Vol. 9 No. 1 (2023)

Issues in Language Instruction

A Journal for Practicing and Interpreting Teaching English as an Additional Language

Table of Contents

1. **Editor's Note** 1
   Marcellino Berardo, University of Kansas

2. **Reflecting on Language Ideologies and Language Practices as an IEP Educator** 2
   Marta Carvajal Regidor, University of Kansas

3. **Gamifying Vocabulary Study During COVID-19: The Challenges of Implementing a Gamified Program in the Online EAP Context** 7
   Peter Johnson, University of Kansas

4. **A Moves-Steps Approach to Teaching EAP from Disciplinary Textbooks: A Case from American Studies.** 16
   Marcellino Berardo, University of Kansas

Marcellino Berardo, Ph.D.
Managing Editor

Marta Carvajal Regidor, Ph.D
Senior Editor

Issues in Language Instruction (*ILI)* is an independent academic journal edited and published at the University of Kansas by faculty at the Applied English Center (AEC). Scholarship, perspectives, and opinions expressed in *ILI* do not necessarily reflect those of the AEC administration or other units at the University of Kansas.

Vol. 9 No. 1 (2023)

Issues in Language Instruction

A Journal for Practicing and Interpreting Teaching English as an Additional Language

Editor's Note

Ongoing changes in university IEPs accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic. The consequences have been serious. The Applied English Center (AEC) at the University of Kansas is no exception. For example, the AEC experienced significant turnover in faculty during the Pandemic period as well as a reduction in the number of faculty members. The disruption also temporarily halted the publication of *Issues in Language Instruction.* Fortunately, we are now able to publish our first volume since the Pandemic.

In our first post-Pandemic volume, Marta Carvajal Regidor investigates effects language ideologies have on language practices in her article *Reflecting on Language Ideologies and Language Practices as an IEP Educator*. Specifically, Carvajal Regidor offers a thoughtful and personal discussion on the power that beliefs such as linguistic prescriptivism and "standard language" can have in the ESL classroom and on how language practices or the strategic use of one's linguistic resources to make meaning can push back against language ideologies and bring agency to language users.

Also in this volume is Peter Johnson's article, *Gamifying Vocabulary Study during COVID-19: The Challenges of Implementing a Gamified Program in the Online EAP Context*. In this article, Johnson discovers and examines specific problems with student engagement during the Pandemic. Key findings include online learning fatigue, poor class cohesiveness, and issues with teambuilding.

Marcellino Berardo's article, *A Moves-Steps Approach to Teaching EAP from Disciplinary Textbooks: A Case from American Studies* describes an approach to teaching English for academic purposes influenced by Swales' moves-steps genre analysis as applied to first-year university textbooks. To illustrate the approach, a section of a textbook chapter from American Studies is used.

To conclude this Note, I would like to mention a change in the editorial staff since the Pandemic. We are now fortunate to have Dr. Marta Carvajal Regidor as an editor of *Issues in Language Instruction*. Dr. Carvajal Regidor specializes in language ideologies, language practices, and language identities and focuses on finding ways to better support students' linguistic rights through culturally sustaining pedagogy and curricula that center on linguistic justice.

Marcellino Berardo
University of Kansas
Fall 2023

Published online September 2023

Vol. 9 No. 1 (2023)

Issues in Language Instruction

A Journal for Practicing and Interpreting Teaching English as an Additional Language

Reflecting on Language Ideologies and Language Practices as an IEP Educator

Marta Carvajal Regidor
University of Kansas

Abstract. The fields of language teaching, language learning, and English language instruction continue to expand and develop. Part of that expansion, for me, as an instructor of English as an additional language is a desire to move towards teaching practices that are more culturally responsive, enhancing a pedagogy of care and linguistic justice. It is because of this, and the language ideologies and language practices that I noticed at play in my classes (and language instruction as a whole), that I offer my reflections in the next few pages. Through this work, I sought to engage with the literature as well as with my own observations in order to investigate two main questions: 1) Whether language ideologies shape, constrain, influence, or dictate the language practices authorized in the classroom and 2) What the pedagogical implications of these language ideologies and language practices are for language teaching and learning in an Intensive English Program (IEP) context.

Keywords: *Language practices, language ideologies, culturally responsive pedagogy, pedagogy of care, IEP, linguistic justice*

Introduction

As a language instructor, I am aware of both implicit and explicit expressions of language ideologies (ideologies about language, language practices, language teaching, and language learning) in my classes, in curriculum, within institutions, and in the field of language teaching. This led me to reflect on the power of language ideologies and why it is important to critically examine them. For example, I started to think about why and how language ideologies might shape, constrain, or influence the language practices in our classrooms and beyond. The aim of this paper[1] is to provide a brief overview of the concepts of language ideologies and language practices and discuss their impact in an IEP setting. I engaged in this reflection because I wanted to think about two main questions:

- Whether language ideologies shape, constrain, influence, or dictate the language practices authorized in the classroom.
- What the pedagogical implications of these language ideologies and language practices are for language teaching and learning in an IEP context.

In a broad sense, the term language ideologies refers to perceptions held by people, institutions, or communities about language. Language ideologies might, for example, encompass beliefs about what language is and how language should be used (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 2006). These beliefs are shaped by a plethora of factors and perceptions, including political, economic, and social ones. Because these language ideologies can surface explicitly or implicitly through verbal and nonverbal communication and influence language use and language instruction, they carry a lot of power (Woolard, 1998).

Another powerful aspect of these ideologies is that they may shape the types of practices related to language use that are deemed acceptable or not (Bourdieu, 1991). Examining these ideologies in teaching and learning is important in order to better understand how language ideologies are related to power dynamics, valuing and devaluating of certain communicative practices, and for finding ways to innovate English language education.

[1] This paper is part of a larger dissertation. See Carvajal Regidor (2020) for more.

Published online September 2023

Language practices refers to the idea that how one communicates (whether verbally or non-verbally) is a combination of knowledge and action. These practices embody habits connected with language that go beyond structural notions of language use (Garcia & Li, 2014). By studying and observing language through the lens of language practices, language is then positioned as a process—languaging (Swain, 2006)—and is conceptualized as interconnected to a myriad of social actions, norms, and practices.

Language practices are emergent in context and include practices such as code-meshing, translanguaging, and discursive uses of language (Canagarajah, 2013; Garcia & Li, 2014). The focus on language practices within an IEP setting foregrounds students' use of language through multiple resources, purposes, experiences, interactions, and situations. This expansive view of language practices encompasses students' use of multiple languages, dialects, language varieties, and discursive functions of language because they are deliberate, strategic, and used for meaning-making and negotiating.

A closer look at language ideologies and language practices

There is an expansive amount of literature on both the concepts of language ideologies and language practices. In this section, I offer a brief overview of the literature I have engaged with that is most pertinent to IEP faculty, staff, and administrators.

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies are particularly important for language teachers to consider because these ideologies, and other perceptions, influence our teaching pedagogy (Razfar, 2012). Similarly, constant engagement and reflection with these ideologies can help instructors develop agency in looking for ways to create more multilingual classrooms and learning environments (Weng et al., 2019). Blackledge (2008) argues that language ideologies mirror the "values, practices and beliefs associated with language use by speakers and the discourse that constructs values and beliefs at state, institutional, national, and global levels" (p. 296). Importantly, language ideologies, which can many times be suppressed, are tied to value and power. Thus, creating languages that are seen as more powerful or useful than others. This is evident in categorizations such as lingua franca, world language, correct and incorrect language, appropriate and inappropriate language. This in turn, creates language hierarchies (Gal & Irvine, 1995) which are rooted in discourses of identity, social, and cultural policies that shape the ways and what we teach and learn. There are two main language ideologies that factor into language teaching and learning: linguistic prescriptivism and standard language ideology.

Linguistic Prescriptivism

The ideology of linguistic prescriptivism posits that there are established rules that make some language usage correct and others incorrect. Curzan (2014) argues that this language ideology emphasizes ways in which language use, and especially the language use of others, is regulated. This belief system then sees language use as something that can be and should be fixed to fit what are thought of as linguistic norms. What is important for us language educators to consider, though, is that these linguistic norms are often influenced by social constructions that become normalized (Otheguy, Garcia, & Reid, 2015). The power of linguistic prescriptivism is that there is a belief or perception that other language practices or varieties that do not fit these characterizations must then be changed, unauthorized or illegitimated because they are not considered linguistically pure nor appropriate (Janicki, 2006).

Standard Language

Closely related to linguistic prescriptivism, is the ideology of standard language or language standardization. A standard language ideology "stigmatizes linguistic practices that deviate from "prescriptive norms" (Rosa, 2016, p. 162). Thus, we see the development of Standard American English and the marginalization of those who speak categorizations considered outside this standard (Endo & Reece-Miller, 2010). These beliefs are reproduced within society at large and Standard American English is then seen as powerful, given status, and is positioned as the language of the classroom and of the educated (Endo & Reece-Miller, 2010; Lippi-Green, 2011).

As language teachers, there is certain prescriptivism and language standardization at play when it comes to the IEP setting. Indeed, within educational spaces, language standardization and prescriptivism continue to play a role in both explicit and implicit curricula that are shaped by a monolingual bias (Gynne & Bagga-Gupta, 2015). For example, in the IEP teaching context, I do not have the power to define what academic language is. Still, I fully understand that in order to help my students succeed in their academic careers, they need to be exposed to and taught a very specific type of language. There are times in which rules and patterns (thus prescriptivism) need to be emphasized in my classroom. However, it is also my responsibility (and part of the agency I have and continue to develop as a teacher) to highlight and emphasize ways these prescriptivist notions are developed, emphasized, and broken. We should explicitly teach our students how language use has and continues to change over time. For example, ideas related to starting sentences with coordinating conjunctions, ending sentences with prepositions, using they as a singular pronoun, and the use (or not) of contractions are all instances of ideas relating to academic language and language standardization. As educators, we have a role to play in helping bring awareness to linguistic justice. Thus, part of our job as English educators should be to expose students to other Englishes and vernaculars such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE). These types of discussions give students an avenue of communication and truly shows the real-life, communicative aspect of language, which is the dynamic and ultimate goal of communication in our day to day lives. Furthermore, these types of discussions and awareness will help our students be better prepared for their classes, jobs, and roles within society. Because language ideologies are present and powerful, I believe language practices give us an avenue to push back against some of these ingrained ideas and make our classrooms more student centered and pedagogically caring.

Language Practices

The approach to language through practice pushes back against abstract binaries such as proficient or not and native speaker or not, to a broader view that focuses on the social talk of activities and practices (Canagarajah, 2013). Thus, language practices prioritize speakers' agency as part of a meaning-making process that is both interactive and agentive. It is an interactive and agentive process because language users use their knowledges as a starting point, as resources, that inform and guide their language learning and experiences with languaging (Garcia & Li, 2014). In this sense, language practices are strategic uses of multiple languages, dialects, language varieties, and discursive functions of language that are used for meaning-making and negotiating.

An Intensive English Program is an important place because language practices are abundant, and thus, a place where we can learn from our students' lives and language experiences and continue to center these language practices. For instance, the language practice of code meshing is one in which, through writing, language users shuttle between linguistic repertoires. This practice highlights creative strategies people deploy in order to interact with others, to bring out their voices, and to achieve communicative success (Canagarajah, 2011; 2013). Translanguaging, a practice that integrates the use of different languages, language varieties, and prioritizes individual idiolects that are influenced by gender, age, social, class, and geography, shows how language users use flexible linguistic resources that are not about the separation of languages, but more so about the integration of multiple modalities, ways of expression, and repertoires (Garcia & Li, 2014). Additionally, the concept of heteroglossia, introduced by Bakhtin (1981), highlights that there are different types of speech and voices that co-exist and influence the meaning of what is being communicated. Thus, language is dialogical and not just a structural concept.

Conclusion

Why are discussions and approaches to language ideologies and language practices important for us as language educators? I have tried to exemplify this in the discussion above by arguing that it is important to be aware of the influences on our language teaching and learning. In other words, we need to provide the language and structure that our students need to succeed academically but also find ways to push back against some of these ideologies by addressing them explicitly in our classes. This will help students be better prepared to participate in future university courses and to develop as agentive and critical thinkers.

There are several important implications brought about by this discussion. First, there is a need to expand conceptualizations and definitions of language, Education as a field itself, can then help lead the way in prioritizing the fluidity of students' language practices. What this means is that a shift in pedagogy needs to take place, centering stu-

dents' backgrounds and experiences as the starting point for teaching and learning. Additionally, with a paradigm shift from language to languaging, as instructors, we can offer more opportunities for students to engage in other language practices such as code meshing and translanguaging. This can further facilitate the incorporation of students' funds of knowledge and validate their experiences. Teaching is not a neutral, nor an isolated practice. This means that we must move away from thinking of classrooms as isolated and insulated. Instead, the life experiences and interests of students should work as guiding frameworks and approaches to learning (Gonzalez et. al., 2005). A final implication is that within higher education and IEPs, there needs to be a transparent and ongoing discussion of the language ideologies that play a role in the classrooms, curriculum, and in the system. These discussions should happen between colleagues, administrators, staff, incoming teachers, and students. Explicit conversations about these ideologies, and the roles they play in teaching and learning, can help teachers navigate goals and expectations while finding ways to empower their students. Discussing this with students is just as important, since, as I have highlighted throughout this paper, they do shape language learning experiences. Students need to be aware of the ideologies at play and the ways they can influence their language use and language learning.

References

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.

Blackledge, A. (2008). Language ecology and language ideology. In A. Creese, P. Martin & N.Hornberger (Eds.), *Ecology of language* (pp. 27–40). Springer.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95(3),* 401-417.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations.*Routledge.

Carvajal Regidor, M. (2020). *A Study of Language Ideologies and Language Practices in an Intensive English Program Class.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Curzan, A. (2014). *Fixing English: Prescriptivism and language history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Endo, H. & Reece-Miller, P.C. (2010). Chapter 6: Monolingual ideology in the US: History, hegemony, and linguistic privilege. *Counterpoints*, 355, 83-98.

Gal, S. & Irvine, J. T. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, *62(4),* 967-1001.

Garcia, O. & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L.C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gynne, A. & Bagga-Gupta, S. (2015). Languaging in the twenty-first century: Exploring varieties and modalities in literacies inside and outside learning spaces. *Language and Education, 29(6),* 509-526.

Janicki, K. (2006). *Language misconceived: Arguing for Applied Cognitive Sociolinguistics.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lippi-Green, R. (2011). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Otheguy, R., Garcia, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6(3),* 281-307.

Rezfar, A. (2012). Narrating beliefs: A language ideologies approach to teacher beliefs. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 43 (1),* 61-81.

Rosa, J. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *26(2),* 162-183.

Swain, M. (2006) Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In: Byrnes, H., Ed., *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*. London: Continuum, 95-108.

Weng, Z., Zhu, J., & Kim, G.J. (2019). English language teacher agency in classroom-based empirical studies: A research synthesis. *TESOL International Journal, 14(1),* 37-61.

Wolfram, W. & Schilling-Estes, N. (2006). *American English: Dialects and variation (2nd ed.)*. Blackwell Publishing.

Woolard, K.A. (1998). The role of language in European nationalist ideologies. In B.B. Schieffelin, K.A. Woolard & P.V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp.3-47). Oxford University Press.

Vol. 9 No. 1 (2023)

Issues in Language Instruction

A Journal for Practicing and Interpreting Teaching English as an Additional Language

Gamifying Vocabulary Study during COVID-19: The Challenges of Implementing a Gamified Program in the Online EAP Context

Peter Johnson
University of Kansas

Abstract. This qualitative case study responds to a significant gap in the literature in the area of gamification for vocabulary study among international students in higher education. It aims to respond to a call for a more in-depth qualitative analysis of gamification techniques on student learning experiences in comparison to the more commonplace quantitative studies (Chiang, 2020; Koivisto & Hamari, 2019). Additionally, the study focuses on the computer-supported learning context during the COVID-19 pandemic and its potential influences on student engagement with gamified language study. Utilizing the Quizlet (Quizlet, 2022) platform for vocabulary study and Blackboard for collecting digital badges based on vocabulary practice, this study explores the gamification of vocabulary review activities and student experiences and engagement with the program. As a qualitative case study, student activity data from Quizlet was collected as well as qualitative data in the form of individual interviews. Findings show significant challenges to implementing this gamified study program. This paper focuses on online learning fatigue, poor perceptions of class cohesiveness, and difficulties with teambuilding. These findings have implications for how instructors can better support gamification in their language classrooms as well as expanding research into the social and contextual aspects of gamification of the language classroom.

Keywords*: Gamification, Vocabulary, Digital Badges, English for Academic Purposes, Motivation, Engagement, Self-Determination Theory, Computer-supported Collaborative Learning, COVID-19*

Background and Literature Review

While EAP programs typically target all four major skills of language in addition to the specific grammatical and rhetorical styles needed by students, building academic and discipline-specific vocabulary knowledge is a particularly fundamental aspect of being successful in a profession or a field of study. Dang et al. (2017) defined academic vocabulary as having "high frequency, wide range, and even distribution in academic texts but infrequent in other genres" (p. 963). Otto (2021) found that, in highly technical fields such as civil engineering, specialized vocabulary can sometimes make up 30% of portions of texts. While these specialized vocabulary families may not appear with equal regularity, the task of learning these word families is monumental, with Coxhead and Demecheleer (2018) writing, "Anything that can help learners lessen the burden of specialized vocabulary learning is therefore a bonus" (p. 104).

The successful inclusion of vocabulary in EAP courses can be immensely challenging for instructors. Using online language review programs has become a popular way to develop and maintain skills without extensive setup and effort, with a variety of applications available at differing levels of complexity and organization (Chien, 2015; Dizon, 2016). On a more basic level, flashcard review programs, such as Quizlet (Quizlet, 2022), allow users to create digital flashcards with their own custom content and even additional media resources such as sounds and images.

Online and self-directed learning options became even more critical in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, which moved education of all kinds out of the physical classroom space early in 2020 and required rapid responsiveness from educators (Núñez-Canal et al., 2022) and flexibility from students (Aguilera-Hermida, 2020). Long before COVID-19, efforts were made to create frameworks for online learning theory supported by technology (Kirschner &

Erkens, 2013; Kreijns et al., 2013). These frameworks recognized that supporting learner engagement online involves challenges that cannot be solved just by translating in-person practices to the online space or simply grouping students together in order to spur collaboration.

Within the past decade, there has been an effort to organize a framework of this online collaboration under the more widespread term *computer-supported collaborative learning* (CSCL) (Kirschner & Erkens, 2013). In this framework, Kirschner and Erkens (2013) theorized that CSCL environments are shaped by the level of learning, unit of learning, and the pedagogical measures chosen by the instructor.

Narrowing their view within this framework, Kreijns et al. (2013) focused on the social collaborative nature of CSCL learning environments. Like Kirschner and Erkens (2013), Kreijns et al. (2013) found that attempts to build collaborative social behavior in the CSCL environment had not resulted in the kind of success as hoped by many. Simply putting learners into groups was not resulting in robust collaboration. Kreijns et al. (2013) concluded that for collaboration and teamwork to be successful, support for *sociability*, *social presence* and the creation of a *sound social space* need to be supported through opportunities for social interaction. In this model, sociability is the ability for the CSCL environment to facilitate social interactions and relationship development between group members. Social presence is the technical ability of the environment to allow group members to seem real to each other, as well as instructors' actions that allow students to get impressions of each other as individuals. Finally, the creation of a sound social space is one which has "strong relationships, group cohesiveness, trust and respect, feelings of belonging, satisfaction, and a sense of community" (Kreijns et al., 2013, p. 234). Motivation and engagement in higher education has also become an area of increased study (Astin, 1984; Finn & Zimmer, 2012; Reschly & Christenson, 2012; Skinner & Pitzer, 2012). As COVID-19 forced learning to become remote, students "checked out" of technology-mediated learning due to online learning fatigue (Bailenson, 2021; Gordon, 2020; Hartshorn & McMurry, 2020). One approach to enhancing engagement with online platforms of all kinds is the use of gamification. In short, gamification is "the use of game design elements in non-game contexts," like leaderboards, badges and levels added to non-game activities in order to enhance enjoyment of, or engagement in, the activity. Gamification's benefits have been well studied in the field of higher education (Bovermann et al., 2018; Dichev & Dicheva, 2017; Dicheva et al., 2019). In the field of language learning, however, research into gamification has been less common.

There is a wide variety of psychological models that are referenced to understand motivation in gamification, but a common theory being utilized in gamification research recently (e.g., Bovermann et al., 2018; Hamari & Koivisto, 2015; Sailer et al., 2017; Seaborn & Fels, 2015) is Self-determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000) and its view of motivation as a need for competence, autonomy and relatedness. Ryan et al. (2006) found that autonomy is supported, and motivation is enhanced when players feel that they are free to pursue goals without feeling excessively restricted by outside forces as well as when "rewards are structured so as to provide feedback rather than to control the player's behavior" (p. 3). Competence, the feature that Ryan et al. (2006) found most impactful in game environments, involves being optimally challenged during an activity as well as receiving feedback that develops a sense of achievement and the sense that they have the capability to complete the task at hand. Finally, the concept of relatedness in games is based on interactions with others (including non-player characters) and often direct comparisons of skills or positions to others, an activity that dovetails with feelings of competence in relation to others. While autonomy and competence are regularly present features in games, relatedness is more variable dependent on the format of the game or gamification being experienced (Ryan et al., 2006).

While the dissertation that preceded this article (Johnson, 2022) had a number of findings, this article focuses on specific challenges to implementing a gamified study program. The challenges are online learning fatigue, perceptions of poor class cohesiveness, and difficulties with team building. This study was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic and the findings should be interpreted within this context.

Methodology

This qualitative case study took place within EAP courses at the English Language Institute (ELI) at a Midwestern University. The ELI houses the Intensive English Program (IEP) and offers a fairly traditional model of EAP programming in the US higher education context. The IEP was organized into 5 levels based on English proficiency, and there were 111 students spread over the 9 IEP sections where the Quizlet and digital badge program was implemented. Of

these, 11 students (representing 9.9% of the total students enrolled) agreed to participate in interviews about their experiences during the semester in which data was collected. The participants span a range of ages (18-42) and student status (beginning undergraduates to Ph.D. Students), and the countries of origin and first languages are fairly representative of the IEP's typical student demographic. First languages included Chinese, Arabic, Vietnamese, Russian, Czech, and Burmese.

The badges for the study were based on the findings of McDaniel and Fanfarelli (2016), who argued that good badge design must consider the behaviors that the designer wishes to reinforce via the incentives of the badges as well as the type of psychology likely to be experienced by the users. In the case of this study, the goal was to promote repeated engagement with the vocabulary chosen by participants over time, a necessary condition to building vocabulary knowledge (Ma, 2009; Nation, 2001). This included the learner making form- meaning connections (Laufer & Goldstein, 2004) through the creation of word sets and practice with flashcards as well as receiving repeated exposure and feedback via formative self- assessment practices like the Quizlet test function (Duque Micán & Cuesta Medina, 2015; Karpicke & Roediger III, 2007). This application of digital badges represented a "goal-setting" function (McDaniel & Fanfarelli, 2016) that intended to reinforce desired behavior by aligning the completion requirements for badges with those behaviors. For more information on designing digital badges and the badges used in this study, see McDaniel & Fanfarelli (2016) and Johnson (2022), respectively.

In Quizlet, participant interactions with the program, the frequency of their review sessions over time, the number/type of digital badges attained, and student performance in self-testing were monitored. Based on these activities, digital badges were awarded through Blackboard Achievements and recorded on a shared, view-only "medal count" Google Docs spreadsheet unique to each class section. This data collection allowed for an overall picture of user behavior, and the shared Google Docs spreadsheet more easily allowed users to see the badges earned by others. Additionally, participants were assigned to teams of 3-4 students, and the combined totals of their medals were recorded. This resulted in a hybrid individual/team competition game structure. Updates on medal counts were provided to each class regularly.

Challenges

The context of the study was challenging for both instructors and students as remote teaching and learning during the pandemic dragged on. Gamification has been seen as a way to spur and support learner motivation, but the broader realities of this case study put these views to the test. The overall interpretation of the findings is that the gamification of the Quizlet program was not found to be engaging in the COVID-19, CSCL context. While participation rates in optional gamified activities are difficult to find in the existing literature, de-Marcos et al. (2014) recorded a substantial engagement rate of roughly 20%. Of the 111 potential student participants in this study, only 3 engaged with Quizlet to a meaningful degree (2.7%), demonstrating a substantial amount of amotivation across the IEP sections in terms of interest and participation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Some potential reasons for this lack of participation are explored below.

Technology and Online Learning Fatigue

Notably, all of the students interviewed expressed a desire to return to in-person instruction. For some of the students, the use of the technology platforms for the online semester was seen as lacking the engagement and interaction that they had hoped for in terms of language development. One student, Liang, was looking forward to an in-person semester without the technology:

> When the pandemic is over, we come into the class, I mean the offline class, and yeah we're coming to the class and we don't use this technology. So I think we are not interested in this technology [laughs]. Yeah, we don't want to use it because by this technology we don't need to talk a lot, so it won't help us a lot with our listening and speaking (Liang, student interview, 10/11/21).

Not all views on the use of technology were negative, however. For Josef, another student, the extended use of classroom technology had actually made him feel more comfortable with it, to the point that he wanted to use it as a standard tool:

> With the technology…for me it was about confidence. I just feel much more confident to use it. Much more confident to actually go in front of the camera. Like a year ago, when we were not using Zoom, like I would be so afraid to use it, even to just talk to people. Okay, but now, I feel good every class that it's actually nice… So, actually, in this way it just becomes standard. Regular. A standard useful tool that doesn't get bored [sic] at all (Josef, student interview, 10/20/21).

While Josef preferred in-person meetings for typical class sessions, he saw the potential for continued use of online platforms in certain situations. Additionally for Josef, who described himself as an introverted person, the online format made him feel less anxious about speaking with others, a phenomenon found in other comparative research into language learners communicating in online and face-to-face spaces (Rodrigues & Vethamani, 2015; Yaniafari & Rihardini, 2021).

Multiple instructors echoed student desires to return to in-person instruction. Instructors Lauren and Stephanie additionally believed that that the Quizlet program would have been better received by the students in a less technology-heavy, in-person environment as shown in Lauren's comment:

> So until we go back face to face, the students are inundated with tech. So, I think if it were a face-to-face class and you went in and said "hey, I've got this tech tool to help you with vocabulary, have you used Quizlet? Well, great! You can practice your vocab." And I think they would be like "cool! I'll get on my phone, [dah dah dah]." But because they have, like, Teams, Blackboard, now they're going to switch to Canvas…One thing we've been talking about at the IEP is "how do we lower their tech burden?" (Lauren, instructor interview, 8/2/21)

Working also in the higher-education EAP setting, Hartshorn and McMurry (2020) and Oliveira et al. (2021) found mixed reactions to the use of online learning. For instructors, the additional use of technology was seen as more helpful for instruction than was perceived by the learners. For students, the online medium of instruction was overwhelmingly seen as a hindrance to their language learning efforts. Largely due to a combination of frustration with the technology used for instruction and the social isolation due to COVID-19 lockdowns and travel restrictions, students perceived that they were getting significantly less time and exposure to others to practice their English skills in a communicative capacity (Hartshorn & McMurry, 2020).

Perceptions of Class Community and Cohesiveness

Nearly all of the students interviewed reported that the online nature of the IEP courses they attended negatively affected their ability to get to know their classmates and develop the types of relationships that were typical for them in an in-person English class. Many of the students, like Lien, reported having only surface-level interactions with their fellow students:

> Yeah, with the others, I just know, because sometimes we in the group, so we just know, we know the name of each other. Not really clearly. Usually because we have to do our work, so not really…It is more difficult for me like because I am the outgoing person, so I want to make friends directly. I want to go shopping with them or talk directly or chat with them at that time, at the same time, not via Facebook or messenger. Some problem I can ask them in my class, but I need to chat on the message, but it does not keep the relationship like between all students. Between us (Lien, student interview, 10/29/21).

The differences seen by Lien have been shown to be common to other remote learning environments during the COVID-19 pandemic. To different degrees, online learning has been seen as lacking the depth, interactivity, and spontaneity of in-person interactions (Gordon, 2020; Kostaki, 2021; Nadler, 2020). Despite collaborating on work during and outside of class time, the depth of sociability and interaction between the students rarely extended beyond class tasks as required to build a sound social space (Kreijns et al., 2013). The instructors felt similarly despite their efforts to create a sense of community in their classrooms under extraordinary circumstances.

Instructor Nicholas echoed Student Lien's perceptions about the lack of developing complex relationships over the course of the semester. For Nicholas, reflecting on his pedagogical choices allowed him to see how implementing group activities affected the class community:

> I kind of imposed community, and it was done strategically. So if I know that two students speak the same language, and they're both equally strong, or equally weak or whatever, I'm not going to likely put those two together in the same group. So, then I'd change, so "you've been with this group, and now you're going to be with this group." So the changing introduces, keeps the community shallow rather than keeping a deeper bond. It keeps it more shallow. I never thought about it like that before until I just said that, but it does keep it more shallow. But it also keeps English being spoken in the classroom… So, I did that a couple of times and I think that helped. But in general, there's not cohesion that we would get when they're physically in class for 4 hours a week, 8 hours a week (Nicholas, instructor interview, 11/3/21).

As realized in the moment by Nicholas, the desire to create community was challenged by the pedagogical goals of the course. The desire to create community was reported by the other instructors as well, but as Kreijns et al. (2013) argued, it is often the case that instructor attempts to impose community or group learners together are made to address cognitive, on-task pedagogical goals rather than to develop a community social space.

Building Teams

Part of the gamification of the Quizlet program revolved around competing via a shared leaderboard of medals for the students both as individuals and as members of a team. Given the difficulties posed to developing relationships and communication as previously outlined, the process of forming teams was also impacted. For some of the highest-performing members of the study, teamwork with others was not identified as being particularly motivating, so little effort was put into organizing with others. When asked about joining a team instead of participating individually, Student Anna replied, "Yeah, good question. I get it. So, I don't know exactly. [laughs] It's a good question. Hmmm... Because it depends on the people. Someone likes to work together with a team, but some people, like… Some people like just individual program [sic]. For example, for me, I liked exactly this program" (Anna, student interview, 8/20/21). Anna, who had competed only as an individual, preferred that for herself.

When originally discussing her perceived complexity of earning some of the medals, Student Thiri thought that the most difficult aspect of the process might actually be the teamwork component, stating, "working with the team might be difficult, I think." Later in the interview, Thiri expanded on this difficulty:

> Thiri: I don't know how to communicate with my team. So there should be a kind of channel so that we can motivate each other to go on Quizlet, but currently after IEP classes we have no communication in proper channels, so…
> Peter: Right, right… Because you're on the zoom or video call, right? So when class is finished it's finished [makes cut-off motion with hand].
> Thiri: Yes, exactly. (Thiri, student interview, 10/13/21)

For Thiri, the lack of what she perceived as a "proper" channel of communication after class time was a limitation of the online format as well. As Kreijns et al. (2013) theorized, instructional design in online learning environments often fails to accommodate anything outside of on-task interaction, limiting the scope for collaboration on anything else, as described by multiple students.

Instructors also recognized the difficulty in encouraging students to join teams and compete. In the summer, Instructors Stephanie and Lauren had been optimistic about the ability of teams to drive participation in the students. As Lauren remarked, "we have students that are just highly competitive, so if you can get into that, like, "hey we're going to be on teams." So, I'm going to split the class and we have two teams and we'll see the team has the most, like you're working alone, but you're also working as a team. I think if they can work together you'd see more buy-in, too" (Lauren, instructor interview, 8/2/21). Toward the end of the Fall semester, Lauren and Stephanie were disappointed to

see that so few students had competed, with Lauren remarking, "I personally thought the team part would work, but I was wrong about that, too!" (Lauren, instructor interview, 11/5/21). For both of them, many of their expectations for student participation had to be scaled back for the Fall semester as it became clear to them that students were becoming overwhelmed with the online learning.

For Instructor Charlotte, the primary factor that prevented team formation was the size of her class. Having experience with smaller class sizes, the large class size impeded the natural grouping of students she was used to:

> So I think, had the class been actually split the way it was originally intended, I think we would have been able to see this. Little groups of community forming. But with 16 of them it just didn't work…I tried to divide them based on how I thought they would work well together as well, and they have done group things before, but they're not motivated to work together like this. And sometimes classes are like that, but I really do feel like the bigger the class, the less collaborative they become (Charlotte, instructor interview, 11/11/21).

Ultimately, despite instructor hopes that the team aspect of gamification would motivate some of the learners in their classroom, students made very limited efforts to find teammates over the course of the semester, instead displaying widespread amotivation across all IEP sections (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Discussion

While the technology used to mediate online instruction may have had some generally negative effects on student engagement with the gamified Quizlet activity, the most significant finding regarding the context in relation to the gamification process were perceptions of the new social environment caused by Covid-19. Using a CSCL social framework (Kreijns et al., 2013) for analysis, the data from the students and instructors indicate significant issues with creating an environment conducive to social interaction. With limited abilities to socialize, be present in the classroom, and create a social space, collaborative work and team-based learning activities may suffer.

According to Kreijns et al. (2013), "… the *sociability* of a CSCL environment is its potential to encourage socioemotional interaction. The tangible (i.e., the physical and technological) elements that determine the sociability of the CSCL environment do not by themselves influence the quality, content, and intensity of the socioemotional interaction, but these elements can be designed in such a way that it becomes more likely that they can exert that influence" (p. 231). One of the major hurdles to sociability cited by students, instructors and the IEP administrator was the lack of class time due to the scheduling challenges brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic and the need to teach synchronously to students in locations around the globe. This restriction, in turn, led to significantly fewer opportunities for students to do anything beyond on-task activities during this class time together.

As Kreijns et al. (2013) propose, on-task collaboration does not necessarily lead to social interaction or the development of the social relationships that are needed to underpin teamwork in the classroom. Kirschner and Erkens (2013) state that it is easy for instructors to assume that simply putting students together in groups would help build student social relations. All of the instructors interviewed mentioned building group work time into their synchronous courses whenever possible, but, as sensed by Instructor Nicholas, these strictly on-task efforts largely developed only shallow relationships. As he said, he "kept the community shallow rather than keeping a deeper bond…But it also keeps English being spoken in the classroom" (Nicholas, instructor interview, 11/3/21). In this example, the pedagogical need to keep students focused on cognitive, on-task activities applied restrictions on off-task, relational activities. This perception was confirmed by numerous students. As Lien mentioned, "… I just know, because sometimes we [sic] in the group, so we just know, we know the name of each other. Not really clearly. Usually because we have to do our work, so not really" (Lien, student interview, 10/29/21). Her statement was echoed by numerous other students who felt that the classroom time was too limited or too "precious" (Ben, student interview, 10/15/21) to spend on anything beyond the learning objectives for the course. This reality of time limitations therefore likely compromised the ability for instructors in the IEP to provide for socialization (Kreijns et al., 2013) for the students.

Another factor influencing the social interaction in the CSCL space is the perception of the *social presence* of others in the learning environment. A presence in the classroom is mediated by the class environment, and "the degree of

social presence is influenced both by sociability and by the techniques used by teachers to allow the CSCL members to get to know each other and to form individual impressions of each other" (Kreijns et al., 2013, p. 235). Students did not feel that the presence of each other on Zoom was as satisfying to their language needs and social needs as they would have wanted. Many students reported instances of peers refusing to turn cameras on, keeping themselves on mute, or otherwise openly showing distraction in the online context. This seems to undermine the concept of "realness" that is a component of being *present* in a social space, an antecedent to social interaction between learners (Kreijns et al., 2013).

Finally, as Kreijns et al. (2013) explain, feeling like you are talking with a real person supports interaction, which in turn maintains what they term a *sound social space* for learning. They write, "A performing group requires that the social space is sound. This is the case when the group structures manifest themselves by strong relationships, group cohesiveness, trust and respect, feelings of belonging, satisfaction, and a sense of community" (p. 234). In the language learning environment, the importance of building a supportive classroom to overcome speakers' affective filters has long been an area of study (Krashen, 1986). However, due to limitations of the technology as well as curricular changes due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the CSCL context appears to have fostered limited feelings of community within nearly all of the students. As Student Liang expressed of his opportunities to get to know others, "I think we have [them], but we don't want to. [laughs] We don't want to share. You know, the teacher is there, so we think he or she will talk, and we don't need to. And there are not so many discussions, so I think we don't need to, so we don't want to" (Liang, student interview, 10/11/21).

Suggestions and Conclusion

The findings of this study can offer a number of suggestions for instructors hoping to implement gamified vocabulary practice in an online learning environment. While the context for this study was especially unique due to the larger COVID-19 pandemic and its effects on teaching and learning, there are still findings that can inform online and in-person instruction in the post-pandemic environment.

The intentional design of a sound social space (Kreijns et al., 2013) for relationship building within a classroom is critical to support students who instructors wish to work collaboratively, whether that work is on required course material or gamified language practice exercises. There are numerous intentional design choices that could support such a space. For example, instructors could hand over hosting of synchronous virtual classes to students who wish to socialize or meet with group members after the official class time has expired rather than closing meeting rooms. This practice, advocated by Bannink and Van Dam (2021), creates a "teacher-free zone" for student socialization.

Also, using a more unified platform of synchronous video, chat channels, links and files provided by Microsoft Teams may provide additional channels of communication between students and allow the instructor to host gamified programs in a more central location. Having students share flashcards openly may also be seen as intimidating by students if the social space is not perceived as being supportive enough to share this kind of information. Instructors may wish to give students options to not share their resources with the class, even though that may prevent some of the collaborative nature of the team activity and make monitoring participation more difficult for the instructor (for example, being unable to see the test performance of such students on Quizlet).

Based on the interpretations of the findings in this study, the context of the learning environment can play a critical role in engagement with certain types of gamification elements. However, as Koivisto and Hamari (2019) explain, more research into perceptions of gamification that goes beyond the individual experience and explores the more social and contextual elements of gamification is needed.

References

Aguilera-Hermida, A. (2020). College students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning due to COVID-19. *Int J Educ Res Open*, *1*, 100011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100011

Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A development theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, *40*, 518-529.

Bailenson, J. N. (2021). Nonverbal overload: A theoretical argument for the causes of Zoom fatigue. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000030

Bannink, A., & Van Dam, J. (2021). Teaching via Zoom: Emergent Discourse Practices and Complex Footings in the Online/Offline Classroom Interface. *Languages*, *6*(3), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6030148

Bovermann, K., Weidlich, J., & Bastiaens, T. (2018). Online learning readiness and attitudes towards gaming in gamified online learning – a mixed methods case study. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0107-0

Chiang, H.-H. (2020). Kahoot! In an EFL reading class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1101.05

Chien, C. (2015). Analysis the effectiveness of three online vocabulary flashcard websites on L2 learners' level of lexical knowledge. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(5), 111-121.

Coxhead, A., & Demecheleer, M. (2018). Investigating the technical vocabulary of plumbing. *English for Specific Purposes*, *51*, 84-97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.03.006

Dang, T. N. Y., Coxhead, A., & Webb, S. (2017). The Academic Spoken Word List. *Language Learning*, *67*(4), 959-997. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12253

de-Marcos, L., Domínguez, A., Saenz-de-Navarrete, J., & Pagés, C. (2014). An empirical study comparing gamification and social networking on e-learning. *Computers & Education*, *75*, 82-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.01.012

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1104_01

Dichev, C., & Dicheva, D. (2017). Gamifying education: What is known, what is bIEPeved and what remains uncertain: A critical review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 1-36. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0042-5

Dicheva, D., Irwin, K., & Dichev, C. (2019). Exploring learners experience of gamified practicing: For learning or for fun? *International Journal of Serious Games*, *6*(3), 5-21. https://doi.org/10.17083/ijsg.v6i3.299

Dizon, G. (2016). Quizlet in the EFL Classroom: Enhancing academic vocabulary acquisition of Japanese university students. *Teaching English with Technology*, *16*(2), 40-56.

Duque Micán, A., & Cuesta Medina, L. (2015). Boosting vocabulary learning through self-assessment in an English language teaching context. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *42*(3), 398-414. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1118433

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 97-131). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_5

Gordon, M. (2020). Synchronous teaching and learning: On-ground versus Zoom. *International Journal of Education and Human Developments*, *6*(3).

Hamari, J., & Koivisto, J. (2015). Why do people use gamification services? *International Journal of Information Management*, *35*(4), 419-431. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2015.04.006

Hartshorn, J., & McMurry, B. (2020). The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on ESL learners and TESOL practitioners in the United States. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, *Vol. 2*(2), 140-156. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.46451/ijts.2020.09.11

Johnson, Peter Sherman. (2022). *Gamified Vocabulary Learning for International Students in the University EAP Context* (Publication No. 29209226) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Karpicke, J., & Roediger III, H. (2007). Repeated retrieval during learning is the key to long-term retention☆. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *57*(2), 151-162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2006.09.004

Kirschner, P. A., & Erkens, G. (2013). Toward a Framework for CSCL Research. *Educational Psychologist*, *48*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.750227

Koivisto, J., & Hamari, J. (2019). The rise of motivational information systems: A review of gamification research. *International Journal of Information Management*, *45*, 191-210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.10.013

Kostaki, D. K., I. (2021). Houston, we have a pandemic: Technical difficulties, distractions and online student engagement. *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal* https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/6mrhc

Krashen, S. D. (1986). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Kreijns, K., Kirschner, P. A., & Vermeulen, M. (2013). Social Aspects of CSCL Environments: A Research Framework. *Educational Psychologist*, *48*(4), 229-242. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.750225

Laufer, B., & Goldstein, Z. (2004). Testing vocabulary knowledge: Size, strength, and computer adaptiveness. *Language Learning*, *54*(3), 399-436.

Ma, Q. (2009). *Second language vocabulary acquisition*. Peter Lang.

McDaniel, R., & Fanfarelli, J. (2016). Building better digital badges. *Simulation & Gaming*, *47*(1), 73-102. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046878115627138

Nadler, R. (2020). Understanding "Zoom fatigue": Theorizing spatial dynamics as third skins in computer-mediated communication. *Computers and Composition*, *58*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102613

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge Universtiy Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656

Núñez-Canal, M., de Obesso, M. d. l. M., & Pérez-Rivero, C. A. (2022). New challenges in higher education: A study of the digital competence of educators in Covid times. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *174*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121270

Oliveira, G., Grenha Teixeira, J., Torres, A., & Morais, C. (2021). An exploratory study on the emergency remote education experience of higher education students and teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13112

Otto, P. (2021). Choosing specialized vocabulary to teach with data-driven learning: An example from civil engineering. *English for Specific Purposes*, *61*, 32-46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.08.003

Quizlet. (2022). Quizlet, Inc. www.quizlet.com

Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 3-19). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_1

Rodrigues, P., & Vethamani, M. (2015). The impact of online learning in the development of speaking skills. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Education 5*(1), 43–67.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.68

Ryan, R. M., Rigby, C. S., & Przybylski, A. (2006). The motivational pull of video games: A Self-Determination Theory approach. *Motivation and Emotion*, *30*(4), 344-360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9051-8

Sailer, M., Hense, J. U., Mayr, S. K., & Mandl, H. (2017). How gamification motivates: An experimental study of the effects of specific game design elements on psychological need satisfaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *69*, 371-380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.033

Seaborn, K., & Fels, D. I. (2015). Gamification in theory and action: A survey. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *74*, 14-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2014.09.006

Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 21-44). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_2

Yaniafari, R. P., & Rihardini, A. A. (2021). Face-to-Face or Online Speaking Practice: A Comparison of Students' Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Level. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, *8*(1), 49-67. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v8i1.3058

Vol. 9 No. 1 (2023)

Issues in Language Instruction

A Journal for Practicing and Interpreting Teaching English as an Additional Language

A Moves-Steps Approach to Teaching EAP from Disciplinary Textbooks: A Case from American Studies

Marcellino Berardo
University of Kansas

Abstract. Classroom application of a moves-steps analysis to textbooks allows the EAP practitioner to use authentic content from textbooks in different disciplines in the EAP classroom. First, the communicative purpose of moves and steps is reinterpreted as student learning outcomes (SLOs). Guided by the SLOs, EAP pedagogy can then focus on how the moves and steps are achieved toward helping students acquire the (pedagogical) discourse of the discipline. Converting moves and steps to SLOs also helps the general ESL practitioner become more familiar with this EAP perspective on disciplinary content facilitating the transition from general ESL to EAP (e.g., Campion 2016). Although the context for this paper is a university pathway program, the practice was also carried out in the university's Intensive English Program (IEP) making the practice relevant to different contexts. Strengths and limitations are included.

Keywords: *EAP, discipline-specific, research to practice, moves, steps, textbooks, genre, student learning outcomes (SLOs), American Studies*

Introduction

Approximately ten years ago, a group of EAP practitioners in a university Intensive English Program (IEP) began developing an approach to teaching academic English from chapters of textbooks in the sciences, humanities, and social sciences.[1] The approach came from perceived needs of advanced IEP students. Students needed the ability to use English to *access, understand*, *recreate,* and *critically discuss/question* disciplinary content typically encountered in first- and second-year textbooks. The EAP instructors continued to refine this approach, with the acronym *AURC,* in a pathway program the university introduced a few years later.[2] The practice discussed here is from the pathway program.[3]

Developed independently, *AURC* systematized Kaspar's (2000) observation that "[b]eing successful in an English-speaking academic environment requires that ESL students be … able to use English to access, understand, articulate, and critically analyze conceptual relationships within, between, and among a wide variety of content areas" (p. 3). Nesi and Gardner (2012) captured Kaspar's observation and the centrality of the textbook in a quote from a biology lecturer, "…[t]he student must understand the current state of knowledge and how it was acquired and be able to explain it. In year one, you can find everything you need to know from the textbook" (p.59).

As the IEP instructors continued to teach EAP from entire chapters of disciplinary textbooks, issues remained concerning how to teach academic English from material intended to introduce the content of a discipline rather than teach English for academic purposes. A pedagogy that exploited textbook design emerged with a component approximating the communicative purpose of moves and steps found in textbooks. Unfortunately, the pathway program closed before data on the efficacy of this approach could be collected. Moreover, curricula in the IEP changed and no longer

[1] See Berardo and Smith Herrod (2014) for discussion on using an anthology for EAP.
[2] For more on *AURC,* see Berardo and Smith-Herrod (2015).
[3] For more about the university's pathway program see *Issues in Language Instruction (2015) The Kansas University Academic Accelerator Program*.

Published online September 2023

incorporated textbook chapters typically used in first- and second-year courses. Instructors had no input on these two events. Therefore, the approach suggested here is theory-based and steeped in practical experience from the IEP and pathway program.

EAP and the Pathway Program

A small team of experienced IEP instructors was asked to teach in a new university pathway program developed with a private recruiter to accelerate the transition of newly arrived international students to sophomore status in twelve months.[4] The international students tested into the program at the level of B1 – B2 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Students in the program were enrolled in standalone EAP classes and first- and second-year classes. Some of the first- and second-year classes were also linked to other EAP courses.

IEP faculty had no influence in how the pathway program would be organized. Moreover, IEP instructors also had no prior experience teaching in a pathway program and little time to transition from general ESL to EAP. In addition, IEP faculty members were asked to teach academic English relevant to disciplinary content not in their areas of expertise. The task was to figure out how and the onus was on the IEP faculty. Challenges discussed in Campion (2016) such as how to negotiate discipline-specific content were immediate. Moreover, the ESL instructors felt they lacked the knowledge, ability, and confidence to teach EAP courses that corresponded with first- and second-year university courses. This feeling of insecurity among ESL instructors was also described in de Chazal (2014, p. 11).

To illustrate the challenges and the application of moves-steps analysis in EAP practice, this article focuses on one EAP course that was paired with a humanities class designed for the pathway program. The humanities class, American Studies, examined race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability through 100 years of American film. The main textbook for the course exceeded 400 pages. The textbook was *America on Film* by Benshoff and Griffen (2009). The American Studies department added a 500-page supplemental anthology for rigor (Andersen and Collins, 2016).[5] The anthology offered short essays with titles such as *Systems of Power and Inequity* and *The Construction of Black Masculinity: White Supremacy Now and Then.* The reading material presented the international students with unfamiliar perspectives expressed by an equally unfamiliar discourse. The books were insightful but left serious questions about teaching academic English relevant to this American Studies class. One need was clear; the newly arrived undergraduate students had to engage with challenging and voluminous texts.

The Undergraduate Textbook

Undergraduate textbooks play a key role in offering an initial understanding of the discipline's subject matter and perspectives (Hyland 2009, p. 112). Specific to EAP is that "the principles of composition and design [of textbooks] are meant to favour understanding and acquisition of concepts, which turns them into potentially useful tools for the learning of academic language" (Bondi 2016, p. 331). Although textbooks do not provide good examples for argumentative writing, "the moves and lexico-grammar of textbooks … play a major role in the development of reading skills and the building-up of the first academic vocabulary" (Bondi 2016, p. 331). Multiword constructions have also been studied in university textbooks, identifying language that is "more grounded in student reality…" (Wood and Appel 2014, p. 2).

An immediate question for the EAP practitioner about textbooks from other disciplines is what to do about the content. The view taken here is that EAP practitioners should engage with textbook content by approaching the material from the knowledge base of EAP, which includes Systemic Functional Linguistics, genre theory (moves-steps), corpus linguistics, academic literacies, and critical EAP (Ding and Bruce 2017, pp. 65-84). Below, disciplinary textbooks are viewed through the lens of genre theory, specifically as a series of moves and steps.

[4] See Winkle (2014) for more on ESL and pathway programs.

[5] Although American Studies instructors required much reading, students were not required to read the books in their entirety. See Anderson (2015) for variation in numbers of pages of required reading across disciplines.

Moves-Steps and Student Learning Outcomes

Moves analysis in academic genres originates with Swales (1990; 2004), who defined a move as "a discoursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in written or spoken discourse" (2004, p. 228). This line of research has been so fruitful that Swales (2019) suggested it may be time to limit publications of descriptions of moves-steps, while recognizing that the application of "move-step assignments can be a very useful vehicle" to teach aspects of academic genres (p. 77). To continue to develop the utility of moves-steps for the EAP classroom, the communicative purpose of moves-steps is reinterpreted as student learning outcomes (SLOs), which can be a useful tool for guiding EAP instruction from discipline-specific textbooks.

Parodi (2010; 2014) applied moves-steps analysis to 126 Spanish language textbooks in four disciplines: Social Work, Psychology, Industrial Chemistry, and Construction Engineering. Parodi's work revealed three macro-moves: *Preamble*, *Conceptualization and Exercising* and *Corollary*. Each macro-move consists of moves. For example, the macro-move *Conceptualization and Exercising* consists of the three moves: *Concept Definition, Practice*, and *Recapitulation*. The focus here is on the macro-move *Conceptualization and Exercising*, which is central to the textbook's function (Parodi, 2010, p. 206). The move *Concept Definition* is central to the macro-move and is used below to show how EAP pedagogy can incorporate move-steps analysis.

Table 1
The Move-Steps for Concept Definition with Communicative Purpose

Move and Steps	Communicative Purpose
Move: Concept Definition	To describe and explain processes, objects, or others
Step 1. Linking Concepts	To link new concepts or procedures with those of one or more preceding articles
Step 2. Presenting the Topic Nucleus	To describe and define the object, concept, or procedure under study, often accompanied by drawings, figures, tables, or formulae
Step 3. Specifying Components of Sections	To subclassify or divide the concept of procedure under study into parts, with descriptions and definitions of types, parts, or components

Note. The move and three steps for Concept Definition as presented in Parodi (2010, p. 211).

The Move-Steps for Concept Definition

The move *Concept Definition* along with the steps that perform the move are given in Table 1. To simplify discussion, the example below only targets Step 2. EAP practitioners can make pedagogical use of the communicative purpose of the move and Step 2 by converting the purpose to an SLO as shown below.[6]

Communicative Purpose of Concept Definition *and Step 2 as SLO*

The student will be able to describe, explain, and/or define the object, concept, or procedure under study, often accompanied by drawings, figures, tables, or formulae.

The wording of the derived SLO is unsurprisingly broad and vague (e.g., object, concept, procedure under study) since the move and steps are derived from a large-scale study reflecting differences across disciplines (Parodi, 2014). Adaptation of the SLO for the specific discipline and textbook is needed. An example for the American Studies textbook, *America on Film,* is shown below.

[6] For an insightful discussion on SLOs in foreign language instruction see Norris (2006).

Adaptation of SLO to America on Film

The student will be able to describe, explain, and/or define representations of race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, and ability in US film history with the aid of chronological organization and movie still shots.

The adapted SLO reflects the textbook's specific concepts (race/ethnicity, class, gender, etc.), the organization style (chronological organization to reflect film history), and the accompanying visual representations, which are primarily movie still shots rather than drawings, figures, tables, or formulae.

SLO and Chronology

To meet the SLO, students will need to organize their descriptions, explanations, and/or definitions chronologically. To illustrate, consider representations of Italian Americans in US film history. As shown in Table 2, this ethnic group is presented as stereotypes starting with immigrants from the "great surge" of Italian immigration in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and ending with the representation of Italian Americans in a TV series from the early 21st century.

Table 2
Italian Stereotypes in US Film History

Historical Stereotypes	Description
Simple-minded working-class man (earliest depictions)	• Assimilationist small businessman; named Luigi, Carmine, or Guido • Broken English • Bushy mustache • Gracious smile • Street vendor, cranked a street organ, ran a small café
Socialist radical or anarchist (earliest depictions)	• Battles against white America rather than assimilating • Dark-skinned antagonist loses to heroic white men
Male Latin Lover (1920's) Female Latin Lover (1950's)	• Handsome, exotic, and sexually alluring • Appeal comes from a sense of "Otherness" • Bold and aggressive and potentially violent in sexual passion • Women lovers expressing earthiness and sensuality
Mafia Gangster (1930's)	• Ruthless, corrupt, ultra-violent, mobsters
World War II Propaganda Characters and Post war years	• Patriotism and loyalty to America during war with Italy, Ger many, and Japan • Musical performers
Gangster and Working class man (1970's-1990's)	• Mobsters and violent gang members • Working-class men struggling to achieve the American dream

To help students meet the SLO, the instructor can have students identify language that expresses time in the section's 10 paragraphs. Once identified, the instructor can help students note that time expressions appear chronologically from the first paragraph of the chapter's section ("early 1800's") to the last ("contemporary Hollywood"). Also noteworthy is that temporal phrases often appear in the first sentence of the paragraph making it easy for readers to follow the historical changes. Other time expressions in the body paragraphs identify movies and their release dates. Two key grammar structures are prepositional phrases and noun phrases. Examples are given in Table 3.

Table 3
Expressions of Time by Paragraph

Paragraph	Times Expressions in First Sentences	Time Expressions in Body Paragraphs
1	During the early 1800's…	• …the final years of the nineteenth century • …by 1900… • Until the late 1800's… • …popular media of the day…
2	One of the earliest of those stereotypical representations…	• Throughout the decades • To this day… • …as in the film Kiss me Guido (1997) • …Super Mario Brothers (1993)
3	…could eventually be assimilated..	• …during the first decades of the twentieth century… • In film of the era…
4	By the 1920's…	…who appeared in films such as *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse* (1921) and *The Sheik* (1921)
5	By the early 1930's…	• …began to proliferate…in the press in the earliest years of the century • During the Prohibition era (1919-1933)… • …in the early 1930's… • *Little Ceasar* (1930) • …followed by *Scarface* (1932) • Throughout the 1930's and continuing for decades…
6	… began to emerge during and after World War II…	• …war movies made during these years, such as *Sahara* (1943), *The Purple Heart* (1944), *Back to Bataan* (1945) and *The Story of G.I. Joe* (1945) • In the postwar years…
7	Postwar film making…	• Consequently, 1950's American film… • Like that of the 1920's Latin Lover… • …swept the Oscars in 1955…
8	During the 1960's and 1970's…	• …during the 1960's… • …*Please Don't Eat the Daisies* (1960) • …*the Thrill of It All* (1963)
9	N/A	• Francis Ford Coppola's *the Godfather* (1972) • …spawning two sequels (1974 and 1990). • Scorsese's … films most movegoers recall: *Mean Streets* (1973), *Goodfellas* (1990), and *Casino* (1995) • …other films from this era • *Rocky* (1976) • *Saturday Night Fever* (1977) • ...used his Godfather films (especially *Part II [1974]*) to indict…
10	…remain in contemporary Hollywood film.	• … (as in *Moonstruck* [1988]) … • …or as mobsters (as in *The Untouchables [1988]*) • …or as the cable TV series *the Sopranos* [1999-2007])

Note. Time phrases, movie names, and dates can be used to help students recognize how Italian stereotypes are organized chronologically.

Once the time expressions and grammar structures are discussed, students can identify characterizations of Italian stereotypes for each period. (See Table 3.) Students may need time to engage with unfamiliar vocabulary such as *bushy mustache*, *cranked a street organ*, *dark-skinned antagonist*, and a *sense of* "*Otherness*." Once comfortable with the vocabulary and the chronology, students can move on to examine movie still shots that accompany the stereotypes.

SLO and Movie Still Shots

The SLO is also met through movie still shots that represent ethnicity. To illustrate this, consider the section on Italians in American cinema, which only includes one still shot. The image is from the 1930's movie *Little Caesar* shown in Figure 1, where we see a short man, nicely dressed, standing by a store window with bullet holes. The man is holding his arm apparently after being shot.

Figure 1

Scene from the movie Little Caesar (1930) portraying an Italian American mobster.

Note. The depiction of an Italian American gangster can be used to define and describe the stereotype.

To show they are meeting the SLO, students would have to use the image to help define, explain, or describe the stereotype. To raise further awareness of the use of visuals as an aid, students may also be asked to explain why this particular image might have been chosen. An activity could begin with a description of the image followed by discussions based on questions and prompts such as those given below.

- Describe the man. Consider what he is wearing and what he is doing. What is he thinking?
- What race/ethnicity is portrayed? How do you know? Which stereotype is portrayed in the picture? Explain.
- Why did this happen to the man? How is this related to the stereotype?
- Why do you think this particular image was used?

Written and oral assessments of the SLO would target the students' ability to describe, explain, define, and/or otherwise characterize Italian American stereotypes chronologically in US film history while incorporating the still shot.

Some Strengths and Limitations of Moves-Steps Applied to Textbooks

In this section, some strengths and limitations of applying a moves-steps approach in the EAP classroom are considered. The discussion below can be used to help practitioners argue for using disciplinary textbooks in the EAP classroom by approaching the textbook as a genre with moves and steps.

Pragmatic EAP

The application of textbook moves and steps in EAP could be characterized as pragmatic EAP or as "a skills-based, instrumental approach that attempts to make students aware of the dominant conventions in Anglo-American writing…" (Harwood and Hadley, 2004 p. 356). Although they argue for *critical* pragmatic EAP, Hardwood and Hadley concede that "[a] pragmatic approach can provide a helpful framework for undergraduates beginning to come to terms with the practices of academic writing" (2004, p. 360). Pragmatic EAP, however, remains open to familiar critiques from Academic Literacies and Critical EAP dating back to Lea and Street (1998) and more recently recounted in Helmer (2013) who claimed that "this pragmatism can also lead EAP programs to unreflectively accommodate to externally imposed demands and institutional structures" (p. 274). Accommodating to "externally imposed demands and institutional structures" reduces teacher autonomy and curtails academic freedom of speech.

Although the application of moves analysis to textbooks is open to such criticism, another way to view it is as *academic socialization* as summarized by Storch, Morton, and Thompson (2016, p. 479). Academic socialization of EAP centers on the text as a means for engaging with the academic community. In this case, students learn that the textbook genre is composed of moves-steps that carry out functions. Students learn to respond to the communicative purpose of moves with discipline-specific content as they begin to acquire the discourse community's language use and perspectives as introduced in textbooks.

Lack of Expertise

The focus on moves-steps allows practitioners to teach EAP from discipline-specific textbooks while remaining on familiar territory of the EAP knowledge base. While highly practical and useful as part of a larger pedagogical repertoire, it can, however, be shallow if the instructor is not able to specialize in the rhetorical organization of academic genres. This is a serious limitation because it risks a familiar critique restated (and countered) in Hyland (2018), which is that EAP instructors are "outsiders who lack the expertise, knowledge, and self-assurance to understand and teach disciplinary discourses…" (p. 386). In fact, incorporating textbook moves-steps into pedagogy requires expertise and knowledge of applied linguistics, a home for EAP instructors and a scientific domain for the investigation of discourse and genre organization.

Textbook-Centric

The focus on the textbook is both a strength and limitation. Studies such as Miller (2011) revealed that language use in introductory university textbooks differs from vocabulary and grammar in ESL textbooks. Adopting university textbooks as a central component of EAP courses, then, provides the student with language more representative of reading assignments for non-ESL classes. However, studies such as Paxton (2007) found that textbook language differs from other literacy practices in the discipline. Therefore, heavy reliance on the textbook for a language source will not expose students to the discipline's other pedagogical and non-pedagogical literacy practices such as the research paper.

Conclusion

The transition from general ESL to EAP is not automatic. EAP practitioners are faced with serious questions about how to teach academic English defined by disciplines across academia. The situation intensifies as universities create partnerships with external entities that require an ESL component to integrate in specific ways with no resources devoted to EAP specialization. Fortunately, the EAP knowledge base offers solutions that can be adapted to new situations. As shown here, a moves-steps analysis of textbooks, perhaps the most ubiquitous academic genre for first-year university students, can be used in EAP pedagogy. Although there are limitations, this EAP practice allows practitioners to be grounded in their profession and adapt to ongoing changes alongside their colleagues in other fields.

References

Andersen, M. L., & Collins, P. H. (2016). *Race, class, and Gender: An Anthology.* Boston: Cengage Learning.

Anderson, N., J., (2015). Academic reading expectations and challenges. In: Evans, N., Anderson, N. & Eggington, W. (eds.) *ESL readers and writers in higher education*. New York, Routledge.

Benshoff, H. M., & Griffin, S. (2009). *America on Film.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell**.**

Berardo, M., & Smith Herrod, K. (2014). Creating and using an anthology for English for academic purposes. *Issues in Language Instruction,* 9-12.

Berardo, M., & Smith Herrod, K. (2015). Teaching English for Academic Purposes in the KU Academic Accelerator Program. *Issues in Language Instruction*, 20-24.

Bondi, M. (2016). Textbooks. In: Hyland, K., & Shaw, P. (eds.) *The Routlege handbook of English for academic purposes*. New York: Routledge.

Bruce, I. (2011). *Theory and Concepts of English for Academic Purpose.* New York: Palgrave Macmillian**.**

Campion, G. C. (2016). The learning never ends: Exploring teachers' views on the transition from General English to EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 59-70.

De Chazal, E. (2014). *English for Academic Purposes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ding, A. & Bruce, I. (2017). The English for academic purposes practitioner: Operating on the edge of academia. Palgrove Macmillan.

Harwood, N., & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 355-377.

Helmer, K., A. (2013). Critical English for academic purposes: Building on learner, teacher, and program strengths. *Journal of English for academic purposes,* 273-287.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic Discourse: English in a Global Context.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Hyland, K. (2018). Sympathy of the devil? A defense of EAP. *Language Teaching*, 383-399.

Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulation in academic discourse. *Applied Linguistics,* 266-285.

Kaspar, L. F. (2000). *Content-based College ESL Instruction.* Routledge.

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student Writing in Higher Education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 157-172.

Miller, D. (2011). ESL reading textbooks vs. university textbooks: Are we giving our students the input they may need? *Journal of English for academic purposes*, 32-46.

Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2012). *Genres across the Disciplines: Student Writing in Higher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, J. M., (2006). The why (and how) of assessing student learning outcomes in college foreign language programs. *The Modern Language Journal*, 576-583.

Parodi, G. (2010). The rhetorical organization of the textbook genre across disciplines: A "colony-in-loops?" *Discourse Studies*, 195-222.

Parodi, G. (2014). Genre organization in specialized discourse: Disciplinary variation across univeristy textbooks. *Discourse Studies*, 65-87.

Paxton, M. (2007). Tensions between textbook pedagogy and the literacy practices of the disciplinary community: A study of writing in first year economics. *Journal of English for academic purposes*, 109-125.

Robinson, F. P. (1970). *Effective Study*. New York: Harper & Row.

Storch, N., Morton, J., & Thompson, C. (2016). EAP pedagogy in undergradaute contexts. In: Hyland, K., & Shaw, P. (eds.) *The Routlege handbook of English for academic purposes*. New York: Routledge.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research Genres.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2019). The future of EAP genre studies: A personal viewpoint. *Journal of English for Academic Purpose, 75-82.*

Swales, J. M., & Post, J. (2018). Student use of imperative in their academic writing: How research can be pedagogically applied. *English for academic purposes*, 91-97.

Winkle, C. A. (2014). *University Partnerships with the Corporate Sector: Faculty Experiences with For-Profit Matriculation Pathway Programs.* Boston: Brill.

Wood, D. C., & Appel, R. (2014). Multiword Constructions in first year business and engineering university textbooks and EAP textbooks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1-13.