2012

The development and analysis of the Global Citizen Award as a component of Asia University America Program at Eastern Washington University

Matthew Ged Miner
Eastern Washington University

THE DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THE GLOBAL CITIZEN AWARD AS A COMPONENT OF ASIA UNIVERSITY AMERICA PROGRAM AT EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

A Thesis

Presented to

Eastern Washington University

Cheney, Washington

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts: English

Teaching English as a Second Language

By

Matthew Ged Miner

Winter 2012

MASTER'S THESIS

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Eastern Washington University, I agree that the JFK Library shall make copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that copying of this project in whole or in part is allowable only for scholarly purposes. It is understood, however, that any copying or publication of this thesis for commercial purposes or for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____

_____

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis report is to document the research, development, and analysis of the Global Citizen Award and its introduction, pilot, assessment, and revision as a curricular component of Asia University America Program at Eastern Washington University. The Global Citizen Award is a merit-based and optional award for students who meet various criteria while attending the five-month study abroad program from Asia University in Tokyo, Japan. The thesis includes background and context for the award, including history and philosophy of the stake-holding institutions such as Asia University and Asia University America Program. This report includes an extensive review of literature, both foundational and contemporary, to reveal and contextualize the various factors that inspired the creation of the Global Citizen Award for Asia University America Program (AUAP) at Eastern Washington University. The primary researcher discusses the research methodology employed, framed in the epistemology of constructivist grounded theory operating through critical ethnography. Data analysis is qualitative in the form of participant-observer reports and analysis of student reflective writing samples.

Acknowledgements

I would first and foremost like to extend my deepest and most sincere gratitude to Dr. LaVona Reeves, who provided sincere and consistent support to me as a graduate student in the MA TESL program at Eastern Washington University. From the moment I inquired into the program, she was available and supportive. Her personal engagement in my work remained constant up to and including the publication of this thesis. Dr. Reeves has been a reliable source of emotional and educational support, always working above and beyond to help me achieve my goals in the program and the workforce.

I would also like to thank the administrators, staff, faculty, and students at Asia University America Program on the Eastern Washington University campus. Evelyn Renshaw gave me a chance to participate in AUAP as a classroom volunteer and many wonderful opportunities to substitute teach; Megan Mulvany supported my research goals in the development of the Global Citizen Award; Michael Reid has been a good friend and a source of immeasurable support, always ready with a listening ear and helpful advice.

But I would like to dedicate this thesis to one person who directly inspired my pursuit of an education and career in teaching English as a second language: Atsumi Yoshimoto. Although years have passed and you have moved on, I will never forget that eager and attentive high school student in Tokyo whose excitement at learning my language and culture helped me discover a love of teaching and the value of communication to share ideas and cross cultural boundaries.

About the Author

I first learned of my love for teaching during a trip to Japan. While there, I stayed with a friend and former Eastern student who was teaching English at a high school in Tokyo. He invited me to meet his students in an after-school club, where I experienced the joy of sharing my culture and language with eager young minds by participating as a volunteer tutor; in return, I learned much of the Japanese way of life, and I developed an immense desire to return and experience more of Japanese culture. The experience impacted me: I decided to pursue a career teaching English as a second language in Japan.

I began working toward my goal soon after, and I've excelled through all of the challenges and difficulties during my journey. While receiving the necessary schooling, I paid for my expenses by working in fields that would complement my goals in education; thus, in addition to my Bachelor's Degree in English and the relevant instruction I received, I had real-world experience in a variety of teaching, tutoring, administrative, and para-educator occupations for all different age groups and backgrounds.

I received my Bachelor's degree in English from the University of California at Berkeley after long years of hard work and dedication. As an undergraduate student, I took a variety of English Linguistics courses focusing on the structure of language as well as a broad gamut of English Literature classes to experience the wealth of authors and poets in English canon. Ultimately, my time studying English at Berkeley strengthened and refined my love for literature and writing while exposing me to a variety of teaching methodologies from instructors of all backgrounds and philosophies.

While attending school, I was also learning through doing: balancing my full-time course-load with jobs to pay the bills. During my years at Berkeley, I was employed at California College of the Arts, where I worked as staff in Education Technology, tutored weekly, and taught three technology classes through the Extended Education program. The unique challenge of these classes came in addressing each individual's needs: while some students were more skilled in the software and quick to learn new concepts, others were still struggling with the fundamentals of computer use, and needed more individual attention. I had to provide a challenging and beneficial curriculum for the more advanced users, and yet be flexible and patient when teaching the novices. What I gained most from teaching these classes was the ability to revise and customize lesson plans and teaching methodology, often on the fly, in order to accommodate the fluctuating learning curve. Well before my MA TESL classes would teach me such terms, I was appreciating and using differentiated instruction as part of a humanistic approach to teaching.

In addition to the adult seminars, I taught two Young Artist Studio Program classes for California College of the Arts. These courses provided middle school students the experience of art education and studio work in a college environment. For me, it was a unique opportunity to teach two full classrooms of excited and creative teenagers. I made tremendous growth as a teacher during that time, and learned a lot about classroom management difficulties and my own strengths and weaknesses as an educator. The experience opened my eyes to the challenge faced by all teachers, and one that I now hold center in my teaching philosophy: how can the educator both engage the students' interest as well as provide the skills and information essential for their growth? Teaching

middle school students presented the opportunity to excite them about both the material and their own abilities, so that learning became an enjoyment rather than an obligation.

I kept this philosophy in mind as I transitioned into a new occupation after moving to Washington State. I was employed with the Pasco School District as a para-educator, working closely with teachers as I tutored certain of their students in reading, comprehension, and writing. I was again able to work with second language learners – this time Spanish-speaking students. The challenge of bridging the language and culture barrier made success all the more rewarding. Through diligence, caring, and employing my own philosophy of making learning both beneficial and enjoyable, I sought to impact these students; to help them not only excel, but want to. I watched as one of my regular students advanced from remedial English comprehension levels to testing on par with his class and to ultimately being rewarded at the end-of-the-year commencement for most improved reading. Playing a part in changing students' lives – being an influence amongst their teachers, peers, and parents – brought a feeling of achievement and happiness. In all, I feel that these early work experiences laid the foundations of my teaching philosophy.

My time as both a student and an educator helped me build my teaching philosophy – a philosophy that I feel can benefit students learning how to write for academic and creative purposes. I know, from both experience and observation, that a student's earnest desire to learn will propel that student farther and faster toward academic success than will the begrudging, reluctant, or passive attempt. Subsequently, the level of desire and engagement on the teacher's part is equally influential upon the learning process, and can often serve to change the student's position on learning – for

better or worse. An educator's skill set and knowledge base, though critical, only make up part of the equation for success; there is a decisive balancing act between providing the information and engaging the students' active interest. I've had instructors who were experts in their respective fields, with a wealth of knowledge and access to key materials at their disposal – and a classroom full of confused, bored, or disenfranchised students who saw no value in what they were learning, because the teachers had no grasp on how to effectively engage their students' interest. Conversely, I've seen teachers and tutors build strong interpersonal relationships with their students, show leniency in expectations, and nourish personalities rather than minds; meanwhile the lack of focus and discipline led the students' intellectual growth to plateau, and they ultimately had no respect for the class or the instructor. From my time as both teacher and learner, I've learned the importance of being both educated in subject and driven to actively engage students' minds.

One of the biggest proponents of this philosophy, in my mind, is Alex Filippenko, astrophysicist and Professor of Astronomy at U.C. Berkeley. Filippenko is a recipient of countless awards for his excellence in teaching, and his Astronomy course is one of the most popular – and populated – classes every year. Why is he so successful in the eyes of students, supervisors, and peers? As a former pupil of his, I know first-hand of his love of his subject and of sharing that subject with his students. While he is one of the most educated men in the fields of Astrophysics, his classes are tailored to share his own excitement with students of all schools, not just science. Through analogies, examples, multimedia experiences, and actively engaging the interest and intellect of his audience, FIlippenko employed multi-faceted methodologies to teaching and differentiated

instruction, thereby successfully creating an accessible curriculum for one of the most complicated subjects in undergraduate studies.

I believe that the challenge to instructors is to create an environment and curriculum conducive to encouraging and maintaining the students' desire to learn. I believe this can be done by actively engaging the minds of the students through varied means; thus encouraging all different styles of learning.

In my time as a graduate student in the Teaching English as a Second Language program, I have had both teaching and learning experiences that have broadened my understanding of teaching methodologies and yet helped me focus my own philosophy. I have come to realize that even before I knew the terms and founding philosophies, I was teaching within a constructivist, humanistic philosophy. I believe that the students have as much to contribute to the learning process as I do as an instructor. I believe that my role as teacher is to facilitate student goals for learning and development. And I believe it is important to have a personal investment in my subject matter and the needs of my students.

As for the teaching of English as a second language, I realize that my preferred methodologies are not all that different from my first experiences sharing my language with a group of Japanese high school students so many years ago. I believe in the value of communicative language teaching—that language learning should be about the discovery and development of communication as a means of sharing ideas and creating meaning. I cannot think of a better way to share not only language, but also culture.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis report is to document the research, development, and analysis of the Global Citizen Award and its introduction, pilot, assessment, and revision as a curricular component of Asia University America Program at Eastern Washington University. The Global Citizen Award is a merit-based and optional award for students who meet various criteria while attending the five-month study abroad program from Asia University in Tokyo, Japan. The students studying at Asia University America Program (AUAP) take specific and limited English-only classes in a sheltered, off-campus program at one of four universities in the United States, including Eastern Washington University (EWU). In addition to their classroom experiences and standardized curriculum, the students are provided with opportunities to engage in activities in the local community in order to better foster an authentic English learning and cultural experience. To help encourage civic, social, and cultural engagement, the staff Asia University America Program at EWU, including the primary researcher, implemented this award program not only to provide motivation but also to recognize student dedication and their experiences participating in activities including service learning through volunteer work, international connections, cultural learning opportunities, and reflective writing.

As part of the development of this award, the AUAP administrators and I piloted the initial stage of the award, assessed and revised the award based on staff, researcher,

and student-participant feedback and evaluation, and implemented a second draft of the award implementing the changes. This report documents the timeline of development, analysis, and revision of the award.

As primary researcher, I also gathered and analyzed the reflective writing that the students provided as part of the award requirements. In this report, I use the qualitative findings of the student reflective writing to provide insight into student experience at Asia University America Program for interested parties, including the administrators at Asia University America Program and their parent university in Japan.

The literature reviewed, data gathered and analyzed, conclusions drawn, and recommendations given in this thesis report serve to document this award, its background, and its origins, and to provide a space for the voice of the participants and reflection by the author.

Audience

The intended and primary audience of this thesis report includes the following parties: administrators, staff, and faculty at Asia University America Program at Eastern Washington University as well as interested parties at other AUAP locations; administrators, staff, and faculty at Asia University and Asia University's English research program, the Center for English Language Education (CELE); the primary researcher's thesis advisor and defense committee, and; the researcher's instructors, peers, and other students studying Teaching English as a Second Language. However, this thesis may be of benefit to anyone interested in the research topics and findings, including developmental and evaluative research, motivation (instrumental and

integrated), ESL sheltered instruction, service learning, reflective writing, and qualitative research methodology such as ethnographic case-study, participant-observation, and document analysis.

Research Questions

In developing, evaluating, and revising the Global Citizen Award, I, as the primary researcher, my thesis advisor, and the AUAP administrators developed research questions to guide the process:

1. How can the Global Citizen Award provide integrative motivation for authentic participation in a communicative English language experience?
2. In what ways does participation in the award process impact the education opportunities of Asia University America Program students?
3. How does the award meet the mission statements of Asia University America Program and their parent school, Asia University? How does it interface with program goals and objectives?
4. What can be learned about the students who participate in the award?
5. What more might AUAP administrators, staff, and faculty do to further engage the students through promoting and offering this award?

The documentation contained in this report, including the data analysis of the award and its participant responses and the researcher's analysis and reflection, seeks to answer or address the preceding questions by the following means:

1. The thesis provides a history and background of the setting and context of the award, namely the stake-holding institutions and their mission goals both in Japan

and in the United States, which ultimately helped create and shape the perceived necessity of the Global Citizen Award; in doing so, the thesis demonstrates that the award operates within the scope of the mission goals of Asia University America Program, Asia University, the Center for English Language Education at Asia University, and the Japan Ministry of Education's policy on foreign language learning.

2. The thesis thoroughly analyzes the Global Citizen Award as a whole, both as a concept and a reality, as well as its individual components and requirements; it frames the award and each of the specific award components within a historical and theoretical context through examining foundational and contemporary theory and literature; the researcher defines, explains, and addresses issues raised by the development and implementation of the award and its component requirements, including the worth of merit-based awards, issues of motivation, service learning, cultural learning, and reflective writing, by supporting them with relevant literature. This thorough analysis supported by an extensive literature review addresses questions of motivation and the impact on language and culture learning.
3. The research includes qualitative analysis of the data gathered, which is primarily in the form of document analysis of the student-participant reflective writing, ethnography, and analysis by the researcher as participant-observer operating in grounded theory. In doing so, the research answers questions about the student-participants and their experiences.
4. The author of the study provides his own analysis, reflection, and

recommendations for the award, moving forward, in order to address questions about future iterations and uses of the Global Citizen Award.

This chapter served to introduce the thesis purpose and the research goals as well as to provide a brief overview of the award properties, the research questions guiding its development, and an overview of how this thesis will attempt to address those questions. The thesis report now turns to examining the setting of the award—namely, the institutions providing for and inspiring the Global Citizen Award.

Chapter 2

The Award Setting: History and Policy of the Stake-Holding Institutions

This chapter provides history, philosophy, and context of the institutions involved in the development and implementation of the Global Citizen Award—institutions within which the award operates and impacts student growth and development. The chapter describes the following institutions in detail: Asia University, the parent school of the relevant programs and home university of the students participating in the award; the Center for English Language Education, Asia University's institute created to facilitate student English language education on their Tokyo campus; and Asia University America Program, the study-abroad program implemented by Asia University. The chapter examines the birth and evolution of these institutions, their mission statements and program policies, and their relationships to the other entities involved in the Global Citizen Award and its development and review.

Asia University

Overview. Asia University is a modestly-sized institution located in the Musashino district of Tokyo, Japan. It features four schools of faculty for undergraduates—Business Administration, Economics, Law, and International Relations—as well as three graduate schools—Asian and International Business Strategy, Economics, and Law. The university also houses two research institutes: The Institute of Asian Studies, which "aims to integrate Asia" through study of "culture, language, religion, politics, economics, and law" (Asia University, 2012, web), and the Center for

English Language Education (CELE), the cornerstone for English education at Asia University (CELE is discussed in greater detail later).

History. The present-day Asia University traces its roots and location back to 1941, when こあ専門学校 (*Koa Senmon Gakkoo*), or Koa Professional School, first opened its doors. The courses of study focused on specific areas in Asia (Continental, South Pacific, and the "Homeland," Japan); the school also established the Koa Educational Foundation with "the aim of contributing to Asian nations" (Asia University, 2012, web).

After the end of the Second World War, Kozo Ota, who would eventually become the first president and chair of Asia University, was appointed president of the school's new iteration, 日本経済専門学校 (*Nihon Keizai Senmon Gakkou)*, or the Professional School of Japanese Economics. The school continued to experience changes during Japanese educational reforms and policy adjustments as it became Nihon Junior College of Economics—the "roots of today's Asia University" (Asia University, 2012, web). With a new focus on resuming relationships with other Asian nations that had become strained or had dissipated during the war, the school adopted a Foreign Student Department in 1954; it was the first post-war college in Japan to accept a significant amount of foreign students (Asia University, 2012, web).

One year later, Asia University was established from the foundation of Nihon Junior College of Economics with one department—the Faculty of Commerce—and with Kozo Ota as its first chairperson and president. Over time, the school expanded and reorganized further to accommodate the current faculties, adopt Graduate and Doctorate

programs, and change its former iteration of Nihon Junior College of Economics to its present-day Asia University Junior College.

Principles and mission. Though the previous incarnations and its current iteration underwent many changes in the post-war and contemporary periods, Asia University still holds at its core many of the values and ideas that the founders built the school upon.

Koa Professoinal School was founded with the underlying belief that "education should be based on a spiritual closeness between teachers and students" (Asia University, 2012, web). This trend continues today, with students developing strong and healthy bonds with their instructors and the program staff at Asia University and its related institutions including at the Center for English Language Education and Asia University America Program. Between its courses of study and the development of the Koa Educational Foundation, the school's primary mission was the study of and contribution to Asian nations, a focus which continued to inspire the curriculum as the school grew and changed over the decades as can be seen with Asia University's introduction of the Institute of Asian Studies.

The younger Asia University continues its predecessor's trend of connecting with Asia and the international community through its fields of study and institutions; additionally, Asia University's founders and leaders introduced their own principles to build from the groundwork set before them. Asia University's founding principles are those of "self-help and cooperation," of which the institution's founder, Kozo Ota, said the following in his essay entitled "Our Founding Principles—Cultivating the Spirit of Self-Help and Cooperation":

> The spirit of 'self-help,' the inspiration behind the establishment of this institution, encourages individuals to achieve personal autonomy, and to look to themselves as the greatest source of aid. Individuals must carve out their fate by virtue of their own efforts.... It is said that the flower of cooperation grows from the root of self-help. (Asia University, 2012, web)

Ota makes explicit and poetic his vision of self-sufficient students who develop a strong sense of personal responsibility from which will arise a desire and ability to aid their respective communities. Core to Asia University's mission, then, is the preparation of its students to become autonomous participants in a society of cooperation and communication, both in Japan and internationally. As Asia University's School Regulations state, “the mission of this institution is to nurture minds capable of achieving an integrated Asia, with priority being placed on conducting research and taking constructive action relating to Asian culture and society” (Asia University, 2012, web). It can be seen in the school's mission statement that the importance of the betterment of Asia remained a core ideal throughout the school's history. The university remains dedicated to this mission statement, and it has extended this spirit of self-help and cooperation by preparing students to “make a positive contribution to Japanese society, to the development of Asia and to the greater international community” (Asia University, 2012, web). By implementing curriculum, research institutes, and international programs that support the school's founding principles and current mission, Asia University maintains inter-cultural education and international cooperation as core values for its student population.

The Center for English Language Education (CELE)

Overview. The Center for English Language Education is one of the two research institutes at Asia University (the other being the Institute of Asian Studies). CELE is "dedicated to the research and teaching of the English language" (Asia University, 2012, web). In addition to developing Asia University's English curriculum, the Center teaches the Freshman English program for Asia University, prepares students to study abroad as part of the Asia University America Program, provides English language education and support for international students, conducts research related to the teaching of English, and publishes a journal (CELE, 2012).

History. CELE was founded in 1989 by former Asia University president Shinkichi Eto. Eto strongly supported the school's long-standing principles of international cooperation; he believed students' ability in foreign languages was essential to successful internationalization (CELE, 2012). He implemented the Asia University America Program, the Freshman English program at Asia University, and the English Language Education Research Institute (ELERI), which would later be renamed the Center for English Language Education (CELE) (CELE, 2012).

Initially, Asia University did not have strong ties to the AUAP consortium schools (CELE, 2012). To address this issue, the American Cultural Exchange program was implemented to recruit and hire Freshman English teachers from the universities hosting AUAP and from other qualified TESOL (Teaching English as a Second/Other Language) programs, develop the Freshman English curriculum, and help structure CELE. Over the years, CELE has continued to develop its program goals and grow its cross-cultural

connections with the consortium schools in the United States. They also serve the important role of preparing Asia University students for their study-abroad experiences via Asia University American Program; consequently, they help the Asia University students reintegrate into Japanese culture upon reentry to Japan, resume their coursework at Asia University, and retain their AUAP education and experiences (CELE, 2012).

Mission Statement. CELE seeks to uphold Asia University's principles of internationalism—"the belief that people of different countries should cooperate with and understand one another" (CELE, 2012, web); evident is CELE's connection to Asia University's ideals in their restatement of the principle of cooperation. CELE claims in their mission statement that "cooperation and intercultural understanding begin with communication and knowledge." It is with this in mind that CELE holds center to their philosophy the importance of communicating in a foreign language (in this case, English) with people from different cultures in order to foster lifelong intercultural exchanges (CELE, 2012).

CELE Freshman English Goals and Objectives

As the Freshman English program is one of CELE's primary purposes, they have explicit and thoroughly developed goals and objectives for the students taking the required course. These goals include the ability to adapt to Freshman English classroom culture, the improvement of English communication skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing), the interaction with people from other cultures, and the expression of critical thinking in English (CELE, 2012). The goals and their means of assessment point toward an understanding of the importance of authentic use of English as a means of intercultural communication.

Additionally, these goals play an important role in preparing the students at Asia University for their experience studying abroad: the students are exposed to a different classroom culture, given opportunity to use and learn English with native speakers, and introduced to another culture through their teachers who are visiting from native-English-speaking countries, all to help them transition into their five-month experience in the United States as part of the Asia University America Program.

Asia University America Program

Overview. Asia University America Program operates at four consortium universities in the United States: Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, Western Washington University, and the University of Arizona. AUAP is a self-support program, receiving no funding from the university in which it is located; the program operates primarily with sheltered instruction—AUAP creates and teaches its own curriculum, which is not part of the consortium university's pedagogy. The program averages about 130 students attending courses at the various branches per school year. Each AUAP cycle is five months, with two cycles per school year: one starting in the fall term and running until the spring term, and the second from the spring term and running into late summer.

At AUAP, the emphasis is on "communicative, interactive, content-based instruction" (CELE, 2012). In addition to providing intensive English instruction, AUAP is involved with campus and community life; they provide numerous opportunities for students to participate in volunteer work, campus events, local culture, and travel within the United States.

AUAP Mission Statement. The AUAP mission statement is as follows:

> The mission statement of the Asia University America Program is a threefold commitment to students, to the institution, and to the profession. The AUAP Program is committed to providing a high quality and dynamic study abroad program for students from Asia University. The AUAP Program will achieve its mission by providing:
>
> - A positive and supportive learning environment for second language learners;
> - Highly interactive and student-centered classes taught by skilled and experienced ESL faculty;
> - Strong student support services which facilitate students' adjustment to a new culture so that they can reach their academic and cultural objectives;
> - A variety of work-related, social, and cross-cultural opportunities for AUAP students. These opportunities help AUAP students to develop a keener sense of cultural awareness and cross-cultural understanding. (CELE, 2012)

The AUAP mission statement shows not only their commitment to the values set forth by the parent university, but also their specific goals of cultural adjustment, cross-cultural opportunities, and a broad multicultural learning experience. Indeed, the mission statement focuses primarily on the opportunity for cultural education and personal growth. AUAP serves the role of giving Asia University students a setting in which to experience authentic language use in the classroom and a variety of cultural-learning

opportunities in the local native culture.

With a brief summary of the history, goals, and relationships of the stake-holding institutions as backdrop, the report now turns to literature review to provide context through examining and synthesizing foundational theory and current studies that create a narrative resulting in AUAP's development of the Global Citizen Award.

Chapter 3

Literature Review: Context for the Global Citizen Award

Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature, both foundational and contemporary, to reveal and contextualize the various factors that inspired the creation of the Global Citizen Award for Asia University America Program (AUAP) at Eastern Washington University.

It begins by defining Communicative Language Teaching methodology (CLT), its origins and development as a popular means of teaching English as a second or foreign language (TESL/TEFL), and how this coincided with the growth and revision of English language teaching (ELT) policies in Japan. New and reiterated government policies from the 1980s to today stress the importance of communicative approaches to teaching foreign language.

This is followed with a collection of research that critiques the struggle by public schools in Japan to adequately implement communicative language teaching methods by examining the various factors keeping educators from advancing to more communicative ways of teaching English; such factors include the pervading cultural emphasis on college entrance exams, which reduces English language teaching to grammar and vocabulary drills, as well as the tendency of Japanese teachers of English to instruct entirely in Japanese. The research also examines the major attempt by policy makers to address the lack of native-level fluency in their teachers—namely, the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program and the deployment of Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) to public

schools. But as the research reveals, ALTs are not necessarily bringing English language teaching to a level of communicative methodology.

The literature review then adds the voice of students. Having experienced English language education through grammar and vocabulary memorization that focused primarily on higher entrance exam scores, Japanese students transition into university English courses feeling ill-prepared and conflicted about their English learning experiences (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009). These misgivings and misconceptions about English language education are exacerbated by the Japanese university culture that perpetuates the importance of English as a means toward higher standardized test scores. The review concludes by examining how all of these factors provide context for the Global Citizen Award: the perceived need to provide integrative motivation to AUAP students to participate in authentic communicative English language experiences outside of a classroom environment.

Language Teaching Policy, Practice, and the Impact on English Learning in Japan

Communicative Language Teaching. Before understanding key changes in Japan's policy on English language education starting in the late 20th century, it is important to understand that the Japanese Ministry of Education was moving toward a resolution that was in line with popular and burgeoning language teaching methodology—namely, Communicative Language Teaching, or CLT. In her article, "Communicative Language Teaching for the Twenty-First Century," Sandra Savignon (2001) explains the significance of a communicative approach to the teaching of a second or foreign language. CLT stresses that using language successfully is not simply sending

and receiving a message, but rather, the collaborative nature of making meaning. If meaning appears to be fixed, then the importance of communication is in the strategies that the participants employ to negotiate meaning rather than the message being conveyed (Savignon, 2011). Thus, according to Savignon, the value of a communicative approach to teaching English comes not in focusing on the content of the message, such as vocabulary, but in the recognition that the students should be using the language to navigate meaning authentically—to communicate with another speaker of the language—and using that recognition to develop a teaching method that encourages students to uncover successful strategies to communicate.

Communicative Language Teaching has a fairly recent history born out of criticism of the language teaching methodology of the time, which was perceived as yielding less-than-ideal results. In *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, Diane Larsen-Freeman (2000) gives a brief overview of the history of CLT. She points out that most 20th century methods of teaching second language education were aimed at teaching students to communicate in the target language; however, in the 1970s, educators began to wonder if they were going about it the right way:

> Some observed that students could produce sentences accurately in a lesson, but could not use them appropriately when genuinely communicating outside of the classroom. Others noted that being able to communicate required more than mastering linguistic structures.… It became clear that communication required that students perform certain functions as well.... In short, being able to communicate required more than linguistic competence; it required communicative competence—

knowing when and how to say what to whom. (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 121)

Larsen-Freeman observes that classroom use of a second language does not necessarily equate to authentic, natural use of that language: students could succeed in standardized language testing or scripted classroom assignments, but out in the world where language was a means of natural, dynamic communication, they were not prepared—they had not developed the strategies to negotiate meaning that Savignon discusses. It soon became the concern of educators and teaching theorists to consider language first and foremost as a system of communication and to address the challenges of meeting the communicative needs of language learners. As a result, ESL teaching moved toward a communicative approach starting in the 1970s, inspired by consistent observation that methodologies employed thus far were not yielding actual and authentic communication in the language being taught (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 121). This favorable view of CLT as language teaching methodology found its way to Japan, where a growing demand for English as a medium of global communication forced policy-makers to evaluate current teaching methodologies.

Japanese education and CLT. At the same time that research was being done into the benefits of communicative language teaching, Japan was experiencing education reformation, including changes to its foreign language teaching policy. One of the biggest revisions in policy was the adoption by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), or 文部省 (*monbushou*), of a communicative approach to the teaching of English as a foreign language, in line with contemporary research. As a result of this shift, the ultimate goal for English language

teaching in public education in Japan became the development of communicative competence in its students. In official guidelines for high school education as published by the Ministry in 1987, titled *The Course of Study for Senior High School* (also known as the Course of Study Guidelines), the objectives of English language teaching (ELT) are as follows:

> To develop students' ability to understand and express themselves in a foreign language; to foster students' positive attitude toward communicating in a foreign language, and to heighten their interest in language and culture, thus deepening international understanding. (Wada, 1994)

These objectives resonate with the decades of research by pioneers such as Lambert and Gardner (1959, 1968) that underscored the importance of positive attitude and interest in the target culture as integral to successful communication in second language learning. Moreover, these "Course of Study Guidelines" represent a significant change in public education policy, especially regarding ELT: they established national standards for the teaching of English as a foreign language in elementary and secondary schools. Minoru Wada (1994), an educator, senior advisor to the Japanese Ministry of Education, and advocate of English language teaching reform, claims the new policy as landmark: "For the first time it introduced into English education at both secondary school levels the concept of *communicative competence*" (p. 14). But why did the Ministry and ELT reformation advocates such as Wada view communicative competence as so critical? For one, contemporary ESL/EFL theory viewed a communicative approach to teaching English as authentic, meaningful, and couched in the idea of language as a means of

communication (Sauvignon, 2001; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Celce-Murcia, 2001). The idea of meaningful communication resonated with Japan's overarching educational policies of making a stronger Japan through stressing international communication and cooperation. Indeed, in promoting the change toward CLT education, Wada states that the purpose of this revision of policy was to better prepare students "to cope with the rapidly occurring changes toward a more global society" (Wada, 1994). The adoption of this policy in 1987 marks the move toward communicative competence in English language education within Japan's school systems, a policy, which, in theory if not always practice (as discussed later), continues today.

The implementation of this new nation-wide communicative ELT policy coincided with the introduction of both CELE and AUAP at Asia University just two years later in 1989. The timing of their creation and focus reflects the change in both Japanese ELT policy and contemporary theories on teaching English as a second language. CELE's philosophy that "cooperation and intercultural understanding begin with communication and knowledge" (CELE, 2006) reveals how the program's purpose ultimately linked Asia University's history of fostering cooperation in the international community with Japan's new policy of communicative second language learning. The program directors developed these burgeoning programs with the focus on a communicative approach to the teaching of English in order to foster successful inter-cultural connections.

As for AUAP, their policies also reflect this change: their pedagogical emphasis is first and foremost on "communicative" education; additionally, their mission statement focuses on the benefits of cultural learning in a new environment (AUAP, 2011), which

ultimately resonates with *monbushou's* objectives for ELT of a "deepening international understanding" (Wada, 1994, p. 13). Since its creation, AUAP has been focused, then, on a communicative approach to the teaching of English as a second language to the students visiting from Asia University, as inspired by both the home University's education policies as well as general trends toward this method of ESL teaching.

As public policy in Japanese primary and secondary education moved to keep up with trends in English language teaching, institutions such as Asia University and its affiliated programs adapted to accommodate the growing demand for communication in English. The decades following the implementation of new national policy as paralleled by the birth programs such as CELE and AUAP would show a cycle of interpretation of policy, evaluation of student progress and need, and revision of curriculum and the creation of programs designed to better meet the needs of Japanese English language learners.

Present day: CLT in theory but not in practice. Asia University America Program recently celebrated their 20 years of cultural exchange and education; it has been a time of reflection for the program, but also a time of evaluation of their progress toward communicative competency in their students. Many of the instructors are looking at the consistent trend of incoming students who demonstrate sporadic and often alarmingly low levels of English proficiency; additionally, students often lack of motivation toward using English authentically and meaningfully. Conversely, back in Japan, the faculty teaching English courses at Asia University experience frustration as many returning AUAP graduates quickly lose what levels of English improvement and classroom motivation they gained in their five months studying abroad, due mainly to

their re-acculturation back into a society where many value English only as a tool to gain a higher TOEIC (Test of English for International Communications) score. This frustration and reflection taking place in both institutions is indicative of a broader concern in the community of teachers, students, and researchers in Japan, primarily in public primary and secondary schools, where students are not receiving adequate preparation for using English in college, the workforce, and ultimately the international community.

Although communicative language teaching policy has been in place in Japan for approximately 25 years, in the public schools, teachers, administrators, and students are floundering when practice is grounded in a methodology aimed primarily at exam scores, which ultimately leads to university students who feel ill-prepared and conflicted about the worth of English as a second language and means of communication (Kikuchi and Browne, 2009).

Global English and its impact on education. The struggle of educators to live up to *monbushou*'s policy and the effect on Japanese students entering the English-speaking international community points to the global impact of English expansion and its effect on education policy in world countries and cultures. In his 2003 report titled "The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region," David Nunan writes, "despite the apparent widespread perception that English is a global language, relatively little systematic information has been gathered on its impact on educational policies and practices in educational systems around the world" (p. 589). Nunan understands that while English as a means of communication had spread around the world, there needs to be more research done into the impact that this trend has

had on education. Ultimately, the rapid and far-reaching spread of English as a global language means that "TESOL professionals need a clear understanding of educational policy implications of global English" (p. 590). So while the demand for English as a second/other language grows, so does the challenge for TESOL educators to uncover the problems it created in policy.

Nunan's own research helped highlight some problematic trends: he cites anecdotal evidence suggesting that "governments around the world are introducing English as a compulsory subject at younger and younger ages, often without adequate funding, teacher education for elementary school teachers, or the development of curricula and materials for younger learners" (p. 591). Such policy changes without considering the practical application or deployment suggests the need for a better understanding of how to adequately and effectively address the growing demand of English in the classroom. His claim also underscores the lack of consideration for teachers and students inherent in a shift in policy without proper training to account for policy change. His call for research is a call for TESOL professionals to understand and address the issues associated with English becoming a global language and how it impacts educational practices. Ultimately, Nunan claims, "governments and ministries of education are framing policies and implementing practices in the language area without adequately considering the implications of policies and practices on the lives of the teachers and students they affect" (p. 591). Indeed, Nunan's observations of English language teaching policy outpacing the classroom hold true in Japanese public schools, where the Ministry's guidelines are having little impact on classroom teaching methodology toward the communicative teaching of English.

Policy versus practice: Three factors. The reality of global English impacting educational practices in Japan led researchers to uncover factors keeping public education from meeting official policy. Two such researchers, Keita Kikuchi and Chris Browne, discuss their findings in "English Educational Policy for High Schools in Japan: Ideals vs. Reality." They claim three important factors that are detrimental to the success of CLT in the Japanese classroom, which they conclude from the synthesis of groundwork theory and contemporary studies. The three factors are 1. the orientation of high school classes toward university entrance exams (which tend to focus on receptive or translation skills), 2. an over-reliance on grammar translation activities, and 3. a severe lack of pre- and in-service teacher training (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009).

1. Teaching to the Test. The first factor holding back CLT in Japanese public schools—the teaching of English toward university entrance exams—speaks to a prevailing cultural value in the worth of standardized tests as means of easily measuring a student's ability against a benchmark. In a case study conducted by the co-author and another researcher (Browne and Wada, 1998), interviews with 1,200 senior high school English teachers found that "one of the strongest influences on teacher practice (even stronger than the influence of the Course of Study Guidelines), was the contents of the ministry approved textbooks [which are] designed to prepare students to pass their college entrance exams [;] all textbooks provide detailed teachers manuals which advocate teacher-fronted grammar translation methodologies" (pp. 175-6). This suggests that while policy makers in the higher levels of education ministry advocate for communicative approaches to the teaching of English, the very materials and training they provide for the teachers contradict the traits of CLT. But this contradiction comes, in

part, from the demand by the public for easily marketable and measurable assessment of student achievement—namely, standardized test scores. Indeed, the worth of the exam has become "deeply embedded in the society at large as well as the secondary education system within which teachers and students function" (p. 176). In other words, the elements of public policy and social values that place high value on the exam are inspiring teachers of English to employ grammar translation methodologies rather than update to communicative approaches. This demonstrates the correlation between all three factors: the pressure to teach to the test inspires teachers, many of whom were inadequately trained in the benefits of communicative teaching, to fall back on grammar translation as a means of teaching English.

2. Grammar-Translation as Methodology. Examining Grammar-Translation as a teaching methodology shows why the second factor introduced by Kikuchi and Browne (2009)—an over-reliance on grammar translation activities—is ultimately detrimental to *monbushou*'s CLT policy. Grammar-Translation Approach is a method of teaching a second or foreign language wherein the target language (in this case, English) is taught entirely in the native language (in this case, Japanese). According to Larsen-Freeman, in the early 20th century, educators used the method to help students learn and appreciate foreign language literature; it was also thought that through studying grammar of a second language, students would become more familiar with their own language's structure, helping them make improvements in their native language use. However, it was thought that "students would probably never use the target language, but the mental exercise of learning it would be beneficial anyway" (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 11). If this is the case, then while Grammar-Translation methodology appears to be a useful tool

in aiding both appreciation of foreign literature and education of one's own language, there seems to be a lack of concern for the actual use of the target language as a means of communicating with people of the target culture. So, Grammar-Translation does have benefits—a focus on reading wherein students learn the grammar rules and vocabulary of the target language, which, in turn, helps them better understand their own language's grammar (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 17)—but the drawbacks of Grammar-Translation as a teaching methodology in the context of communicative language teaching philosophy are manifold: the teacher's role is of absolute authority in the class; there is little interaction between students (most of the interaction is from teacher to student); there are no principles of this method which deal with the feelings of students; and the emphasis is almost solely on the skills of reading, writing, and the memorization of vocabulary and grammar at the expense of other language arts (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, pp. 17-18).

While Larsen-Freeman explains Grammar-Translation's origins, uses, and benefits as well as drawbacks, the question arises as to what, exactly, it looks like in the classroom—what form it takes in instruction and materials. The author of "Language Teaching Approaches: An Overview," Marianne Celce-Murcia (2001), describes Grammar-Translation Approach as having the following traits:

- Instruction is given in the native language of the students.
- There is little use of the target language for communication.
- Focus is on grammatical parsing, i.e., the form and inflection of words.
- The result of this approach is usually an inability on the part of the student to use the language for communication.

- The teacher does not have to be able to speak the target language.

(p. 6)

While the method may be appealing to teachers who are not fluent in English and who were taught the language in this way, it lends itself to perpetuating second language education as being nothing more than a formality as implied by Larsen-Freeman. Grammar-Translation ultimately dissuades or handicaps the learners from using English as an authentic means of communication; indeed, the trend away from Grammar-Translation was primarily in reaction to its "failure to produce learners who could communicate in the foreign language they had been studying" (Celce-Murcia, 2001, p. 6). Thus it is that Grammar-Translation Method in isolation is considered by most TESL scholars and researchers to be less effective than communicative methodology. It becomes quickly evident that a solely Grammar-Translation methodology is not compatible with Communicative Language Teaching, nor is it reflective of Japan's growing policy on English language teaching; if use of this method results in an inability of students to use the language to communicate (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Celce-Murcia, 2001), the time and energy spent teaching and learning English becomes counter-productive and fruitless in meeting policy goals and student needs.

3. Teacher Training. Looking at the third factor holding back CLT in public education—that of pre- and in-service teacher training—Kikuchi and Browne's (2009) research suggest that educators are aware of a public policy of communicative language teaching but are unable to effectively put it into practice. Through interviews with teachers, teacher-trainers, and researchers, Kikuchi and Browne state that *monbushou*'s Course of Study Guidelines, although viewed as "very important" by the participants, are

"not fully implemented in the classroom" (p. 175). If it is evident that educators and their trainers understand the Ministry's guidelines as integral to successful ELT, why do they not adopt communicative teaching in practice? Besides the reasons mentioned before, including demand for entrance exam preparation, Kikuchi and Browne suggest that one of the answers to this dilemma is in the pre-service and in-service training of Japanese English teachers. Surveys of 1,200 senior high school English teachers in the Chiba prefecture of Japan (a populous area east of Tokyo) show that most of them majored in English literature (63%) as opposed to ESL/EFL (only 3%) (Browne & Wada, 1998; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009, p. 175). The authors claim that this trend indicates an "absence of good pre-service training;" in its absence, "teachers tend to fall back on how they themselves were taught in school as a student" (p. 175). If this is the case, educators may be resorting to Grammar-Translation not only because of the demands of entrance exams, but also because it is what they are most familiar with.

With all of the factors inspiring a reliance on Grammar-Translation as the sole instructional methodology for the teaching of English, it is no wonder teachers and their institutions are struggling to adopt a dramatically different and seemingly contradictory means of language teaching. But the government attempted to adjust for these issues by implementing supplementary support primarily through the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program.

The JET Program and Assistant Language Teacher (ALT) issue. It seems that the ministry was aware of the issues impeding a communicative English-teaching methodology from the beginning of their policy change: In 1987, the same year that the Ministry of Education rolled out its new vision of communicative teaching of foreign

language, the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program was established.

JET and ALTs: history and overview. According to their website, the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program is "aimed at promoting grass-roots international exchange between Japan and other nations [through] foreign language education and international exchange activities" (JET, 2012). The JET program is governed by a public entity know as the Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR), which administers JET in cooperation with other government ministries, including *monbushou*. The JET program hires thousands of recent college graduates every year from various countries "to assist in international exchange and foreign language education in local governments, boards of education, and elementary, junior, and senior high schools throughout Japan" (CLAIR, 2012). The vast majority of those selected to participate in the JET Program are assigned to work as Assistant Language Teachers, who "assist with classes taught by Japanese teachers of English (JTE)"; in fact, more than 90% of JET participants are employed as ALTs (CLAIR, 2012). Thus, for over 25 years, the JET Program, in conjunction with and as overseen by the government, has brought ALTs *en masse* into secondary education as a primary means of meeting the growing demand for English language education in Japan.

The hope with ALTs operating in public schools and aiding in the teaching of English is that they would provide the much-needed elements of CLT: native instruction, authentic dialogue, and the facilitation of language as communication. The JET vision of ALT roles includes "team teaching" with the Japanese teachers of English, assisting in the development of curriculum, and participation in extra-curricular English activities (CLAIR, 2012). But how successful have the implementation and reinforcement of ALTs

been in fostering communicative learning? In the article, "Problems in the Assistant Language Teacher System and English Activity at Japanese Public Elementary Schools," the author, Chie Ohtani (2010), writes about the shortcomings of ALTs in English language education and how new government policy expands their role instead of addressing their inadequacy.

The "Rainbow Plan" and the expansion of ALT roles. According to Ohtani's 2010 article, Japan's Ministry of Education reinforced their goals of communicative teaching of English by revisiting it with new policy: in 2001, the Ministry of Education released their "Rainbow Plan," a 21st-century iteration of their ELT policy that makes English education activities mandatory at public elementary schools starting in 2011. Ohtani explains the plan:

> The purpose of the Rainbow Plan is to establish a system to foster a school environment in which Japanese students can become functional in English within a five year period. The goal is to promote international understanding through these programs. [The Ministry's] hope is that the students will then carry what they learned in school to their adult lives thereby benefiting Japan as a whole" (p.38).

The Rainbow Plan may be Japan's vision for 21st century ELT in elementary schools, but it echoes the sentiment of communicative English teaching policies established for high school education over 15 years before: the goals of inspiring functional English use, international connections, and the ultimate benefit to the community in which the students dwell. The new policy inspired many Japanese elementary schools to begin adaptations to their systems and curricula.

The government had introduced new policy to reinstate their goal of communicative English education and a timeline for its implementation, and schools were making preparations accordingly. But, just as with high school English teachers, the problem of non-fluent teachers relying on Grammar-Translation entirely in Japanese (as suggested by Kikuchi and Browne) had thus far been the primary means of English language education in elementary schools as well, even with two decades of policy advancement toward communicative approaches. To address this issue, *monbushou* introduced within the Rainbow Plan a recommended goal that "one-third of all English activity conducted in the classroom should utilize either Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs), fluent English speakers, or junior high school English teachers" (Ohtani, 2010, p. 38). The explicit requirement of schools to incorporate fluent or experienced English speakers shows that policy, at least, recognized that communicative language learning couldn't take place as long as English language education was taking place exclusively in Japanese. Because so many Japanese elementary school teachers never experienced English instruction when they were elementary school children, and because pre-service teachers generally didn't and don't have adequate curriculum to prepare them to teach English in Japanese schools (Kikuchi & Brown, et al), there are perceived "deficiencies" that need to be supplemented by the use of native or fluent English speakers. As a result, about 70 percent of English activities in elementary schools use ALTs to supplement English language teaching and answer the Rainbow Plan's goal (Ohtani, 2010). This means that the large majority of public schools are interpreting and attempting to meet the national ETL policy by utilizing Assistant Language Teachers as an integral component of English teaching to make up for the native teacher's reliance on Japanese.

And so, in 2002, "the JET program was extended to provide an elementary school ALT program to meet the recommendations of the Rainbow Plan;" as a result, 80 percent of JET participants are working in public schools in Japan (Ohtani, 2010). Thus, Assistant Language Teachers, who were already playing a major role in the teaching of English at junior high and high schools, became the primary means at all levels of public education to meet the demands of the Rainbow Plan and account for the problem of teacher language fluency.

The issues with ALTs: Qualifications, training, and cultural barriers. The problem in using ALTs to address the demands of this new 21st century policy, however, is that doing so did not take into consideration the efficacy or adequacy of the ALT system in the first place. Ohtani writes that "the Rainbow Plan failed to address the impact of ALTs on English activities because there is no discourse regarding the quality of ALTs, nor does it address the issue of communication between ALTs and Japanese teachers" (p. 38). While the JET program claims success based on the numbers of participants, it does not assess the quality of the program through "qualitative surveys and other forms of research" (p. 38).

Ohtani (2010) attempts to field this research by first critiquing the inaccuracy of JET contract language between Japanese and English in describing the ALT position requirements, which ultimately results in poor eligibility criteria; she then reviews and analyzes the AJET study (Huang and Swallow, 2005), which provides interviews with ALT and other JET participants who discuss frustrations with inadequate training, ambiguities between expected and actual jobs, and "insufficient education and pedagogic background" (Ohtani, 2010, p. 40). Ultimately, between misleading and inaccurate

contract rhetoric, poor pre- and in-service training, a lack of TESL or similar background requirements, and short contracts resulting in revolving-door employee rotation, the JET program, while playing a critical role in Japan's English education, continues “the cycle of inexperience and ineffective training” (Ohtani, 2010, p. 41).

But the burden of responsibility does not rest entirely with the JET program; the schools in which ALTs operate are a large factor contributing to their success or failure. One of the major issues that Ohtani raises is of language and cultural barriers. ALTs are not required to speak any level of Japanese before being offered a contract: it is merely required that they “make an effort to study or continue studying the Japanese language prior to and after arriving in Japan” (CLAIR, 2012). Conversely, many Japanese teachers “cannot fully communicate in English” (Ohtani, 2010, p. 42). As a result, neither the ALTs or the JTEs (Japanese Teachers of English) can use either language well enough to communicate about more complicated issues involved in teaching without devoting “a lot of time and energy to exchange ideas and information” (p. 42)—time and energy that overworked teachers may not have and may resent giving, making the creation of authentic communicative curriculum difficult at best. So the language barrier not only prevents adequate communication about teaching methods in the classroom, but also potentially inspires an uncomfortable or nonexistent partnership between the team teachers. “This results in a lack of communication that impedes the quality and quantity of information and the preparation of lessons” and “makes ALTs feel a sense of isolation,” says Ohtani (p. 42)–ironic, considering that both the goal of the JET program and *manbushou*'s position on foreign language learning is one of international cooperation.

Another facet of the language and culture barrier is that most Japanese teachers of English expect the Assistant Language Teachers to understand not only teaching but also Japanese culture, including the culture of the Japanese classroom and education system. However, most of these teachers are not familiar with the ALT recruit system (Ohtani, p. 42). The reality is that ALTs are not required to understand Japanese culture or education, nor are they required to be versed or even familiar with Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language theory: JET only requires that applicants "be interested in Japan, and be willing to deepen their knowledge and appreciation of Japan after their arrival" (CLAIR, 2012). In the JET Program's defense and in light of recent critique of ALT qualifications, they have adjusted hiring eligibility guidelines for ALT applicants. But while the newer requirements speak of an awareness of the problem, the language in the requirements are, again, vague and open-ended: ALT applicants must "be interested in the Japanese educational system and particularly in the Japanese way of teaching foreign languages;" additionally, they must "be qualified as a language teacher *or be strongly motivated* to take part in the teaching of foreign languages [my emphasis]" (CLAIR, 2012). Taken verbatim, the "requirements" are nothing more than suggestions to potential ALT applicants that they express interest in motivation in critical areas if they don't have background or training in Japanese culture and language teaching methodology. The hiring policy, while updated, still demonstrates the misleading contract language that Ohtani's research uncovered; such vague eligibility criteria cannot ensure that qualified JET applicants are hired or that communication or cultural understanding will take place between ALTs and JTEs.

These teams of English teachers cannot hope to adequately instill in their students

international communication and cooperation as long as they are incapable of communicating or cooperating amongst themselves to improve the process. Ultimately, while the Japanese public education system turned to ALTs to address their inability to use and teach English in fluency, they cannot necessarily implement them effectively because of language and cultural barriers and inadequate hiring and recruitment procedures.

ALTs as detrimental to Communicative Language Teaching. While the JET Program is an attempt by the government to enforce a communicative language teaching policy, the perception by many is that it isn't working. With the program flaws and cultural-language barriers aside, how, exactly, is the inadequate use of ALTs ultimately detrimental to the concept of communicative language learning?

ALTs are not necessarily a communicative resource. First, one should examine the teacher roles in Communicative Approach and consider whether the dynamic of ALT and JTE working together matches the criteria. According to Celce-Murcia in *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, the roles of teachers and their materials in Communicative Approach are defined in the following terms:

- The teacher's role is primarily to facilitate communication and only secondarily to correct errors.
- The teacher should be able to use the target language fluently and appropriately.
- Classroom materials and activities are often authentic to reflect real-life situations and demands. (Celce-Murcia, 2001, p. 9)

Because Assistant Language Teachers are just that—assistants to the actual teachers of

the subject of English (the JTEs)—we should look first at whether the primary instructors can meet these criteria. As established by Ohtani (2010) and Kikuchi and Browne (2009), the Japanese teachers usually cannot function in the English language well enough to communicate and end up relying on their native language to teach English; it is logical correlation, then, that they cannot facilitate adequate English communication in the student learners within the precepts of authentic CLT methodology. The second criterion also cannot necessarily be met for the same reason: they are using Japanese almost exclusively to teach English, and many Japanese teachers cannot or will not self-identify as fluent. As for the third criterion, it is possible that the implementation of ALTs represents an attempt to meet the CLT requirement—authentic materials and activities in the form of dialogue with native English speakers that can, theoretically, represent real-life situations and demands. But how do ALTs, then, measure up to the traits of Communicative Approach, either as teacher or material?

While it is usually the case that ALTs can and do meet the second criterion of target language fluency, it is often not utilized by the schools "appropriately": as many ALTs have lamented in surveys and personal interviews, they are often reduced to roles of mimicry or modeling; one pervading JET stereotype discussed in the 2008 JET handbook is that teachers may limit the ALT role to "model reading" and "pronunciation" (Ohtani, 2010, p. 42). Part of the issue creating this dynamic arises from the language and cultural barriers and lack of pre-service training or requirements of most JET participants mentioned earlier, effectively excluding ALTs from the production of curriculum. Another factor is the native teachers' high work load, which, coupled with the language barrier, can lead to frustration, resentment, and confusion on what to do with

the ALT in the classroom (Ohtani, 2010), often resulting in vocabulary or grammar drills, pronunciation modeling, or out-of-context dialogue practices. With no role in the development of a curriculum, the native expert on both English language and culture may be excluded from the development of "authentic curriculum" as prescribed by Celce-Murcia. Additionally, reducing ALT roles to language modeling does not "reflect real-life situations and demands" as defined by CLT's trait of meaningful communication and implicit in *monbushou*'s goals of international understanding, positive attitude, and interest in foreign language and culture. Ultimately, the use of ALTs in this way, rather than bringing English language teaching methodology into the 21st century to match contemporary theory and policy, ensures that it remain grounded in non-communicative methodologies.

ALTs as Audio-Lingual Methodology. If ALTs and their supervisors struggle to operate in a truly communicative approach to teaching English, how can an observer best describe what, exactly, they are doing? It is my claim that they are actually operating in another methodology of teaching English as a foreign language, one that attempts to overcome the shortcomings of Grammar-Translation but doesn't go as far toward a communicative approach as CLT: that is, Audiolingualism.

In contrast to CLT, the Audiolingual approach to teaching English as a second or foreign language has the following traits as defined by Celce-Murcia (2001):

- Mimicry and memorization are used, based on the assumption that language is habit formation.
- Pronunciation is stressed from the beginning.
- Language is often manipulated without regard to meaning or

context.

- The teacher must be proficient only in the structures, vocabulary, etc. that he or she is teaching since learning activities and materials are carefully controlled. (p. 7)

If ALTs are excluded from production of authentic curriculum and reduced to pronunciation, vocabulary, and non-contextualized language learning as suggested by many ALTs and critics of the JET program; and if the native Japanese teachers are not "fluent" in the target language beyond basic structure and vocabulary because of an over-reliance on carefully-controlled curriculum (ministry textbooks focused on grammar drills); then, based on contemporary theory of language teaching methodology, it is more accurate to describe the role of ALTs in Japanese English language teaching as part of an audio-lingual teaching style employed by Japanese educators. And, as evident by the overwhelming reliance on the ALTs in all aspects of primary education, elementary through high school, coupled with an exam-inspired focus on grammar and vocabulary, it may be accurate to describe the overall practice of ELT in Japanese schools not in terms of Communicative Approach, but in terms of Audiolingualism.

Audio-Lingualism and CLT. How is Audio-Lingual Method not appropriate for Japan's policy on communicative language teaching? While in many ways it is an advancement from Grammar Translation by recognizing certain facets of language learning, such as that language forms "occur most naturally within a context" and that language learning is about using language "to communicate" (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 43), its main means of delivery and ultimate purpose are not fully conducive to Japan's strong CLT policy. Larsen-Freeman explains that Audio-Lingual Method "drills students

in the use of grammatical sentence patterns" (p. 35); additionally, the feelings of the students are not dealt with, and grammatical patterns are the most emphasized (p. 46). The focus on grammar drills and the absence of consideration of student feelings toward the target language lend themselves to perpetuating the culture of teaching to the test and disregarding the affect of such methodology on the learner. So, the reliance on ALTs is a step in the direction toward communicative language learning, but the resource is rarely utilized adequately or authentically, potentially putting the language teaching process in a methodology more akin to Audio-Lingualism.

The result of the absence of CLT in public schools. Ultimately, between a reliance on grammar-translation through Japanese, a focus on English as a tool for exams, and a reliance on potentially untrained and unqualified ALTs to attempt communicative teaching, Japanese students are entering universities with a severe lack of proficiency in English, and it is due, at least in part, to the impact of policy changes in response to the globalization of English without adequate structural change in educational practices.

English Language Education in the Japanese University

The student voice. While educators, researchers, and policy-makers grapple with the issues preventing an adequate implementation of communicative language teaching, students learners of English are often feeling that they receive an inadequate English education and are entering their adult careers or college life unprepared to use English to communicate. Thus, in addition to the research, analysis, and conclusions provided by scholars, it is important to analyze and consider the students' voice as part of the dialogue on education policy. As part of their study on English educational policy in Japanese

high schools, Kikuchi and Browne included student voices by conducting both quantitative and qualitative follow-up surveys with university freshman who had experienced English education in public school. Their study "focused on recent high school graduates' perceptions of senior high school classroom practice connected with the Course of Study Guidelines" (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009, p. 173).

Quantitative data of freshman interviews. Their quantitative study results yielded convincing numbers. Utilizing a Likert scale, the questionnaire asked 90 students to rate their responses to various questions about their English education experiences on a scale of 1 (Disagree) to 6 (Agree) (see figure X.X). The questions represent the goals and traits of communicative language teaching as defined by Larsen-Freeman (2000), Celce-Murcia, et al (2001), as well as those that embody the spirit of *monbushou*'s stated policy on ELT. The first set of statements are framed within the broad dependent clause, "In high school English classes that I took..."

Quantitative Results

Table 1. *Students' Views on Overall Objectives* (*n*=90)

Overall objectives of the high school English classes		Disagree ←→Agree					
In high school English classes that I took…		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1	I studied how to use English to communicate about everyday topics.	14	34 (53%)	22	15 (41%)	4	1 (6%)
2	The way I was taught English helped me to have a more positive attitude about studying English.	11	17 (31%)	21	22 (48%)	14	5 (21%)
3	The way I was taught English helped me to be better able to convey my ideas in English.	20	35 (61%)	15	15 (33%)	5	0 (6%)
4	The way I was taught English helped me to be better able to understand English better.	12	28 (44%)	24	16 (44%)	9	1 (11%)

Figure 1. Likert scale table from Kikuchi & Browne, 2009

As the results of the survey shown in Figure 1 suggest, a dramatically high percentage of the students surveyed disagreed with the claims that their high school classes helped them communicate authentically in English and/or convey ideas in English; most students felt negative or neutral about how it helped them understand English; and few felt positive about their experience learning English. If a communicative approach should stress the purpose of language as communication—the navigation between conveying and understanding meaning—the poll results indicate that many students do not perceive their education as communicative.

Qualitative data. Kikuchi and Browne developed the following questions for students to provide written responses to; they analyzed those responses and reflected on the significance accordingly:

Question 1. What are students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom practice in

the high school English classroom? In analysis of the answers students provided to this question, Kikuchi and Browne claim, “the overall trend in the data clearly indicates that students didn't feel that the goals of the Course of Study Guidelines were being effectively implemented by their teachers in the classroom” (p. 187). The statement implies that students are aware of *monbushou's* designs for communicative ELT and recognize its absence or ineffectiveness in classroom pedagogy.

Question 2. How well does classroom practice (as understood by students) support the stated goals related to teaching English for communicative purpose as stated in the Course of Study Guidelines? Kikuchi and Browne surmise from student comments that they are “already clearly feeling that their English classes were not being taught for communicative purposes;” with some of the respondents lamenting that “*almost everything we did was related to reading*” (p. 188). Additionally, many respondents consider their classes as nothing more than “'grammar in preparation for college entrance exams'” (p. 188). Although the student respondents may not be experts in or even familiar with ESL/EFL teaching theory, their comments and ideas demonstrate that they recognize positive and beneficial methods of learning a foreign language, and they perceive that they did not receive it through high school English curriculum.

Their comments also highlight one of the biggest and lasting roadblocks to successful policy-implementation: the primary focus of English language education toward exam scores. The reflection of students on their English education experience points to a meta-awareness of Japanese cultural ideas of the worth of English education; until focus is shifted from test preparation, students will not experience truly communicative English language learning.

What the student voices tell us. In the conclusion of their study, Kikuchi and Browne synthesize the student voices to make a bold but evident claim:

> In this study, there was clear evidence of a gap between the stated goals of the ministry's course of study guidelines and actual teaching practice in the high school English classroom. Although it is true that the stated goals of these guidelines clearly emphasize the importance of developing students' communicative competence, it seems equally true that Japanese teachers of English, for whatever the underlying reasons may be, are either unwilling or unable to teach English in a communicative manner. (pp. 188-9).

Kikuchi and Browne recognize that while Japan's official policy is of communicative teaching of English for authentic inter-cultural communication, the practice employed in Japanese high schools is not meeting the expectations of language education policy makers and, ultimately, the goals of teaching English as a second or foreign language.

Where Kikuchi and Browne do not suggest what underlying reasons prevent communicative teaching, the literature that I have gathered, analyzed, and synthesized in this report indicate that the primary factor inspiring a reliance on Grammar-Translation is the cultural value placed on exams, and that the attempt by the government to correct for this—utilizing ALTs in the classroom—is not adequately accounting for or correcting this trend. Ultimately, high school graduates are entering universities ill-prepared for any coursework or programs designed to build off of an assumed CLT experience. But more importantly, students enter the university culture bringing in the prevailing values of English as a means to be used to achieve higher exam scores—a value reinforced, not

refuted, by the university culture through its focus on the TOEIC exam.

TOEIC: The paradox of CLT and standardized testing. "TOEIC' stands for "Test of English for International Communications." Created in 1979 by the Educational Testing Service, a nonprofit test development institution operating since 1947, the TOEIC was conceived and implemented in Japan as, according to ETS, "a common global yardstick for measuring English skills" (TOEIC, 2012). Though the TOEIC was adopted by the government almost a decade before they dramatically revamped their English language education policy, TOEIC survived as one of the primary and oft-selected means of measuring English success.

As much as *monbushou* was advocating for and enacting policy in support of communicative means of teaching and learning English, they made their own task more difficult by also implementing policy enforcing the value of standardized testing, as seen in government-approved textbooks suggesting grammar drills as a means toward exam preparation (which, as demonstrated, resulted in a reliance on grammar translation and not communicative approaches).

In the early stages of the communicative policy's implementation, political debate raged regarding the path that English education should take in public policy. Many criticized the influence of college entrance exams on English education and called for the removal of English from exam requirements, a component that was perceived by these parties as a hindrance to the effectiveness of language teaching (Kikuchi and Browne, 2009). But there was a backlash against anti-exam rhetoric in the 1990s when current policy came under fire: for example, one influential government official argued that "rather than drop English as a subject on the entrance exams, more standardized

measurements, such as the TOEFL [Test of English as a Foreign Language] exam, should be used instead" (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009, p. 174).

Partly influenced by this latter logic, and mostly as a result of dissatisfaction with education practice not meeting policy, *monbushou* revised their policy yet again: in 2003, the Ministry implemented even more specific goals for their English education policy with the "Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities." Part of the plan called for "criterion-based assessment of student ability via such measure as the TOEIC test" (MEXT, 2003). In part, the inclusion of this provision reflects that "standardized proficiency measures such as the TOEIC test are prominently mentioned as ways of gauging the effectiveness of the plan's implementation" (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009, p. 174). So not only is there a conflict of interest between government policy and public education practice in the call for communicative education and the necessity of teaching to the test, but also there is an internal conflict in the policy itself, which demands a communicative language teaching process but expects to gauge it based on standardized test scores. Ultimately, the 21st century's iteration of public ELT policy underscored the value of the tests like the TOEIC at the same time it stressed the importance of communicative English learning.

The result is a paradoxical university culture, valuing both communicative teaching to help students enter the community of global English and the TOEIC as a culturally accepted and demanded benchmark through which to evaluate student and institutional success. Nowhere is this more evident than at schools like Asia University, where students study Business Administration, Economics, Law, and International Relations—fields that demand the TOEIC test as a measurement of graduate ability to use

English in the public and business sectors of Japan. So while schools like Asia University, operating in this paradox, are providing communicative classroom experiences in English education, they also face the reality of student, public, and cultural expectations and goals for English: namely, preparation for TOEIC and improvement in TOEIC scores. To combat this paradox, Asia University can, in large part, turn to their secondary English programs to supplement the classroom focus on improving TOEIC scores—programs that are designed to heighten student communicative learning opportunities grounded in cultural authenticity and application—in other words, Asia University America Program.

Asia University America Program and the Effort Toward Communicative Teaching

CLT curriculum in practice. In light of the national goals of Japanese education for English language teaching, and in no small part a response to the lack of adequate English education that freshman are entering the university with, the administrators, staff, and faculty at AUAP have developed and continue to evaluate and revise a curriculum grounded in Communicative Approach. This can be seen first and foremost in the very nature of AUAP as a sheltered model.

Sheltered programs. The term "sheltered model" is defined by Marguerite Ann Snow in her 2001 essay, "Content-Based and Immersion Models for Second and Foreign Language Teaching," as a "deliberate separation of second/foreign language students from native speakers of the target language for the purpose of content instruction" (p. 303). The benefit of this model is that sheltered courses can be effective in "integrating language and content instruction for intermediate ESL students whose language skills

may not yet be developed enough for them to be mainstreamed with native English speakers" (Snow, 2001, p. 308). This description is apt for the average AUAP student who has learned enough English to operate in a modified and adaptable English-only content-based curriculum, but not quite enough to enroll in the average EWU course.

Content-based instruction. Content-based instruction in the framework of communicative language learning is based on the idea that second language acquisition occurs when students receive comprehensible input, not when they memorize vocabulary or grammar (Snow, 2001). A content-based curriculum in communicative teaching therefore provides both comprehensible input and the opportunity for comprehensible output from the students: in other words, the content focuses on the "communicative purposes for which speakers use the second/foreign language" (Snow, 2001, p. 303). The content needs to reflect when, how, and why the student would be using the language. For an AUAP class operating in a truly communicative methodology, the content of a given class may focus on "invitations, and individual lessons might cover question types, polite versus formal invitation forms, and ways to accept or decline invitations" (Snow, 2001, p. 303). In fact, this specific kind of content-based instruction is the theme of the AUAP class called "Functions."

In Functions, the content is built around developing comprehensible dialogue in real scenarios in AUAP American life—everything from ordering pizza to having conversations with American peers and friends. Students in Functions also learn the nuances and idioms of American English, such as slang and standard greetings, and the socio-cultural significances of certain words or phrases. These are traits that Celce-Murcia (2001) describes as "semantic notions and social functions" of a communicative

approach (p. 8): the students learn the various meanings of the language they use and how meaning can change from one use to the next; they also learn how to operate in the target culture by adopting strategies to use the target language for effective communication. Students taking Functions also experience other communicative activities: they "often engage in role play or dramatization to adjust their use of the target language to different social contexts"; they also extensively "work in groups or pairs to transfer (and, if necessary, negotiate) meaning" (Celce-Murcia, 2001, p. 8). Functions is just one of the many AUAP courses that have authentic content designed to encourage a communicative English learning experience.

Incorporation of all language arts. In all of the AUAP courses, students are learning communicatively by using all of the language arts, defined by the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English as "reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing, and visually representing" (IRA & NCTE, 1996, p. 1). AUAP students read authentic texts, write dynamically-constructed responses, sentences, or essays, listen to native speakers and their peers, speak in response to prompt questions or as part of pair or group dialogue, view media, and visually represent through creative projects including poster presentations. Use of the language arts fits within the traits of CLT: "Skills are integrated from the beginning" and "involve reading, speaking, listening, and also writing" (Celce-Murcia, 2001, p. 8). In *Language Arts: Patterns of Practice*, Gail Tompkins (2009) writes, "the goal of language arts instruction is for students to develop communicative competence" (p. 30). If the purpose of a broad language arts experience is to inspire communicative competence, AUAP courses ensure that students learn English communicatively through utilizing all of the six language arts.

CLT curriculum and classroom limitations at AUAP. As demonstrated, the content and methodology of AUAP classes are highly communicative in nature. But the effectiveness of the curriculum in inspiring students to adapt to and retain communicative learning faces three significant hurdles: student ability, habit, and motivation. Much of the following analysis is based on my observations as participant-observer in AUAP for over 17 months, supported by foundational and contemporary literature.

***Student ability*.** Because the majority of Freshman at Asia University enter the program without having received much or any communicative language teaching in public schools, they often transition into Asia University America Program ill-prepared for the practices and demands of an authentic communicative learning experience. Celce-Murcia suggests as a caveat to CLT's integration of language arts the assumption that "learners are educated and literate" (p. 8). While "educated" and "literate" can be seen as subjective terms, it is often that case that a given AUAP student operating at a low level of English fluency struggles with using English to communicate because they have rarely or never had the occasion to. Often, the students who are operating at low or no levels of communicative ability resort to familiar patterns of practice in an attempt to succeed in classes: namely, memorizing what are perceived as key terms within the content of a given class. While they aren't necessarily navigating meaning, and comprehensible input and output are not necessarily taking place, they can hope to regurgitate "bold" terms in response to teacher inquiries or fill-in-the-blank test prompts.

***Student habit*.** This segues into the next issue, one that is so pervasive as to directly impact the success of communicative curriculum: the belief of English as a tool to achieve higher TOEIC scores, and the habit born out of it—memorization. Again, this

belief and these habits are not groundless: Even at AUAP, they are reinforced by the use of standardized tests and quizzes; additionally, there is the overarching goal of TOEIC improvement at AUAP as seen in both a TOEIC preparation class and in the culminating AUAP final—the TOEIC test itself. Even with classroom practice and materials grounded in communicative approach, the demands of standardized tests every week, in every course, and every term impact student perception of the use and purpose of English. While significant amount of class time is given to communicative dialogue in English, just as much if not more time in and out of class encourages grammar and vocabulary memorization. Benefits of testing aside, this impacts student motivation—their reasons for learning and improving English in the first place.

Student motivation. Both student ability and habit relate to each other and directly impact student motivation, which in turn directly impacts the other factors. If students are struggling in class, and/or if they perceive English as a means to an end and nothing more, they may not feel the same kind or level of motivation as those who have a personal and invested desire to do so. As established by extensive and foundational research by Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert (1959, 1968), attitude and motivation directly correlate with second-language achievement (Gardner, 1968). Decades of study show that students who understand that learning a second language will help them interact with the target community tend to have positive attitudes toward that community; they are more motivated to learn the second language and work harder to do so, and are ultimately more successful in acquiring the target language (Gardner, 1968). Gardner describes this as “integrative motive,” which implies that “successful second-language acquisition depends on a willingness (or desire) to be like valued members of the 'other'

language community" and a realization that acquisition of that language requires behavior that characterizes the target community (1968, p. 143). What this means for second-language learners (and for the purposes of this study, AUAP students) is that if their motivation is based on an internal and authentic desire to interact in meaningful ways with the language users, they are more likely to acquire the second language successfully and effectively. Thus, it is in AUAP's best interest to encourage integrative motivation in the participant students so that they truly embrace the communicative nature of language learning and live up to the philosophies in Japanese policy underscoring the importance of international awareness and inter-cultural appreciation and cooperation.

Contrasted with integrative motivation is instrumental motivation, where "the reasons reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement" (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, p. 267). For AUAP students, this can mean the use of English to achieve a higher TOEIC score. While it may be a motivational factor to succeed on a test or pass a class, this, ultimately, is not nearly as beneficial in the learning of a second language as suggested by the groundwork studies conducted in 1959 by Garnder and Lambert:

> Integratively oriented students are generally more successful in acquiring [second language] than those who are instrumentally oriented. Further, the students with the integrative orientation have more favourable attitudes towards members of the [target] group and are more strongly motivated to acquire their language. (p. 271)

As established, the prevailing cultural value in Japan on entrance and placement exams influences the teaching methodology employed in ETL; but according to Gardner and

Lambert, this instrumental motivation is also ultimately detrimental to the quality and success of second language learning.

Integrative Motivation: The Inspiration for the Global Citizen Award.

Summary of literature review. The changing trends in TESL/TEFL inspired not only educational reform in Japan, but also new policy and programs at Asia University, including Asia University America Program. But in the decades of revision, evaluation, and assessment of policy, research shows that public education still relies on methodology such as Grammar-Translation and first-language instruction instead of truly communicative approaches to teaching English as a second language. Additionally, attempts to address these issues, such as employing ALTs in public schools, have made little headway in overcoming the fundamental problem: a focus by teachers, students, government, and the public on standardized tests. This focus continues into the university, where students who rarely or never encountered communicative English education not only are now thrust into it via programs such as AUAP, but also are potentially entering it with purely instrumental motivation.

The purpose of the Global Citizen Award. With all of these factors in mind, the administrators and staff at Asia University America Program sought to encourage students to develop integrative motivation to learn English—an internal and authentic desire to interact in meaningful ways with the language users. The belief was that students could further enhance authentic communicative English learning and supplement classroom education by participating in opportunities to integrate into American society, including but not limited to service learning, campus and community activities, and inter-

cultural connections with the people they came in contact with outside of the classroom. As a result, the students would potentially, of necessity and/or desire, adopt positive attitudes of the English-speaking community and adapt to their environment by navigating meaning through communication. From this belief came the Global Citizen Award: a system developed to acknowledge the integrative motivation of AUAP students who are learning English communicatively, and one that gives them a framework though which to do so.

The thesis now turns to revealing and explaining the research methodology employed for the development, analysis, and revision of the Global Citizen Award.

Chapter 4

Research Methodology

This chapter discloses the research methodology that I, as primary researcher and thesis author, employed in the development, analysis, and evaluation of the Global Citizen Award. Aside from the inclusion of a literature review, this report features primarily qualitative research methodology operating in the epistemology of constructivist grounded theory and taking the form of ethnography. The ethnographic research is conducted by means of both participant observation and document analysis.

Constructivist Grounded Theory

The TESOL guidelines for qualitative research state that the researcher should "approach data analysis and findings through an inductive and recursive process;" the researcher should "expect patterns, categories, or themes to evolve as data collection proceeds rather than imposing them a priori" (Chappelle and Duff, 2003, p. 174). In other words, research is conducted not necessarily with the hopes of supporting or refuting claims already established, but rather, to disclose what elements reveal themselves in the process. This is the essence of grounded theory and the epistemology I have adopted throughout my research process: my analysis of the documents—both the Global Citizen Award as a text and the written texts generated by the students—provides me with the patterns and themes of the Global Citizen Award as they emerge.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) define "grounded theory" as being generated from a qualitative study that fits the situation being researched and works when put into use—in

other words, theory that is based in the data being collected and is relevant to the behavior being studied. The purpose of adopting a grounded theory in research is to bring awareness to the research project, the roles of the author of the research, and the interactions between the author and the research participants. As explained by Mills, Bonner, and Francis (2009) in "Adopting a Constructivist Approach to Grounded Theory: Implications of Research Design," constructivist grounded theory forces the researcher to "reflect upon his or her underlying assumptions and heightens his or her awareness of listening to and analyzing participants' stories as openly as possible" (p. 9). In this thesis, I have revealed my own assumptions about all aspects of the program and its participants, considered multiple voices in the analysis of supporting literature, and ensured that the focus of my qualitative research was to gather and analyze the voices of the participants, including myself as participant-observer and the student participants through analysis of their reflective writing.

Ethnographic Research

Operating in constructivist grounded theory, I turned to ethnography as my primary research technique. In *TESOL Quarterly*, Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo (1988) defines ethnography as "the study of people's behavior in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, with a focus on the cultural interpretation of behavior" (p. 576). In my qualitative study of the Global Citizen Award at Asia University America Program, I seek to "provide a description and an interpretive-explanatory account of what people do in a setting" (Watson-Gegeo, 1988, p. 576). In my case, I describe the AUAP program and the Global Citizen Award through the history of the various institutions, the background

of communicative language teaching in Japanese education, and how AUAP students are learning English; I then attempt to explain the students behaviors in the AUAP classrooms and as participants in the Global Citizen Award and interpret the meaning of the award for the participants (as seen in my analysis of the Global Citizen award and the student writing from the award).

According to Watson-Gegeo (1988), ethnography is concerned with the behavior of a group of people, though it takes into consideration the individual. Additionally, ethnography is holistic: any single aspect of the group or culture should be seen through the lens of the whole. Finally, ethnography "begins with a theoretical framework directing the researcher's attention to certain aspects of situations and certain kinds of research questions" (pp. 577-8). For my purposes, I have been looking at common trends and themes across both the general AUAP population as well as the group of award participants; I have been looking at the award, and specifically the reflective writing, in order to better understand the community as a whole; additionally, I began my research and development of the award with a focus on communicative language learning and integrative motivation, but as is the case with grounded theory research, I allowed my analysis of the process and documents to develop my claims.

Another concern in ethnography is that of the "etic" versus "emic" perspective. An etic view will be "from the researcher's ontological or interpretive framework" whereas an emic will be culturally specific and "used by the members of a society/culture for interpreting and assigning meaning to experiences" (Watson-Gegeo, 1988, p. 579). Watson-Gegeo claims that "concern with the understandings participants themselves have of the situations in which they are observed has led ethnographers to emphasize emic

analysis" (p. 579). In other words, the meta-awareness of the participants is crucial to ethnography; but to accurately represent the participant experience requires an emic perspective. "Emic terms, concepts, and categories are therefore functionally relevant to the behavior of the people studied by the ethnographer. An analysis built on emic concepts incorporates the participants' perspectives and interpretations of behavior, events, and situations and does so in the descriptive language they themselves use" (Watson-Gegeo, 1988, p. 579). So an authentic ethnography with a true emic perspective seeks to give an unfiltered and authentic voice to the target community. In order for my research to be ethnographic, I have included in my document analysis the reflective writing provided by the award participants, which I have left unedited. While I will interpret and analyze their writing in broader etic educational terms, I include their texts as unedited to reveal their own interpretations of their experiences participating in the award process as members of the AUAP community.

Participant Observation

Participant observation is a research approach that is characterized by a "prolonged period of contact with subjects in the place in which they normally spend their time" (Bogdan, 1973, p. 303). For my research, I have been a participant observer with AUAP at EWU for over 17 months, integrating as much as possible with the students' everyday life, from classroom participation to eating meals with AUAP students to participating in social activities with them, such as shopping or sports. Robert Bogdan (1973) says that the observer will "participate in the everyday life of those he wishes to understand; engage them in casual conversation, joke with them, eat with them, and share

their concerns and accomplishments" (p. 303). Being a participant observer in this way has given me a close connection to the students, especially those participating in the award process, so that I could observe first-hand their individual struggles and accomplishments as they integrated into the American community in Cheney and Spokane and participated in the variety of activities culminating in the Global Citizen Award. I feel that my integration into the community was a balance of professional and academic responsibility and sincere participation, which resulted in authentic data and minimal obtrusion.

According to Robert Bogdan in his 1973 essay "Participant Observation," "the purpose of the method is to develop an understanding of complex social settings and complex social relationships by seeing them holistically" (p. 303). This suggests that an optimal way to understand the complexity of a community is for the researcher to become immersed in it. While this research method can be used to test existing hypotheses, this process lends itself to the generation of theory (in other words, grounded theory) and the understanding of specific organizational forms (Bogdan, 1979, p. 303)—in this case, better understanding of the AUAP community.

Document Analysis

In my analysis of both the Global Citizen Award as text and the reflective writing provided by the award participants, I strive for critical ethnography. TESOL's guidelines for critical ethnography calls for careful and thorough analysis and interpretation of the data through the following points:

1. "Show evidence of residing or spending considerable lengths of time with people

in the study setting" (Chappelle and Duff, 2003, p. 174)--in other words, participant observation, which I document and include.

2. "Record participant beliefs and attitudes through... participant journals" (Chappelle and Duff, 2003, p. 174). I seek to do so through inclusion of the students' reflective writing contained within the award requirements, which are similar in function and purpose, though more limited in scope, to journals.
3. "Include several different sources of data. Besides participant observation and interactions with participants, these sources might include... narrative analysis... written documents... and questionnaires and surveys" (Chappelle and Duff, 2003, p. 174). The Global Citizen Award as text and student reflective essays and narratives serve to provide these sources of data, as does my analysis of the data.
4. "...Use additional sources of data and reflection. These include… your attitudes and biases toward the community and culture. Record how your perspectives changed during the course of the research and how these changes shaped the data gathered" (Chappelle and Duff, 2003, p. 174). I have included a section wherein I disclose my role as participant-observer as well as my attitudes, biases, and assumptions about the subjects.

Through the lens of critical ethnography framed in grounded constructivist theory, my thesis now turns to analyzing the data gathered:

- My role as participant-observer, including the disclosure of my biases and assumptions
- The Global Citizen Award itself as text, its pilot and revised iterations, and

reflections and analysis on the elements changed in each iterations

- Student voices gathered in the Global Citizen Award reflective writing components, primarily the Global Citizen Essay.

Chapter 5

Participant Observation

My Role as Participant-Observer

I have been a participant-observer at Asia University America Program on Eastern Washington University campus for approximately 17 months, fulfilling a number of different roles.

My first role was as a Classroom Volunteer, wherein I assisted in AUAP classrooms for several hours every week in numerous voluntary roles, including instruction assistance, one-on-one conversation, leading group discussions and class work, and acting as a model of spoken and/or written English. During my time as a classroom volunteer, I was able to observe the use of communicative language teaching methods in the course curriculum, especially in classes such as Functions and American Studies. Students were exposed to communicative methods including pair and group work, dialogue and vocabulary grounded in functional and authentic uses, a focus on the negotiation of meaning between participants, and lessons and class work entirely in the target language of English. I also observed how the community of students operated within the classroom setting—their methods of navigating meaning in their foreign language of English, how they responded to communicative language teaching methodology, and their varying levels of motivation.

At the same time that I was participating as a classroom volunteer, I served as an AUAP Campus Friend. This is another volunteer program wherein Eastern Washington University students are matched with AUAP students with similar interests, hobbies, and

desired activities. As a campus friend, I helped the AUAP students I was matched with acculturate to their new life in the Spokane area by spending time with them and participating in various American social activities such as eating at restaurants, watching movies, attending social events, etc. As a Campus Friend, I was able to witness and participate in the students' use of English in purely communicative means; the AUAP students used the language dynamically, developing grammatical structures and adopting vocabulary case by case.

It was during my second cycle as a classroom volunteer that I was asked to assist in the development of the Global Citizen Award and subsequently tasked with overseeing its implementation, monitoring and assessing student participation, and helping in its revision.

In the following cycle, in addition to continuing my work with the Global Citizen Award, I became the Student Services Assistant. My primary role was to coordinate volunteer service learning activities with community partners to provide volunteer opportunities for the AUAP students.

Throughout my time working with AUAP, I have also served as a substitute teacher as the need arose. I have had numerous opportunities to familiarize myself with the AUAP curriculum and interact with the students from different cycles and sections as a facilitator of various course subjects.

In this my fourth cycle working with Asia University America Program, I am continuing my role of Student Services Assistant and Global Citizen Award coordinator as well as substitute teaching as necessary.

With my longstanding personal interest in Asia University America Program, my

work as a volunteer and staff, and my role in the development of the Global Citizen Award, I recognize and acknowledge my vested interest in the viability of the award as a component of AUAP.

Researcher Assumptions

Throughout my numerous cycles working with AUAP, including both the pilot and subsequent cycles of the Global Citizen Award, I have held assumptions about student proficiency in English as well as their general levels of motivation for participating in the activities relevant to the award.

Background. The administrators at Asia University America Program assess incoming student English proficiency based on certain factors, including the students' Asia University Freshman English grade and level, their TOEIC (Test of English for International Communications) score, an AUAP entry written exam, and a one-on-one verbal interview with AUAP faculty. Based on evaluation of all of these factors, students are given a numerical score. All of the students falling with a certain range are placed in a "section." The sections are ranked from level 1, being the lowest level wherein the students are unable or nearly unable to function in English, up to level 7, defined as near fluency in English. The score range that determines each section varies from cycle to cycle and from one AUAP branch to the next. The assignment of students into sections and the number of sections per cycle depends on various factors, including the number of students and the mean level of their English ability. For example, one cycle may have a large student population with a majority of those students functioning at low fluency and bringing in low TOEIC and Freshman English scores; however, within that grouping,

there may be enough students with significantly higher (though still low) assessment to justify that one class be taught with a higher-level curriculum than the other – thus, students may be assigned into a section 2, 3, or 4, even if that cycle's sections are not necessarily at the level of proficiency of the equivalent sections in another cycle wherein the students are assessed at a higher or lower mean level of English fluency. Additionally, if one section has enough students to make up multiple classes, that section is divided further by letter (3a, 3b, etc).

In my three cycles working with AUAP, the student populations of each cycle were divided into the following sections based on their assessed English ability, shown in Table 1:

Cycle II, 2010 (80 students)	Section 3a	Section 3b	Section 3c	Section 4
Cycle I, 2011 (33 students)	Section 3	Section 4		
Cycle II, 2011 (44 students)	Section 2	Section 3	Section 4	
Cycle I, 2012 (25 students)	Section 3	Section 4		

Table 1. AUAP Sections per Cycles (2010-2012)

As Table 1 shows, over the course of 4 cycles, there was always at least one section 3 and 4. This inspired my own assumptions about the average makeup of any given AUAP cycle – that the likelihood of a low-average or average (3 or 4) level of English proficiency was commonplace, and extremes either way (low or high) were less likely.

My Assumptions. During my first cycle as a volunteer, the students were divided into four sections: 3a, 3b, 3c, and 4. This meant that I saw a narrow range but generally moderate level of English proficiency, with most of the students being able to communicate both in written and spoken English well enough to function in their English-only classrooms at a high rate of understanding and accuracy if basic sentence structure and vocabulary and moderated speech speed were used; the same held true in their ability in casual, conversational English. Based on my experience working with these students in the classroom as a Classroom Volunteer and interacting with them outside of the classroom as a Campus Friend, I assumed the students in the next cycle participating in the pilot of the Global Citizen award would, on average, have a similar level of English proficiency.

I also made assumptions about the reception to the Global Citizen Award and student motivation to participate based on my perception of student levels of motivation during my first volunteer cycle. I perceived the general student body (with exceptions) to be, at best, instrumentally motivated with most official components of their AUAP life, both in the classroom and out. I anticipated a similar response with the introduction of the Global Citizen Award the following cycle: a limited interest from a few dedicated students.

After the pilot of the Global Citizen award, I revised my assumptions based on my experience with the pilot cycle. I had new assumptions about English proficiency, motivation, reception to the award, and the ratio of students participating to those completing the award requirements. My new assumptions were of a much lower English proficiency, a much higher initial interest in the award, and a smaller percentage of

students completing the entirety of award requirements.

In Chapter 9, Conclusions, I discuss in detail these assumptions, how they changed, and how they impacted both the initial revision of the award as well as my current recommendations for future iterations of the award.

Chapter 6

Analysis of The Global Citizen Award: Components and Rationale

This chapter turns to analyzing the award itself: its initial iteration and component elements, which of those components were changed or removed after pilot and evaluation and why, and ultimately how the award fits within the concepts of communicative language learning and integrative motivation as supported by both foundational theory and current study.

Acknowledgments and Disclosures Regarding the Award

Origins of the Global Citizen Award. In the preliminary discussion and development of the Global Citizen Award, ideas and features of the award components and requirements were heavily borrowed from a similar award being used by Asia University America Program at Central Washington University. Our development considered and adapted from Central's award purpose, form, and many of the requirements and components. I would like to acknowledge the groundwork that the staff and administrators at all branches of AUAP, especially Central Washington University, had in inspiring the Global Citizen Award at the Eastern Washington University campus.

Disclosures of Potential Conflicts of Interest. In the conception, development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of this award, I, as the primary researcher and award coordinator, have been aware of the potential of the award to initially be instrumentally motivational instead of integrative. There is the potential for students to participate in the Global Citizen Award purely to receive the acknowledgment, physical

award, and/or the extra-curricular experience for their resumes.

In the development and revision of the award, the AUAP administrators and I have attempted to account for this possibility as much as possible. Our rhetoric in announcing and promoting the award has always been focused on student participation in authentic and meaningful communicative learning experience in the community through which they could become better integrated and appreciative of the culture and language, and that this would be acknowledged by the Global Citizen Award. For example, in the primary announcement of the award, we ask students the following prompt questions: "Do you want more chances to speak English confidently? Do you want to learn more about American life and culture? Do you want to challenge yourself? Then you should try to get the Global Citizen Award!" The significance of this rhetoric is that students are offered information about opportunities to participate in English communication and community activities; the announcement is not framed as the promotion of an award that happens to have prerequisites.

AUAP administrators and I also feel that the components of the award are authentic opportunities and experience that embody truly communicative approaches to learning and using English and intrinsically inspire integrative motivation. So, even if a student enters the award program with instrumental motivation, the hope is that he or she will develop integrative motivation in order to adequately meet the demands and requirements of participating in the community activities.

Participants

The participants in the development of the Global Citizen Award are the AUAP

administrators, AUAP faculty who provide valuable feedback and support, the AUAP students, specifically those participating in the award, and me, as the primary researcher and award coordinator.

Procedure

By the first week of class within a given cycle, the Global Citizen Award coordinator, in conjunction with the American Life Class instructor, makes an introductory announcement about the award to all of the students in American Life Class. American Life Class is a weekly lecture for all sections to meet and receive general announcements about upcoming activities at AUAP, EWU, or in the region; relevant or timely information about American culture; health and safety tips; and information about AUAP classes and programs, including awards offered to the students. The Global Citizen Award announcement highlights the elements of communicative learning, cultural experiences, and personal growth and reflection that the students take part in, which culminate in recognition for student participation by the award itself. Students are encouraged to attend a follow-up meeting to learn more about the award.

During the scheduled Global Citizen Award introductory meeting, the coordinator further explains the specific requirements of the award and allows for questions. Students who wish to participate are given the Global Citizen Award information packet (Appendix B; see Appendix A for the pilot handout) and the date of the next meeting.

Throughout the cycle, the coordinator has periodic meetings to check in with students, gauge how many are continuing versus how many have opted out, assess student progress toward time-sensitive requirements, provide instructions and/or

modeling for components of the award as necessary, and answer any questions or concerns that the students may have.

As deadlines approach, the coordinator checks in with students to ensure timely completion. The coordinator confirms the completion of all requirements by their deadline through direct evaluation.

By the final deadline of the Global Citizen Award process wherein the packet must be submitted by the students, the coordinator meets with the AUAP administrators to evaluate whether the student participants have adequately fulfilled the award requirements and then select the award winners accordingly; they also discuss the current cycle's iteration of the award, evaluate components for revision, deletion, or addition, and use the findings for the revision of next cycle's award iteration.

During the AUAP Graduation Ceremony, the Global Citizen Award Coordinator and/or the Program Director announce the award recipients as well as explain their accomplishments before handing out the awards and certificates.

The Award's Form. The Global Citizen Award comes in two tangible forms: an award medal, which is engraved with the name of the award and the cycle year, and a personalized certificate of acknowledgment of student achievement in receiving the award. In addition to the physical award and certificate, students receive personal acknowledgment and congratulations during the AUAP Graduation Ceremony.

Award Participant Requirements. Any current cycle AUAP student may receive the Global Citizen Award for completing the award requirements; there are no limitations on the number of participants or recipients. In order for students to receive the award, they must meet all of the required criteria by given deadlines as established

and provided to the students in the Global Citizen Award information packet (see Appendix B, Appendix A for the pilot handout).

The Global Citizen Award Pilot

Overview. The AUAP administrators and I developed the categories and sub-category component requirements based roughly on a similar award at Central Washington University; from this foundation, we modified and revised as necessarily to best meet our program's needs and the overarching goal of integrative motivation in communicative learning of English. But we were unsure as to whether the award would be successful and which of the components would be beneficial, which would need to be revised or removed, and which new requirements could be implemented to better meet our needs. Nevertheless, we piloted the award as an optional component of the AUAP curriculum, but one, unlike other AUAP student achievement awards, that required the student's active pursuit of the award through specific and tailored requirements. We felt in the development of the award that the requirements reflected authentic communicative language use, integrative motivation toward language learning, and cultural awareness.

Analysis of the award components and requirements. In the pilot version of the Global Citizen Award, the requirements of the award were divided into five categories: Academics, Volunteer Activities, Global Connections, Active Participation, and Optional Activities. In each of these categories, requirements had specific deadlines that either represented correlating deadlines at AUAP (such as the poster presentation, which had to be displayed during AUAP Night) or perceived convenient deadlines to ensure timely completion (such as a deadline to have interviewed the international

students before the end of the EWU quarter). The categories, their requirements, and analysis of their pilot versions are as follows:

Academics. To fulfill the requirements in this category, students had to do the following:

Earn all A's or S's in each AUAP class. The first requirement was that students had to have a grade of at least "A," which in the AUAP grading scale is equivalent to an 85% or higher. A grade of "S" (Superior) is equivalent to a 4.0 in standard grading at EWU. The initial purpose of this requirement was to encourage students to participate fully in the primary means of their English learning experience in the classroom; however, this component was quickly perceived as detrimental to the award purpose and process and was eliminated for the next iteration.

Have no more than three absences per class. For the second requirement, students could not be absent more than three times in a given AUAP class. Students can accumulate absences by not attending, arriving significantly late (five or more minutes after the start of class), or by receiving two "strikes," which are warnings from the teacher for various classroom rule and conduct infractions, two of which can result in eviction from the class and a record of "absent" for the period. This attendance requirement was removed after the pilot; there is already an AUAP award that acknowledges students with perfect attendance, and ultimately, it did not fit with the purpose of this award in promoting integrative motivation for learning English communicatively.

Visit and watch an EWU class with an American friend and write about your experience. The third requirement was included as an attempt to encourage students to

participate in EWU classes beyond the one AUAP "Student for a Day" requirement. The hope in inspiring students to participate in EWU classes was that they would further develop integrative motivation to adapt to the community by developing strategies to use English to navigate meaning in classes that weren't tailored for their experience. We also included a writing component to encourage reflective writing and to aid in the assessment of student participation in the requirement. This component remained, but was heavily modified and moved to the "Active Participation" category due to an existing AUAP academic requirement wherein students attend an EWU class, called "EWU Student for a Day."

***Volunteer Activities*.** This component and the requirements make up one of the most important elements of the Global Citizen Award—namely, the encouragement of service learning through community volunteer work. But service learning is more than community service, and in my description of the activities that students participate in and the requirements associated with the award, it is a noteworthy distinction that requires explanation.

In "Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education," Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher (2006) define service learning and its role in college culture. The authors describe two types of service for universities to support and promote community partnerships: extracurricular and curricular. Extracurricular service is usually left to the discretion of faculty, staff, and students, "independent of the university" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2006, p. 222); conversely, curricular opportunities such as internships, practica, and student teaching tend to focus on the student's development of professional skills and do not necessarily emphasize "the importance of service within the community and

lessons of civic responsibility" (p. 222). Bringle and Hatcher (2006) propose service learning as an ideal alternative to extracurricular voluntary service, but one that doesn't isolate the curricular focus from civic engagement. "Service learning is a course-based service experience that produces the best outcomes when meaningful service activities are related to course material through reflection activities such as directed writings, small group discussions, and class presentations" (p. 222). In other words, the volunteer work that students do is connected in meaningful ways to their course of study, but it still embodies authentic community service and civic responsibility. As the Volunteer Activity component is a major requirement for the Global Citizen Award, it is not "credit-bearing," but it is "means for reaching educational objectives" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2006, p. 222): it provides an educational experience that meets community needs at the same time it helps students better understand course content (in our case, communicative use of English). Bringle and Hatcher (2006) claim that service learning "brings new life to the classroom, enhances performance on traditional measures of learning, increases student interest in the subject, teaches new problem solving skills, and makes teaching more enjoyable" (p. 222). Thus, service learning is not only beneficial in helping students learn civic responsibility, it supplements their education—in the case of AUAP students, their English language learning—through increasing student interest in the subject and making it more enjoyable, which fall within Gardner's (1968) explanation of integrative motivation for learning a second language. According to Bringle and Hatcher (2006), it also teaches them new skills and improves their performance on measurable assessment, which will ultimately aid in their classroom productivity. With these elements of service learning in mind, we designed the Global Citizen requirements not only to require

community service, but also to integrate it meaningfully into their education by including reflective writing into the category requirement and requiring discussion of volunteer work in the Global Citizen poster presentation (discussed later).

For the pilot, the students had to c*omplete three AUAP or EWU volunteer activities during the cycle.* By requiring three separate volunteer activities, we hoped the students would experience a variety of service-learning opportunities. We also requested a brief description of the volunteer activity to help evaluate student completion of the requirement; this was ultimately expanded to a more authentic reflective writing prompt as well as a required component of the reflective essay (implemented in the second award iteration). This activity, viewed as integral to the award purpose, was kept but expanded in the next iteration, as discussed later in the chapter in the analysis of the award revision, in order to better situate it as a service learning component instead of simply community service.

Global Connections. In the pilot version of the award, there were only two requirements in this category: *Write 10 questions to ask international students at EWU*, and *Interview at least three students from different countries (other than Japan and the U.S.).* The purpose of this requirement is to encourage students to truly embrace and understand the communicative nature of language use. By requiring students to interview other non-Japanese international students, both parties are required to navigate and negotiate meaning by use of the *lingua franca*: English. While modifications were made after reflection and revision of the pilot, the essence of this requirement remained the same.

Active Participation. There are numerous required activities within this category.

The pilot version of the award had the following elements:

Participate in an EWU and/or AUAP club or group. Examples include: AUAP Photo Club, EWU Japanese Club, and EWU intramural sports. This requirement not only matches AUAP goals of encouraging students to participate in EWU campus life, but also promotes communicative uses of English as students will need to negotiate meaning in order to operate successfully in a given club or group, which will have its own set of "semantic notions and social functions" as described as traits of communicative language learning by Celce-Murcia (2001, p. 8). Students involved in clubs, groups, or sports teams will be using English as an expression of integrative motivation: as suggested by Gardner (1968), they are expressing a "willingness or desire to be like valued members of the 'other' language community" (p. 143) and adopting behavior of the community in their acquisition of the language. This award requirement was kept, modified slightly, and expanded as explained later.

Complete at least one challenge from the Eagle Hall Challenge Board each time they are presented in American Life Class. This requirement is related to a specific component of AUAP's American Life Class wherein the students are challenged every week to participate in authentic language and cultural learning opportunities, such as "order a pizza on the phone," "create a Facebook account and post in English," or "participate in a dorm activity." While the Eagle Hall Challenges do, indeed, represent authentic uses of the language in the target community, this requirement was ultimately dropped because AUAP already has an award recognizing successful completion of the Eagle Hall Challenges (fittingly named the Eagle Hall Challenge Award). Thus, the overlap was determined to be redundant.

Have perfect IPA meeting attendance. IPA stands for "International Peer Advisor." These are student employees who serve as the immediate and consistent cultural brokers for the AUAP students during their stay in America. "Cultural brokers help ease people into each other's cultures," according to Dr. Mary Pipher (2002, p. 89), author and psychologist who specializes in working with immigrants and refugees. Pipher (2002) defines cultural brokers in America as "schoolteachers, caseworkers, public health nurses, and American friends who may teach [refugees] to make intentional decisions about what to accept and what to reject in America (p. 89). While the IPAs work with exchange students, not refugees, their goals and purpose are essentially the same; to help the AUAP students make informed decisions in a culture very alien to them in many aspects.

While the purpose in encouraging IPA meeting attendance was to ensure that students were receiving the guidance provided by these cultural brokers as well as the group use of English for important social functions, having it as a requirement for the award was determined out of context and was ultimately removed.

Attend at least one EWU (or Spokane) cultural activity. Examples include musical performances, plays, lectures, art showings, etc. This requirement matches AUAP goals for its students to participate in cultural and community experiences while in the United States; it also fits within the context of communicative learning of the language and encourages integrative motivation toward second-language learning: students expressing interest in the community's arts, music, sports, and/or local events are demonstrating a "positive attitude" toward the community, and will, according to Gardner and Lambert's studies, work harder to acquire the language of that community (Gardner

1968, p. 143). This requirement was modified slightly in the revision of the award after the pilot (discussed later).

Have no warning letters. AUAP students receive warning letters only under extreme circumstances: either as a result of missing an extensive amount of class (20 or more absences) or breaking a major AUAP rule, such as drinking alcohol while underage, harassing or bullying other students, or participating in forbidden recreational activities such as skydiving. If a student receives two warning letters, they are immediately sent back to Japan under academic probation and receive no AUAP course credit. The purpose of the requirement is to discourage harmful behavior and extensive absence from class, which ultimately interfere and could potentially eliminate their opportunities to integrate into the culture and learn the language in the form of dismissal from AUAP.

Present a poster presentation about your AUAP life and experiences at the Global Citizen Symposium. This requirement, which still remains one of the crucial "Active Participation" requirements, was designed to give students an opportunity to create an artistic and individual project using all of the language arts as defined by the IRA and NCTE (1996) and to utilize reflective writing as a component of the students' language learning process (more on reflective writing later).

In preparation for this requirement, the Global Citizen Award coordinator gives the participants a guideline for the poster requirements (see Appendix C). The writing requirements of the poster essentially cover a reflection on the student's experience in the various categories of the award: academics, volunteering, global connections, and active participation. The students also write about their "favorite activity/accomplishment" during their time at AUAP. The writing that students include in their poster is both

reflective and authentic use of two language arts: reading and writing. The poster should include at least one or two pictures, which help them visually represent their award experience.

In addition to the poster, students prepare a speech as part of their presentation. The speech is a chance for them to "explain their growth:" to describe themselves at the beginning of the cycle, why they wanted to earn the award, the specific elements of the award that they worked on, and where they are now. Essentially, the speech is a narrative of their poster to provide for the speaking and listening components of language arts used in communicative learning.

Both the poster and speech are described to the students as low-stakes: the poster does not require a lot of writing, and the speech is described as informal. Students are encouraged to be creative and have fun in the process. The low stakes and creative freedom are to keep students' motivation to participate integrative.

***Optional Activities*.** Within this section, students self-select at least three activities to supplement the other required components. The optional activities are as follows:

Volunteer as a Japanese tutor (with EWU students taking Japanese). The purpose of this optional activity was to recognize students that were participating in communicative teaching for students studying Japanese. These opportunities for students to share their language and culture with second-language learners of Japanese also presented them with opportunities to form meaningful bonds with their pupils and exchange their own language for learning English in return. This activity embodies the spirit of CLT as well as Japanese education and Asia University policies calling for

international cooperation.

Teach and share Japanese culture with friends, students, or children in the EWU/Cheney/Spokane area. While the value of this activity is evident in its promotion of communication and cooperation as well as integrative motivation, as an activity, it was difficult to assess in measurable terms, and it overlapped with other components of the award, such as volunteer activities, leading and planning AUAP Night or other activities, and Japanese tutoring. It was ultimately removed as an optional activity.

Lead an "AUAP Night" activity. AUAP Night is a single organized event in a given AUAP cycle wherein the students share Japanese popular or traditional culture with an American audience through song, dance, or other performance arts. AUAP night is an entirely optional component of the AUAP experience; as such, students demonstrate integrative motivation if they plan, lead, and/or participate in any AUAP Night event. Such participation requires communication in English at many levels: event planners must communicate with English-speaking AUAP staff to prepare and coordinate activities and with EWU staff to coordinate technology needs; additionally, AUAP Night Emcees must communicate the activity events in English to the audience, and participants must respond to cues in English. Thus, those who take on leadership roles in the development of AUAP Night activities are demonstrating integrative motivation by recognizing the need to acquire the necessary language to communicate their activity needs to outside parties.

Organize and lead an activity for your IPA group. For similar reasons to the AUAP Night activity, students demonstrating the leadership roles and integrative motivation to plan and organize IPA group activities appreciate the need to use English

authentically to communicate needs and desires with the English-speaking IPAs.

Lead or start an EWU or AUAP club. While the merit of such an activity is evident, none of the participants selected this as an optional activity. It was removed after the pilot.

Join an international club or organization at EWU such as the International Student Association. The rationale behind this component's inclusion is similar to that of the Global Connections section: Students will be participating in truly communicative uses of English as a *lingua franca* with the other participants in an international club. The International Student Association, for example, hosts exchange students from all over the world, from various countries, cultures, and first languages; the AUAP students will be learning how to use English to negotiate and navigate meaning with international students who are doing so as well.

Participate in a cultural event in Spokane such as [relevant examples provided] and write at least 100 words about it. As with the similar "Active Participation" requirement, this optional activity encourages students to participate in cultural and community events and promotes integrative motivation. While there is significant overlap, rather than remove this optional component, both this and the required Active Participation activity were reworded in the revision to make each specific and unique activities.

The preceding requirements made up the entirety of the award categories and components. With the pilot award ready to implement, we unveiled it during Cycle I, 2011.

The pilot cycle. After announcement of the Global Citizen Award to a cycle of

33 students, we had a very high turnout at the first information session: 29 students attended the meeting, listened to the thorough and detailed explanation of the award, and took Global Citizen information packets, indicating an interest in pursuing the award. But the high initial turnout was soon dismissed as an anomaly attributed to confusion about the award caused by the cycle's relatively low level of English proficiency; the high initial participation was also indicative of an early surge of student energy and motivation that quickly leveled out to more realistic participation. While it was difficult to gauge exact student participation as it fluctuated throughout the cycle, based on a poll taken in American Life Class, we had an initial participation of about 20 students.

Throughout the cycle, I, as the Global Citizen Award Coordinator, held regular meetings with the participants to tell them about deadlines, activities that would meet award requirement criteria, model award projects such as writing prompts and the poster presentation, and answer any questions. During the cycle, meeting attendance grew exponentially smaller, until by the third meeting, only two students were attending. We then modified the meetings, holding them only when required for deadlines. Otherwise, I met students on a case-by-case basis as needed or requested.

During the poster presentation deadline, which fell about mid-cycle, we were able to ascertain a more realistic estimate of which students were still participating and able to complete the award. Many students by this point had opted out of participating as the poster creation and speech preparation took a significant amount of time and effort. By the poster presentation, we had an exact number of participants: nine. The poster presentation proved to be the critical factor of the award requirements: while it eliminated most of the earlier participants, the nine who created posters continued to pursue the

award until the deadline. Of those nine, eight completed all the award requirements and received the award during graduation (the one exception will be explained in the pilot reflection).

Pilot results. While there were issues with the implementation of the award, assessment of student completion, and award requirements, which resulted in significant revision to the award requirements, the pilot was deemed a success by the AUAP administrators and staff. It was received well in its introduction, even disregarding the initial anomaly, with a large group of participants consistently participating in the relevant activities. The award was challenging and required integrative motivation, and yet it was not unapproachable or unavailable to any student dedicated enough to complete its requirements. By the completion of the cycle and the Global Citizen Award pilot, eight of the nine still in the running fulfilled all requirements and earned the award. We feel that the ratio of students completing the award to the student population (8 to 33, or 24 percent of students) demonstrates that the award was achievable through dedication but not an easy and meaningless handout.

Pilot reflection and assessment. There were many components of the pilot that the AUAP administrators and I thoroughly evaluated and revised based on feedback and assessment. I will discuss the major elements that were evaluated and revised: award policy, participant assessment and tracking, and award requirements.

Award policy revision. The pilot of the award revealed factors that were both preventing qualified and motivated students from getting the award and applying external pressure on those who were not invested in the process.

First, the extensive focus on and requirement of academic success as an integral

component of the award was ultimately detrimental to its purpose. The AUAP administrators and I came to realize this as we approached the end of the cycle. One student—a student who went above and beyond in integrating into the community, who expressed authentically integrative motivation in communicating with everyone he met in many ways in order to better learn English—would not receive the award because of the academic requirement (this student did not have all 'A' or 'S' grades). We were able to develop a separate award to acknowledge this student's hard work, but in evaluating and revising the award purpose and our goals in implementing it, we changed the policy to exclude academic achievement as a focus. We realized that an academic excellence requirement did not embody integrative motivation, necessarily; this particular student demonstrated, regardless of grades and despite disqualification from the award running, a truly vested interest in integrating and adapting to the community to better learn the language and culture.

The other policy that was changed heavily after pilot evaluation was the amount of outside pressure or influence we as AUAP staff put on student participants. While providing encouragement and motivation is laudable, I perceived that a number of the students only participated and completed the award after repeated suggestion from multiple sources that they do so. While not necessarily detrimental or artificial, it did detract from the nature of the award in recognizing students with integrative motivation. Logistically, this policy also created extra workload for the coordinator and, ultimately, took away time from the students to proceed at a natural and self-developed pace: I made an over-abundance of announcements, held extensive meetings, and met one-on-one repeatedly with the participants. I hypothesized that a more “hands-off” policy in the

next implementation would not only result in equivalent student participation levels, but also lessen the stress and workload of everyone involved.

Participant assessment and tracking. The issue of external motivation segues into the problems we faced in assessing student progress and tracking total number of participants. It was difficult to know an exact number of participants at any given time, considering that the award inherently functioned as recognition for their self-motivation and participation in a variety of events outside of AUAP jurisdiction. The best means of assessing student participation was through mandatory and regular meetings. But for the pilot cycle, the frequency of meetings was burdensome to all participants. One of the major factors of the award pilot that called for frequent meetings was the individual component deadlines: the consistent and frequent award requirement deadlines throughout the cycle created a burden on both the students and the coordinator. This was streamlined in the revision by reducing all deadlines to one final due date with the exception of the poster presentation; however, we maintained mandatory but less frequent meetings to gauge student participation, provide assistance and direction, and minimize burden on both students and the coordinator.

Award revisions. All of the categories underwent extensive revision; some were simply modified, others removed, and new categories were implemented as well.

Academics. This entire category was removed, primarily for reasons mentioned in the reflections on pilot policy changes. Grade and attendance requirements were deemed to be irrelevant to the award, and the requirement for students to attend an EWU class was adjusted and moved to the "Active Participation" category.

***Volunteer Activities*.** This category remained and was slightly modified to include

more reflective writing about each of the three volunteer activities the students elected to participate in.

Global Connections. While this category remained, it was adjusted to have more clearly worded and explicit instructions that would be more fruitful in providing authentic dialogue between the participants and their interview partners and in yielding more developed questions and answers. Rather than having the students develop ten questions to ask three different international students, we gave them worksheets to develop two questions and two related follow-up questions for each of the three interviewees. The hope was that fewer but more focused questions would result in more developed, complex, and engaging dialogue.

We also included a summative reflection prompt, asking the students to write about what they learned through interviewing the international students.

Active Participation. Most of these requirements remained the same, except those that were deleted, such as the Eagle Hall Challenge requirement and perfect IPA meeting attendance. We included a new requirement for the students to write about a memorable experience they had in America.

Optional Activities. This category was renamed to "Three Additional Activities" to avoid confusion about the category: students are required to select three, but they can choose which activities; the category is not optional as such. Most of the activities remained the same, but the wording was adjusted to help avoid confusion. For example, almost without exception, the students did not understand the verb "lead" in the relevant activities, such as "lead an AUAP Night activity." Inevitably, many of the students selected this as an activity they completed, only to describe their role as participant, not

leader. We reworded the requirement description to better explain the concept of leadership in terms of activity planning and organization.

These were the major changes inspired by reflection of the pilot process of the award. Our next draft of the Global Citizen Award reflected these changes and implemented new improvements.

The Current Iteration of the Global Citizen Award

Current components and requirements. While many of the categories remained the same, one major category—Academic Achievement—was removed and replaced with a new category—the Global Citizen Essay. The current award categories are as follows:

Volunteer Activities. The only new feature of this component is the extensive inclusion of reflective writing. We have two prompt questions for each of the three activities: "What did you do?" and "What was the most interesting thing about this activity?" The latter question provides interesting insight into the students' social and cultural learning experiences as they reflect on their service learning.

Global Connections. We kept the requirement to "interview three international students at EWU," but we modified the wording and added additional caveats: "They cannot be American or Japanese. Choose two interesting questions and two follow-up questions for each interview. You must write the answers yourself." The latter point was introduced as we perceived that some students simply handed the packet to their interviewees to expedite the process; but, in doing so, they ultimately hampered their own language learning as they removed the means of navigating meaning through multiple

language arts: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

As mentioned earlier, we incorporated the idea of questions and related follow-up questions to force the students away from simple yes/no or other stock questions and into developed, creative, individual questions that resulted in both thorough answers from the interviewees and careful reflection of the process on the interviewer's part.

This reflection came in the new Global Connections requirement: that students write about their conversations with the international students. We asked them to ponder the prompt questions, "what did you learn?" and "What was interesting?" Between the element of follow-up questions and the summative reflection prompt, the Global Connections section of the award came to better implement reflective writing and promote critical thinking as well.

Active Participation. Most of the requirements within this category that carried over after the pilot remained essentially the same, with three exceptions. The first is that all of the requirements (except for "have no warning letters") now incorporate reflective writing prompts. For example, the requirement that students participate in an EWU and/or AUAP club or group now has the following prompt: "Write at least 50 words about your experience in this group, club, or sport. Describe what you did and how often, what was most fun, most difficult, etc." Such writing not only helps the students connect back with their activity in meaningful ways through their use of English, but provides the administrators and me, as this thesis writer, with valuable data to collect and analyze to gauge student integration into the given community and their experiences at AUAP.

The second feature is that the former Academic Achievement requirement for students to attend an EWU class was moved into this category. The requirement was

altered to discount the existing course requirement that they be an "EWU Student for a Day;" now, the award participants must "go to an EWU class at least three times" and write a reflective response about it.

The third new feature is a new activity requirement that the students "write about a memorable experience that [they] had in American culture." This prompt is rather open-ended: the student can write about "an activity in Cheney or Spokane, [their] vacation travels in the United States, etc." for a minimum of 50 words. Hatcher and Bringle (1997) suggest that a personal journal may be an effective activity "if a learning objective is personal growth and development" (p. 154). In this regard, this prompt allows students to examine what they have experienced during their time in a new culture and write reflectively about it in order to increase language competence (NCTE, 1996).

Three Additional Activities. Other than the aforementioned removal of certain activities, the major change to this category was the inclusion of an option to "be a student in an EWU class." This, unlike the activity wherein the students simply visit a class, is an opportunity for the student to integrate significantly into the community: they enroll in and take a regular EWU course, taught by a university professor to the general student population; it is not a sheltered course as per the standard AUAP classes. The students taking these classes are demonstrating a vested interest in the community by sincerely attempting to integrate and adapt and, ultimately, learn and use the language to do so in the given community.

Additionally, the remaining activities were reworded for clarification. They now read, "Create and organize an 'AUAP Night' Activity," "Create an activity for AUAP and EWU students in your dormitory," and "Organize an activity for your IPA group."

The Global Citizen Essay. This new category was the culmination of our focus on the benefits of reflective writing, incorporating many of NCTE's (1996) traits of a competent language user: personal expression, strategic language use, reflective interpretation, and thoughtful application (pp. 12-13). We require that the students write about their "experiences in AUAP and [their] work for the Global Citizen Award." We then provided them with prompt questions that they were to answer within the body of their essay in organized paragraphs. Paragraph One provides the writers with prompt questions about their time before they came to AUAP—questions about their motives, their expectations, their fears and excitements, etc. Paragraph Two is focused on their experiences at AUAP in general: things that surprised or interest them and what they learned about the community. Paragraph Three is focused on their volunteer work: things they learned about the community in which they volunteered, differences between here and Japan, and what they learned about themselves by volunteering. Paragraph Four asks them to synthesize their reflection and look to the future: now that AUAP is finished, what they learned about themselves and how they changed. We also ask them to provide advice to hypothetical incoming AUAP students to better prepare them for their experience. We then ask them for any final thoughts or opinions in retrospect of their time in America and at AUAP.

Ultimately, the global citizen essay encourages the students to think critically about their time in America, to write reflectively, expressively, and personally about their experiences, to connect those experiences to social and cultural issues, to write persuasively to an audience of their peers, and, in line with the goals of communicative language methodology, to "create and share meaning through language" (NCTE, 1996;

Tompkins, 2009, p. 19). While the poster presentation is an opportunity for the students to share their experiences creatively, the Global Citizen essay is the culminating project that allows them to reflect on, analyze, and narrate their entire AUAP experience in a meaningful, functional, and genuine way.

The current award cycle results. This cycle's initial interest in the Global Citizen was significant but modest compared to the pilot cycle: of 44 students, 12 attended the introductory Global Citizen Meeting. For the majority of the cycle, the number of participants was easier to gauge with less-frequent but mandatory meetings, which revealed a similar trend from the pilot cycle: exactly nine students regularly attended the meetings and participated in the award activities. As with the previous cycle, the biggest determiner of participants finishing the award was the poster presentation: one student dropped out, and, again, the eight students who finished and presented posters completed the award requirements and received the award during the graduation ceremony. Although it was exactly the same number of students who received the award, the ratio of recipients from the student body was smaller at 8 out of 44 students (18 percent). It is difficult to make any conclusive statements or even educated hypotheses about the significance of the change in percentage of award participants and recipients after only two cycles, other than to return to my assumption as participant observer about student motivation fluctuating between Cycles I and II.

Reflections on the current iteration of the award. The elimination of elements that did not meet integrative learning criteria and the inclusion of reflective writing across all award components gave the award a unifying theme and purpose: that of recognition for students learning and using the English language in authentic and communicative

ways outside of the classroom. I feel that the award, while still needing improvements based even on critique of the current cycle's iteration, is a viable means of encouraging and recognizing students who develop integrative motivation to learn English in a communicative, authentic context.

Chapter 7

Data Collection and Analysis: Student Reflective Writing

This chapter serves as the data collection and analysis of the reflective writing that the Global Citizen Award participant students completed as part of the award requirements. The first section discloses the data collection method

Data Collection

Procedure. The student reflective writing was collected as part of the second iteration of the Global Citizen Award during Cycle II of September 2011 to February 2012. The students participating in the Global Citizen Award were given all of the writing prompts as part of the Global Citizen Packet (Appendix B) during the first Global Citizen Award meeting. The participants had until January 31st, when the award paperwork was due, to complete the reflective writing in conjunction with relevant activities. On January 31st, 2012, I, as the Global Citizen Award Coordinator, collected the remaining participants' award packets, including their reflective writing components and the Global Citizen Essays. The data was collected for the purposes of this thesis after the participants completed the award process in order to minimize external influence and encourage honest reflection on the parts of the participants.

Participants. For the Cycle II 2011-12 Global Citizen Award, eight participants completed the award requirements. As a result, I have collected eight separate samples of student reflective writing to be analyzed in this chapter. All of the participants were Asia

University America Program students during Cycle II of 2011-12 at Eastern Washington University, studying abroad from Asia University. The students participating in the reflective writing gathered in this chapter adequately represent the population of study—Asia University America Program students at Eastern Washington University. All of the students in this study participated in the phenomena being discussed throughout the thesis: communicative language learning, service learning, using English as a second or foreign language, reflective writing, and integrative motivation.

Purpose of the data collection and analysis. The purpose in collecting this data is to provide valuable insight into the student experience of participating in the award. The student reflective writing provides diversity of perspective to the experiences at AUAP, the value of the Global Citizen Award, and the benefits of reflective writing. By analyzing the student writing, we can uncover themes consistent across the selection of essays.

IRB compliance. In the gathering and analysis of the student essays, every effort was made to ensure minimal obtrusion on the students and their environment and to ensure their anonymity. I drafted an IRB-approved consent form (see Appendix D) to explain to the participants the assurance of anonymity, their right to opt out of participating without consequence to their AUAP course grades or Global Citizen Award standing, and how and why their reflective writing would be used. All eight of the student participants during Cycle II, 2011-12, provided written consent for my use of their reflective writing from the Global Citizen Award packets in this thesis report.

Data Analysis

Prompt. The Global Citizen Essay prompt was given to the student participants as part of their Global Citizen Packet (See Appendix B). Students were asked to write at least 200 words, following the prompt guidelines.

To ensure anonymity, I have given the eight participants fictitious labels of "Student One" to "Student Eight," which are assigned randomly with no hierarchy or significance. I include each of the student essays followed by my own analysis. I have transcribed their essay exactly as it was written, changing nothing except the names of the participants.

The data analysis for each of the eight essays is as follows:

1. The student writer's essay in its entirety, transcribed as submitted with no grammar, spelling, lexical, or content corrections.
2. Researcher analysis of the essay, with a summary of the student's writing and my own analysis of significant themes emerging in the student text.

Student One's essay

Before I came to AUAP, I was very excited to go to America. I was not nervous or didn't worry about I will live in America about 5 month. I worried about if I can make American friends. I came to AUAP because I wanted to study English. I wanted to improve my English skills. And I wanted to make many American friends. And also I wanted to join EWU band. Before came to America, I was most excited about to join EWU band. I really like playing instrument. So I wanted to play music with many people. I wanted to know what different how to play in Japan and in

America. I was so worried about I couldn't speak English well before came to AUAP. I thought I can't have a conversation with American.

At AUAP, I experienced many things. I'm surprised about American class. I think it is very strict more than Japan. We have to raise our hand, we have to discussion many times and we have to do a lot of homework after school.

And I learned that it is important to cooperate with people. I joined all volunteer activity while at AUAP. I joined River Clean-Up, Tree Planting, Leaf Raking, and more volunteer activity. I should cooperate with American or my friends while these activities.

And also I joined a Folk Festival as a volunteer in Spokane. It is very interesting and good experience for me. Many people played many kind of music in that festival. I could listen to many cultural music and I had a conversation with audience. I had fun in that volunteer activity. I'm glad I could join Folk Festival in Spokane.

Now that AUAP is finished, I'll miss American life, AUAP stuff and my friends. I learned to have a conversation, to cooperation and to enjoy with people. All these things are close to people. Before AUAP I didn't like to close to many people. But now I think it is very important things for me. And I improved my English skills because I talked to many American. I thank to many American who I met in AUAP. I think future AUAP students should try to study English vocabulary. It is very useful at American life. And they should be positive. I got confidence in my own

ability. I'm proud of my experience in AUAP. I never forget my many happy memories and good experience in AUAP.

A***nalysis.*** Student One reveals her desires in coming to America: to study and improve in English and to make American friends. These goals directly correspond to her worries: her ability to make new friends and her feelings of inadequacy in speaking English. The parallel between the two factors suggest that Student One sees a correlation between the two: that the improvement in English requires communication with Americans, and that the factor possibly impeding her ability to make new friends is her lack of English proficiency. This seems to point toward integrative motivation on the part of Student One: her interest in forming meaningful relationships with the community members is inspiring a desire to improve in the community's language. And yet, according to Student One, her feelings of inadequacy may be hampering her integration into the community. This dynamic plays out in most if not all of the subsequent student essays.

Student One also reveals one of her biggest motivating factors for participating in AUAP as well as learning English: joining the EWU band and learning about the differences in musical practice between Japan and America. In fact, the elements of AUAP life that Student One chose to write about are primarily her social and cultural experiences; with the exception of her surprise at the difference between American and Japanese classes, Student One focuses on music, her volunteer experiences, and how she communicated and cooperated with others in social settings. In many ways, Student One's reflective writing reveals her integrative motivation in participating in AUAP and community activities: the desire to learn and improve in the second language born out of

an authentic interest in the culture and people. Again, this theme plays out commonly throughout many of the other student essays.

Student One reflects that before AUAP, she didn't like to be close to many people. Her time at AUAP inspired her to think positively about having conversations and cooperation, which she credits for her improvement in English because she "talked to many American[s]." Student One recognizes her growth as a language learner in adopting communicative approaches to learning her second language.

Student One suggests to future AUAP students to "study English vocabulary" and to "be positive:" she claims to have gained confidence in her ability. Her recommendations, especially the latter point of positive attitude, point toward an awareness of the importance of integrative motivation as defined by Gardner, whose studies revealed that attitude and motivation directly correlate to second-language achievement (Gardner, 1968). Overall, Student One's essay resonates with positive memories and experiences.

Student Two's essay

> Before I came to AUAP, I was looking forward to going to America. But I was nervous a little. I came to AUAP to I wanted to improve my English skills and learn about American culture. I was most excited to experience it was touched by American culture and I could talk to American many times. I was worried about my English skill. I did not have confidence in my English.
>
> At AUAP, I could experience many things. I was surprised about

AUAP classes. Because, we should volunteer many time during class. It was big difference from my university. So I did my best to do volunteer!

I also could learn about international student. There are many studying abroad program in EWU. I could understand that international students also wanted to improve their English skills. But, their English skills were good for me. So I thought that I also wanted to do my best.

I did "Clean-up river" by volunteering. It was good experience for me. Because, I could do volunteer outside of EWU and I could clean up around river. There were good things!

Now that AUAP is finished, I want to study more. So I am sad. I could learn that it is important to get chance by my self. Like, sign-up to volunteer and joining activity...etc. There were good for improving English skills and learning about American culture. So I did my best about them. And I would like to tell about them to future AUAP student. I feel good because I could have curiosity for studying English more by AUAP. I do my best for studying English after I back to Japan.

Analysis. Like Student One, Student Two expresses that improving English was a goal of hers in coming to AUAP; she also touches on the value of communicating with Americans in this process. Similar to Student One, she feels inadequate in her English speaking abilities, expressing worry and a lack of confidence. This feeling of inadequacy in the target language is common amongst all of the participants in the study, and speaks of the phenomenon of "foreign language anxiety" (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, 1986), born in part of the misconception that nothing should be said in the second language if it

isn’t said correctly.

Student Two introduces the element of interacting with other international students. She surmises that the international students are also seeking to improve their English speaking abilities; however, she insists that their English skills are “good,” which in turn inspires her to strive for improvement. I posit that witnessing other non-native speakers using English well helped this student overcome some of her foreign language anxiety, as well as the unfortunate cultural perception that English is a language that is “owned” by native speakers such as Americans and “borrowed” by second-language learners. Her experience ultimately helped her strengthen her integrative motivation to improve in the English language. To reiterate Gardner's definition of integrative motive, Student Two displays a willingness to be like “valued members of the 'other' language community;” her observation of the international students shows that these “valued members” are not just necessarily Americans, which in turn inspired her to work harder to improve in the second language.

Student Two also came to recognize the value of the service learning activities in aiding her language learning experience: she says that they were “good for improving English skills and learning about American culture.” Indeed, this statement resonates with many of the ides that the various student participants have regarding the value of authentic community experiences outside of the classroom in aiding their language learning.

Student Three's essay

Before I came to AUAP, I thought I was so exciting to go to

America. For my major I had to go to America. I wanted to make many American friends and I wanted to study American history. I was nervous to speak English with Americans and I worried about how can make American friends. I really wanted to hang out with American people.

At AUAP it is so nice life for me. I feel American people are very kind and so funny. I'm so happy. Because I thought American people are scary. I joined my American friend class that nobody slept in the class and they said their ideas in the class. These things are very different from Japan and surprised me.

I volunteered “Help old people” we played bingo game with old people. I had fun time with them and I learned about nursery home. There were many helpful things in there. That was very nice experience for me.

Now that AUAP is finished, I learned many things. For example I learned American history and American culture. Especially during most important thing is to make good American friends. Because after AUAP I think we lose speak English opportunity with American people, if I have good American friends who can contact with me on internet or Skype. I did not change my mind. I would like to tell you guys, please hung out with American people and please have good experience at AUAP. I thought AUAP was very nice program for improve English skills. Last my opinion is should not be nervous. You can do everything in the U.S.

Analysis. Student Three introduces the element of potentially instrumental motivation: the requirement of Asia University students in certain fields of study such as

International Relations to attend AUAP: the student writes that he “had to go to America” for his major. However, this student immediately follows this statement up with “I wanted to make many American friends and I wanted to study.” The difference between “had to” and “wanted to” seems poignant here, as if to underscore the self-awareness of both instrumental and integrative motivating factors, and the preference for the latter as spelled out by the remainder of his essay, which focuses on his community and social experiences.

As with the other students, Student Three has similar goals, similar concerns, and similar surprises regarding American culture: he wants to improve English, but he has misgivings about his own ability to speak well and make friends. But this student highlights misconceptions he entered the program with regarding Americans and how his cultural awareness changed and grew during his time in America.

Student Three's description of one of the volunteer activities as “Help old people” introduces an interesting and creative way of claiming ownership of something through renaming it.

Student Three claims that the “most important thing is to make good American friends,” which resonates with many of the other students' sentiments. But Student Three explains why he thinks it is so important: he recognizes that after AUAP and the return to Japan, the students lose the opportunity to speak English with native speakers; he also recognizes that keeping in contact with good friends will provide him the opportunity to maintain that use of English.

Student Four's essay

Before I came to AUAP, I was so excited, but I was very nervous because I thought I'll have homesick during 5 months if I will not get American and Japanese friends and I can't used to spending life in American culture. I came to AUAP because I wanted to improve my English skills, make American friends and experience American culture. Before I came to AUAP, I was most excited about all AUAP classes consist of English, and we must speak only English, so I think it was very chance to improve my English skills. But I was nervous about my English skills because I can't speak and read English very well. I was also worried about American greasy foods.

I experienced so many things at AUAP life. I was most surprised about American people are very kind to people of other countries. When I can't understand English explanation of something, and I can't know what they said, they teach and speak very slowly for me. They helped me so many times. Each times, I think about American people's kindly mind.

I also learned many things about American communities. I attended the international festival as a volunteer in Cheney on October. I wore yukata as Japanese. There were so many people, American, Mexican, Spanish, Brazilian, Portuguese, German, Singaporean, Thai, Indonesian, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese. They also wore dresses of own countries, and showed their traditional things. We could enjoy and know each other very much. The event was so excited, I could learn about other countries, and make many international friends. Eastern has a very nice event and

chance.

> Now that AUAP is finished, I learned that I should say my opinion clearly to someone even if I can't speak languages of other countries very well. So I can improve my language skills, make new friends, and discover new myself. I can change a person who has strong sense of responsibility through 5 months. I want to tell future AUAP students to be active to do everything. Don't be shy! I'm so sad to finish AUAP and leave America, but I'm very happy because I can get many wonderful memories in America. I decided to go to America again by myself. I want to improve my English skills more and more to talk with many American people and to use English for my future. AUAP and America taught me many good things for me. I love the USA! Let's step up!

Analysis. Student Four is one of only two students to talk about the possibility of homesickness. Homesickness is a common response to moving way from home for school or college. Recent studies into homesickness suggest that one major cause of homesickness, especially in new university students, is the need to belong (Watt and Badger, 2009). This correlation between the need to belong and homesickness provides new insight into the student reflection essays, which reveal their concerns that they had before arriving at AUAP. Indeed, students who worried about homesickness, such as Student Four and Student Seven, also expressed desires to fit into the new community; in fact, Student Four directly correlates homesickness to her desire to belong: she says, thought I'll have homesick during 5 months if I will not get American and Japanese friends and I can't used to spending life in American culture." Her homesickness is

contingent on her not making friends and not getting used to her life in her new community, not on the absence of her family. The student essays seem to support the correlation between homesickness and the need to belong: most of the students write about their feelings of acceptance into the community by the end of their time, and none of them conclude their reflection with feeling homesick any longer.

Student Four expresses similar goals and interests in coming to AUAP (improving English and making friends); however, she mentions her excitement at taking classes taught entirely in English and wherein the students must speak only in English, which she says is a "chance to improve my English skills." Student Four demonstrates an understanding of the value of learning the target language through immersion; her excitement at doing so suggests its rarity back home in Japan. Again, student reflection here points to an awareness to the value of communicative approaches to second language learning.

As with all of the participants up to this point, Student Four demonstrates foreign language anxiety, as evident in her belief that she "can't speak and read English very well."

Student Four speaks about the opportunity to meet other international students from all different backgrounds. Her experience speaks not only of the cultural learning taking place as part of her communicative learning experiences, but also of the value of English as the *lingua franca* for people from different cultures and languages to communicate.

In her final reflections on personal growth, Student Four concludes that she should speak with others even if she "can't speak languages of other countries very well."

She understands that through overcoming her anxieties about imperfect language use, she can “improve [her] language skills, make new friends, and discover [herself].” Such reflection suggests that Student Four came to terms with her foreign language anxiety and understands that she should use the language despite the possibility of incorrect usage. Indeed, part of language learning and use is making mistakes.

Student Five's essay

Before I came to AUAP, I was excited that I can learn English and American culture, because my interest thing is international culture. I came to AUAP, because it is requirement of my major. But I wanted to come to AUAP to learn about American culture. Before I come, I was most excited to experience meet to many Americans and feel American culture. Before I came, I was nervous that my English was not enough to talk with Americans. Also I was worried about whether make American friends.

At AUAP, I learned about American Culture and history at class. And I could experience so many things. I joined some of volunteer. I learned about American communities in volunteer. The communities of Spokane had many events. In Spokane River clean up, there were so many people join volunteer. Volunteer was good for me to learn English and communication.

Now that AUAP is finished I could change my mind. I came to AUAP, I did my best everything. For example, I tried joined many activity

and volunteer. I could learn communicate with new people from volunteer. Before AUAP, I couldn't communicate with new people very well even Japanese. Now, I can say, “I can speak English. And then, I can communicate new people!”

I think future AUAP students should study a lot of English word before they come to America. AUAP was good for us to understand foreign culture. I'm glad that I came to AUAP, because I had fun for everything!

Analysis. Student Five speaks of the familiar interests in English language improvement and American culture as well as the same fears of language inadequacy or an inability to make new friends. But Student Five also reflects on how she changed as a person—how, through volunteering, she learned to communicate with new people, a trait she felt she didn't have even with Japanese. Student Five's reflection on her personal growth also supports the importance of communicative language use as part of the activities that the students participate in as part of their AUAP and Global Citizen experiences.

Student Five demonstrates her integrative motivation when she says that she “did [her] best [at] everything,” including joining multiple activities and volunteer opportunities. Her reflections on the volunteer activities suggest the culture and language-learning opportunities inherent in such service learning.

As with other student writers, Student Five recommends that future AUAP students study English. She feels that AUAP was a good opportunity for her to better understand foreign culture; in her experience, AUAP fulfilled the expectations of

communicative language learning and *monbushou's* guidelines on cultural understanding and awareness.

Student Six's essay

Before I came to AUAP, I was nervous. But, I was fun because I never been to America. I wanted to go America. I came to AUAP because I wanted to learn English skill, American culture, and communication with American people. So, I wanted to experience to everything. For example, learn English culture, make American friend, trip in famous place. Before I came, I excited to see many places in America. I was so nervous that I can't take communication with American people.

At AUAP, I experienced many things. I surprised that American people are so voluntary. When I visited Americans classes, American people were raised hand and voluntarily for many times. I thought, student are wonderful!

I also learned many things about American community. I went to Las Vegas to feel different culture. In Las Vegas, all buildings are illumination. And, some buildings were represented of famous countries. For example, Egypt, Italy, France, etc. I was very interesting. So, I went to Grand canyon too. It was beautiful! I could feel great earth! Las Vegas is a good place for many people from all over the world to sightseeing.

At AUAP, I helped the community by volunteering. Halloween party is the most remember activity because in Japan, Halloween party

was very small and I never seen big event just like EWU Halloween party. I thought good activity because we could communication with children and another people who are living in area through Halloween party. I could feel happy and different American culture by volunteering.

Now that AUAP is finished, I am so sad. I could have many memories. I learned all people can have connection between myself and another people who living another country. I learned about American culture and history, and, speaking English is so fun! I had never feel homesick during AUAP life. I changed that I have more interesting about U.S. I want to go another location to feel different culture. I thought, future AUAP students should find something that they want to be before come to EWU. I'm so happy that I can spend in EWU with AUAP staffs and my friends. Thank you so much and I love there life that spend in AUAP.

Analysis. Student Six's interests in studying abroad coincide with those of his peers: learning English and making friends. As with all of his peers, Student Six reflects on his foreign language anxiety: he was "nervous" that he couldn't communicate with Americans.

As with many of his peers, he is surprised by the different classroom dynamics in America with a more active student population.

Student Six also expresses an interest in traveling, and the benefit of cultural education it provided him. He provides specific examples from his travels in the United States, including Las Vegas and the Grand Canyon. He considered Las Vegas to be

multicultural, and suggests it is a good place for people from all over the world to visit.

Student Six also recognizes the value of the service learning activities in improving his English: he says that the Halloween volunteer activity was good because he could communicate with children and the local residents and learn more about American culture. Ultimately, Student Six discovered that he could form meaningful connections with people living in another country. Again, the student reflective writing reveals both the integrative motivation that the students form as well as the communicative nature of the activities they are participating in.

In his final reflections, Student Six discovered that people from different countries and cultures can form meaningful connections, despite the borders and differences. As one of the three students to address the issue of homesickness, Student Six insists he "had never [felt] homesick during [his] AUAP life." Indeed, this student developed a sense of belonging that helps support the correlation between a need for belonging and homesickness.

Student Seven's essay

> Before I came to AUAP, I felt very sad because I had never lived separate from my family. But I was looking forward to go to America. I came to AUAP because I wanted to improve my English skill. My English skill was very poor, so I wanted to study real English in America and make friends not only Americans. Before I came, I was most excited to hang out with many friends and learn about American history in English. I was nervous that I couldn't speak English very well. I was thinking that I

couldn't communicate with American people and other international students.

At AUAP, I had many experiences that Japan doesn't have. I was surprised by Native speakers speak English so fast. When I talked with my floor mate at first time, I couldn't hear her English. But it is practice for me to hear and speak English with Native speakers.

I also learned American communities. I joined a volunteer called "River Clean Up." When we arrived near Spokane River, I saw many volunteers. In Japan, most of volunteers are senior citizens or 40-50 years old people. But in America, many ages are volunteering. I think it is good point of America. I also think EWU has good environments. I like Cheney. Cheney is good for students to study.

Now that AUAP is finished, I feel really sad. I learned that we have almost same feelings even if our hometown is different. Before I came to AUAP, I was not active person. But now I became to raise my hand in the classes. I grew up better because of AUAP. I recommend future AUAP students to study English words and practice speaking English. I'm glad that I could study at EWU, because I could expand my horizons and become an active person!

Analysis. Like Student Four, Student Seven introduces the negative feelings associated with parting from her family for five months. Again, with this author, we can see the correlation between homesickness and the need to belong: she follows up concerns of homesickness with goals of studying English to make many new friends;

also, her concerns reflect a desire to belong to the community by being able to communicate with its members. While few of the students wrote about this issue of homesickness, it is a factor that often weighs heavily on students studying abroad for such an extended period of time. But by the end of her time in America, Student Four writes that she feels "really sad" that AUAP is finished. She found that she could belong in this community away from home; even if the "hometown is different," she realized that members of that community have similar feelings.

Student Seven, like the others, wishes to improve English and make new friends; she also considers her English to be "very poor," which she hopes to remedy by studying "real English in America" and through making friends. Her insistence on American English being "real" further supports the interesting cultural value of English and ownership: Americans have a "real" English, and the unspoken implication in such a reflection is that any English spoken in Japan is artificial. Nevertheless, Student Seven's reflection highlights her integrative motivation; she exhibits a positive attitude toward the community and a motivation to learn its language.

Her surprises in America are slightly different than her peers in that she focuses on the speed of "native speakers," which she considered too fast to understand. But this actually inspires her; she considers it "practice" to hear and speak English. This further highlights the student's integrative motivation by underscoring her willingness to work harder to learn the second language.

Student Seven's reflection on her volunteering experience provides interesting insight: she was surprised by the variety of age groups participating in the "River clean up," compared to her experience in Japan, where primarily older citizens volunteer. Such

reflection not only provides insight into the AUAP students' home culture for us to better understand their experiences, but it tells us just how valuable volunteer and service-learning activities are for the students during their time at AUAP.

Student Eight's essay

Before I came to AUAP, I didn't have any chance which I talk in English with American or people who can speak English hardly ever. I had only freshman English class. I have enrolled Asia university to take part in Asia University America Program. When I was high school student, I considered about my dream. Then, I couldn't decided definitely. But, I realized that I like to study English and I wanted to speak English fluently. If I can speak English, it'll useful in the future. That's why, I came here. I was really interested in foreign country. I wanted to experience American life. And I wanted to improve my English skill. Before I came to America, I was very excited to visit many place in America and to eat American food. But I was very nervous. Because I had never been to foreign country before I came. And I didn't have confidence which I can talk with American in English. And I thought there are many dangerous people in America.

At AUAP, I learned many things. I was surprised about class. First, in Asia University, we have to take class for one hour and half hour. It is very long. But, in EWU, it takes only 50 minutes! When I went to EWU class with my campus friend, I felt very short. Second, student attitude is

very active during class. Many students raise their hands. No one didn't fall asleep. It is very different from Japan. In Japan, most of students didn't active. I visited folk festival. I could learn about many kinds of culture. I saw many interesting goods. I interviewed EWU student many times. And I thought they are very cooperative and helpful. This is one of good point of American. I often went to see the sport game. Then, I realized difference between American and Japanese. American supporter is more aggressive than Japanese. They shouted bad words. I was so surprised.

I helped the community by volunteering. When I went to folk festival, I worked at reception desk as a guide. If visitor asked me how to go somewhere, I must teach direction in English. It was very hard work for me. Even though, I could realize that I was happy when I was working worth work doing such as help people even if it is difficult. This volunteer was great experience.

Now that AUAP is finished, I really don't want to go back to Japan. Because the chance which can talk with American will decrease absolutely. I could learn about myself that I became nervous when I talk with Americans face to face. I was upset. But now, I can speak more naturally.

I want to tell future AUAP student. It is important to study hard English before they come to America! It is really necessary! If I can back before AUAP, I might study English more hard. And they should start early to prepare luggage for study abroad as much as possible. I could not

sleep the day before departure day because I prepared. AUAP will finish soon. I could get a lot of wonderful experience and meet many wonderful persons.

Analysis. Student Eight provides a thorough reflection on her experiences both past and present. She claims that before she came to AUAP, she rarely had the opportunity to speak English with Americans or people who can speak English. She talks about her dream to speak English fluently, which directly inspired her participation in AUAP. These two ideas represent both the recognition of the need for communicative learning of English for her success as well as her development of integrative motivation for learning the language.

As with all of her peers, she highlights her primary interest of improving English, and as with many of them, she expresses an interest in American culture. She also discusses her lack of confidence in speaking English. She, too, is surprised by the difference in classroom styles, especially student attitude and active participation.

In her reflections on volunteer work, she talks about how hard it was to use English to negotiate meaning with native speakers and provide functional information in the form of directions, but how beneficial it was: even if it was difficult, she felt happy. Again, student reflection on the volunteer activities reveals the communicative and authentic language learning opportunities that they feel they are experiencing.

As with her peers, she is sad to be finishing AUAP; however, she laments returning because the chance to speak English with Americans "will decrease absolutely." Based on her pre-AUAP experiences with learning English, this student feels that the opportunity to use it authentically to communicate is not present in her home culture.

As with many of her fellow award participants, Student Eight admonishes future AUAP students to study English "hard" before coming to America.

Summary

My inclusion of the writing samples provided by the Global Citizen participants gives voice to those participants and includes them in the process of making meaning out of the Global Citizen Award. In my ethnographic research, I have provided an emic view of the AUAP experience and examined it holistically, but through the theoretical framework of the role of communicative language learning in TESOL and specifically AUAP curriculum, and how integrative motivation is a determining factor in second-language acquisition.

Chapter 8

Discussion

Major Themes In the Global Citizen Award

After the pilot of the award, the changes and new additions to the policies and requirements helped us discover the themes that we, as researcher, AUAP administrators, and AUAP student participants perceived and helped create as central to the award.

Communicative language learning. The major theme of the award remained the communicative approach to the learning of English as a foreign language, as evident by the removal of elements that did not fit within or support this theme and the addition of new features that helped stress it. We ensured ample opportunities for students to experience authentic communication with native speakers and other learners of English in a variety of social and cultural contexts and settings. The underlying theme in all of the award components was the use of English to navigate and negotiate meaning—between the student and the community in which they volunteered, their international peers, in social and functional settings and contexts, and by utilizing all of the language arts.

Reflective writing. The biggest of emerging themes that became primary to the award's purpose and benefits was reflective writing. While the award pilot did, in a limited sense, include reflective writing elements, we felt it most beneficial to include it extensively in each category as well as incorporate a personal essay prompt. The importance of such writing cannot be overstated: the successful production of language is, according to the NCTE (1996) and Tompkins (2007), a sign of "competent language users" (p. 19).

The National Council of Teachers of English (1996) identified seven characteristics of competent language learners: personal expression, aesthetic appreciation, collaborative exploration, strategic language use, creative communication, reflective interpretation, and thoughtful application. In personal expression, "students use language to express themselves, to make connections between their own experiences and their social world" (Tompkins, 2009, p. 19). The award reflective writing prompts encourage that students form this connection. Students also employ strategic language use as they attempt to "create and share meaning through language;" (p. 19) they employ creative communication by using "text forms and genres creatively as they share ideas through oral and written language" (p. 19) in their poster presentations; and they utilize reflective interpretation and thoughtful application in the reflective writing and personal essay: they "use language to organize and evaluate learning experiences, question personal and social values, and think critically" (p. 19) as well as "use language to solve problems, persuade others, and take action" (p. 19). By ensuring that reflective writing takes place in all elements of the global citizen award process, we are ultimately helping the participants increase their English language competency through using the language in "meaningful, functional, and genuine" ways (Tompkins, 2009, p. 19).

Reflective writing is also essential for successful integration of service learning into a curriculum. In "Reflection: Bridging the Gap Between Service and Learning," Bringle and Hatcher (1997) define reflection, specifically in terms of its relationship to service learning, as "the intentional consideration of an experience in light of particular learning objectives" (p. 153). They describe many forms that this reflection can take; we have opted for an approach similar to what the authors called "guided reflection" in the

form of personal journals—we provide the students with guide question prompts to encourage the students to write a reflective response that connects their reflection to the activity in meaningful ways. This is similar to what the authors describe as a "three-part journal" wherein students describe the activity, analyze how it relates to the course material, and apply it to their personal or professional life. Our reflective writing prompts seek to encourage the students to write reflectively in such a way as to consider meaningful personal connections to their experiences, especially in reflecting on their service learning experiences both in the individual prompts and the service learning reflection required in the new award category requirement: the Global Citizen Essay. The questions posed in the Global Citizen Essay prompt direct students to formulate or uncover those meaningful connections with their time before, during, and after AUAP, their language learning processes, their experiences in service learning, and their connections with their peers.

Summary of Findings from Data Analysis of the Student Essays

Analysis of the preceding essays revealed common patterns and themes throughout the students' reflective writing and experiences at AUAP and as participants in the Global Citizen Award. With the epistemology of constructivist grounded theory and as part of critical ethnography, I allowed for these patterns and themes to emerge based on the voice of the students. The following are patterns and themes that were common across all or most of the student essays:

Motivation for participating in AUAP. All eight of the participants considered the improvement of English as a primary reason for coming to AUAP. Seven of the eight

students expressed an interest in American life, culture, and/or history; six of the eight desired to make American friends and/or friends in America. Ultimately, all eight of the participants juxtaposed their desire to learn English with their interest in integrating into the language community.

The correlation between the two motivating factors—improvement in English and experience in the American community—can be safely assumed, as all students connected the two in their reflections on their motivations for coming to America. Based on this correlation, it seems that all of the students exhibited some level of integrative motivation in their participation in AUAP: the desire to improve in a second language born out of an authentic interest in the community.

Feelings of inadequacy in the use of English. All eight participants expressed concerns about their ability with English. Five of the eight students used terminology that expresses a feeling of lack of ability, such as "I can't speak English well/enough" or "I speak English poorly." Six of the eight used the term "nervous" or "nervousness" when describing their feeling when using of English. One student expressed explicitly a lack of "confidence" in using English. These all point to signs of foreign language anxiety, as well as a phenomenon known as anomie, or "normlessness," when social bonds break down or are non-existent between an individual and his or her community (Okabe, 2008)

Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) suggest that certain beliefs about language learning contribute to anxiety, especially the belief that "nothing should be said in the foreign language until it can be said correctly and that it is not okay to guess an unknown foreign language word" (p. 127). Indeed, many of the AUAP students, in my

observations as participant-observer, elicit this belief, which, in turn, affects their behavior. Such anxiety does have a detrimental impact on language performance: studies on the effects of anxiety on language learning "indicate that anxiety can affect the communication strategies students employ in language class," inspiring students to avoid more complicated messages in spoken or written forms (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986, p. 126). Studies also suggest that "anxiety centers on the two basic task requirements of foreign language learning: listening and speaking," with difficulty speaking in class being the most frequent (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986, p. 126). From my observations as participant-observer, the correlation between anxiety and speaking performance in the classroom helps explain why so many AUAP students, especially those represented by the Global Citizen Essay samples, struggle with functioning in spoken English, but write very clearly and effectively, even with minimal grammatical errors.

Surprises in the classroom. Most of the students expressed their surprises at certain differences between Japan and America, specifically regarding classroom cultural norms. Five of the students expressed surprise at the student participation in EWU classes, using terms such as "volunteering," "raising hands," and "sharing ideas" as elements of student participation that surprised them. Five students contrasted the EWU classes with their Japanese university classes. The surprise that the students reflect upon highlights the differences in cultural values regarding the adoption of communicative teaching methodologies within the classroom.

Volunteer activities. The reflections on volunteer work provided by the students reveal some common themes in what students perceived as beneficial. Three of the

students considered the volunteer activities as good opportunities to improve their English; three students discovered the value of cooperation through volunteer activities; five students felt the activities to be culturally educating; and all of the students described their volunteer activity experiences as positive, using terms such as “good,” “glad,” “nice,” “enjoy,” and/or “happy,” to describe the activity or their feelings toward the activities.

Reflections on the end of AUAP. Most of the students expressed sadness at AUAP coming to an end, but just as many of them expressed happiness when reflecting on their experiences and education. Six students claimed a newfound confidence as a result of their time at AUAP; six explicitly stated an improvement in their English language abilities; four students stated that they were able to learn about another country or culture.

For future recommendations, four students advised that new AUAP students study English “hard” or “well” before coming to America.

The correlation between the improvement of English and access to native speakers. Several of the writers claim in their reflection that being able to speak with native users of English is crucial to their learning of the language. Other than the implied correlation between a desire to learn English and a desire to make American friends, many of the student participants explicitly stated their reliance on native speakers to improve in the foreign language. Student One writes, “I improved my English skills because I talked to many American[s],” implying a causation with her “because” dependent clause. Student Three says, “after AUAP I think we lose speak English opportunity with American people, if I [don’t?] have good American friends who can

contact with me on internet or Skype." The idea here seems to be that the loss of the native speaker will result in a loss of opportunities to speak English unless he can maintain a relationship with the American contacts. And Student Eight writes, "Now that AUAP is finished, I really don't want to go back to Japan. Because the chance which can talk with American will decrease absolutely." In their reflections, these students demonstrate a premonition of what many students at Asia University realize: the loss and lack of access to native speakers.

Chapter 9

Conclusions

In the conclusions of this thesis report, I revisit the assumptions I made about the community of language learners at AUAP during my fifteen-plus months as a participant observer. Additionally, I revisit my research questions to address if and how the questions were answered. I then offer recommendations for future work and iterations of the Global Citizen Award. I call for future research to be done to better answer questions left unstated or not fully addressed. Finally, the chapter ends with my final reflections on the research and development of the Global Citizen Award and how I have changed as a participant in AUAP as well as a future teacher of English as a Second or Foreign Language.

Assumptions Revisited

From the time I began working with AUAP until the pilot of the Global Citizen Award, I developed assumptions about the students participating in the study-abroad program from Japan. These assumptions influenced my participation in the development and coordination of the award; additionally, my changing assumptions helped shape the next iteration of the award, and guide the claims I make throughout this report. The following are some of the common assumptions I adopted throughout the award development process:

1. Students operating in a given section will demonstrate language capabilities, both in writing and speaking, that coincide with the mean level of that section. If students are speaking at a lower level, they will write at a lower level.

This assumption was dramatically disproved when I saw the resultant student essays. The AUAP administrators and I developed the writing prompt length requirements based on our perceptions of section capabilities and in my assessment of their abilities based primarily off of verbal communication. But as the research regarding foreign language anxiety demonstrates (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986), students experiencing anxiety tend to demonstrate this anxiety in spoken classroom use of the foreign language; indeed, my assumptions of their written ability based on observation of their spoken ability was a gross miscalculation, probably the result of this phenomenon of foreign language anxiety affecting their speech but not their writing. The students disproved my assumption wholly by writing above and beyond the minimum requirements and expectations we had set for them.

2. Motivation levels correlate to the cycle, with Cycle I students professing higher levels when compared to Cycle II in a given year, due, primarily, to their voluntary participation in AUAP versus their mandatory participation.

   After two cycles of the Global Citizen Award, and after almost four cycles working with AUAP students, I tend to agree with this assumption, based on my observations. I have worked with students from Cycle II 2010 to the current Cycle I 2012, so I have observed two Cycle II 's and Two Cycle I's. Cycle I students seem more motivated to participate in everything related to AUAP, including the Global Citizen Award. During Cycle I of 2011, we had an overwhelming initial interest in the award, with a significantly high ratio of participants to the student body participating throughout most of the cycle. The

final ratio of 8 out of 33 is significantly higher than 8 out of 44 for the following Cycle II award.

3. AUAP students desire a communicative language learning experience.

   Based both on my participant observation and my analysis of the Global Citizen Essays, this seems unequivocally to be the case. Students prefer the opportunities to have meaningful conversations with their peers or Classroom Volunteers during "free conversation," where they produce more authentic dialogue and more natural usage of the language with less focus on perfect form or memorized terms. As the student authors of the Global Citizen Essay demonstrate, all of them came to AUAP with the desire to improve in English through communication with new friends.

4. Students can gain a communicative language learning experience through activities such as service learning.

   Through both my observations as Student Services Assistant and my analysis of the student essays, this seems to be the case. I have seen first-hand the students negotiate meaning by communicating in functional and meaningful ways with other participants in the volunteer activities and cultural events. The reflective writing from the Global Citizen award seems to suggest this, as well, with several students claiming an improvement in English ability through their volunteer work, and most expressing some form of cultural learning taking place.

5. AUAP students perceive the need for native speakers to elicit a truly beneficial English-learning experience.

   Through both the student writing and my observations of student behavior in and

out of the classroom, this also appears to be the case. In the reflective essays, many students lament the loss of native partners and the seemingly inevitable, consequential loss of ability they will face upon return to Japan. Additionally, while the students are here, they seek out opportunities to practice English with "native" speakers as opposed to each other, where dialogue is primarily in Japanese.

6. Students quickly lose motivation and communicative English practices upon their return to Japan.

   Based on the predictive reflections of the Global Citizen Essay writers as well as the current frustrations expressed by Asia University faculty, this assumption has merit, though it is not applicable to all of the AUAP students, past or present. Many of the current students predict that they will not be able to maintain their motivation or communication in English; however, just as many, via their reflective essays, promise themselves that they will maintain contact with their friends and other native speakers and keep studying in order to nurture their English language learning process. In my own observations, I have seen many of the previous cycle students do so through use of social networking resources such as Facebook, where they regularly post in English or hold dialogue with others in English.

Revisiting these assumptions helps me envision where the Global Citizen Award has succeeded and where it should go from here for improvements and seeing to future student needs. I have the realization that different cycles will evoke entirely different levels of motivation; it is a safe bet that those who are here of their own volition will be

more motivated to participate in certain activities. The challenge is two-fold: living up to the expectations and demands of a highly motivated group, and providing additional motivation for those less so.

Through my extensive research, my observations as a participant in AUAP, and my analysis of student reflection, it is evident that CLT is beneficial to second-language learners studying abroad from Japan; all of the participants, from administrators to teachers to students, should make every attempt to maintain, enforce, and build upon communicative language teaching methodologies in AUAP curriculum.

The worth of service-learning learning activities is self-evident. Challenging though they may be, these volunteer activities give students authentic opportunities to use the language functionally and communicatively, and they provide (often sobering) cultural lessons.

Finally, the Japanese cultural belief of the ownership of English coupled with the evident success of working with native speakers in the study-abroad program combine to create a dramatic and swift regression to old habits and cultural values upon the return to Japan. While this trend is common, it is not complete: many students find ways to overcome their perceived handicap and maintain English usage communicatively through viable resources. With this in mind, it is worth positing curricular adaptations for returning students that encourage them to continue using English in meaningful ways with perceived "authentic" users.

Research Questions Answered

1. How can the Global Citizen Award provide integrative motivation for authentic

participation in a communicative English language experience?

To best answer this, I will first reiterate the definitions of both terms. "Integrative motivation" as defined by Gardner and Lambert is the "willingness or desire to be like valued members of the 'other' language community," which results in more motivation and harder work to learn that community's language and a higher resultant success rate (Gardner, 1968). "Communicative language learning" requires "using the language to navigate meaning authentically—to communicate with another speaker of the language" (Savignon, 2001) and is learned through content-based instruction focused on "semantic notions and social functions" (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

With these definitions in mind, the students participating in the award are demonstrating integrative motivation—based on my analysis as participant observer and their own reflective writing samples, the student participants in the global citizen award desire to participate in the language community in meaningful ways, and this, in turn, inspires their desire to improve in the target language. And, as my analysis of the Global Citizen Award as text suggests, the component requirements of the award are communicative in nature. So, whether the award inspires integrative motivation or recognizes the students who have it, it provides a space for students to develop their own integrative motivation and the opportunities for them to do so.

2. In what ways does participation in the award process impact the education opportunities of Asia University America Program students?

It is my observation that the Global Citizen Award provides a beneficial

complement to the classroom curriculum; additionally, it provides its own educational opportunities that support the mission statements of AUAP and Asia University alike. For the former point, by participating in many of the activities via the Global Citizen Award, the students take the knowledge they have gained in the class—the "semantic notions and social functions—and gives the students real-world, authentic space and time in which to use them. Students must apply their practice in English dialogue to the dynamic and authentic scenarios they face in the communities in which they volunteer or participate. For the latter point, the activities embodied in the Global Citizen Award process are their own educational opportunities. Students are learning about international and inter-cultural communication, gaining cultural education, and developing their critical and reflective writing skills.

3. How does the award meet the mission statements of Asia University America Program and their parent school, Asia University? How does it interface with program goals and objectives?

Looking back on Asia University's foundational policy of "self help" as the root of cooperation, the Global Citizen Award acknowledges students that display integrative motivation to participate in the various opportunities presented to them. The award, while encouraging students to participate in group activities, recognizes their autonomy in actively pursuing the award and fulfilling its requirements. IN this way, the award supports the idea that autonomy leads to cooperation.

As for how the award fits within AUAP's goals and objectives, the Global

Citizen Award is a resource designed specifically for meeting the component of AUAP's mission statement that promotes “a variety of work-related, social, and cross-cultural opportunities for AUAP students [that] help AUAP students to develop a keener sense of cultural awareness and cross-cultural understanding” (AUAP). The opportunities promoted through the award are designed to give students experience in social arenas and exposure to a variety of cultures, and not just those of America.

4. What can be learned about the students who participate in the award?

   The analysis provided in Chapter 7 of the Global Citizen Essays provides a wealth of information about the experiences of the students who participated in the award, including their motivating factors, their experiences volunteering, and their multicultural educational opportunities.

5. What more might AUAP administrators, staff, and faculty do to further engage the students through promoting and offering this award?

   To answer this question, I turn now to the recommendations for future iterations of the award.

Recommendations for Future Award Iterations

Even with the extensive amount of revision that the award underwent post-pilot, there are still changes that can be made to best promote students' integrative motivation and authentic communicative language learning experiences.

1. Modification of reflective writing prompt length requirements and scaffolding as necessary.

As the second Global Citizen cycle demonstrated, assumptions about student ability were dramatically refuted by the quantity and quality of essays provided by the students. Based on the capabilities and motivation of a given cycle and the range of sections within that cycle, the word number requirements can be adjusted to fit the perceived abilities of the students accordingly.

Additionally, a student over-reliance on scaffolding, such as the essay prompt outline and an additional essay model, were factors into the similar format and rhetoric of all of the essays. However, this is not necessarily of detriment; it makes analysis and evaluation of the awards more streamlined and consistent. The scaffolding can be modified as necessary.

2. Merging of "leadership role" activities and clarification.

   Based on dialogue with AUAP administrators about the continued confusion regarding the language of activity requirements such as "Create and organize an 'AUAP Night' activity," the relevant activities will be merged into one activity and renamed: "Help an IPA or CA plan a new activity for AUAP and EWU students. Help the IPA or CA with the activity."

3. Modification of the poster presentation to be more integrative and more in the theme of global connections, i.e., a "cultural presentation."

   The poster presentation has long been problematic for the award process. While as an activity it incorporates all of the language arts (NCTE, 1996), it was perceived by many parties to be out of context of the award and overlapping with an existing class assignment of similar form and function. There were also issues with organizing and holding the poster presentation. I recommend that the next

iteration of the award change the scope of the poster: it should be an optional component, and it should fit the theme of global connections and communication, rather than overlap with the reflective writing. With this in mind, the AUAP administrators and I have suggested a "Cultural Presentation" poster, wherein the student can share one part of their home culture during an AUAP "Culture Night." This will allow the students to truly share their own culture with an audience, using all of the language arts within the context of intercultural communication.

Suggestions for Future Research

As I took part in the extensive research to build a foundation for this thesis project, I have come to recognize both large-scale and immediate issues that can and should be researched to continue the work I have developed and the work I have referenced as well.

1. Conduct follow-up research of previous AUAP students.

   Considering the general trends toward loss of motivation and ability in speaking English that the students exhibit after returning to Japan, it may be beneficial to poll previous participants of the Global Citizen Award to see what methods, if any, they are taking to remain motivated and continue using English communicatively.

2. Continue research into CLT implementation in Japanese public schools.

   Much of the research that I gathered and analyzed looks at the lack of Communicative Language Teaching methodology in Japanese public schools. If the Japanese Ministry of Education continues to call for its implementation

through numerous new policies, is imperative to continue looking into the factors impeding CLT education in primary and secondary schools as well as research into how to best integrate it.

3. Conduct more follow-up research into the adequacy of pre-service and in-service training of Japanese teachers of English and JET participants.

    As suggested by the fairly recent studies conducted by Kikuchi and Browne (2009) and Ohtani (2010), there are still issues with the pre-service and in-service training of both Japanese teachers of English and the Assistant Language Teachers hired and deployed through JET that are preventing an adequate adaptation of CLT in public schools in Japan. While the research conducted by Kikuchi, Browne, (2009), Ohtani, et al, (2010) suggests what factors are causing the lack of adequate teacher preparation, future research may look at possible corrections, modifications, and/or changes to pre- and in-service training methods employed by public institutions and the JET program that would help better train teachers in communicative approaches to teaching English.

4. Provide more representation of the teacher voices in the issue of CLT in Japanese public schools through critical ethnography.

    While much of the research I've gathered and analyzed looks at how teachers are not adopting CLT methodology, and while some of the research briefly gives voice to the teacher's side of the issue (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009), there is the opportunity for more thorough and extensive representation of the teacher's role in curriculum development and decision-making. A series of interviews and/or prolonged participant-observation operating in critical

ethnography would not only give the teachers a bigger voice in the discourse taking place about the inadequacies of public second-language education in Japan, but also ensure that they are taking part in progressive steps toward remedying those inadequacies.

Final Reflections

My work with Asia University America Program, especially as coordinator for the Global Citizen Award, has given me invaluable time and experience working with the very students I am preparing to teach. As I write this thesis, I am making arrangements to move overseas to teach English as part of the Center for English Language Education at Asia University in Tokyo, Japan. Working with Asia University students taught me about the experiences and expectations that they enter the program with from Asia University and Japanese culture; it also taught me about how they change in positive ways while they are here. But ultimately, these fifteen months working with the students from Asia University has taught me the most about myself and helped me shape my goals for teaching as I prepare to begin a new life educating new Freshman at Asia University.

For three cycles now, I have witnessed new groups of bright-eyed, bewildered, jet-lagged Japanese students disembark from Spokane International Airport into a country vast and spacious and dramatically different from Japan. They gawk at the vacant plains and distant hills, at the size of American cars and food and people. They shiver in the cold and dry climate. And they sit, bewildered, in an American class where they are expected to participate and volunteer as opposed to sleep or use their iPhones. But as time goes on, they adapt: they grow accustomed to the large portions of food, the weeks

of endless snow... and they learn the value of participating in class, of communicating with their peers and the native speakers all around them. They make new friends (hopefully lifelong); they excitedly participate in a myriad of activities, and try new restaurants, and ride the bus into Spokane to go shopping at the vintage clothing stores and the Valley Mall. All the while, they begin to realize that in order to succeed in America, to survive, they need to use the language not just as a tool to answer questions on a test, but to navigate the community, to negotiate meaning with its inhabitants. By the time the students leave, they have given up on the anxiety of using English incorrectly, and instead enjoy its use to communicate meaningful experiences and memories with their new friends, some of whom are remaining behind in America to see them off, but many of whom are flying with them back to Japan—back to Asia University—to begin school again with (hopefully) a new perspective on what English can be, and what it can be used for.

I feel that my observations of the way the students grow and change while they are here has given me a preemptive understanding of what attitudes and expectations they will enter my Freshman English class with, and how it is to their benefit that I help them grow and change in advance—not only to prepare them for their time at AUAP, but also to give them an advantageous communicative language education that they may have never gotten in elementary or high school. And with the valuable and countless hours that I have devoted to researching the factors in Japanese culture and education that have helped shape these students, I hope to add my voice and assistance to the betterment of Teaching English as a Second Language in Japan and in the community of language teachers the world over.

References

Asia University. *Asia University.* Retrieved January 2012, from http://www.asia-u.ac.jp/english/

Bogdan, R. (1973). Participant observation. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 50(4), pp. 302-308.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education,* 67(2), 221-239.

Buswinda, H. F., Butler, A., Five, C. L., & Harste, J. C. (1996). Exploring language arts standards within a cycle of learning. *Language Arts, 73*(1), 10.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne. (2001). Language teaching approaches: An overview. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 3-11). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Center for English Language Education (CELE). *Center for English Language Education at Asia University*. Retrieved January, 2012, from http://www.asia-u.ac.jp/cele/

Chapelle, C. A., & Duff, P. A. (2003). Some guidelines for conducting quantitative and qualitative research in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly,* 37(1), pp. 157-178.

Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR). *The Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme*. http://www.jetprogramme.org

Educational Testing Service (ETS). About the TOEIC test. *TOEIC.* http://www.toeic.or.jp/toeic_en/toeic

Eyler, J. (2002). Reflection: Linking service and Learning—Linking students and communities. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(3), 517-534.

Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, R. C. (1968). Attitudes and motivation: Their role in second-language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly,* 2(3), pp. 141-150.

Gardner, R. C., Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*.

Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (1997). Reflection: Bridging the gap between service and learning. *College Teaching,* 45(4), 153-58.

Henze, R. C. (1995). Guides for the novice qualitative researcher. *TESOL Quarterly,* 29(3), Qualitative Research in ESOL, pp. 595-599.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), pp. 125-132.

International Reading Association (IRA) & National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). (1996). *Standards for the English Language Arts*. Newark: International Reading Association.

Kikuchi, K., & Browne, C. (2009). English educational policy for high schools in Japan: Ideals vs. reality. *RELC Journal,* 40(2), 172-191.

Koyama, T., & Takeuchi, O. (2007). Does look-up frequency help reading comprehension of EFL learners? Two empirical studies of electronic dictionaries. *CALICO Journal*, 25(1), 110-125.

Lecompte, M. (2002). The transformation of ethnographic practice: Past and current challenges. *Qualitative Research,* 2(3), 283-299.

LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Ethnographic data collection in evaluation research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 4(3), pp. 387-400.

Mills, J., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). The development of constructivist grounded theory. *International Journal,* 5(March), 1-10.

Mills, J., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). Adopting a constructivist approach to grounded theory: Implications for research design. *International Journal of Nursing Practice,* 12(1), 8-13.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly,* 37(4), pp. 589-613.

Ohtani, C. (2010). Problems in the assistant language teacher system and English activity at Japanese public elementary schools. *Educational Perspectives*, 43(1-2), 38-45.

Okabe, M. (2008). *ESL students report their experiences of anomie in journal writing: \ Action, participant-observer research*. Published Graduate Thesis, Eastern Washington University.

Pipher, M. (2002). *The Middle of Everywhere*. San Diego: Harcourt.

Savignon, S. J. (2001). Communicative language teaching for the twenty-first century. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 13-28). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Snow, M. A. (2001). Content-based and immersion models for second and foreign language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 303-318). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Tompkins, G. (2009). *Language Arts*. Upper Saddle River: Merrill/Pearson.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1988). Ethnography in ESL: Defining the essentials. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(4), pp. 575-592.

Wada, M., ed. 1994. The Course of Study for Senior High School: Foreign Languages (English Version). In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 13-14). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Appendix A

Global Citizen Award Pilot Information Packet

Name: _____

Global Citizen Award

Asia University America Program

To earn this award, students must complete the following:

Required Activities (all of these must be completed in order to receive the award)

Academics

- ☐ Earn all A's or S's in each AUAP class.
- ☐ Have no more than three absences per class.
- ☐ Visit and watch an EWU class with an American friend and write about your experience. **Deadline is May 27th**

My EWU Class Experience

1. Whom did you go with? _____

2. What class did you visit? _____

3. Date: _____

4. Write three interesting things about this experience:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Volunteer Activities (Deadline is June 10th)

☐ Complete three AUAP or EWU volunteer activities during the cycle.

Activity #1 What did you do? _____

_____

Activity #2 What did you do? _____

_____

Activity #3 What did you do? _____

_____

Global Connections

☐ Interview three international students at EWU. **(Deadline is July 1st)**

Interview One

Whom did you interview? _____

Where did you meet him/her? _____

Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Question #3 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Interview Two
Whom did you interview? _____

Where did you meet him/her? _____

Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Question #3 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Interview Three
Whom did you interview? _____

Where did you meet him/her? _____

Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Optional Activities (*choose and complete at least three*)

☐ Volunteer as a Japanese tutor (with EWU students taking Japanese 103 or 203). **(Deadline is June 3rd)**
Whom did you tutor? _____
*How many times?*_____
What are some things you taught him/her? _____
_____
_____
_____

Teach and share Japanese culture with friends, students, or children in the EWU/ Cheney/Spokane area. **(Deadline is June 3rd)**
What did you do? _____
_____
_____
Date: _____ *Place:* _____

☐ Lead an "AUAP Night" activity.
What did you do? _____
_____
_____
_____

☐ Lead an activity for AUAP and EWU students in a residence hall. **(Deadline is June 3rd)**

What did you do? _____
_____
_____
_____
Date: _____ *Place:* _____

☐ Organize and lead an activity for your IPA group. **(Deadline is July 1st)**

What did you do? _____
_____
_____
_____
Date: _____ *Place:* _____

☐ Lead or start an EWU or AUAP club (English club, Kamishibai club, Global Communications club, etc.). **(Deadline is July 1st)**
What did you do? _____
_____
_____

Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Question #3 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

_____

Active Participation

Participate in an EWU and/or AUAP club or group. Examples include: AUAP Photo Club, EWU Japanese Club, EWU intramural sports. **(Deadline is June 3rd)**

What did you do? _____
How many times? _____

☐ Complete at least one challenge from the Eagle Hall Challenge Board each time they are presented in American Life Class.
What did you do? _____
_____
_____
_____

☐ Have perfect IPA meeting attendance during AUAP.
Ask for your IPA's signature: _____

☐ Attend at least one EWU (or Spokane) cultural activity. Examples include: musical performances, plays, lectures, art showings, etc.

What did you do? _____
_____
When did you go? _____

☐ Have no warning letters.

☐ Present a poster presentation about your AUAP life and experiences at the Outstanding Ambassador Symposium.

Join an international club or organization at EWU such as the International Student Association. **(Deadline is June 3rd)**
How many times did you go? _____
What did you do? _____
_____
_____
_____

☐ Participate in a cultural event in Spokane such as "Bloomsday," "Lilac Festival Torchlight Parade," "Hoopfest," or "4th of July Neighbor Day" and write at least 75 - 100 words about it.

Cultural Event

1. What did you do? _____

2. Whom did you go with? _____

3. Date: _____

4. Write three interesting things about this experience:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

This is an opportunity for you and your classmates to challenge yourselves!
Be your best and accomplish greatness!
Matthew Miner via email: mminer@eagles.ewu.edu

Appendix B

Global Citizen Award Current Information Packet

Global Citizen Award

Asia University America Program

Name _____

To get this award, students must complete the following by January 31st:

I. Required Activities:
- ☐ Volunteer Activities (page 2)
- ☐ Global Connections (pages 3 and 4)
- ☐ Active Participation (page 5)
- ☐ Global Citizen Essay (page 6)

II. 3 Additional Activities: (pages 7 and 8)
- ☐ Activity 1 (your choice)
- ☐ Activity 2 (your choice)
- ☐ Activity 3 (your choice)

*Check each box when you complete the activity.

When you complete this packet, have the Student Services Assistant sign below:

Student Services Assistant Signature_____Date_____

Volunteer Activities

☐ Complete three AUAP or EWU volunteer activities. Write complete sentences.

Activity #1: What did you do? _____

_____

_____

What was the most interesting thing about this activity? _____

_____

_____

_____

Activity #2: What did you do? _____

_____

_____

What was the most interesting thing about this activity? _____

_____

_____

_____

Activity #3: What did you do? _____

_____

_____

What was the most interesting thing about this activity? _____

_____

_____

_____

Global Connections (complete both requirements)

☐ Interview three international students at EWU. They cannot be American or Japanese. Choose two interesting questions and two follow-up questions for each interview. You must write the answers yourself.

Interview One

Whom did you interview? _____

Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Follow-up Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Follow-up Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Interview Two

Whom did you interview? _____

Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Follow-up Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Follow-up Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Interview Three

Whom did you interview? _____

Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Follow-up Question #1 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

Follow-up Question #2 _____

_____

Answer: _____

_____

☐ Write at least three sentences about your conversations with international students. What did you learn? What was interesting? Etc.

_____

_____

_____

Active Participation (complete all five requirements)

☐ Participate in an EWU and/or AUAP club or group. Examples include AUAP Photo Club, EWU Japanese Club, and EWU intramural sports.

Write at least 50 words about your experience in this group, club, or sport. Describe what you did and how often, what was most fun, most difficult, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Attend at least one EWU cultural activity. Examples include musical performances, plays, lectures, art showings, sporting events, etc.

Write about the activity. What did you do? When and where did you go? What did you think about it? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Have no warning letters.

☐ Make a poster about your AUAP life and present it at Sushi Night.

☐ Write about a memorable experience that you had in American culture. You can write about an activity in Cheney or Spokane, your vacation travels in the United States, etc. You must write at least 50 words.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Global Citizen Essay

☐ Write an essay in English about your experience in AUAP and your work for the Global Citizen Award. Answer the following questions in complete sentences. The essay must be at least 200 words. Please staple your completed essay behind the Global Citizen Award packet.

Your essay should follow this order, and each sentence should answer one of these questions:

Paragraph 1 – "Before I came to AUAP, _____"

1. Why did you come to AUAP?
2. What did you want to experience at AUAP? (Improve English? Meet Americans? Etc?)
3. Before you came, what were you most excited about?
4. Before you came, what were you most nervous or worried about?

Paragraph 2 – "At AUAP, I experienced / learned many things."

1. What are some surprising or interesting things you learned while at AUAP?
2. What did you learn about the communities at AUAP? Think about
    a. the communities you visited,
    b. the international students you interviewed, and
    c. the American communities such as Eastern, Spokane, the U.S., etc.

Paragraph 3 – "At, AUAP, I helped the community by volunteering."

1. What volunteer activity do you remember the most? Why?
2. What did you think of this activity?
3. How did you feel volunteering at this activity?
4. What did you learn about the community by volunteering?
5. What did you learn about yourself by volunteering?
6. How do you feel about volunteering? What is good, bad, etc?

Paragraph 3 – "Now that AUAP is finished, _____"

1. What did you learn about yourself during AUAP?
2. How did you change as a person at AUAP?
3. What would you tell future AUAP students to prepare them for AUAP?
4. What are your final thoughts on AUAP? Did your opinions change from before you came?

If you need help with is essay, talk to Matthew during his office hours in LA 106A or by email at mminer@eagles.ewu.edu.

Three Additional Activities (*choose three from pages 8-9*)

☐ Be a student in an EWU class (Concert Choir, Brass Band, Fast Fitness, etc.)
*What class did you join and attend?*_____

☐ Go to an EWU class at least three times. Observe the class and write about your experience below. What class did you attend? How did the professor teach the class? How did the students work? How was it different from Asia University? Etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Volunteer as a Japanese tutor with EWU students taking Japanese 101 or 201.
Whom did you tutor? _____*How many times?*_____

What are some things you taught him/her? _____

_____

_____

☐ Create and organize an "AUAP Night" activity.
What did you do? _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Create an activity for AUAP and EWU students in your dormitory.
What did you do? _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Organize an activity for your IPA group.
What did you do? _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Join an international club or organization at EWU such as the International Student Association (ISA).
What did you do? _____

_____

_____

☐ Go to a cultural event in Spokane. What event did you go to? What happened there? Did you go with someone? What did you think about the event? Write at least 50 words about it below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Questions? Email Matthew: mminer@eagles.ewu.edu

Appendix C

Global Citizen Award Poster Presentation Handout

Global Citizen Award Poster Requirements

- Title – be creative!
- Your name
- Several pictures
- At least one sentence about each of the following:
    - Class experiences
    - Volunteer work
    - International student connections
    - Active participation
    - Your favorite activity or accomplishment while earning the Global Citizen award

Speech requirements

1. Describe yourself at the beginning of AUAP cycle.
2. Why did you want to earn this award?
3. Talk about
    a. School (for example, favorite class and why)
    b. Volunteer work (what was your most memorable volunteer activity? what did you learn? How did you change?)
4. International student connections
    a. What did you learn by interviewing international students?
    b. Any other experiences with international students?
5. Favorite activity at AUAP
6. Describe yourself now. How have you changed or grown?

Remember:

1. Be creative with your poster! Have fun! It does not need a lot of writing.
2. Your speech does not have to be serious or formal. You will just answer questions about your poster and AUAP experience.
3. If you have any questions, ask the Student Services Assistant.

Appendix D

Institutional Review Board Forms

Institutional Review Board
for Human Subjects Research

Application for Exemption
Appendix A: Consent Form Appendix B: Writing Prompt

Return original and two copies to: Grants Office, 210 Showalter

Principal Investigator	**Responsible Project Investigator**
Matthew Miner, Master of Arts Candidate in English 2800 Al Ogdon Way, Apt. 226 Cheney, WA 99004 509-551-0852 E-mail: mminer@eagles.ewu.edu	**(faculty or staff supervisor required <u>if PI is a student</u>)** Dr. LaVona Reeves, Director of MA-TESL Department of English, 158A Reid School (509) 359-7060 lreeves@mail.ewu.edu

Title of Project
The Asia University America Program Global Citizen Award Reflective Essay

For students only: Is this research being done to meet a course, thesis or other academic requirement? (please specify)
Thesis
If not, why is it being done?

Project anticipated starting date September 10, 2011 **Anticipated termination date** September 9, 2012

Funding: **Non-funded**___X__**Internal funding**_____**External funding**_____
Funding status: **proposal in preparation**_____**pending agency decision**_____**funded**_____
Funding Agency (if applicable): **Grant or Contract Number:**

Check the type of exemption applicable to the project
1. _X_ 2._____ 3.____ 4._____ 5._____ 6._____ None_____
Why should this project be considered exempt?
This study will be conducted in AUAP classes, which include journaling, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing. The requirements remain the same—everyone participating in the award process writes a reflective essay at the end. Data collected in these essays will be analyzed for the study and are valuable to the AUAP faculty and administrators and thesis writer (Miner). The project is similar to the projects of Ochs (2011), Ray (2011), Ubaldo (2010), Lohpaisankrit (2008), Okabe (2008), Parker (2008), Wolfe (2004), Huff (2005), and Browne (2005), whose studies all incorporated essays of this kind.

Please state the purpose and methodology of the research:
This action research will investigate the benefits of the Global Citizen Award as students state in their essays. Quotes from students' essays will be analyzed to better understand their motivation, interest, language gains, and service learning. This kind of expressive and reflective writing is commonly included in the existing AUAP curriculum.

Describe the procedures: what specifically will subjects do? If data are anonymous, describe the data gathering procedur insuring anonymity.
Miner will write the essay prompt, and participants will write the essay at home and submit it to Miner by the stated dead Essays will meet the standards established by Miner earlier this year. With student consent, some of these essays will be included in the thesis and will be analyzed and/or coded and qualitatively discussed. The essays will not be collected anonymously, but the information will remain confidential. Students will not be mentioned by name in the thesis, but by number. The students will be assigned a unique number to ensure the students' anonymity. Miner, AUAP Faculty, and R will know the identity, but files will be secured so that no else knows who wrote the essays.
Attach all surveys, questionnaires, cover letters, information sheets, etc. (including required IRB contact information (see instructions)

The information provided above is accurate and the project will be conducted in accordance with applicable Federal, State and University regulations and ethical standards.

Signature, Principal Investigator(s)_____ **Date**_____

Recommendations and Action	**Date**	**Approve/Disapprove**
Faculty Sponsor (for student)		
Dept IRB Representative or Dept Chair		
Institutional Review Board		

Conditions:_____ **Approved from**_____ **To**_____

Exemption Decision Aid

Research Qualifying for Exemption from Federal Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects
(Quoted from the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 46.101(b)(1-6))

(1). Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or on the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

(2). Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that the human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

(3). Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) requires without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

(4). Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or though identifiers linked to the subjects.

(5). Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of the department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

(6). Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level of and for a use found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Based on both federal policy and/or University policy, exempt status may not be granted for research in the preceding six categories if any of the following conditions applies (except for certain exemptions for children):

Yes	No	
_____	__x__	If any of the subjects are confined in a correctional or detention facility.
_____	__x__	If pregnancy is a prerequisite for serving as a subject.
_____	__x__	If fetuses *in utero* are subjects in this research.

_____ __x__If any subjects are presumed not to be legally competent.
_____ __x__If personal records (medical, academic, etc.) are used without written consent.
_____ __x__If data from subjects (responses, information, specimens, etc.) are directly or indirectly identifiable.
_____ __x__If data are damaging to subjects' financial standing, employability or reputation
_____ __x__If material obtained at autopsy is to be used in the research.
_____ __x__If subjects are to be asked sensitive questions about personal feelings, behavior, interactions, or sexual experiences.
_____ __x__If alcohol or any other drugs will be ingested.
_____ __x__If blood or body fluids will be drawn.
_____ x____If any of the subjects are children as defined by state law.*
_____ x____Will the child participate in a survey?
_____ x____Will the child be interviewed?
_____ x____Will the investigator manipulate the environment or interact with the child as part of the data gathering?

* Children are persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted. If subjects have the legal status of emancipated minors, or are mature minors, i.e., they may legally be treated as adult for certain purposes, they may be exempt from the restrictions applicable to children.

Procedures for Submitting Requests for Exemption from Review of Research Using Human Subjects

I. Necessity for Review

It must first be determined as to whether or not the activity to be undertaken involves research and involves human subjects. In a university setting there is frequently a pedagogical as well as research function to activities, especially in group student projects, which may make it difficult to determine whether actual research is involved as opposed to teaching the methodology of research.

Research is defined by federal regulations as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities which meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this policy, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities." [Federal Policy 45CFR45.102(d)] Resulting *generalizable knowledge* is the key element in the definition. If results of a study are to be published, presented in a paper or otherwise implied to have implications beyond the test population, this is considered evidence of the intent to obtain generalizable knowledge.

Human subjects are defined by the regulations as "living individual(s) about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains (1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or (2) identifiable private information" [Federal Regulation 45CFR45.102(f)]. Additionally, there are guidelines that distinguish therapeutic activities from research in the health fields. If the Responsible Project Investigator is unsure as to whether an activity should be classified as research, the Director of Grants and Research Development or the Chair of the IRB should be consulted.

II. Determining Exempt Status

Research involving human subjects or data derived from human subjects falls into one of three review categories: Exempt, Expedited and Full IRB Review. To be exempt the research must meet the following conditions.

Exempt Research

Categories of exempt research are established by federal regulations and cannot be amended. In general, research that does not disrupt or manipulate subjects' normal life experiences, or incorporate any form of intrusive procedures, may be exempt as long as it does not include one of 12 exceptions to the provisions for exemption (see Exemption Decision Aid attached to Application for Exemption). These exceptions focus on more than minimal risk, lack of anonymity, and protection of vulnerable subjects. It should be noted that adults as well as children are subject to the above provisions, with additional protections in place for children.

In the Application for Exemption, the criteria for exemption established by federal regulation 45CFR46.101(b)(1-6) are listed in the Decision Aid. If the proposed research conforms to one of these categories and does not include one of the 12 exceptions to the exemptions, then the investigator may apply for an exemption from further IRB review. When there is no more than minimal risk, it may take several weeks or more depending on the volume of incoming research involving vulnerable populations, particularly children, may be exempt in some instances. All six grounds for exemption may be applied to children except in some cases of exemption #2. The legislation regarding the differences in exemptions for children is as follows:

> "The exemption at 45CFR46.101(b)(2) regarding educational tests is also applicable to this subpart. However, the exemption at 45CFR46.101(b)(2) for research involving survey or interview procedures or observations of public behavior [of children] does not apply to research covered by this subpart, except for research involving observation of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed." (45CFR 46.401(b)).

Based on applicable federal regulations and/or provisions of the University's Policy and Procedures, investigators whose research involves human subjects will not make final determination of exemption. Exemption requires the approval of the IRB.

The IRB reserves the right to require review of specific research activities or classes of research activities even though they qualify for exemption. Exercise of such oversight will rarely be necessary. Requirements of sponsoring agencies, unexpected problems, and the need to evaluate exemption procedures might trigger such review.

III. Guidelines for Completing Application for Exemption from Review

Principal Investigator. Please include all individuals, but not the faculty sponsor in case of student research unless the faculty member is actively involved as a researcher in the project. The mailing address listed here is the one to which all correspondence will be sent including requests for clarification and notification of approval/non-approval. Please list a telephone number where the PI can be reached, and email and/or fax if desired. This contact information should only appear on the original document not on any of the copies because of privacy regulations. If there is no mailing address, correspondence will be sent to the applicant in care of their Responsible Project Investigator.

Responsible Project Investigator. All student projects must have a faculty/staff sponsor who is officially liable for their work being conducted in accordance with the requirements of University and federal policy. Please include the RPI's campus phone number and address.

Student's Course/Thesis Requirements. All students must indicate, as applicable, what course the research is being conducted for, whether it is a graduate thesis or other project required to meet degree requirements, or, if it is not being conducted to meet an academic requirement, the reason for which it is being undertaken.

Anticipated starting date. This date must be subsequent to the date of submission to the Grants Office of the application for exemption and allow sufficient time for review of the application.

Applicants are reminded that they may not begin the research, e.g., collect data, recruit subjects, until they have received approval of their IRB application.

Although the IRB will make every effort to act upon applications as expeditiously as ping applications and the time of the quarter. It is therefore necessary that submission of requests for exemption be made sufficiently in advance of the need to begin the research. If there are unexpected time constraints beyond the applicant's control, e.g., a subject leaving the country, an unforeseen opportunity to gather data, etc., then you should explain this when you submit your application. If your proposal includes a pretest given at the beginning of a quarter you should submit your application for exemption the previous quarter.

IRB approval must be given before subject recruitment or initiation of any procedures that involve human subjects. Retroactive approval will not be given to use research data that were collected solely for the purpose of this research project prior to the date of approval from the IRB. This does not mean that records and other data already collected for other purposes may not now be used for the specific project in the current application.

Rationale for exemption. Please state exactly why you feel the research meets the specific grounds listed in the exemption checked. If the applicant checks "yes" under any of the twelve conditions in the decision aid list that exclude an exemption then they should explain why an exemption should still be considered. Note: Non-vulnerable adults are subject to most of the same requirements as children and other vulnerable populations.

Purpose and methodology of the research. Please state concisely what the purpose of the research is and, as appropriate, the hypothesis to be tested, the dependent and independent variables, research methodology, etc. Be specific and provide sufficient information so that the IRB can make an informed decision as to what the research will entail. Failure to provide sufficient information in this and the following question is the basic cause of slowing the approval process.

Procedure for the subjects. Please state explicitly what the subjects will be required to do for the research. To be exempt the subjects will usually be anonymous, not vulnerable, and will be involved in procedures that involve no more than minimal risk. If there is to be a survey or questionnaire administered please attach a copy of the questionnaire to the application as well as any written cover material or the script for an oral explanation to the subjects as to what they will have to do. In cover material you should include IRB contact information using the following sentence: "If you have any concerns about your rights as a participant in this research or any complaints you wish to make, you may contact Ruth Galm, Human Protections Administrator, Office of Grant and Research Development (509)-359-7971/6567)."

You should also indicate the method by which surveys, etc., will be distributed and collected in order to insure anonymity. The normal procedure is for the Principal Investigator, rather than the subjects' teacher, supervisor, coach, etc., to pass the survey out to everyone in a class or at a meeting, telling them that they don't have to participate if they don't want to, and then have them return it anonymously to your mailbox or a manila envelope on the desk, in the office, etc. (as long as they don't hand them to the investigator). Alternately, the survey can be mailed, with an explanation of the project and instructions on how to return the survey anonymously; if a self-addressed, stamped envelope is provided there must be no identifying marks on it or the survey, for tracking or other purposes.

It should be noted that anonymous means that the investigator cannot associate the data with a specific subject. Confidential means that the investigator can associate a subject with his/her data but protects that association from being known by others.

If the researcher also has the role of teacher in relation to the subject, the pedagogical procedures should not be included, state only the procedures used in the research. Admittedly it will

sometimes be difficult to distinguish between these two roles, but in the case of children, as a teacher the investigator can interact with the child, but when the same teacher is acting as a researcher they may not interact with the child or manipulate their environment solely for the purpose of the research (see above) and still be considered exempt. The latter case would entail a Full Board Review.

Vulnerable subjects. Depending on the specifics of the research, some vulnerable populations of subjects may not be granted exemptions that would apply to normal or non-vulnerable subjects.

Signatures. Applications without the requisite signatures will not be considered and will be returned to the applicant. All Principal Investigators for a project must sign the application.

Consent forms. Although a protocol that needs a consent form normally requires Expedited or Full Board review, there are some exceptions when a consent form is used for a protocol that would otherwise be considered exempt. If this is the case, the required format for the consent form is found at the end of the instructions for the Expedited/Full Board review application.

IV. Submission Procedure

The investigator should complete the Application for Exemption and submit the original and two copies to the appropriate review body, either the IRB (through the Office of Grant and Research Development) or, if required by their department, the Departmental Review Committee. If a department has a Departmental Review Committee, that body should review the application in the case of all student research; in the case of faculty or staff applications for exemption these may be submitted directly to the IRB unless department policy requires department review. This should be done in a timely manner prior to the start of research. If the research is approved as exempt by a Department Review Committee, the Application will be signed by the Chair of that review committee in lieu of the IRB representative of the department Chair.

Approval of exempt protocols is valid for one year from the date of approval for students, and from one to five years for faculty and staff. If research is to continue, with no substantial changes, beyond that date, a renewal of IRB approval must be obtained prior to continuation of the project (contact OGRD for procedure). If, subsequent to initial approval, a research protocol requires minor changes, the OGRD should be notified of those changes. Any major departures from the original proposal must be approved by the appropriate review process before the protocol may be altered. A Change of Protocol application must be submitted to the IRB for any substantial change in the protocol. The Human Protections Administrator or the Chair of the IRB will determine whether or not the research must then be resubmitted for approval.

Attachment A

Background or rationale for this activity. In AUAP students have the option of participating in The Global Citizen Award process. The final component of the award process is the reflective essay in which they summarize and reflect on their experiences with course work and related service learning in the community. These are not graded, but Miner and the award committee read them in making their final decision about the winners—any number of students can win the award so long as they meet all of the requirements. The essays are normally 3-5 paragraphs in length to be analyzed for content only. (Appendix B) This project is similar to (Ray, 2011; Andre, 2011). Writing essays like this increases fluency (Narathakoon, 2006), expressiveness (Simmons, 2005), and empathy (Dinneen, 2010). These are standard procedures for teaching at the AUAP, and the project is similar to the projects of Lohpaisankrit (2008), Okabe (2008), Parker (2008), Wolfe (2004), Huff (2005), and Browne (2005), whose studies all incorporated essays of this kind.

A. Objectives of this specific research. The objectives of this research are to 1) provide an opportunity for reflective writing; 2) provide a means of expressing feelings in a structured, empathetic setting; 3) to collect student feedback on the award process and the benefits students received from participation.
B. Describe how subjects will be involved; specify what they will do. Subjects will participate in essay writing in the manner described in "A" above. This is required writing of all award participants—whether they participate in this thesis project or not.

C. Explain how data obtained will answer the research problem. The essay/s will demonstrate their ability to reflect on their experiences and to analyze their social and cognitive gains.

D. Identify alternative procedures, if any, that might be advantageous to the subjects. Informal gatherings in situations outside the classroom can be rich opportunities for language development and community building. If students are struggling with the essays in any way, we can allow them to work with the primary investigator in conference to achieve their goal of completing the essay.

VITA

Author:	Matthew Ged Miner
Place of Birth:	Provo, Utah
Undergraduate Schools Attended:	Peralta Community College, University of California, Berkeley
Degrees Awarded:	Bachelor of Arts, 2009, U.C. Berkeley
Honors and Awards:	Recognition for Honors, U.C. Berkeley, 2007-2009
	H.W. Hill Scholarship, U.C. Berkeley, 2009
	Graduate Assistantship, English Composition Department, 2010-2011, Eastern Washington University
	Dolores Gibler Scholarship, 2011-2012, Eastern Washington University
Professional Experience:	Instructor, English 101, 2010-2011, Eastern Washington University
	Intern teacher, English 695c, 2010-2012, Eastern Washington University
	Substitute Teacher, 2011-2012, Asia University America Program
	Student Services Assistant, 2011-2012, Asia University America Program