Language Education in Asia

Volume 5 | Issue 1 | 2014

ISSN: 1838-7365

LEiA
Language Education in Asia

CAMTESOL

About *Language Education in Asia*

Background Information

Language Education in Asia (LEiA) is a publication that presents well-researched aspects of language education and learning, innovative, practical approaches to classroom practice, discussion on language education issues in Asia, and reviews of books on research, practice, or issues in language education relevant to the region. Papers can be submitted by researchers, educators, educational leaders, and other language education professionals. All papers are blind-reviewed by members of the Editorial Board. Accepted papers are published on a biannual basis. The first issue of each volume will highlight exceptional papers presented at the annual CamTESOL Conference Series during that publication year. Each volume is online for public viewing and downloading at: http://www.camtesol.org/publication

The *Language Education in Asia* Advisory Board

Since 2011, IDP Education has invited a number of eminent ELT professionals, including several recent CamTESOL plenary speakers, to join an Advisory Board for the *Language Education in Asia* publication. The Advisory Board will offer advice as the publication is developed and expanded.

Publication Assistants

Disclaimer

Every effort has been made to ensure that no misleading or inaccurate data, opinions, or statements appear in the *Language Education in Asia* online publication. Articles included in the publication are the sole responsibility of the contributing authors. The views expressed by the authors do not necessarily reflect the views of the Advisory Board, the Editorial Board, the conference organizers, the hosting institutions, or the various sponsors of the conference series; no responsibility or liability whatsoever is accepted by these groups or institutions regarding the consequences of any information included in the authors' articles.

Notes to Prospective Contributors

The readership of *Language Education in Asia* is comprised of Asian and expatriate educators as well as those from international institutions. *Language Education in Asia* encourages the submission of papers presenting innovative approaches of interest to both local and international audiences. The development context of Asian TESOL should be considered; most schools have limited resources and teachers often have to contend with large numbers of students in their classrooms. The Editorial Board takes into account the regional context as well as areas of interest for international participants when selecting papers for publication.

The *Language Education in Asia* online publication includes four sections:

- Research highlighting ongoing projects in the Asian region, based on and emphasising a practical focus in the discussion and conclusion sections. Maximum 5,000 words.

- Teaching Practice focusing on classroom-based and action research more directly related to the realities of language teaching in the region. Maximum 3,500 words.

- Commentary focusing on well-researched, balanced reports and discussions of current or emerging issues in the Asian region. Maximum 2,000 words.

- Book Reviews of books focusing on research, practice, or current issues relevant to language education in Asia. By invitation.

For more details concerning specific guidelines, formatting, and submission, please refer to the *Language Education in Asia* page on the CamTESOL website at http://www.camtesol.org/
For any questions, please contact the Editor-in-Chief, Ms. Kelly Kimura, at leia@idp.com.
Papers for consideration for Volume 6, Issue 1 should be submitted to leia@idp.com by 8 March 2015, and those for Issue 2 should be submitted by 7 June 2015.

Copyright and Permission to Reprint

LEiA is inspired by the CamTESOL Conference Series

Find out more at www.camtesol.org

ISSN: 1838-7365

The language learning and teaching context in the Asian region is as varied and complex as the countries encompassed in this part of the world. Each context is defined by the history and culture of each specific country and the region as a whole and the language policies and languages involved, including a myriad of local, indigenous, colonial, and "global" languages.

In 2010, in response to the ever-changing and challenging linguistic landscape in this area, IDP Education (Cambodia) established the fully peer-reviewed online journal *Language Education in Asia* as a forum to highlight and exchange research and insights into language education in this dynamic region.

The CamTESOL Conference Series is an initiative of

idp education

Sponsored by

UECa UNIVERSITY ENGLISH CENTRES AUSTRALIA

Table of Contents

Editor's Note

Academic Writing for Publication and English as a Lingua Franca Audiences

Kelly Kimura
Soka University, Tokyo, Japan

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) has been described as "*any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option*" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7). ELF is not used exclusively among non-native speakers; the "first languages" in this description include English (Jenkins, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2011). In spoken ELF interactions, when there are differences in language proficiency or difficulty in comprehension, speakers tend to cooperate to help the interaction succeed (Mauranen, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011). The study of written ELF in academic settings (WrELFA) is an emerging field (see http://www.helsinki.fi/englanti/elfa/wrelfa); if and how ELF authors of academic papers write differently from native English speaking authors for the success of their interactions with audiences are not yet known. As non-native English-speaking teachers and other language education professionals find increasing acceptance in the field (see Yilin Sun's article in this issue), these audiences include growing numbers of ELF users. In the absence of studies on the topic, as an advocate for both our authors and our audience, I recommend that authors, regardless of their first language, consider how to successfully communicate with audiences which include ELF users.

That authors follow this recommendation is of obvious importance to this publication. *Language Education in Asia* (LEiA) has an international readership of multilingual language users and monolingual users of English. The journal's reach is even wider than the 26 countries from which we have received submissions in the past three years. Every year, CDs containing all issues to date are distributed to all CamTESOL Conference participants. At the 10th annual conference earlier this year, participants came from over 40 countries. Furthermore, the publication is freely available online. Teachers, researchers, and other language education professionals in Cambodia, Vietnam, Myanmar, and Laos are part of the LEiA audience, as are those in Australia, Japan, and the U.S.

Authors interested in sharing their research and teaching practices must think of this audience when writing for submission to LEiA. Assuming that papers are based on good research projects (see Brian Paltridge's paper in this issue), there are several general items for authors to consider. First, authors should address the greater readership, not only narrow audiences within, such as other researchers interested in the same topic or university teachers in a certain country. This means that authors need to study what is happening beyond their own contexts in the region and include this information in their papers. Authors should also consider the audience's familiarity

Language Education in Asia, 2014, *5*(1), 1-6. http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/14/V5/I1/A01/Kimura

with the topic, relevant areas of the topic where the audience lacks knowledge, and what its members would like to know about the topic. Next, authors should realize that teachers as well as researchers may read their research articles; teachers may look for recommendations that can improve their related practices. Authors of teaching practice papers should provide information on practices and materials that can be adapted for use in different situations. In addition, authors must consider the diverse audience contexts throughout Asia.

However, the considerations above are not sufficient for an audience that includes ELF users. While we at LEiA expect submissions to be professional and academic, academic writing should not hinder communication with our audience. In papers where reading academic writing is difficult for native speakers of English in academia (Pinker, 2014), highly proficient ELF users will have at least the same difficulties. Access to current knowledge in the field is already limited in some of the areas we serve. When up-to-date papers are available, they do not benefit the audience if the authors have used academic writing for purposes other than communicating. When an author does not focus on appropriately communicating with the audience, academic prose can easily get in the way of the message.

Authors should acknowledge that users of ELF form the majority of our audience by writing papers for submission to LEiA using academic English as a lingua franca. Here, writing with a lingua franca perspective means that authors make accommodations to help their attempt to communicate succeed with ELF audiences. While in an ELF conversation, participants can negotiate meaning as communication breakdowns happen (Mauranen, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011), readers are likely to decipher texts for meaning alone. When readers have difficulties with a paper, they may use a dictionary or ask someone for help; however, they may also stop reading. If an author's goals are to contribute to knowledge in language education, engage the interest of the audience, and encourage further research, discussion, or improved practice–that is, if the author wants to communicate with our audience–the author should accommodate the audience from the beginning to try to avoid communication breakdowns. These accommodations include being clear and concise, yet sufficiently explicit.

Writing with clarity will more effectively communicate the author's message to ELF users. Papers too often include passages where meaning (or lack of meaning) is obscured by the use of the passive voice, overly complex sentence constructions, jargon, and more. Writing should present the content, not itself. While not aimed at writing for ELF audiences, a relevant and thought-provoking article on academic writing for publication and an accompanying free, downloadable booklet point out problem areas and give guidance on writing more clearly (Pinker, 2014).

Writing with conciseness also conveys the author's message more effectively to ELF audiences. We regularly see oversized submissions above and below our word limits, but authors should not burden audiences of ELF users with redundant text. Regardless of the article's length, words, sentences, and passages should be examined objectively and eliminated when they are unnecessary. Authors struggling with being concise sometimes declare that reducing any part of the paper is impossible; however, what usually emerges is a better text. Authors should note that article word limits are the maximum number of words allowed, not the number of words required. If complete, clear, and concise, an article with a word count lower than the word limit will not suffer in the review process for this reason. It will also be much appreciated by an audience which traditionally has little free time.

While clarity and conciseness are important accommodations, at the same time, writing with explicitness is necessary for this varied ELF audience. Sufficiently explaining terms, procedures, and other items is essential. We have noticed that sometimes a deep knowledge of the topic leads an author to forget that the audience does not share this familiarity. Our editorial team and review editors form a first, constructively critical audience to represent our larger audience, and we often ask for more explanations and details. Authors should check that their articles are sufficiently explicit, perhaps by asking other people to read their work. If the paper is not explicit enough, the audience's work in understanding is more difficult than necessary.

Although having a paper published is an accomplishment, a truer mark of scholarship is an author's ability to present relevant research and practices in an accessible way and thus inspire and inform further research, action, and discussion by the audience. This ability starts with considering the audience. While all of the accommodations above could and should be done for writing in general, for this publication and many others, authors must be more conscious of making accommodations when writing for audiences of ELF users.

As Mauranen (2012) noted regarding speakers of academic English, there are no native writers of academic English. The increasing interactions between authors and ELF readers have the potential to improve academic writing. By taking the lead in consciously using English as a lingua franca to communicate with ELF audiences, authors of all language backgrounds can contribute to making reading and learning for research and professional development more audience-friendly for this community of communities.

Turning to the papers, Volume 5, Issue 1 starts with an article by Yilin Sun, LEiA Advisory Board member, opening plenary speaker at the 10th CamTESOL Conference, and current President of TESOL International. She writes on important worldwide trends that she observes in these areas in the language education field: perspectives on the field, educational goals, teaching approaches, curriculum content and design, communicative competence, non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) as English language educators, the timing of the introduction of English as a foreign language in educational systems, information technology, and the roles and responsibilities of teachers. The influence of NNESTs on a number of these trends is shown.

Brian Paltridge, the current co-editor of *TESOL Quarterly* and author or editor of publications on academic writing, research methods, discourse analysis, and English for Specific Purposes, was a plenary speaker for the CamTESOL Regional Research Symposium. While his plenary topic was "Current and Future Directions of English for Specific Purposes Research," his paper in this issue is on his CamTESOL workshop topic: "What is a Good Research Project?" This article is particularly excellent for beginning researchers and those who need guidance or a review. Brian covers developing research questions and proposals that lead to well-constructed research projects and papers with a good potential for publication. He discusses an interesting study to illustrate the characteristics of a good research project and lists resources for further guidance.

The research section begins with Do Thi Quy Thu and Dang Thi Cam Tu's study on video recording presentations for use as feedback in a public speaking course at a university in Vietnam. Students' ability to observe and reflect on their own performances had positive effects on their communication competence and apprehension about public speaking. In the second research paper, Indika Liyanage and Brendan Bartlett in Australia and Thomas Tao in China report on the

extent of Chinese university students' usage of the cognitive strategies of translation, deduction, and contextualisation when listening and speaking in EFL classes. The authors discuss the need to develop students' oral communication skills and the washback of China's required English test for university graduation on EFL programs. In the next paper, Kerry Pusey and Karen Lenz examine the relationship between visual input, working memory, and L2 listening comprehension, particularly in the context of assessment. They provide questions for teachers to consider to more effectively assess L2 listening with visual input. From Japan, James Emmet Owens describes an experiment at a university in which students used a standard reading exercise (SRE) in a foundational literacies course. The SRE, used repeatedly throughout the term with a range of texts, is found to have a number of benefits. The SRE is included in the appendix.

How Japanese university students feel about peer feedback for written work and how teachers think students feel are explored by Brett Morgan, Bjorn Fuisting, and Jeremy White. They offer useful suggestions for teachers interested in using peer review. Linda Mary Hanington reports on a study on professional development in the area of reading aloud for preservice primary school teachers in Singapore. The phonological awareness that teachers gained from an intensive program may improve their required reading aloud activities in the classroom. In the final research paper, from Japan, Michael Guest reports on his field observations of conference presentations and the speech forms used in four areas of successful performances. While the professionals he observed were in the medical field, the examples are suitable for professionals in many other fields.

The teaching practice section starts with Monica Hamciuc's examination of Japanese students' perceptions of the effect that studying with international students had on their communicative skills and confidence. In their shared classes, Japanese students prepared topics of their choice for discussion or presentation and had opportunities to ask and answer questions. From Indonesia, Ignatius Harjanto writes about teaching academic writing to graduate students using the I-Search approach, in which students choose, research, and write about a topic that has interest and meaning for them. On a post-course questionnaire, students indicated the approach had been useful in developing their writing skills. In the last paper in this section, Aeric Wong and Paul Leeming, writing from Japan, demonstrate that dictation can be used as an informal and inexpensive test of language proficiency. The authors use dictation tests for purposes such as group construction in classes with students of varying language proficiency levels. The design and administration of such a dictation test is described.

The issue concludes with the first book review for LEiA, co-authored by George M. Jacobs in Singapore and Harumi Kimura in Japan. The topic of Graham V. Crookes' *Critical ELT in Action: Foundations, Promises, and Praxis*, incorporating social justice into second language education, is one of the trends Yilin Sun observes in her plenary paper. The reviewers examine a number of points Crookes explores and show that Crookes' deft handling makes responsible critical pedagogy accessible for teachers who are interested in its practice for their classrooms.

Moving on to the people behind LEiA, many people contribute a generous amount of time and effort to LEiA and the production of each issue. I am very grateful to John Middlecamp for his continuing work for the journal. John created the framework of our new editorial team and has also authored or made major contributions to documents that are making the publication process run more smoothly. In addition, he is in charge of copy editing. Our new editorial team members include Keuk Chan Narith, a longtime review editor who has received recognition from the

CamTESOL Conference for his contributions to scholarly research on education in Cambodia. Rith now oversees the initial screening of papers and is additionally is responsible for the review and revision process for Issue 2. Rith recently gave a presentation titled "English Language Teacher Research in Cambodia: Development and Challenges" at AILA (International Applied Linguistics Association) in Australia. Another new editorial team member, Naashia Mohamed, has joined us from the Maldives; she is in charge of the review and revision process for Issue 1 of each volume. She also presented at AILA; her presentation was titled "Bilingual Children's Language Use and Linguistic Identity: Home Contributions and Family Language Policy." Rheanne Anderson, Caroline Ho, and Anthony Fenton coordinated reviews and revisions between authors and review editors and checked papers at every step for Issue 1; Rheanne and Caroline continue to do so for the second issue. Alice Svendson and Deborah Sin ably assist John Middlecamp in copy editing. I very much appreciate the editorial team members' voluntary work for LEiA on top of their responsibilities at their universities or institutions and elsewhere. My thanks and best wishes go to Phanith Pheng, who was our very capable editorial assistant; he is leaving us to further his education. We welcome our new assistant, Vathana Serey.

The editorial team relies on our dedicated Editorial Board to inform our decisions on papers and guide authors in revising. Their professionalism and their willingness to support the journal and their peers in contributing to published knowledge in the field are essential for LEiA, and we are grateful. Gratitude also goes to the Advisory Board for their continued valuable guidance and support.

Thank you to all the authors who submitted for consideration for publication. There were many good papers, and we had difficult choices to make.

Finally, congratulations to those whose articles appear in this issue. We appreciated these authors' patience with our questions and our requests; they were made with our audience in mind.

References

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 200-207. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x

Klimpfinger, T. (2007). 'Mind you, sometimes you have to mix' – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca. *Views*, *16*(2), 36-61. Retrieved from https://anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_anglist/weitere_Uploads/Views/Views_0702.pdf

Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Pinker, S. (2014, September 26). Why academics stink at writing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Academics-Writing-Stinks/148989/

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Teaching EFL Academic Writing Through I-Search

Ignatius Harjanto
Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, Indonesia

Abstract

EFL (English as a Foreign Language) graduate students are prepared and expected to be able to write good EFL academic papers. However, previous research and preliminary observation revealed that EFL graduate students still experience difficulties in grammar rules, idea development, referencing skills, and rhetoric. Academic writing problems have become a major challenge for many EFL students of graduate schools in Indonesia. To help graduate students write academic papers in English, the I-Search approach was employed to teach them academic writing. The I-Search approach appeared to help students to select topics, develop ideas, and find concrete support.

Writing papers in English is a challenge for EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students, and constructing academic papers in English is even more challenging. In general, EFL students, including the EFL graduate students of the master's program of a major university in Indonesia, have similar problems in writing English academic papers: finding ideas, rhetoric, and language (Bloor & Bloor, 1993; Harjanto, 1999, 2001, 2012; Sa'Addedin, 1991). Despite student difficulties in writing academic papers in English, the master's program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) requires the students to attend the Academic Writing course in the first semester and to submit an academic paper about TEFL as the final project.

Considering that EFL academic writing proficiency is a very difficult skill for many EFL graduate students to master, the master's program in TEFL not only seeks to ensure that academic writing in English is intelligible, but that it is also accepted and, hopefully, acted upon. One of the teachers of the Academic Writing course attempted to motivate the students to write an academic paper by assigning an I-Search paper for their mid-semester project. This paper reports how the I-Search approach was integrated in the teaching of academic writing.

What Is I-Search?

Experiences in teaching English academic writing have shown that students undergo cyclical revision activities. This is in line with the idea that writing is not an instant skill but is gained through a process consisting of a series of sequenced stages (Clark, 2012). The I-Search approach is a process that includes four general parts: (1) selecting a topic (What I Already Know), (2) finding

Language Education in Asia, 2014, *5*(1), 151-159. http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/14/V5/I1/A12/Harjanto

information (What I Want To Find Out), (3) using information (The Search), and (4) developing a final product (What I Learned). The stages of the I-Search approach are parallel to the "planning, drafting, and revising" sequence of the writing process (Clark, 2012, p. 7). According to Macrorie (1988), an I-Search paper is an alternative to the traditional research paper. Instead of working with topics of others (e.g., the teacher's topics), students select their own topics and work on meaningful projects of their own. They focus on their personal needs. The students' personal voices, including their own experiences on a certain topic, are usually the topic of an I-Search paper. The topic that they choose to write about could be one that they know or have experienced but want more deeply to understand, so the topic should not always be one that they are thoroughly familiar with. To understand deeply about the topic, the students have to browse the Internet, read written resources, discuss it with their friends, and interview experts.

Why I-Search?

Considering students' difficulties in writing academic papers in English, teachers need to seek a teaching approach that may motivate the students to learn academic writing. Indeed, students entering graduate school are faced with a range of adjustments to the ways they are expected to write academic papers in English (Hyland, 2009). Adjusting their prior rules and expectations in academic writing to the new ones requires a process of experience and is not always easy to do. Many students of the master's program graduating from non-English departments may be worried when dealing with academic writing. As argued by Friedrich (2008, p. 1), "writing is hard work," and academic English writing is quite possibly very hard for EFL students. To lessen the feeling of alienation (Hyland, 2009) in learning English academic writing, EFL students' personal experiences should be well considered. Thus, before writing on a serious academic topic, students are required to write about their own topic. A model of teaching English academic papers which deals with a personal need and requires students to take an active role of inquiry is the I-Search approach to writing.

A criticism of I-Search projects is that the assignments may not help students think critically (Luther, 2006). However, for EFL students, I-Search projects could be beneficial. As previously described, most students taking Academic Writing, especially those graduating from non-English departments, could be classified as novices. Novice students of EFL need to write meaningful papers for themselves before writing for others. This is in line with Macrorie's argument (1988) that the key to I-Search is that students work on meaningful projects, i.e., papers about topics they want to know more deeply.

Course Context and Curriculum

The master's program in TEFL admits multidisciplinary undergraduates. The students' English writing proficiency levels varied from intermediate to upper intermediate; those graduating from the English department (i.e., college level) had studied how to write academic paragraphs and papers, while those graduating from non-English departments practiced much less systematically writing academic papers in English. As a result, by the time the 23 students took the Academic Writing course, they came with their insufficient English writing experience and competence. Considering the students' background of writing papers in English, the course was designed to help the students to be able to write academic papers in English, such as final papers for courses, papers for journals and seminars, and a master's thesis. The course met once a week for 14 weeks: seven meetings for the first half of the semester and seven for the second.

Implementation of the I-Search: Tasks and Instructions

The I-Search approach was not taught independently but integrated in the course of Academic Writing. The topics of the course were organized according to the syllabus, and an I-Search project was an integrated assignment in the first half of the semester. For seven meetings, the students learned theories of writing and practiced writing an I-Search paper.

In the first meeting, Part 1, What I Already Know, was introduced. The students started to learn how to find a topic from a broad theme (education). They explored topics which they might not be thoroughly familiar with but were interesting to them. To find a topic, the students were guided to think about something within the theme that they wanted to know more about. They were encouraged to search for ideas applicable to their lives in some way that they genuinely wanted to research. The guiding questions used to search for the topic were as follows:

1. Why is the issue important to my life?
2. What do I already know about my subject (theme / topic)?

In the second meeting, the students learned how to write a good academic paragraph as described by Oshima and Hogue (2006). They wrote a complete paragraph consisting of a topic sentence, supporting sentences, and a concluding sentence. Applying the structure of a paragraph, the students were assigned to write about the chosen I-Search topic (i.e., Part 2, What I Want To Find Out) outside of class. The students were also instructed to include reasons for writing about the chosen topic; they were ready to do this through using the guiding questions.

At the same time, in preparation for gathering the needed information, the students developed plans. In other words, in the third meeting, the students kept a journal of their research process, in addition to learning to write a good paragraph, containing values of unity, coherence, development, and completeness. In the classroom, the students learned and practiced writing a good paragraph, and outside the classroom they searched for sources by reading journals, books, and research reports and by browsing the Internet. They had to have a minimum of five written sources for their I-Search papers.

Part 3 of I-Search (The Search) was integrated in the fourth and fifth meetings. While learning to support a topic sentence with concrete details in the fourth meeting, the students searched for information. They learned to take notes from written sources to support their curiosity about their I-Search chosen topic and learned to quote and paraphrase from the original written texts.

In the fifth meeting, the students learned how to write a data commentary on the data displayed in a table, graph, or figure (Swales & Feak, 2009). The students wrote summary statements, highlighting statements, and discussions of implications. The exercises done in the classroom were practiced and reinforced outside the classroom. As homework, in addition to taking notes, the students were assigned to write a data commentary.

In the sixth and seventh meetings, the students learned to develop a paragraph into a paper (Arnaudet & Barrett, 1990). At the same time, they kept writing about The Search and practicing Part 4, What I Learned. Outside the classroom, the students were assigned to write paragraphs of What I Learned, including paragraphs reflecting upon the entire search experience. The What I Learned paragraphs could be about the process of searching or what they learned about the topic.

Results and Discussion

The theme of the I-Search papers was about education, which could be broadly divided into two topics: ELT and non-ELT. Examples of ELT topics were Translation in ELT, Learning English Vocabulary, and English Grammatical Errors; the non-ELT topics were Classroom Atmosphere to Enhance the Learning Quality, Edmodo (an online learning community) as Blended Learning, and The Effective Punishment: Types, Procedures, and Effects.

In general, the students' knowledge and experiences of the topics were written about well. The introduction to the topic was presented in Part 1 of the I-Search paper. Most of the students (18), were able to elaborate reasons for the topic with little difficulty; the rest (5) wrote a brief introduction with less clear reasons for choosing the topic. However, even those who might have experienced more difficulties in writing aspects of the topic wanted to know more than just how to write the background of the topic.

The topic and the controlling ideas of the I-Search paper were stated in the objective statements in Part 2. As with the introduction, 18 students did not have any difficulties in stating the objective of the I-Search paper. The following are examples of objective statements:

> What is the effective non-physical punishment I can use in my classroom?
>
> Can I teach English to the elementary and pre-intermediate EFL learners effectively by applying storytelling technique?
>
> What kind of classroom management techniques should be implied in my formal and informal classroom? What is the teacher's role in managing the classroom? How can I understand ideal classroom for students?

With such clear objective statements, the writers were able to develop a plan for their research. Some students wrote their plans of research with few details, while more students wrote their plans with the steps of research, such as reading books, browsing the Internet, and interviewing experts.

Five students, including two students who did not provide clear reasons for choosing the topic, wrote unclear objective statements, such as, (1) "I will briefly summarize some of the ways RPGs [role-playing games] have been effectively employed in language classroom at different levels" and (2) "What should adults do in order to give the best nutrition and stimulation?" Objective Statement 1 did not tell about the topic learned, including the reasons for learning about the topic. Objective Statement 2 did not express the writer's curiosity about the topic. These objective statements did not contain personal questions and interest and could not guide the writers to investigate the topic.

Discussion of the topic was much influenced by the objective statement, the plan of research, and the number of sources. A clear objective statement with a clear plan of research was usually followed with a deeper discussion of the topic searched. Students who discussed almost all of the aspects of the topic read at least five sources, students who discussed many aspects of the topic read three to five sources, and students who discussed few aspects of the topic read less than three sources.

The searched topic was presented with relevant concrete support taken from written sources, interviews with experts, or discussions with friends or teachers. Written sources mostly cited were books, followed by articles from the Internet. Journals and research reports were rarely cited. Usage of written sources was mostly done in paraphrases and quotations. Interviews with experts and discussions with friends and teachers were presented in quotations.

Regarding text citations, many students did it incorrectly and improperly. Twenty students experienced difficulties in citing written resources, although they felt that writing Part 3 was very easy. Incorrect citations could be related to (a) repetition of author's name for the same citation, (b) wrong writing of author's name and reference's title, (c) mistakes in the dates or pages (when necessary) of the source, or (d) date missing. The following are examples (errors shown in italics):

(a) Mamiq, in his book, explained that basically punishment is not for changing the characteristic of students but rather it focuses on the seen behavior which can be increased, reduced or modified (*Mamiq*, 2012).

(b) Stories are excellent opportunity for integrated skills practice including listening to stories which is based on "a positive attitude to not understanding everything" and "the skills of searching for meaning, predicting and guessing" (*Wright A. 1995. Storytelling with Children)*.

(c) Kamil (*2004*) said, "Cooperative or collaborative learning can be considered both a strategy and a social organization that fosters learning. Many effective approaches to strategy instruction feature having students work on comprehension-related activities in small groups or pairs."

(d) According to *Gardner*, . . . an intelligence includes the ability to relate and solve problems, create products or provide services that are valued within a culture or society.

Students who did not credit their sources and missed the dates and the pages of their written sources could be seen as plagiarizing. As was described by Hyland (2009), many students in this project seemed to experience difficulties in doing in-text citation.

Previous research (Harjanto, 1999, 2001, 2012) showed that serious problems in academic writing experienced by Indonesian students were idea development and rhetoric. In the case of idea development in this study, however, students might not have serious problems in developing their thesis / objective statements and topic sentences. The I-Search papers showed that the students developed their topic with relevant concrete support. Regarding rhetorical problems in this study, to some extent, most of them could be overcome. Such problems were partly solved because I-Search paper writing provided clear steps and text organization.

Both responses to a questionnaire (see Appendix) and Part 4 of the I-Search papers showed that most of the students thought that the I-Search approach was very helpful to develop ideas, present arguments, write standard academic papers, and review references. Almost 71% opined that they benefited greatly, almost 21% said they benefited moderately, and over 8% said they benefited slightly from writing I-Search paper exercises. None thought the exercises useless. Indeed, the

students thought that they spent their time in a highly valuable way writing I-Search papers. Although the quality of the I-Search papers varied, none of the students thought they had wasted time writing them.

Conclusion

To help the students write English academic papers, the I-Search approach was introduced and integrated in the teaching of the course, Academic Writing. I-Search exercises were supplements to Academic Writing topics, which were not changed but enriched by the I-Search assignments. The students learned theories of writing and practiced them in the I-Search paper writing done outside the classroom.

In general, the students positively responded to the I-Search exercises. To some extent, they could solve their academic writing problems in terms of topic selection, idea development, referencing skills, and rhetoric. Of these four skills in the teaching of academic writing, more serious attention should be addressed to referencing skills. Rhetorical and idea development problems related to critical thinking should be further carefully identified and solved as well. This is imperative, for academic writing requires that students think critically.

Author Note

Ignatius Harjanto, Head of Master's Program in TEFL, the Graduate School of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, Indonesia.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ignatius Harjanto, Jl. Dinoyo 42-44 Surabaya 60265, Indonesia. E-mail: ig.harjanto@gmail.com

References

Arnaudet, M. L., & Barrett, M. E. (1990). *Paragraph development: A guide for students of English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (1993). Cultural expectations and socio-pragmatic failure. In P. Adams, B. Heaton, & P. Howarrth (Eds.), *Socio-cultural issues in English for academic purposes* (pp. 1-12). London, England: Modern English Publications and The British Council.

Clark, I. L. (Ed.). (2012). *Concepts in composition: Theory and practice in the teaching of writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Friedrich, P. (Ed.). (2008). *Teaching academic writing*. East Sussex, England: Continuum.

Harjanto, I. (1999). *English academic writing features by Indonesian students of English* (Unpublished dissertation). Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia.

Harjanto, I. (2001, November). *The rhetorical problems in writing papers in English*. Paper presented at the TEFLIN International Conference, Denpasar, Indonesia.

Harjanto, I. (2012). *EFL student teachers' voices and behaviors on academic writing and teaching writing*. Surabaya, Indonesia: Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. London, England: Continuum.

Luther, J. (2006). *I-Searching in context: Thinking critically about the research unit*. *English Journal*, *95*(4), 65-73. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30047092

Macrorie, K. (1988). *The I-Search paper*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing academic English* (4th ed.). London, England: Addison Wesley.

Sa'Addedin, M. A. A. M. (1991). Writing across language communities: The structure of Arabic text. In P. Adams, B. Heaton, & P. Howarth (Eds.), *Socio-cultural issues in English for Academic Purposes* (Developments in English language teaching) (pp. 1-12). London, England: Modern English Publications and The British Council.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2009). *Academic writing for graduate students*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.

Appendix
The Impact of I-Search on Academic Writing Skills

Indicate the extent or degree of agreement to the following statements by placing a tick in the appropriate box.

1. How do you feel about writing your own topic in your I-Search paper?
   - ☐ Very easy
   - ☐ Moderately easy
   - ☐ Slightly easy
   - ☐ Less easy
   - ☐ Not at all easy

2. How do you feel about writing a topic you want to know more?
   - ☐ Very easy
   - ☐ Moderately easy
   - ☐ Slightly easy
   - ☐ Less easy
   - ☐ Not at all easy

3. How helpful is the application of I-Search paper in developing your own ideas?
   - ☐ Very helpful
   - ☐ Moderately helpful
   - ☐ Slightly helpful
   - ☐ Less easy
   - ☐ Not at all helpful

4. How helpful is the application of I-Search paper in synthesizing others' ideas to support your own idea?
   - ☐ Very easy
   - ☐ Moderately easy
   - ☐ Slightly easy
   - ☐ Less easy
   - ☐ Not at all easy

5. How helpful is the application of I-Search paper in presenting your argument in a coherent manner?
   - ☐ Very helpful
   - ☐ Moderately helpful
   - ☐ Slightly helpful
   - ☐ Less helpful
   - ☐ Not at all helpful

6. How helpful is the application of I-Search paper in writing a standard academic paper?
   - ☐ Very helpful
   - ☐ Moderately helpful
   - ☐ Slightly helpful
   - ☐ Less helpful
   - ☐ Not at all helpful

7. How helpful is the application of I-Search paper review references related to your topic?
   - ☐ Very helpful
   - ☐ Moderately helpful
   - ☐ Slightly helpful
   - ☐ Less helpful
   - ☐ Not at all helpful

8. Of the four parts of I-Search paper, which one do you feel difficult to do?
   - ☐ Part 1 – What I Already Know About My Topic
   - ☐ Part 2 – What I Want to Find Out
   - ☐ Part 3 – The Search
   - ☐ Part 4 – What I Learned

9. How do you benefit from I-Search paper writing exercises?
   - ☐ Very beneficial
   - ☐ Moderately beneficial
   - ☐ Slightly beneficial
   - ☐ Less beneficial
   - ☐ Not at all beneficial

10. What is your opinion on I-Search paper writing?
    - ☐ Extremely needed for academic writing
    - ☐ Very important for academic writing
    - ☐ Important for academic writing
    - ☐ Less important for academic writing