

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.75.1.2020003.3>
<http://journal.kate.or.kr>

The Title of a Manuscript Should Not Exceed Two Lines

Kil-Dong Hong and Jane Brown*

Hong, Kil-dong, & Brown, Jane. (2020). Mediating second language learning through collaborative dialogue. *English Teaching*, 75(1), 3-35.

The abstract of a manuscript should be composed of approximately 160 words and include the purpose, research method, and results of the study. It is not recommended that it includes citations. The abstract of a manuscript should be composed of approximately 160 words and include the purpose, research method, and results of the study. It is not recommended that it includes citations. The abstract of a manuscript should be composed of approximately 160 words and include the purpose, research method, and results of the study. It is not recommended that it includes citations. The abstract of a manuscript should be composed of approximately 160 words and include the purpose, research method, and results of the study. It is not recommended that it includes citations. The abstract of a manuscript should be composed of approximately 160 words and include the purpose, research method, and results of the study. It is not recommended that it includes citations. The abstract of a manuscript should be composed of approximately 160 words and include the purpose, research method, and results of the study. It is not recommended that it includes citations. The abstract of a manuscript should be composed of approximately 160 words and include the purpose, research method, and results of the study. It is not recommended that it includes citations.

Key words: L2 motivational changes, motivation, demotivation, remotivation, retrospective perspective

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation Research (BCS-1749240).

*First Author: Kildong Hong, Graduate Student, Department of English Education, Hankook University
Corresponding Author: Jane Brown, Professor, Department of English Education, Hankook University;
Hankookmunhwa-ro 1, Jung-gu, Seoul 10000, Korea; Email: jbrown@hankook.ac.kr

Received 4 December 2019; Reviewed 29 December 2019; Accepted 1 March 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

Curriculum improvement is a crucial process for achieving a high quality of education. Curriculum developers are required to make constant attempts to revise curriculum design and promote their teaching plans to increase the effectiveness of education (Norris, 2006, 2009). The importance of curriculum development holds especially true for foreign language education where learning a foreign language poses great challenges for learners.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Needs Analysis

A needs analysis in language classrooms refers to the systematic collection and analysis of information which identifies “general and specific language needs that can be addressed in developing goals, objectives and content in a language program” (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p. 156). Importantly, the information collated from a needs analysis helps determine what needs to be supplemented for curriculum development (Alderson & Scott, 1992; Coleman, 1992; Mackay & Bosquet, 1981; Palmer, 1992), for curriculum change or improvement (Snow & Brinton, 1988), and for material development. These resources can guide the curriculum developers and teachers in establishing and improving the specific goals and contents of the curriculum as well as helping them select tasks and activities appropriate to the established goals.

Despite the well-attested value of a needs analysis in curriculum development and enhancement, it has received relatively little attention in the EFL context (Gardener & Winslow, 1983; Long, 2005; Richterich, 1983; Seedhouse, 1995; Watanabe, 2006; West, 1994); most needs analysis studies have focused on the context of English for specific purposes (Bosher & Smalkoski, 2002; Cameron, 1998; Cowling, 2007; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Jasso-Aguilar, 1999; So-mui & Mead, 2000) or on the context of English for academic purposes in an ESL classroom (Ferris, 1998). Moreover, few studies have targeted child language education (for needs analysis studies on adult language education in an EFL context, see Lee & Villacorta, 2017; Nam, 2005). The lack of research on children’s needs in language classrooms may stem from the relatively short history of the English curriculum implemented in elementary schools, which had begun in 1997, and the recognition that children are not sufficiently mature to appreciate their own needs. However, children have been recently viewed as those who are “able to play an active role in the planning of/and participation in [educational practice]” (Broström, 2012, p. 1; see

also Howell, 2018). In line with this view, we consider it important to identify specific needs from child learners, which have not received much attention so far from curriculum researchers. To address this issue, we conducted a needs analysis with 6th-grade elementary school students in Korea, who had numerous opportunities to express their opinions through engagement in several decision-making processes in class and thus are considered an appropriate target group for a needs analysis.

2.2. Curriculum Evaluation

Brown (1989, 1995) defined a curriculum evaluation as a process in which all relevant information is systematically collected and analyzed with the aim of assessing the effectiveness of a curriculum and improving it under the context of the particular institutions. Similarly, Worthen and Sanders (1973) contended that a curriculum evaluation is a determination of “the worth of a program, product, procedure, or object, or the potential utility of alternative approaches designed to attain specified objectives” (p. 19).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Purpose of Learning English

This construct, asking specific purposes of learning English, contained one open-ended question and one closed-response question with 10 sub-items. We analyzed participants’ responses to these questions in terms of whether each response corresponded to an instrumental or an integrative purpose. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), an instrumental purpose is ... as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Principal Component Loadings for the Participants’ Responses
to the Items about “Purposes of Learning English”

Item	Description	Component	
		1	2
11-01	to get a good grade in school	-.138	.886
11-02	to enter a good university	-.018	.940
11-03	to get a good job in the future	.109	.878
11-10	I don’t know why I learn English	-.700	.020

Note. Loadings higher than 0.50 are boldfaced.

For each of the two components, we compared the two groups in terms of their mean

ratings, using independent sample t-tests. For the instrumental purpose component, there was no significant difference, but the HSS group ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.05$) had numerically higher ratings than the ESS group ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.88$).

Applicable levels: Early childhood, elementary, secondary, tertiary

REFERENCES

- Alderson, J. C., & Scott, M. (1992). Insiders, outsiders and participatory evaluation. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 25-57). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ba, T. T. B., & Huan, N. B. (2017). Reading strategy instruction to Vietnamese young language learners: Teachers' practices and perceptions. *Can Tho University Journal of Science*, 7, 138-147.
- Alderson, J. C., & Scott, M. (1992). Insiders, outsiders and participatory evaluation. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 25-57). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ba, T. T. B., & Huan, N. B. (2017). Reading strategy instruction to Vietnamese young language learners: Teachers' practices and perceptions. *Can Tho University Journal of Science*, 7, 138-147.

APPENDIX A

Title

--