher has

asked them to do it. They do not need to do anything beyond what the teacher requests, but they need to avoid negative class participation behaviors.

Plus Points

Because we want to emphasize and promote student initiative and interaction, the plus points in our point scale are based on students taking initiative, and on students interacting with each other in English. Points are not based on the accuracy of learners’ English; it does not matter how many “mistakes” they make while they are using English, as long as they are using it. The plus points are in two categories:

- 1) free talking points
- 2) classroom atmosphere points (see Fig. 2).

Learners can earn up to 1 point in each of these categories.

Plus Points	
Each minute you spend freely communicating in English (at times when your teacher has not specifically asked you to use English) you can earn +0.1 point. Be sure to write the details of when you were using English on your own initiative.	___+0.1 ___+0.1 ___+0.1 ___+0.1 ___+0.1
Ex: I talked with my partner in English for 3 minutes after freewriting, before the teacher started the next activity.	___+0.1 ___+0.1 ___+0.1
Ex: After I finished my vocabulary exercise, but other students weren’t finished yet, I talked to another student who was finished (2 minutes).	___+0.1 ___+0.1 ___+0.1

When you make an effort to make a good atmosphere for yourself and your classmates to communicate in English; or when you work to bring other students into class activities, or free communication, you can earn +0.25 points. You must give a detailed description of what you did.	___+0.25
Ex: After we finished our vocabulary exercises, I got 4 people who weren't doing anything to play a word game in English with me.	___+0.25
Ex: I was in a group of four people, and three people didn't want to do anything, but I led this group and we talked about our weekend activities in English.	___+0.25

Figure 2. Plus Points section

Free talking is unstructured, student-initiated, student-student discourse. *Unstructured* means that students can talk to whomever they choose, about anything they choose. The *free talking* plus points are added when learners use any lag time in class to talk to each other in English. *Lag time* means any time that the teacher has not given students specific tasks to do, or has not specifically requested that English be used. Learners document the time they spend in free talking, and for each minute they earn +0.1 point.

An example would be if students are doing pair or group work: It rarely happens that everyone finishes at the same time, so the students who finish early can earn points by using the waiting time to talk to each other in English until everyone else is ready to move on.

The other way to earn plus points is to somehow put forth an effort to make the classroom a better place for learning

English. A student can earn +0.25 *classroom atmosphere* points for each time s/he takes the initiative to improve the classroom atmosphere.

We deliberately left this part ambiguous. The reason for the ambiguity is that what can be done to improve the classroom atmosphere, and how it can be done, depends greatly on the group dynamics of different classes, and on individual students. If students think they have done something to make the classroom a better place, they write it down in this space, and explain what they did, and how it improved the classroom atmosphere.

The bar for getting the +.25 points is continually being raised. What might have earned this point at the beginning of the year when students did not know each other very well (striking up a conversation with the person sitting in the next chair, for example) will not earn the +.25 at the end of the year when learners are well acquainted with each other. The guideline we give to students for earning this 1/4-point is that it cannot be “easy”: If learners felt a little nervous about doing something they thought would improve the classroom atmosphere, but they did it anyway, it is worth the quarter-point. This is another reason we left this part less structured; what is sufficiently challenging for one student might be easy for another.

Minus Points

The minus points, like the plus points, have nothing to do with accuracy of the learners' English. The purpose of the minus point section (see Fig. 3) is to deal with negative class participation.

Minus Points	__-0.25 __-0.25 __-0.25 __-0.25
Used Japanese (without loopholes)	__-0.25 __-0.25 __-0.25 __-0.25
Not doing what teacher asked (if you aren't sure, <i>ask!</i>)	__-1 __-1 __-1 __-1
Sitting idle or not contributing to group work	__-1 __-1 __-1 __-1
Sleeping, or not listening to teacher/classmates	__-1 __-1 __-1 __-1
Doing things not related to class (including cell phone)	__-1 __-1 __-1 __-1

Figure 3. Minus Points section

Total Points

At the end of the class, the students calculate their total points for the day, and record it in the *Total Points* section (see Fig. 4).

Total Points	Total (T1)
---------------------	-------------------

Figure 4. Total Points section

A passing participation score is 60%, or 2.4 points (for one class period). In other words, to ensure a passing participation score, without needing any nerve-racking *classroom atmosphere* points, students should finish homework on time, bring all their things to class, do everything the teacher asked them to do, and spend four minutes each class in some kind of unstructured, student-

initiated spoken discourse. This is if the student earns no bonus points.

Bonus Points

On the reverse side of the main participation point scale is the *Bonus Point* section (see Fig. 5). The purpose of the bonus point section is to call to learners' attention other aspects of positive and negative class participation, aspects that, while still important, are not emphasized in the main point scale.

The maximum number of bonus points a learner can earn in one quarter is five. The way points are calculated is by taking the total number of +’s and dividing by a “standard” (see Fig. 6). The standard is decided by the teacher or by learner/teacher negotiations. Some groups might set the standard at 2, so two +’s is 1 bonus point; other groups might set the standard at 5, so five +’s is one bonus point.

			Date	Date	Date	Date	Date	Date	Total	
			/	/	/	/	/	/	+	-
Plus Points										
1	+	You asked a question, answered a question, or otherwise spoke up in class								
2	+	Using your QuickLook, you used the right Classroom English at the right time								
3	+	You used the right classroom English at the right time without looking at your QuickLook								
4	+	You asked another student (or your teacher) for help, using English								
5	+	You helped another student (using English)								
6	+	You made your teacher laugh								
7	+	You came to class late, but were very quiet, or spoke in English								
8	++	You didn't panic when you didn't understand something; you used communication skills to understand								
9	++	After missing class, you found out (from your teacher or a classmate) all necessary information, and you did all necessary work to be prepared for the next class								
Minus Points										
1	-	You did not use classroom English when you should have								
2	-	You used an incorrect version of Classroom English								
3	-	You looked at your partner when you didn't understand your teacher								
4	-	You waited for a long time before replying to someone who spoke								
5	-	You called teacher something other than what he/she requested								
6	-	You talked, etc., while teacher or classmate was talking or presenting								

7	–	You came to class late, and were very noisy, or spoke in Japanese											
8	–	You didn’t find out about homework, etc., when you missed class											
9	–	You didn’t laugh when your teacher made a joke											
Daily +/- total													

Figure 5. Bonus Points section

Total’s ÷ (standard)=	Quarter Bonus points: BP
-----------------------	--------------------------

Figure 6. Bonus Point standard

Calculating the Quarter Participation Grade

To calculate the participation score for one quarter, students average their six daily participation point totals from the main side of the page (see Fig. 7). To this score, they add their bonus points to get their total points for the quarter. For example, if a student had 16 total participation points, her percentage would be 67. If she earned four bonus points, her participation score for the quarter would be 71.

Thus, if a student earned the maximum number of bonus points, in order to ensure a passing participation grade

(without any +0.25 points), s/he would come to class prepared, do everything the teacher asked, and be engaged in an average two minutes of unstructured, student-initiated, student-student discourse.

Students have participation point record sheets for each of the three courses in the IE program; at the end of each class, learners take five to ten minutes to assess their participation for the day, and to fill in the record sheet.

Although we have students assess themselves using this scale, teachers have veto power if they think students are inflating their scores, or not giving themselves enough points. Teachers use the same point scheme (although not necessarily the same piece of paper) to estimate student scores.

Total Points	Total (T1)	Total (T2)	Total (T3)	Total (T4)	Total (T5)	Total (T6)
Quarter Participation Point Score	T1 + T2 + T3 + T4 + T5 + T6 = ÷ 24 x 100 = (PS)				Quarter Participation Score (PS)	

Figure 7. Quarter Participation Score calculation

Introducing the Point System: Making the Video

At the end of the first year of using the participation point system, we were getting complaints from students that there was inconsistency among teachers about how the participation point system was being used, particularly how strictly it was being enforced. A few students complained that they didn't understand the system, as it was "so different from high school systems." As a result, we designed a series of short videos to illustrate key concepts, stimulate discussion and provide examples of successful student behavior.

A video approach has a lot of appeal because it can serve to standardize the instruction: Each group of learners is getting the same information regardless of the teacher. Even if the teacher decides to be less strict about enforcing the participation rules, at least all the students will know what the rules are. Video also works well because it gets the message across in the minimum amount of time and it will stay with learners longer than any other medium.

We decided that the primary participants in the video segments should be students. Teachers are rarely seen anywhere. The hope here of course, is that the students will be more willing to listen to and pay attention to their peers, rather than listen to a teacher giving a long, boring lecture about appropriate classroom behavior. About thirty students from the university and several instructors participated in the filming of the video.

It must be noted that making a video was a major commitment of time and resources. The required hardware and software was quite expensive, and after the several days of filming, the editing took an additional two months.

The content of the video was divided up into a Program Introduction Section, a Participation Section, and a Classroom Rules Section. For the purposes of this paper we will discuss only the participation section (for a detailed explanation of each section, see Appendix 4).

The first segment of the Participation Section is an interview with students regarding their interpretation of participation. They are free to say whatever they like, good or bad, and may use either Japanese or English. The important thing at this point is simply to establish a context for discussion; most importantly it was necessary to show that these were real students in the video who had the same everyday concerns as the new students coming in and seeing this for the first time. All of the students in the video used Japanese in the interview with a smattering of English. Twelve interview clips were used for this segment.

The second segment presents our way of looking at participation. After having a chance to consider what participation is, then students can see how we will be assessing participation in class. The information is given as a voiceover in Japanese so that students can be sure to understand it. Also, since the explanation is already given in Japanese, teachers are freed from having to resort to *nihongo setsume* in English class. This also guarantees that all students in all classes will receive precisely the same information regarding our program. Different teachers may have a different interpretation of what that means exactly, but at least this core information is consistent across the program.

The next two segments give detailed examples of positive and negative participation, corresponding to the set of plus

points and minus points that teachers and students keep track of on their record sheets

The last segment allows teachers and students to practice grading participation after looking at video of students in class.

Since we have used the video to introduce our participation point system in the orientation quarter, we feel that everyone has been able to understand the system faster and more effectively. Students can see immediately what needs to be done and can grasp more complicated concepts without excessive explanation. We have a better, more consistent program now, and have minimized some of the frustration and confusion that any new system can cause. While it has been a lot of work, in the end doing the video has saved us time and made the program run much smoother.

Conclusion

Although participation point systems may not be effective in all contexts, particularly in those where learners have a high initial motivation to use English in the classroom, in our context, where we have low-level learners who would not likely use English without the use of some instrumental motivation, we have had great success. We have also found that the system aids in making participation grading more consistent across a standardized program where 16 teachers are supposedly using the same methods of assessment for several hundred learners.

While a drawback of the system is its meticulous detail, the detail is necessary to maintain the consistency and standardization that the university requires of us. We have

greatly cut down on the tediousness of introducing/learning such a system by producing a video in which students who have had success with the system introduce the system to new students.

We have had success with the system, but we do consider it to be a work in progress; we continue to make changes as our learners and faculty members make suggestions or find solutions to problems that arise.

References

- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (4th edition)*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Elbow, P. (2000). Embracing contraries in the teaching practice. In P. J. Corbett, N. Myers, & G. Tate (Eds.), *The writing teacher's sourcebook (4th edition)* (pp. 54-65). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ETS (Educational Testing Service). (2003). *TOEIC guide for students*. Osaka: ETS.
- Foreman-Takano, D. (1987). Book review: "Speaking and social interaction". *The Language Teacher*, 11(6), 29-31.
- Fujii, T. (1993). Classroom management: Creating motivation by use of a clear grading system. *The Language Teacher*, 17(6), 37-39.
- Gainer, G. T. (1989). In response to "Effective bribes." *The Language Teacher*, 13(3), 31-32.
- Haas, S. (1999). Motivating students to communicate in English: Those "shy" kids can talk. *Bulletin of Nagoya College*, No. 39.

- Hidi, S. (2000). An interest researcher's perspective: The effects of extrinsic and intrinsic factors on motivation. In C. Sansone & J. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 309-399). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Horio, T. (1988). *Educational thought and ideology in modern Japan* (S. Platzer, Trans.). Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.
- Johnson, K. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knowles, M. (1975). *Self-directed learning*. New York: Associated Press.
- Lee, W. (1989). In response to "Effective bribes." *The Language Teacher*, 13(3), 32-33.
- Levi, L. (1988). Introduction to Gainer's "The effective use of bribery in the language classroom." *The Language Teacher*, 12(13), 47.
- Levi, L. (1989). In response to "Effective bribes." *The Language Teacher*, 13(3), 33-35.
- Lepper, M., & Henderlong, J. (2000). Turning "play" into "work" and "work" into "play": 25 years of research on intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation. In C. Sansone & J. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 257-307). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1993). Units of analysis in syllabus design: The case for tasks. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice* (9-54). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lovelock, C. (2002). Instant feedback for learner training: Using individual assessment cards. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(4), 26-33.
- Lowry, C. M. (1989). *Supporting and facilitating self-directed learning*. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 312 457)
- Peters, M. (1990). 'Streamlining EFL classes administration and organization': A response. *The Language Teacher*, 14(1), 46-49.
- Prabhu, N. (1990). There is no best method—Why? *Tesol Quarterly*, 24(1), 161-176.
- Sansone, C., & Harackiewicz, J. (2000). Looking beyond rewards: The problem and promise of intrinsic motivation. In C. Sansone & J. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 1-9). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Taylor, B. P. (1983). Teaching ESL: Incorporating a communicative, student-centered component. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(1), 69-87.
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy & authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- Wadden, P., & McGovern, S. (1989). Streamlining EFL class administration and organization: A user's guide for university instructors in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 13(10), 11-13.

Wadden, P., & McGovern, S. (1991). The quandary of negative class participation: Coming to terms with misbehaviour in the language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 45(2), 119-127.

Further Reading

- Altman, R. (1989). *The video connection: Integrating video into language teaching*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Aiex, N. K. (1999). *Mass media use in the classroom*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse in Reading, and Communication. Eric Digest ED436016.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hart, I. (1992). Video, foreign language teaching, and the documentary tradition. *System*, 20(1), 1-13.
- Lonergan, J. (1984). *Video in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacWilliam, I. (1986). Video and language comprehension. *ELT Journal*, 40(2), 131-135.
- Petrie, G. M. (2003). ESL teachers' views on visual language: A grounded theory. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(3), 137-168.
- Stempleski, S. (1993). Teaching communication skills with authentic video. In S. Stempleski & P. Arcario (Eds.), *Video in second language teaching: Using, selecting, and producing video for the classroom* (pp. 7-23). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Walker, S., Halvorsen, J., & Kawana, N. (2003). Creating DVD materials for English language education: A step-by-step approach. *JALT Hokkaido Journal*, 7, 55-69.

Appendix 1

Participation Point Guidelines

0 points: Even if you come to class, it is still possible for you to get 0 points in participation. If you don't use English, or if you are doing nothing (sleeping, staring at your desk, etc.) or if you don't do what your teacher asks you to do, you cannot say you are participating in class.

1 point: If you do *some* of the things your teacher asks, or use *some* English in class for *part* of the class, you get one point.

2 points: If you, *for the full 90 minutes of class*, do *everything* your teacher asks you to do, *and* do it *in the way your teacher asked you to do it*, *and* you always ask questions when you don't understand, *and* you come to class completely prepared, you get 2 points.

3 points (2 points PLUS): If you, *for the full 90 minutes of class*, do everything your teacher asks you to do, *and* do it in the way your teacher asked you to do it, *and* you always ask questions when you don't understand, *and* you come to class completely prepared (2 point score), PLUS you use only English for 90 minutes (even when you are not specifically asked to use English), PLUS you use any spare time to speak freely in English, you get 3 points. To get 3 points, you never use Japanese in class (except for loopholes), and you never sit idle.

4 points (3 points PLUS): If you, *for the full 90 minutes of class*, do everything your teacher asks you to do, *and* do it in the way your teacher asked you to do it, *and* you always ask questions when you don't understand, *and* you come to class completely prepared, *and* you use only English for 90 minutes (even when you are not specifically asked to use English), *and* you use any spare time to speak freely in English, *and* you never use Japanese in class (except for loopholes), *and* you never sit idle (3 point score), PLUS you make an effort to help everyone around you speak in English, you get 4 points. If you see someone who is having trouble using English (doesn't have a partner, or is shy, or doesn't have confidence in his/her English, or is sleepy, or hates English, etc.), make an effort to help them use English for communication and fun.

パーティシペーションポイント(参加点)のガイドライン

0点: 授業に出てもそれだけでは参加点は得られません。授業に出席して、なお参加点は0点ということもあり得ます。英語を使わず、何もしないでいたり、担当教員が指示したことをしなければ、授業に参加したとは言えません。居眠りをする、じっと下を見たまま、というも参加にはなりません。

1点: 担当教員の指示したことの一部しかしなかった、あるいは、授業の一部分でしか英語を使わなかった場合は、参加点は1点となります。

2点: 90分の授業全体を通じて、担当教員が指示したことを正しくすべておこない、さらにわからない場合には常に質問をし、なおかつ授業の準備を完全におこなっていた場合、参加点は2点となります。

3点: 上記の2点の条件を満たしたうえで、90分間の授業全体を通じて(英語で、と指示がなかった場面でも)英語を使い続け、諸活動で余った時間を英語での自由会話にあてた場合に参加点は3点となります。3点を獲得するためには、一切日本語を使わないようにしなければなりません。(QuickLookを使って日本語を使用す

る許可を得た場合は除きます。)そして、ただ何もしないで座っているということがないようにしなければなりません。

4点: 上記の2点と3点の条件を満たしたうえで、あなたの周りの人たちが英語で話すのを援助した場合に4点となります。例えば、いかのような人たちに積極的に声をかけて英語でのコミュニケーションをするように導いた場合がこれにあたります。(パートナーがいなくて困っている人、シャイで話せないでいる人、英語に自信がなくて話そうとしない人、眠そうにしている人、英語嫌いの人)

Appendix 2
Participation Point Record Sheet

Name: _____
Student Number: _____
Group/Class: _____
Teacher: _____

General Participation Point Record Sheet

Date	Points	Reasons	Absent	Late
/			—	—
/			—	—
/			—	—
/			—	—
/			—	—
/			—	—
Total	↓	100 = Participation Score		
Average	→ ±24 =			

Appendix 3**Participation Point Record Sheet**

([Click here](#) to view Appendix 3 in a new window)

Appendix 4**Teacher's Guide for the 1st Year Orientation Video****Overview**

In an effort to make it easier for everyone to understand the Intensive English Program system, we have made a series of short videos designed to emphasize certain key points. By doing so, we hope to decrease the amount of confusion and increase the degree of standardization.

However, be aware that the video clips are short and will require some explanation on your part. The video helps provide the overall theme of the program; it will still be up to you to fill in the details. This guide is intended to provide you with information you will need to get the most out of the videos during your classes. If you have any questions or need any further help or explanation, please ask.

The video comes in three sections: Program Introduction, Participation, and Responsibility. Each section contains student interviews, a section overview and some clips that highlight key points in each section. Following is the list of clips and the time for each clip.

Clip Title	Clip Time (min.: sec.)
Section 1: Program Introduction	
English is....	1:22
Welcome	1:07
Lecture Class	1:10
Your IE Class	2:12
Section 2: Participation	

Participation	1:29
Participation Intro	1:10
Plus Participation	3:03
Minus Participation	2:05
Participation Practice	5:57
Section 3: Responsibility	
Responsibility	1:39
Responsibility Intro	1:22
Attendance	1:44
Contacting Your Teacher	1:46
Class Items	1:29
Late Homework	2:11
Grades	1:14

Section 1: Program Introduction

The overall point of this section is to show that 1) it's OK to have different opinions about English, and 2) our English program is probably very different from any they have had before.

English is....

This clip shows students expressing their opinions about English. You may try to get your students to discuss or comment on the opinions from the video. Encourage them to express themselves—even if you disagree with their opinions.

Program Introduction

This is the English version of the Program Introduction:

Welcome to Intensive English at TUES. We hope you will find your class time enjoyable and challenging. You will probably find our program to be different from your previous English classes. To be successful, you will be expected to use English all the time in every class. Not beautiful English, not perfect English, just the basic English that you know. We do not care about grammar, we do not care about mistakes, we only care that you come to class and try. In our classes you will learn by doing. Listen to your teachers; listen to the other students who have already taken Intensive English. Then get ready to experience a better way to learn English.

The Lecture Class

This section is intended to be somewhat humorous and exaggerated. Please notice that this is a totally teacher-centered class. Students are not encouraged to interact at all. The teacher and the students hardly even seem to notice each other. These students will not learn anything and are not enjoying themselves. There is nothing good about this class.

Your Intensive English Class

In this section we see an example of what class should be like. Notice that we do not see much of the teacher. The students are responsible for continuing the conversation on their own. They are responsible for the atmosphere in the class. The teacher goes around and checks and monitors but does not interfere with the flow of the class. The students are

all talking, but they do not need to talk quickly, loudly or in complex sentences to do well and have a good time.

Section 2: Participation

This section introduces general information about participation. This is a fairly long section. Students will get the chance to see a number of examples of participation so that they will be able to better understand what is expected of them. Please play this section as much as necessary in order that students get the idea. After the Plus/Minus Participation Points would be a good time to have a general student discussion on what they will have to do to succeed at participation. You will need to do group discussion for the Participation Practice section.

Participation

This is another student interview section. Some of the students talk about communication instead of participation, but the point is the same. Again some brief discussion about participation may be good.

Your Participation Introduction

This is the English version of the Your Participation Introduction section:

Participation will be a key part of your class work in the Intensive English program. Participating in class means that you are actively doing something in English with other students. Talking with your teacher is good, but you will learn more and

practice more English if you take the time to help other students or discuss topics with them. In every class your teacher will give you the chance to participate in discussion with other students. Be sure you take advantage of these chances. Look for these chances. Your teachers will expect you to find these chances without being told about them. At first, it may be hard to know what to do or when to do it, but as you do it more and more participation will become easier and easier.

Plus Participation

Points made are: *Come to class, Do your work, Bring all items, Talk with other students in English, Make a good atmosphere, Bring people into class.*

The first three are pretty self-explanatory. Some students may try to give themselves points even if they are not in class. There is no way to get any participation if you are not in class. All work has to be finished on time to get these points. Going for last-minute points doesn't count. Bringing items to class also means being able to find them easily. Encourage your students to be orderly.

In the *Talk* part, we can see students talking, but also adjusting themselves to talk. They will need to get up and move around to find people to talk with. Again, checking answers with a partner also counts towards this point. They need to take the initiative to do these things if necessary. It is not up to the teacher to point out what they should be doing. In fact, teachers should avoid doing so except for the initial orientation period.

In the *Good atmosphere* and *Bring people* parts, we can see students trying to encourage others to participate by asking questions, playing games, and encouraging other students. Even if students decline or give short responses, it is still up to the students to continue to try to find ways to communicate with these reluctant students. This is key if they want to get a high participation score. These points contribute to the overall betterment of the class. Things like asking “Do you have a pen?” do not do that.

Minus Participation

Points made are: *Be absent*, *Talk in Japanese*, *Don't do what your teacher asks*, *Do nothing*, *Sleep*, *Don't listen to others*, *Do things not related to class*.

Again, these points should be pretty obvious. The *Be absent* point is repeated several times in the video to make it absolutely clear that this is absolutely the worst thing they can do. *Talk in Japanese* is only acceptable within the rules from the Intensive English Handbook. *Don't listen* applies to the teacher as well as to other students. *Not related* covers cell phones, PCs, diaries, other class homework, etc.

Practice Participation

This is probably the most important section of the video. There are eight scenes here for students to practice on. Have them get into groups and discuss what they see students in the scene doing or not doing. Ask them to discuss if this is good participation or not. Be sure they give reasons and examples. Review the opinions as a class. Following are the points that everyone should be clear about.

1. How many Participation Points do you get? Watch the video. There are four different situations:

An empty chair _____ points

Students doing nothing _____ points

Students raising their hands _____ points

Student using QL _____ points

2. These students are working very hard; however, they will not get very good participation for their efforts. During class time students should not work alone unless told to do so. While these students show an excellent attitude about doing their work, they are not communicating with anybody. Also, the teacher could say that the students weren't listening to him.

3. In this example, we have several girls trying to work out how to get another student to participate in a discussion. Teachers should not interfere with this process unless students start to give up. It will take some time for many students to work up the courage to try what these girls are doing. They are making an effort to include him in the discussion, so their participation score will be higher than if they ignored him and talked amongst themselves. Would you give points to these students?

4. These students are all involved in a very good discussion. Everyone is participating. They take turns and do not dominate the conversation. No

one here needs any obvious help, but they should look for chances to do so. This can be help with vocabulary, grammar, something that is unclear, or anything else that improves the quality of the conversation. They are not talking loudly, quickly or using long complex sentences. Everything is very casual and easy-going. Notice the time (9:05 - 9:12). How many Participation Points do they get? _____ points

5. Evaluate the highlighted student. He does a number of things wrong. He is late, he talks on his phone in Japanese and he sleeps and the end. Anything else? However, he does seem to be using the QL to do some discussion from 10:58 – 11:07. How many Participation Points does he get? _____ points

6. Evaluate the highlighted student. From 10:45 – 10:50 he is talking to another student. Later we see him speaking in Japanese at least two different times. How many Participation Points does he get? _____ points

7. Evaluate the highlighted student. He is talking from 11:17 – 11:30. Notice that it is OK for them to get points for talking about the exercises/ homework when they have finished doing it. They do not have to avoid it as a topic for discussion. Then he wakes up another student and explains the exercise. After that he plays a game in English. How many Participation Points does he get? _____ points

8. Evaluate the highlighted student. At first, she is asking for a pen. Does she get Participation Points for this? Then from 9:38 – 9:48 they are working on the exercise and talking a lot in English. Does she get Participation Points for this? How many Participation Points does she get? _____ points