Learner Development Forum: Learning to express ourselves

Marlen Harrison
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Christopher Carpenter
Dokkyo University
Terry Fellner
Himeji Dokkyo University
Renée Sawazaki
Surugadai University
Amanda Bradley
Miyazaki International College
Peter Mizuki
Nihon University
Paul Doré
Tama University
Denise Haugh
Momoyama Gakuin University and Kyoto University of Foreign Studies
Robert B. Sanderson
Momoyama University and Hannan University

Reference data:

Harrison, M., Carpenter, C., Fellner, T., Sawazaki, R., Bradley, A., Mizuki, P., Doré, P., Haugh, D., and Sanderson, R. B.(2006). Learner Development Forum: Learning to express ourselves. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2005 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Seven presenters from the 2005 Learner Development Forum at the JALT National Conference summarize their research and reflect on what they learned from their experiences as presenters. Themes explored include: skill development with regards to reading, writing, and speaking; the importance of critical feedback for both students and teacher-researchers; and applying real-life experiences in the language classroom.

2005年JALT全国大会における学習者ディベロプメント研究部会フォーラムに出席した7名の発表者は、各々の研究成果を概要し、発表者としての経験から何を学んだかについて考察しています。取扱われるテーマの中には、リーディング、作文および会話のスキル向上、学習者と教師／研究者両者にとっての批判的フィードバックの重要性、ならびに実生活の経験の語学教室への適用などが含まれています。

In the spring of 2005, a small group of teacher-researchers began preparing for presentations on the themes of learner development and learner autonomy. Though all of the researchers explored the language classroom and activities to enhance learner development and self-expression, some also chose to examine more specifically, their own processes as teachers-as-learners and how they were applying these ideas in their classrooms. What follows are summaries (in their own words) of their research and reflections of sharing, developing, and presenting their ideas for both individual presentations at a 2005 summer mini-conference in Osaka, and the poster session at the LD Forum at the 2005 National Conference.

Unique to this experience was the amount of feedback, peer support, and variety of settings in which they could explore their ideas. For many of the presenters, it was their first-time to present their ideas to their peers and the presentations were as much a learning experience for the presenters as for those in the audience.

The first three essays by Fellner, Sawazaki, and Bradley address writing, reading, and speaking skills respectively. From there, Mizuki and Doré address presentations and the power of feedback, with regards to both students and teacher-researchers. Haugh and Sanderson close with an examination of their own development and how they applied their own experiences to their classroom settings.

In their own words: LD Forum presenters share their research and reflections

Terry Fellner–*Dealing with plagiarism*

The impetus for my poster came about when I discovered that some of my students had plagiarized their final papers in one of my classes. This was surprising and upsetting as I thought I had thoroughly reviewed the requirements of writing a paper while in the classroom. After talking with these students I discovered that while they were aware of what plagiarism is in an abstract sense, they had very little understanding of plagiarism in a concrete sense. I realized prescriptive measures such as those I had initially taken do not adequately prepare L2 students and therefore I had to first understand why my students plagiarize and only then could I develop strategies to help them avoid it.

Examination of this issue proved more challenging than I had assumed it would be because plagiarism does not have a universally accepted definition. As a starting point for the discussion, I used the Oxford dictionary's definition of the verb plagiarize as to "take and use as one's own (the thoughts, writings, inventions, etc., of another person); …improperly or without acknowledgement" (Trumble & Stevenson (Eds.), 2002, p. 2226). Then, based upon research

and discussions with my students I came up with eight common reasons as to why students may plagiarize:

- To get better grades
- Not enough time
- The internet makes it easy
- Poor writing skills (specifically paraphrasing and summarizing skills)
- Different cultural citation methods
- Students don't know how to do cite authors correctly
- Plagiarism is done unconsciously
- Japanese students have very little knowledge of what Western universities expect in regards to writing. (Errey, 2002; Hart & Friesner, 2004; Kirkpatrick, 2004)

Dealing with plagiarism requires a process-based approach of increasing students' awareness of the subject and developing the required writing skills. My poster presented some of the actions I am taking in this process. To avoid plagiarism to get better grades, I now evaluate the process of writing rather than the product. I do this by evaluating the first and second drafts of each assignment along with the final version.

In dealing with time constraints I ensure that students have ample time to do their assignment and provide them with a schedule for when each draft version is due. Additionally, I am flexible with the assignment due date.

Dealing with the internet can be troublesome for both teachers and students as there is so much information available. For this reason, I limit the number of internet sources students can use to just one. As well, I limit the total number of sources to three and have all students provide photocopies of all their sources along with the final version of their papers.

In dealing with poor writing skills, I now spend a great deal of class time modeling, and practicing summarizing and paraphrasing skills. I also spend time modeling and having students practice citation skills.

By taking the above measures I not only provide my students with skills and knowledge needed to avoid plagiarism, I also ensure that they understand what western university instructors expect students to do.

Renée Sawazaki—*Reading for communication: Using stories as course materials*

Once upon a time there was a fine young man who had an enormous challenge—he had to pass basic English in order to graduate from university. After many tries he entered my class. He struggled with drills and other tasks, but tried drudgingly nonetheless. I started to bring in my favorite children's books to read at the beginning and end of class. His eyes lit up. For the final project, I asked my discouraged, yet diligent students to choose a book, read it to the class, and either explain the theme or how it related to their lives. He chose Eric Carle's classic, *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* (1969). His eyes filled with pride as he read and he spoke very seriously about how it represented God's work

during the week of Genesis. From that moment, I trusted that he knew in his heart that at some level, even he could understand English.

Although using stories was not new to my teaching before this experience, from then on I consistently incorporated stories into the curriculum for my basic English communication university classes for non-majors. I even designed a course based solely on stories.

For this study, I compared student feedback from two kinds of courses—one that used stories as supplementary materials to the course book, and one that used stories and worksheets as primary course materials. For both classes, stories were successful tools for helping students actively engage in creative dramatic tasks, exploration of cultures, and discussions about universal themes. Feedback showed that students overwhelmingly agree that stories should be a part of the curriculum, but it also indicated that a standard course book is also desirable. This reflects research that shows that, in addition to extensive reading, direct instruction is beneficial. We may also conclude that students feel comfortable studying with a standard course book, yet enjoy the refreshing freedom of using English with stories.

Some feedback from students was, interestingly, related to autonomy, at least my interpretation of autonomy. One learner said that she actually thinks about the text when it's a story and engages with it, processes it. Whereas, when text is, say a passage or dialog in a course book, her mind goes into the mode of *I must memorize this!* and she doesn't focus on the meaning of the text. Another said that he felt that the stories were *real English* he could relate to as a person. Textbooks, to him, felt very distant.

Two courses used stories as the primary text. One required Cambridge's *The Fruitcake Special and other stories* (Brennan, 2000) and for the other, stories were taken from *Exploring Cultures and Their Stories* (Joy, 1996a) and *Investigating Cultures and Their Stories* (Joy, 1996b). One unit consists of three lessons: culture and understanding, discussion and preparation for the presentation, and presentations.

Although this study showed that low level and often unmotivated students seemed to benefit the most from using stories as course materials, I would like to encourage teachers to explore this content area and enjoy using stories as a base for true communicative experiences for all levels of students.

Amanda Bradley—*The student's voice, literally: Public speaking as a student-centered and interactive learning process*

The English speech contest is a traditional event held by junior high to tertiary institutions in Japan, and it is a logical step to develop this time-honored tradition in the college where I teach. I have often judged and coached speech contestants. Of course, speech contest judges usually focus on the end product only. However, through awareness of the learner's process from deciding to take part and choosing a topic to performing on the day of the event, teachers can more fully appreciate the pedagogical value of speeches being a forum where the student's voice can, literally, be heard. At an orientation to a college speech contest, a former participant stated, "The only time I ever said what I really

wanted to was in the speech contest." For this student, making a speech was a tool for developing autonomy and critical thinking, both attributes of learner empowerment. The speech had given her an intellectual opportunity beyond the regular curriculum, a notion I have come to share with the much of the general student body.

In this presentation, the English speech process was discussed with reference to undergraduates across four years in an English language immersion liberal arts college. Contests or exhibitions are held twice annually and participation is voluntary. During the past five years, all students who committed themselves have completed the process successfully, regardless of their initial competence in English. Preparation time is individually negotiated. Participants choose, write and deliver a speech based on a story they tell and interpret. The tutorial system validates the learner as a young adult capable of following a Socratic dialogue with the tutor and honing content and expression in the process.

The speech process, as structured at Miyazaki International College, is a holistic tool for empowerment, entailing the four English skills and the ability to apply them autonomously to other English medium academic challenges, such as listening to lectures, making presentations or writing papers. It facilitates academic progress because the skills are learned in a nurturing affective climate. Tutorials focus on individual needs, a chance rarely guaranteed in tertiary education. But speech tutors may need to ask the following questions: How much should I *give* the student? What's the role of native/non-native pronunciation? Is competition beneficial? What if my tutees lose in a speech contest? Do speech activities highlight gender differences? If so, how do I deal with that? Dialogue with the tutee provides the answers on an individual basis.

A student recently voiced the comment, "I am a weak student, but my friend X was too. But after her speech, she changed and is confident and takes part in class now. If I can do that, I will join." The student subsequently joined in the speech process, exemplifying a tendency for observers themselves to be drawn into the experience and motivated to take part, a final example of development from teacher-made choices at earlier stages to student initiatives in college.

Peter Mizuki—*Critical evaluations, autonomy, and motivation: A story and comments on stimulating learner presentations*

I based my poster on the following research question: "*Do the instructor`s critical evaluations improve learners' presentation performances?*" Positive responses to this question by my third-year students at a four-year foreign language university coupled with the overall improvement of their presentation skills reflect how critical evaluations by the instructor can both motivate and improve future presentation performances. The students completed an activity entitled *newspaper talk.* In this activity, four students form one group and each student presents an English news article of their choice. Allowing students to choose their own article emphasizes some fundamental principles of autonomy, giving the learners freedom of choice and responsibility for their own learning (Benson & Voller, 1997), and stimulating learners' intrinsic motivation.

Critical teacher evaluations and reflections are completed at the end of the activity, at which time critical reflection is also encouraged by students having to write a self-evaluation of their performance. Critical evaluations are important for learners because they promote awareness of weaknesses and hopefully with this awareness, development of skills. They are given to the students by the instructor in the form of a written evaluation and a numerical score based on the instructor's evaluation criteria.

The instructor's critical evaluations given to the students should be as positive as possible, even when their performance is poor, in order to nurture and encourage the development of the L2. These evaluations can serve to improve students` future presentation performances. Students' responses to the following question "Did you think the critical evaluations of your presentations by the instructor were useful for improving your English ability? Why or why not?" included:

> Yes, it was very useful, [because] I have no idea what I have to improve while the presentation.
>
> Yes, I didn't notice my weak point of my presentation.

A story of a student

A student in a university English speaking class took her studies seriously. Though initially she spoke very quietly and would read her presentations, as the semester progressed she became more confident, and at the final presentation of the semester she was poised, composed, and maintained good eye contact with her audience. I can't be sure if my critical evaluations were the reason for her improvement, but I like to think so.

Paul Doré—The irony of autonomy: Reflections on a poster session

There I was, after months of worrying, thinking and re-thinking layout, sifting the insignificant from the poignant detail, about to explain my poster to the first group of LD forum goers. They looked at my poster and asked, "What is this about?" I tried my first rendition of the semi-rehearsed explanation. They nodded and studied the poster and looked some more. Someone asked a question that revealed that they hadn't quite understood what I was explaining. They couldn't clearly see what I wanted my poster to show them. So I explained it some more. This time a little slower, and with some extra detail. They listened and nodded, studied the poster some more and looked at it a little closer. Then the second question came … Nope! They still hadn't quite got it. So, being a teacher, I tried to clarify by re-explaining using more detail, trying to untangle the knot. But the knot just got more complicated and confusing. My poster simply didn't display my ideas to other people's minds with the clarity that I thought. There was nothing I could do, except finish the session as best I could and reflect on it later to see if I could nut out the problem. So, the end came and I was trying to locate the problem when one guy put it all into perspective for me with one single question …

First, some background information: I presented on an activity in which I use a familiar story from the Japanese children's cartoon series, *Mukashi Banashi*, as content for collaborative story re-telling. Using a very familiar story

made it easier for students to concentrate on applying their English. The re-telling activity also seemed to be suitable for groups of students in which the language proficiency varied. I set time limits for practice to prevent full memorization of the story, as well. This seems to foster extra opportunities and a need for peer support and language prompting. These two types of interaction between peers in the activity, I feel, successfully facilitated peer learning through creating that genuine need for language.

The activity uses a rather elegant jigsaw technique to reveal the existing information gaps in the classroom which the students must work together to bridge. I wanted to demonstrate the technique clearly in my poster presentation. My plan was first to outline the activity process so that it would lead to a discussion with my audience of the activity's value for learners. Spending most of my time trying to explain and then clarify my explanations meant that a chance for discussion about the connection with learner autonomy did not develop.

The question the guy asked me was "Why did you focus on process and not product?" He added, "I would like to have seen how this contributed to your learners' autonomy development." And when I thought about it, that was my original intention, but I lost focus along the way. I didn't develop materials fast enough to share thoroughly at the Osaka JALT mini-conference. I got stuck in one, narrow perspective. Admittedly, the mini-conference format was different from that of the poster presentation, and at the forum all presenters were starting their posters from scratch. In hindsight, options of format for the next mini-conference/forum might be worth discussing. Nonetheless, I really wished I had been asked that question before the conference.

I had something to learn from this guy, from my audience. In Vygotskian terms, there was an opportunity to bridge a zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1962). I feel confident now that I could re-do the poster and produce a very different presentation with a clearer focus. The LD Forum was a lesson for me in developing teacher autonomy. The interaction with peers opened my eyes to broader perspectives and reminded me of the value of working with people and their role in my development as an autonomous learner/teacher. Coincidentally, this is exactly the type of interaction I believe is occurring in interactive classroom tasks such as the video jigsaw activity I was presenting. This interaction scaffolds the learner into a productive interdependence, coined *critical collaborative autonomy* by Jacobs and Murphey (2000), and such interaction is invaluable to language learners, language teachers, teaching learners, and learning teachers, alike.

Denise Haugh—*Exploring the value of dramatized role-plays to foster learner autonomy*

> I hear and I forget
>
> I listen and I remember
>
> I do and I understand
>
> *Chinese proverb in Wessels (1987, p. 7)*

My own involvement with theatre workshops and acting lead me naturally to want to experiment with drama in my classes. In 2003, when I first started using dramatized role-plays in my oral communication class at Momoyama Gakuin

University, I presented the activities with lots of energy and enthusiasm in hopes of actively engaging my students. I wanted them to forget about feeling awkward, shy, and nervous and hoped their absorption in the exercises would allow them to feel comfortable while speaking English. But was I successful and were my students aware of my intentions? For the most part the answer was "no." From my class of twenty students, nine out of fifteen wrote that they were uncomfortable about doing dramatized role-plays. They cited such difficulties as feeling nervous and shy about performing, forgetting lines and not being able to act. One student wrote the following: "We came here for studying English not for practicing act …" This led to the question which created the theme for my presentation: *Do my students see dramatized role plays as a viable means to foster learner autonomy?*

Whenever I learn a part for a play, I am engaged cognitively and kinesthetically. Are my students as engaged when they are learning their lines and staging their role-plays? My presentation was based on a continuing examination of these questions. An interview with one teacher who has used drama in the EFL classroom made me understand the need to help my students become more aware of the ways in which drama can benefit their language development and communicative abilities. As she explains,

> It is important to let your students know how they are benefiting. Some students think drama is not a viable way to study English—it's too informal, game-like—too much like play. But if you can justify why you are doing it…(H.Wier, personal communication, July 14, 2005)

These insights have moved me to focus more on practical instruction and techniques for clarifying the value of dramatized role-plays for language practice. From this semester, I plan to incorporate a list of teaching objectives and learning goals in English and Japanese addressing the following questions: Are dramatized role-plays efficiently facilitating the acquisition of language and communication skills? Are my students aware of all the ways in which dramatized role-plays do this? For example,

- Are they discovering how body movement, gesture, and facial expressions shape the way in which they communicate?
- Are they applying learned communication skills during the role-play process?
- Are they feeling a sense of accomplishment and achievement?
- Are they learning and practicing to be confident while speaking English?

With these questions in mind, my aim is to create a structured framework using dramatized role-plays to prepare my students for *real life* communication in English by equipping them with skills and attitudes which encourage exploration, heighten awareness, and instill confidence. I am also continuing to research student perceptions of the value of drama in the classroom, as well as the power of dramatized role-plays to develop student awareness and control of the learning process and to promote learner autonomy.

Robert B. Sanderson—*Focus on philosophy: Developing personal philosophies to enhance our teaching, our learning, and our lives*

I have long been interested in the power that one's philosophy has over his or her life. I became increasingly convinced of the importance of focusing on the development of a personal philosophy some years ago when I first heard Jim Rohn (1996) assert that "philosophy [is] the major determining factor in how your life works out … Each person's personal philosophy is like the set of the sail". This idea has resonated with me ever since, and has motivated me to continue focusing on developing my own personal philosophy and to encourage my students (many of whom often seem very unmotivated in their studies) to do the same in the hopes of increasing their *appetite* for learning (Murphey, 1997) and of dramatically improving their effort, attitudes, and learning.

I wasn't sure how to go about doing this in English with my lower to intermediate level students in the several classes I teach at two Japanese private universities. I decided to design a questionnaire (see Table 1), which drew heavily on Sakui and Gaies (1999), Covey (1990), Murphey (1997), Bateson (1994, cited in Murphey, 2003), Lager (1994), and others that have influenced my own philosophy. All but the last question utilized a seven-point Likert scale to indicate degree of agreement or disagreement. I hoped that this would serve as a relatively easy means of focusing each student's attention on their own philosophy and as a departure point for discussion and reflection.

Table 1: Questionnaire on personal philosophies of learning

1. Ben and Jerry's motto is "If it's not fun, why do it?" Oral Communication class should be interesting and enjoyable, if not "fun."
2. "Imakara kokokara..." We have to start from where we are. I can improve my English here and now by speaking with my classmates a lot in English.
3. To learn English well, it is important to repeat and practice a lot, and to participate actively. Learning comes from participating.
4. Making mistakes and asking questions help me learn. I should ask questions when I don't understand or ask for help when I need it.
5. "An apple a day keeps the doctor away!", "Practice makes perfect," and "We are what we repeatedly do,"... I believe that if I study and practice English by myself for 30 minutes to one hour everyday, my English will be very good by the time I graduate.
6. I am 100% responsible for my learning.
7. It's possible for me to master English without ever leaving Japan.
8. I come to this class and study English only because I have to.
9. "No pain, no gain!"
10. What enjoyable things do you do now that you feel most help you to improve your English? What else could you do to improve more quickly? What other ideas are important in your personal philosophy of language learning?

The results were rather interesting and sometimes surprising to me, as when most students claimed to agree that class should be enjoyable and that they were largely responsible for their own learning, yet their actions in class often didn't coincide with this. Some classes' results served as reality checks for me, such as when several students agreed more strongly with question 8 or disagreed more strongly with question 7 than I would have hoped.

It seems too early or perhaps impossible to say definitively what good has come of this project, but I have the sense that the process I undertook of developing and administering the questionnaire has at the very least helped me to focus more on my own philosophy, which I feel has benefited my teaching. My students seem to have been spurred to seriously reflect on their philosophies of learning and on their participation in our class, perhaps for the first time. Our discussions of the results have seemed to enhance our rapport and to have helped to initiate some positive changes in behavior of some students. Reminding my students of their stated beliefs when their behavior indicates otherwise has also proven useful on occasion (such as the stated beliefs that learning should be enjoyable if sometimes *painful,* and that we are each largely, if not entirely, responsible for our own learning). I plan to continue experimenting with ways of focusing on and developing my own and my students' personal philosophies. I expect that the benefits will outweigh the effort.

Conclusion: Presenting, learning, and reaffirming our beliefs as teachers

The 2005 LD Forum was a success on multiple levels. First, it was a successful event for attendees of the forum. In the wrap-up discussion, those in attendance were asked to reflect on and discuss what they learned, what inspired them, and what surprised them. One of the attendees stated that he had been teaching English in Japan for 40 years, and yet each presentation had offered him something new that he had never before considered. Certainly a ringing endorsement, and indeed, the eclectic mix of presenters had original and fresh perspectives on all of their topics.

Besides being a successful event for attendees, it was also a success for presenters, who, like Doré (above), found the experience very educational. Again, some of these people were first time presenters. As the culmination of a yearlong process, which included the July mini-conference in Osaka, the LD Forum brought together a group of people who had been interacting, supporting and inspiring each other for a long time. Throughout the year, presenters kept in contact via personal and group e-mail discussions. This interaction scaffolded the participants to deeper understandings of their research and the presentation process.

This process was not only professionally rewarding. For many, it was an opportunity to reaffirm the philosophical and emotional bases of our professional lives, the ideals which inspired us to become teachers in the first place. The individual presenters, with diverse interests and from diverse backgrounds, all seemed united by one common theme which could be stated as a deep trust and respect for the people in their classrooms. Of course as members of the LD SIG, a community specifically concerned with learner/teacher development and autonomy, this should not be surprising. But it was refreshing. Paolo Freire (2000) said of the *real humanist* that she can be identified by her "trust in the people" (p. 60). This sentiment was echoed by various presenters, including by Caspino (a presenter not represented in the summaries above), who spoke of his *expert* students (expert karaoke singers!), by Sawazaki who finds her *discouraged* students being drawn out by the power of stories, and by Haugh who bravely illustrates how teachers can learn and grow with their students. This theme of humanism and trust in the learner was underscored by Sanderson who asks his

students (and us) to reflect more deeply on their personal philosophies about living and learning.

Once again, the LD Forum became a site of learning and sharing between attendees and presenters, all searching for ways to support our students and our selves on our paths to autonomy. Writing about the previous year's forum, Nachi, et al., (2005), compared the community brought together by the event to a classroom of learners. This spirit emerged again this year, reaffirming a happy tradition, as we continued learning to express ourselves.

Terry Fellner holds an MA from the University of Birmingham, UK. He has been a language instructor for over 14 years in Canada and Japan. Terry's current interests include CALL, student motivation, the use of the outdoor environment to create meaningful contexts for language learning, academic writing, and discourse intonation. Terry can be contacted at <terryfel@himeji-du.ac.jp>.

Renée Sawazaki is an Assistant Professor of English at Surugadai University. She has a Masters in Teaching from the School for International Training in Vermont. Her current research interests include curriculum design, using stories and intercultural understanding. She also coordinates a literacy project for bilingual children in Gunma. She may be contacted at <renee@alum.calberkeley.org>.

Amanda Bradley is a Lecturer of English at Miyazaki International College. She has taught EFL for 38 years, including 15 years in Japan and 5 on the faculty of MIC. Her research interests include the subordination of teaching to learning, the student's spoken and written voices. She may be contacted at <abradley@miyazaki-mic.ac.jp>.

Peter Mizuki holds an M.S. Ed. in TESOL from Temple University Japan and his research interests include learner autonomy and intercultural communication. He is currently an Associate Professor at Nihon University, in the University Research Center. He may be contacted at <pmizuki@cronos.ocn.ne.jp>.

Paul Doré teaches at Tama University in Tokyo. He is interested in exploring ways to apply Vygotskian educational psychology to the L2 classroom. In particular, he wants to find ways to help teachers teach, and students learn, language as well as how to enjoy compulsory language study. He is a member of the Learner Development SIG and the Testing and Evaluation SIG. and may be contacted at <brucedore2002@yahoo.com.au>.

Denise Haugh currently teaches part-time at Momoyama University and Kyoto University of Foreign Studies. She has been an active member of the Learner Development SIG for two years. Her research interests include integrating her experiences in theatre, dance, and video production in the EFL classroom to foster learner autonomy. She may be contacted at <hadeeha@hotmail.com>.

Robert Sanderson teaches at Momoyama University, Hannan University, and in Osaka International School's Saturday School program. He received his MA-TESOL training at the School for International Training (SIT) in Brattleboro, Vermont, and holds a B.A. in History from the University of Colorado at Boulder.

References

Albom, M. (1997). *Tuesdays with Morrie: an old man, a young man, and life's greatest lesson.* New York: Doubleday.

Bateson, M. (1994). *Peripheral visions.* New York: Harper Collins.

Benson, P., & Voller, P. (1997). Introduction: Autonomy and independence in language learning. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and Independence in language learning (pp. 1-12). New York: Longman.*

Brennan, F. (2000). The Fruitcake Special and other stories (Level 4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carle, E. (1969). The Very Hungry Caterpillar. New York: Scholastic.

Covey, S.R. (1990). *The 7 habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change*. New York: Free Press.

Errey, L. (2002). Plagiarism: Something fishy? ...Or just A fish out of water? *Teaching Forum, 50*, 17-20.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M.B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum (originally published in 1970).

Hart, M., &, Friesner, T. (2004). Plagiarism and poor academic practice: A threat to the extension of e-learning in higher education? *Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 2 (2)*, retrieved November 20th, 2005 from <www.ejel.org/volume-2/vol2-issue1/vol2-issue2-papers.html>.

Jacobs, G.M., and Murphey, T. (2000). Encouraging critical collaborative autonomy. *JALT Journal,* 22 (2), 228-244.

Joy, F. (1996a). *Exploring cultures and their stories.* Torrance, CA: Frank Schaffer Publications.

Joy, F. (1996b). *Investigating cultures and their stories. Torrance, CA: Frank Schaffer Publications.*

Kirkpatrick, A. (2004, Oct. 1-3). Teaching academic writing—Whose norms? Presentation at the ACTESOL Conference, Perth, Australia.

Lager, F. (1994). Ben & Jerry's: The inside scoop: How two real guys built a business with a social conscience and a sense of humor. New York: Crown.

Murphey, T. (1997). *Language hungry! Nagoya: South Mountain Press.*

Murphey, T. (2003). Assessing the individual: Theatre of the absurd. *Shiken: JALT Testing and Evaluation SIG Newsletter,* 7 (1), 2-5.

Nachi, H.E., Stevenson, J., et al. (2005). Learner development forum: Empowering students for class and beyond. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, and M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT 2004 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Rohn, J. (1994). *The Art of Exceptional Living* (audiotape). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sakui, K., & Gaies, S. (1999). Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning, *System, 27(4), 473-492.*

Trumble, W.R., & Stevenson, A. (Eds.) (2002). The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (5th ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language* (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (originally published in 1934).

Wessels, C. (1987). *Drama: Resource books for teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.