

Approaches to Pedagogy, Part II: Traditional vs. Communicative & Task-based Activities

David Ockert

Abstract

This paper reports the findings of an exploratory investigation into first-year Japanese university students' ($N = 220$) preferences among twelve pedagogical activities based on their English proficiency. Six of the twelve activities may be considered traditional, instructivist classroom pedagogical activities and six may be considered components of a constructivist communicative language teaching pedagogy and/or task-based language teaching activities. A principal components analysis placed the six traditional activity variables into one factor and the communicative / task-based activity variables into two factors of three items each. The results and implications are discussed.

本稿では、英語能力に基づいた12の活動のうち、日本の大学一年生 ($N = 220$) の好みの教授法研究成果を報告する。12の活動のうち6つは、伝統的で一番になる教室での、instructivist教育的活動と考えられるかもしれない（以下、TAS）。残りは（以後、C構成主義コミュニケーション・ランゲージ・ティーチング（CLT）教育またはタスク・ベースの言語教育（TBLT）活動の構成要素と考えられるかもしれない（C/TBAs）。そして最後に、C/TBAsのすべてはUIグループにより高く位置づけられており、PIグループと比較して統計学的に有意な差を示している。その結果が暗示することについて議論する。

Keywords: CLT, EFL, Japan, pedagogy, TBLT, traditional methods, university students

This paper reports on the distinctions between traditional, teacher fronted classroom activities (TAs) and communicative language teaching methods and/or task-based activities (C/TBAs). Students' affective response to different pedagogical approaches is well known to classroom practitioners. As Hsu (2005) writes, "some learners like doing grammar and memorizing, others want to speak and role-play; while still others prefer reading and writing, but avoid speaking" (p. 55). However, the author is unaware of any research studies which have investigated student pedagogical preferences based on English proficiency.

The results presented herein are from students ($N = 220$) in a single faculty at the same College of Science and Engineering at a large private university in the Kansai area of Japan. Since the students reported on were in the first semester of university, it should be noted that the results of the activity preferences may reflect activities

from high school (HS) and/or junior high school (JHS). However, the results of this research may help educators and curriculum developers make more informed decisions based on ability level and activity preferences. It is hoped that this paper will add to the research literature on classroom pedagogical activities and preferences.

Research on Classroom Pedagogical Approaches

Research on Traditional Pedagogical Approaches

Green (1993) was amongst the first researchers in English as a foreign language (EFL) studies to explore student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities. He has defined the following activities as non-communicative in nature: looking up words in a dictionary, explaining grammar, and whole class activities, such as repeating vocabulary words or phrases from a text after the teacher. His research found that the non-communicative activities were rated lower in both ‘enjoyableness’ and ‘usefulness’ by the students surveyed.

Research by Schmidt and Watanabe (2001) and Jacques (2001) on correlations between motivation and student preferences for different types of classroom activities found factors comprised of TAs. For example, Jacques’ (2001) results contain the items Grammar should be an important focus in this class, which grouped with Reading and writing should be an important focus in this class, forming the factor Traditional Approach (p. 195; 209). In the Schmidt and Watanabe (2001) study, these two items plus an additional item, Vocabulary should be an important focus in this class, came under the factor Traditional Approach (pp. 345-46; 355). Based on these studies, grammar, reading, writing, and vocabulary have been determined to be TAs in the literature.

Research on Communicative & Task-based Activities

Jacques (2001, p. 194; 209) and Schmidt and Watanabe (2001, pp. 345-46; 355) found a factor that they labeled Challenging Approaches. This factor consists of the items *I prefer a language class in which there are lots of activities that allow me to participate actively*, plus *I prefer to sit and listen and don’t like being forced to speak in language class* (reverse coded), as well as *In a class like this, I prefer activities and material that really challenge me to learn more*. In addition, Jacques (2001, p. 194) and Schmidt and Watanabe (2001, p. 355) found a factor, Cooperative Learning, that has three items: *I like language learning activities in which students work together in pairs or small groups*, *I prefer to work by myself in this language class, not with other students* (reverse coded), and *I prefer a language class in which the students feel they are a cohesive group*.

Dörnyei (2002) has reported on action research involving communicative activities in dyads using an interactive problem-solving activity. The results showed higher correlations between task attitudes and words spoken and turns taken with the dyads as compared to the individual data. This indicates “that task-motivation

is, at least partially, co-constructed” (p. 154). In addition, Nation and Hamilton-Jenkins (2000) have shown that group work tasks improve both speaking skills and vocabulary acquisition.

Research on Tasks and Motivation in the JEFL Classroom

Additional research in the Japanese EFL (JEFL) environment by Burden (2005) contrasted several TAs (lecture, translation, and grammar exercises) and C/TBAs (pair-work / group-work) and their perceived enjoyableness and usefulness by university students. The results indicate that several activities that are perceived as effective were not perceived as enjoyable (e.g. *Memorizing vocabulary lists*, p. 7, Table 2). In addition, Ockert (2006, 2011, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c) has found distinctions between TAs and C/TBAs based on principal components analysis (PCA) and reported on the relationship between activity type and learner EFL motives. The results show that students surveyed preferred to engage in specific activities and may also do so based on EFL motives.

This paper adds to the literature on TAs and C/TBAs by reporting on non-English Japanese students’ results for their preferences for pedagogical activities based on the activities’ motivating aspect or enjoyableness, according to student ability. The author is unaware of any research into pedagogical preferences of learners of differing English ability level based on a placement exam. The researcher believes that current study will contribute to the growing body of literature on the topic of classroom activities and our understanding of student perceptions of specific activities as enjoyable or motivating based on a placement level analysis.

Research Question and Hypothesis

Research Questions

The previous studies on TAs and C/TBAs and their motivational qualities / usefulness guide the present research. However, in this research project, three groups of first-year university students of differing levels of proficiency participated. The three levels of proficiency serve as independent variables. Twelve pedagogical activities serve as dependent variables. The research question explored in this study is:

1. Will a principal components analysis show classroom activity factors according to TA and C/TBA distinctions as described by researchers previously?

Hypotheses

The following two conjectures are offered:

Hypothesis 1: A principal components analysis will distinguish between TAs and C/TBAs.

Methods

For this research project, the numerical format choices for each item are the numbers 1 to 5. It is important to remember when viewing means scores for each variable that those below '3' are, in fact, representing negative affect for these respondents. It is also important to consider that survey use in the JEFL environment has a rather 'checkered' history. According to Reid (1990), students from different language and cultural backgrounds differ in the ways they respond to surveys. The author developed the scale used for this research before finding out about this phenomenon. However, appropriate measures were taken before analyzing the data (see Procedures, below).

Respondents

The participants were all first year students ($N = 220$) in communication classes in the College of Science and Engineering in a top-tier private university in Japan. Students from nine classes were chosen at random for participation with the cooperation of their teachers. Female and foreign students account for a very small percentage of the total respondents.

Instrument

The author created an English-language instrument for this research under the supervision of a recognized expert in the field, an approach referred to as the "expert opinion method" (Brown, 2001, pp. 179-180). The scale used in this research was designed with Japanese learners in mind; the items / activities were selected based on JEFL learners' classroom and learning situation. The Classroom Activities Questionnaire lists twelve classroom activities commonly used in foreign language classrooms. The first six are generally used for instructivist or teacher-fronted classrooms and are referred to as TAs. The latter six involve a more active student role, are socio-collaborative (group learning based) and are referred to as C/TBAs. No distinction was made on this survey to indicate to the students that the twelve activities were hypothesized to either one or the other. This questionnaire uses a Likert-type format from 1 to 5, corresponding to (1) strongly dislike, (2) dislike, (3) neutral, (4) like, and (5) strongly like (please see the Appendix). The Cronbach's *alpha* is .76 for the twelve items, which indicates that it is not a uni-dimensional scale. Rather, there are two or more sub-scales measuring different constructs.

Procedures

The author's colleagues administered the surveys to students in three classes from each level in the fourth week of the first semester. The author was present to assist in distributing the surveys, answer questions,

collect the surveys, and insure that they were filled out. The survey was administered in a paper version and students were encouraged to ask any questions of their instructor after the instructions were read aloud. The students were given as much time as necessary to complete the survey on a voluntary basis. However, no students opted to not fill in the questionnaire. The students were given confidentiality and assured that their course grade would not be affected in any way for their participation or non-participation. Due to the issue raised by Reid (1990), above, students from all three ability levels who chose the '3' option across all items were removed to create a more robust sample. Therefore, 14, 17, and 15 students' results were removed from the PI, IM, and UI groups, respectively, before analysis.

Statistical Issues

Sample size and subject to item ratio in principal components analysis. Some researchers claim that using principal components analysis with small numbers of respondents may be inappropriate; however, others disagree. For example, consider the minimum sample size or subject to variable ratio in several practical studies. Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum and Strahan (1999) reviewed articles in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* and the *Journal of Applied Psychology* that used EFA. 18.9% of the articles in the former journal and 13.8% of the articles in the latter had sample sizes of 100 or less. Regarding the ratio of subject to variable, 24.6% of the papers in the former journal and 34.4% in the latter were 4:1 or less. The sample size for the research presented herein has a total of 220 participants; twelve survey items; therefore, an STV of >18:1. Both the sample size and subject to variable measures meet the criteria for a principal components analysis.

Identification of the factors. There are two main points to consider for factor retention: the minimum items per factor group and the issue of cross-loadings. The communality between the items of .8 or greater may be 'ideal' but numbers between .40 and .70 are more common. Some (e.g. Costello & Osborne, 2005) suggest a minimum loading of .32 as a "good rule of thumb for the minimum loading of an item" (p. 4). However, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest this cutoff for *N*-sizes of 300+ respondents. Stevens (2009) suggests .40 for *N*-sizes below 200. Since the sample number for this study was 220, the cut-off of .40 is used to determine the factors. There were no cross-loadings above .40 in the PCA results. The level of significance was set at .10, which is appropriate for an exploratory study, according to Cohen (1992).

Results and Discussion

The collected data were initially analyzed using the SPSS software. The descriptive statistics for the twelve items, minimum / maximum (from 1 to 5) and rankings were reported in a previous article (Ockert, 2015). The skewness results indicate that variables 2, 4, and 8 have relatively normal distributions; variables 9, 10,

and 11 are to the right of the mean. This would be expected since the minimum for each was a '2', indicating that none of the respondents chose 1 (strongly dislike) for either of these activities.

Determining Factorability

SPSS tests of factorability include the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (kmo) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity. For the KMO, "values between 0.5 and 0.7 are mediocre, values between 0.7 and 0.8 are good, values between 0.8 and 0.9 are great and values above 0.9 are superb" (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999, in Field 2009, p. 647). The results are provided in Table 1. As can be seen, the KMO result is good. The level of statistical significance of $p < .001$ for the Bartlett's test indicates the data is suitable for a PCA.

Table 1. The KMO and Bartlett's test of Sphericity Results

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.775
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	465.771
	df	66
	Sig.	.000

The first Research Question and Hypothesis 1 required a principal components analysis (PCA) to determine if the variables will 'cluster' into factors comprised of TAs or C/TBAs. The PCA results are presented in Table 2. For these results, 60% or less explained variance is satisfactory for the social sciences. The *alpha* reliability estimate of .76 indicated inconsistency in the data. However, the PCA result of three factors indicates the instrument measures three distinct constructs, one for TAs and two for C/TBAs.

Table 2. Principal Components Analysis of the 12 Activities for the Students (N = 220)

Item number and name	Factor 1 <i>Traditional Activities</i>	Factor 2 <i>Active Pair / Team work</i>	Factor 3 <i>Brains</i>
1. Lecture (Listen to the teacher and stay in my seat)	0.726	0.157	0.030
2. Listening exercises (CD, tape or DVD)	0.621	-0.180	0.246
3. Dialogue / reading practice from the text	0.705	0.055	0.067
4. Writing exercises	0.664	0.171	0.134
5. Translation exercises	0.421	0.246	0.328
6. Grammar drills / practice	0.424	0.399	0.178
7. Small-group / team activities	0.167	0.771	0.074
8. Info-look / finding information activities	0.119	0.175	0.653
9. Problem-solving activities	0.121	0.050	0.763
10. Activities where I am moving around in the room	0.018	0.563	0.258
11. Tasks that are intellectually challenging	0.157	0.114	0.680
12. Pair-work	0.054	0.770	0.033
Eigenvalue	3.394	1.390	1.135
% Total rotated variance explained per factor	19.107	15.494	14.720

Note. Principal components analysis with Varimax rotation, with 49.321% total variance explained.

The three factors are explained in more detail below. However, it should be noted that the factors are formed by items which are related to each other as determined by the software algorithms. As such, the factor groupings themselves do not indicate a 'preference' or approval, or disapproval by the participants. The three PCA factors, Cronbach's *alpha* reliability estimates, and explanations are as follows:

Factor 1: *Traditional Activities* ($\alpha = .71$)

0.726 Item 1: Lecture

0.621 Item 2: Listening exercises (CD, tape or DVD)

0.705 Item 3: Dialogue / reading practice from the text

0.664 Item 4: Writing exercises

0.421 Item 5: Translation exercises

0.424 Item 6: Grammar drills / practice

The variables loading on this factor consist of activities *Lecture* and *Listening exercises*, which focus on teacher-fronted lessons, audio recordings, movies or listening to a partner in dialogue practice. In addition, this factor also contains *Writing* and *Translation exercises*, *Grammar drills / practice* and *Dialogue / reading practice from the text*, all traditional approaches to foreign language learning. With six variables, this factor has the highest *alpha* reliability score of the three.

Factor 2: *C/TBAs Active Pair / Teamwork* ($\alpha = .61$)

0.771 Item 7: Small-group / team activities

0.563 Item 10: Activities where I am moving around in the room

0.770 Item 12: Pair-work

The second factor has been labeled *C/TBAs Active Pair / Teamwork* since the three variables loading on this factor involve *Pair-work*, *Small-group / team activities*, and *Activities where I am moving around in the room*.

Factor 3: *C/TBAs Brains* ($\alpha = .57$)

0.653 Item 8: Info-seek / finding information activities

0.763 Item 9: Problem-solving activities

0.680 Item 11: Tasks that are intellectually challenging

The variables loading on factor three emphasize task-based activities including variables 8 *Info-seek, finding information activities* and 9 *Problem-solving activities*, activities that require problem-solving skills and definite outcomes. In the process of reviewing this paper, it was suggested that variable 11 *Tasks that are intellectually challenging* be dropped from the analysis as it appears based on its face value to include several activity types. Yet, it loaded with variables 8 and 9 nicely, forming a factor of three items with no meaningful cross-loading.

Conclusions

Implications for Pedagogy and Curriculum Development

The results should not lead readers to infer that having students engage in the activities that the students chose as more motivating / enjoyable will, in fact, increase their motivation to study English. The relationship of effectiveness and enjoyableness / motivating aspect of pedagogical activities has not been 'firmly established. In fact, it may not necessarily be a linear relationship but may be circular or even self-reinforcing.

What curriculum developers and classroom educator need to be aware of is "the possibility of problems arising from a mismatch of classroom activities with student expectations" (Green, 1993, p. 8). For example, students who have passed a university entrance exam will almost certainly have mastered basic grammar. To place such students in a class in which the teacher places an emphasis on grammatical rules / activities will almost certainly lead to student frustration, boredom, and burnout. Non-English majors

How are these results to be interpreted? For example, are these results generalizable to the larger body of university students in Japan in general? Lazaraton (2005) cautions that using parametric procedures may lead researchers to overgeneralize their results and to make claims regarding their findings that exceed what is permitted by their methodologies (p. 219). However, according to Dörnyei (2011), "researchers should also not to be afraid to extend research interpretations to a general class or population if (there are) reasons to assume that the results apply" (p. 213). In Japanese universities, the vast majority of students who must study English are majoring in subjects other than English. Therefore, the results presented in this paper may very well apply to university English students in Japan in general. Teachers may wish to experiment with various activities to see what works and what does not work so well in their specific situation. For example, can we combine activities that students perceive as enjoyable / motivating with essential activities that are perceived as useful? I.e. make a vocabulary memorization activity a group activity.

Limitations and Future Research

Admittedly, the current study has several limitations. First, several of the activities on the survey are not exclusive. For example, translation requires a source, a text or other written document as well as writing

skills. Furthermore, it is more important to recognize this study's sampling limitations. This sample was drawn from the students, overwhelmingly male, of a highly ranked university. Therefore, since the students who answered this survey are a sample of convenience, the results may not generalize to the population of Japanese university students as a whole (see Brown, 2006). However, these students come from varied demographic backgrounds and this should be taken into consideration when interpreting these results for practical applications in the classroom. Yet, this study involved students from a highly homogenous group and further research is needed to determine the extent to which their pedagogical activity preferences would be similar or different to students elsewhere. Gender could play a role in activity preference; future research should take this into consideration and report the results accordingly.

There are several questions which could be addressed in future studies. For example, *What could be the reason why some students prefer one pedagogical approach over another? Could the reason be the relevance of the material to her life now, or future goals for language use? Are educators using 'level appropriate' pedagogies, materials, and methodologies in the classroom? Is this a 'chicken and the egg' syndrome? In other words, Which comes first, the desire to engage in specific activities or the level of achievement? Does one cause the other?* Using a mixed methods approach utilizing open-ended questions would help answer the question of why students may prefer certain pedagogical activities. The findings in this paper of a survey of pedagogical activities are by no means conclusive, and it should not be assumed or inferred from these results that any specific activity in and of itself leads to an increase or decrease in proficiency. The author hopes that classroom teachers and curriculum developers may benefit from the information presented herein. It would be wonderful if other researchers explored survey differences as well and shared their students' preferred activities with the broader community of language researchers and teachers worldwide.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank David Beglar for his advice and support with the original research project(s); the teachers and students who participated in the project. Any errors are the author's.

References

- Brophy, J., & Alleman, J. (1991). Activities as instructional tools: A framework for analysis and evaluation. *Educational Researcher*, 20(4), 9-23.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. D. (2006). Generalizability from second language research samples. *Shiken*, 10(2), 24-27. Retrieved from http://jalt.org/test/bro_23.htm
- Brown, J. D. (2012). What do distributions, assumptions, significance vs. meaningfulness, multiple statistical tests, causality,

- and null results have in common? *SRB: Shiken Research Bulletin*, 16(2), 28-33.
- Burden, P. (2005). The castor oil effect: Learner beliefs about the enjoyment and usefulness of classroom activities and the effects on student motivation. *The Language Teacher*, 29(10), 3-9.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-59.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-7.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2002). The motivational basis of language learning tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 137-158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53, 3-32. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9922.53222
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (Vol. 2, pp. 719-731). New York: Springer.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009a). Motivation and the vision of knowing a second language. In B. Beavon (Ed.) *IATEFL 2008 Exeter Conference Selections* (pp. 16-22). Kent: IATEFL.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009b). Communicative language teaching in the 21st century: The 'principled communicative approach'. *Perspectives*, 36(2), 33-43.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2011). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Tseng, W.-T. (2009). Motivational processing in interactional tasks. In A. Mackay & C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass* (pp. 117-134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Duffy, T. M., & Cunningham, D. J. (1996). Constructivism: Implications for the design and delivery of instruction. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (pp. 170-198). New York: Macmillan Library Reference USA.
- Egbert, J. (2003). A study of flow theory in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 499-518.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272-299.
- Felix, U. (2005). Multiplying modalities: Opening up the fourth dimension to the online learner. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 1(3), 17-32
- Green, J. (1993). Student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(1), 1-10. DOI:10.2307/329552
- Hair, Jr., J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Hsu, S.-Y. (2005). Building language-learning environments to help technological university students develop English

- independent learning. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 1(2), 51-66.
- Jacques, S. (2001). Preferences for instructional activities and motivation: A comparison of student and teacher perspectives. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (Technical Report #23, pp. 185-211). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Julkunen, K. (2001). Situation and task-specific motivation in foreign language learning. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (Technical Report #23, pp. 29-41). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Lazarton, A. (2005). Quantitative research methods. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Leont'ev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Nation, I. S. P. (1991). Managing group discussion: problem-solving tasks. *Guidelines*, 13(1), 1-10.
- Nation, I. S. P. & Hamilton-Jenkins, A. (2000). Using communicative tasks to teach vocabulary. *Guidelines* 22, 2: 15-19.
- Norris, R. W. (1993). Using creative dictation to manage, motivate, and activate large groups of false beginners. *Fukuoka Women's Junior College Studies*, 45, 71-82.
- Nose, N. (2005). Shogakko ni okeru eigo katsudo no kenkyuu – Shogakko hayaki eigo kyouiku suishin jigyou wo o toshite [Research of English activity in an elementary school – On the promotion of early English education] The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology elementary school English activity situation investigation (the Heisei 17 fiscal year). Retrieved from <http://www.nps.ed.jp/narac/gakushi/kiyou/h18/data/a/11.pdf>
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1998). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Ockert, D. (2006). Survey results: Learning about language learners' learning styles. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2005 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Ockert, D. (2008). Dialogue dictations as four-skills communicative activities. *The Language Teacher Special Issue: My Share Activities*, 32(4), 6-7.
- Ockert, D. (2011). A multivariate analysis of Japanese university student motivation and pedagogical preferences. *The Language Teacher*, 35(2), 9-17.
- Ockert, D. (2015a). Approaches to university pedagogy, Part I: An exploratory study of classroom activity preferences. *Keizai Ronshu: The Economic Review of Toyo University*, 41(1), 169-176.
- Ockert, D. (2015b). A placement level study: Do students enjoy traditional or communicative activities? *The OnCUE Journal*, 8(1), 3-34.
- Ockert, D. (2015c, September). *Pedagogical Activity Preferences: Differences based on Placement Exam Level*. Paper presented at the CUE SIG 2015 Conference, *Diversity: Communication and Education*, Sugiyama Jogakuin University, Nagoya, September 26-27.
- Reid, J. (1990). The dirty laundry of ESL survey research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 323-338.
- Schmidt, R., & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (Technical Report #23, pp. 313-359). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Stevens, J. P. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.S

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watanabe, T. (2010). What comprises the foundation of communicative ability? Content and method for non-linguists. In M. Brierley, T. Tagami & Y. Lim (Eds.) *English for elementary schools*. Matsumoto, Japan: JALT Shinshu.
- Willis, J. (1996). A framework for task-based learning. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Willis, J. & Willis, D. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Some questions and answers. *The Language Teacher*, 33(3), 3-8.

Author Bio

David Ockert has a M.Ed. from Temple University and a Level 2 JLPT certificate. His research interests are in CLT, TBLT, CALL, motivation and student affect and self-determination theory in educational contexts.

Appendix

What classroom activities do you enjoy or find motivating?

Circle the number on the right that best matches your opinion.

1 = strongly dislike, 2 = dislike, 3 = neutral, 4 = like, 5 = strongly like

- 1) Lecture (Listen to the teacher and stay in my seat)
- 2) Listening exercises (using a cd, tape or DVD)
- 3) Dialogue / reading practice from the text
- 4) Writing exercises
- 5) Translation exercises
- 6) Grammar drills / practice
- 7) Small-group / team activities
- 8) Info-seek / finding information activities
- 9) Problem-solving activities
- 10) Activities where I am moving around in the room
- 11) Tasks that are intellectually challenging
- 12) Pair-work